

'DRUG' CLAUSE / IS QUESTIONED

Attorney-General and Dr.
Forbes Godfrey Clash on
Disease Bill

SELLING OF REMEDIES

Matter of Druggists' Prescribing
Remedies for Venereal Patients
is Challenged.

Members of the Legislature had almost forgotten what a verbal battle sounded like, and when they heard Hon. I. B. Lucas and Dr. Forbes Godfrey, the West York member, exchanging verbal bouquets yesterday afternoon they could hardly believe their ears. The Opposition and the Government have buried the hatchet since the truce was declared at the outset of the session, so it remained for Government members to stage a set-to among themselves. The differences between the Attorney-General and the member for West York occurred when the House was in committee on the bill to prevent venereal diseases. The doctor declared that it was a grave mistake to allow any druggist to sell drugs for the treatment of venereal diseases without a prescription from a medical practitioner after a proper diagnosis. He suggested that the only reason he could find for the measure being introduced was for the benefit of commercial interests. The Attorney-General refused to allow any such allegations to go unchallenged and he protested most vehemently.

Hon. Mr. Lucas said he resented the imputation made by Dr. Godfrey that the "drug" clause was inserted in the bill because of the influence brought to bear on him from commercial interests. "It is there with the full consent of the health authorities of the Province, and it was recommended by the Commissioner who drafted the bill," declared the Minister. He cautioned the doctor against losing his head. This brought the West York member to his feet again. He retorted that the Attorney-General, in his enthusiasm, sometimes lost his head.

Deputation Had Success.

"The honorable gentleman should not say that I have lost my head because this happens to be something that I know something about," replied Dr. Godfrey. "I know that certain pharmaceutical gentlemen approached the Minister. I do not know whether they discussed the dog tax bill or something else or not, but we know that the sub-section stayed in to protect their business—the business of counter prescribing. If what I am stating is my opinion, it is my opinion based on facts that I know, and my honorable friend hasn't any business, in my humble opinion, to impute to me motives that I haven't given utterance to in this House."

The Attorney-General again took the doctor to task. He said that the West York member had again made a statement that was incorrect, because he had told the House last Friday the facts about the deputation of druggists which waited on him. However, he again explained that the deputation protested against the clause as it stood, contending that the power given the Provincial authorities to refuse approval of any drug placed the doctors in supreme

Control.

"What is the clause in for then?" asked Dr. Godfrey. "They don't want it, I don't want it, and the medical profession doesn't want it." Mr. Lucas offered no explanation. The Opposition Leader, Mr. Proodfoot, said that the bill was not in the interest of victims of venereal diseases, that druggists should practically be allowed to prescribe. He was not satisfied that the Provincial health authorities would have sufficient power to give or refuse approval to particular drugs to make it a real safeguard. A drug that might be all right for one victim might do harm to another. Mr. Thomas Marshall of Lincoln bore out his leader in this argument.

Sir William Hearst said that if any of the drugs were dangerous for one kind of venereal disease the medical authorities would not allow them to be sold. The bill had been reported by a committee composed of all the doctors of the House. He thought it better to err on the side of not going far enough than to go too far.

Dr. Robb of Algoma, on the Government side, and Sam Carter of South Wellington both supported the clause. Dr. Godfrey moved an amendment to strike out the clause permitting druggists to sell approved drugs without a doctor's prescription. However, the House voted it down, and the bill was given its final reading. It will become law July 1.

Bounty on Timber Wolves.

The House approved a motion brought in by Hon. Mr. McGarry to increase the bounty for the killing of grey timber wolves from \$15 to \$20.

A bill was introduced by Mr. J. C. Elliott (West Middlesex) to amend the Natural Gas Act. It provides for compensating the persons who have been financially prejudiced on account of the recent legislation, and also for remedying the omissions from the last act. The bill also provides for making the recent act applicable only to emergencies caused by cold weather.

Mr. J. H. Ham (South Brant) asked the Prime Minister why commercial travellers were being discriminated against in the bill allowing railway employees to vote at municipal elections three days before election day. The Leader of the Opposition pressed the same point.

Sir William Hearst intimated that the Government had given some consideration to including commercial travellers in the bill. However, when the Government is advancing one step there is no reason for thinking discrimination is being shown. There is some difference between commercial travellers and railroad men, he said, as the former are home over the week-end, and municipal elections usually take place on Monday. He asked that the advisability of including commercial travellers in the act be left over until next session. Then the bill was given third reading.

Mr. Dewart Stands Alone.

Mr. Hartley Dewart (Southwest Toronto) protested against the records of the House stating that the bill to extend the duration of the Legislature until after the close of the war had been carried "unanimously." On the second reading Mr. Dewart voted alone against the measure.

The Prime Minister replied that the word "unanimous" did not apply to the second reading of the bill, but to certain statements expressed when the bill was introduced.