

sections were repealed. Thursday was substituted for Wednesday as the day for the meeting of the Council. Section 5 provided for the registration, on payment to the registrar of the college of a fee of \$4, of any person in business as a chemist or druggist, or who had served an apprenticeship of three years and acted as a druggist's assistant for one year. The Bill also increased the fee of candidates for certificates from \$4 to \$10. While the Act made the maximum penalty for infringing the Act \$50, it did not provide for a minimum penalty, which the present Bill proposed should be \$20 for the first, and \$10 for each subsequent offence. He mentioned some further provisions with reference to apprenticeships.

Mr. LAUDER—Does the Pharmaceutical Association approve of the Bill?

Mr. CLARKE—They do.

Mr. BOULTER objected to the Bill requiring all persons who dispensed drugs to register under the Pharmacy Act, as some now registered under the Medical Act.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) did not know whether the Government approved of the restrictive kind of legislation proposed by this Bill; but he thought they would require better reasons for doing so than those given by the hon. gentleman who proposed the second reading. Its object seemed to be to interfere with the free course of trade; they might as well attempt to interfere with the business of ordinary shopkeepers. The whole apparent intention of the Bill was to compel all parties who sold medicine to be subject to this Association, and to pay their fees. He thought several of the sections were quite *ultra vires*, as they were intended to restrict this particular trade.

Mr. CLARKE (Norfolk) said if the hon. gentleman had studied medical jurisprudence he would have found that this kind of legislation was necessary for the protection of the public against the incompetency of ignorant druggists. The Pharmacy Act was a transcript of the English Pharmacy Act, adapted to the necessities of this country. The amendments he proposed were not for the benefit of pharmacists, but entirely in the interests of the public, and did not hamper trade. Abuses had been fewer since the passing of the Act, and the proposed amendments would make them still fewer. He thought the comparison of this trade with ordinary trades was unfair.

Mr. MOWAT said that as his hon. friend opposite (Mr. Macdougall) did not object to the second reading of the Bill, it would be unnecessary for him to make many remarks. The hon. gentleman had expressed doubts as to whether the Bill was in the competence of the Local Legislature, on the ground that it interfered with trade. A man required now to be pretty bold who would dogmatise as to what was under the jurisdiction of the Local House; but when the Pharmacy Act was passed in 1871, it was generally assumed that they had jurisdiction, and he did not think any harm had resulted in consequence. He admitted that there should be a strong case to justify any change being made in the revised statutes; but the general object of this Bill was to secure a larger measure of public confidence in persons engaged in the business of pharmacists.

Mr. MACDOUGALL—I don't see any clause that looks that way.

Mr. MOWAT said the general tenor of the Bill indicated it. The Bill might perhaps require some further amendments, which could be made by the Committee to whom it would be referred. He was quite willing that the second reading should take place.

Mr. BARR took objection to the 17th clause, which, he contended, would give young chemists an advantage over the chemists who obtained their certificates under the old Act. He thought the word "examination" should be struck out of the clause.

The Bill was read the second time and referred to a Special Committee consisting of Messrs. Hardy, Macdougall, Baxter, Haney, Harkin, Barr, Boulter, McMahon, Mostyn, O'Sullivan, Wilson, Striker, Preston, Grange, Deroche, and the mover.

#### MECHANICS' LIEN ACT.

Mr. ROBINSON moved the second reading of a Bill to amend the Mechanics' Lien Act. He remarked that the Act passed in 1874 did not go far enough for the protection of the workman and mechanic. The proposed measure provided that 10 per cent. of the contract price should be retained by the owner of the property for ten days after the work was completed to give the workmen a chance to take out a lien. A great many contractors were in favour of this Bill, which he thought would remedy a serious defect in the existing law.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE said he had a Bill on the subject, and he asked the hon. member for Kingston to allow his to stand so that both measures might be considered together in Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON had looked over the Bill of the hon. member for Ottawa, and he found that not only did it cover a large number of matters in the present Act, but that it went further than people generally would like to go. He was disposed to press his Bill.

Mr. MEREDITH thought the House should have some explanation of the Government policy in relation to those Bills, which he considered leaned in a dangerous direction.

Mr. CROOKS said the object of the Bill proposed by the hon. member for Kingston was to make the protection of the workman more specific than it is under the present law, to the extent of holding a drawback of ten per cent. of the contract price. That provision did not interfere in the least with the revised Statutes, and he thought it could not work injuriously.

Mr. MEREDITH thought the provision would injure the employer, and not add much to the security of the employed.

Mr. SCOTT suggested that the Bills should go to Committee together and that the question of whether any further legislation on this subject was necessary at present should be carefully considered. The Bill of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. O'Donoghue) proposed to give the mechanic a lien not simply on real estate, but on any class of personal property. That was a provision which required the attention of the Government before it passed into law. But the Bill had another strong clause, which provided that the mechanic should have a lien on all the property of his employer. This, he thought, should also receive the consideration of the Government. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. O'DONOGHUE said if both Bills were sent to a Committee, the Government would have an opportunity of studying what course to pursue with reference to them. He thoroughly believed in all that his Bill proposed, and perhaps a little more, and had he not thought it was a just measure he would not have introduced it.

Mr. MEREDITH said the House should be careful in legislating in this direction. While endeavouring to secure to the workman the reward for his labour, they should not attempt to interfere with the building operations throughout the country. He thought the retention of ten per cent. of the contract price by the owner would interfere with the building, and instead of benefitting the mechanic would work in the opposite direction. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ROBINSON was understood to say that in all contracts above a certain amount there was a clause that twenty per cent. of the contract price should not be paid until the work was finished. Therefore the provision in his Bill could not interfere with building operations.

Mr. MEREDITH—But you take this ten per cent. to pay the labourer, if necessary.

Mr. ROBINSON—Well, the labourer has as much right to be paid as the contractor. The amendment, I think, is a perfectly reasonable one, and one to which contractors do not object.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Simcoe) asked if the measure, should it go into effect, would