

To quote also from the statement of the Board made July 22, 1919: "Indeed, the laxity that arose through misinterpretation or otherwise of a physician's rights of prescription under the Act reached such a pitch that the Ontario Medical Council felt obliged to cancel the status of five physicians who had been convicted in Police Court for violation of the Act, and to suspend two others. It is but fair to say, however, that the physicians who had offended by giving evasive prescriptions in large numbers are a small minority of the profession."

It must be admitted, however, that among the unscrupulous the law formed a splendid loop-hole for pecuniary advancement. This was strikingly evident during the recent Epidemic of Influenza. Men with exceedingly small practices, and some with apparently none at all, suddenly developed a practice which required from 200 to 1,200 prescriptions a week. I think I may safely say that no doctor in Ontario is justified in prescribing alcohol in such quantities. This prescribing has, in many cases, been most remunerative. One practitioner told me that he had written few prescriptions, and those only to his own patients, but actual count showed that he had issued 3,900 in five months. He charged regularly not less than \$1.00, and generally \$2.00, for each prescription. Such men have brought odium on Medical men. Surely we, as a Profession, cannot stand idly by and countenance such flagrant actions.

What is to be the outcome? If the Temperance Act stands we must try to find some measure to cope with the situation. In order to protect the Medical Profession as a whole, we must demand adequate punishment for offenders, and we must also aim at gaining legislation which will prevent such glaring transgressions as have been reported. The License Board and the Government both say that the Doctor is the person qualified to prescribe liquor, and therefore all alcoholic beverages must be procured from a licensed regular physician. If the Doctor follows the law, further legislation of the matter is unnecessary, but for the above-mentioned unscrupulous, laws must be made to protect the Profession. Firstly, there should be some limit placed on the number of prescriptions one man may issue. Because of the varying sizes of practices, this number cannot be absolute, but must be relative to the size of the man's practice. Surely it might be possible to devise a method whereby a physician would be obliged to prove that he prescribed only to his own patients. There are certain difficulties about this means, but it should do away with a great deal of promiscuous prescribing. So much for prevention. For those who transgress there must be punishment. The Legislature, at its last session, passed an amendment to the Medical Act, whereby a member may be suspended from practice for a limited period. This is a great improvement on the only method previ-