

Correspondence.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the opinions of correspondents. Correspondents must in all cases send name and address, not necessarily for publication.

The "Reason Why."

Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—Under "Reason Why" in CANADIAN DRUGGIST, July number Mr. Dettlor attacks the Council of College of Pharmacy, regarding faulty legislation, etc. Permit me to say first, regarding collection of fees: The fee question was a settled law some years ago, and if there is any fault it belongs to long ago, and again two years ago on motion of the Council these fees were reduced one-half (it evidently was not fees they were after then). This fee question being law, it was only right they should be collected. If Mr. Lewis, the secretary, be one referred to as having a fat salary, as your correspondent terms it, let me say he earns it, as by his earnest and constant endeavor, more just due and overdue fees are collected: then why not reward him if he is (and he is) a good servant? If, however, some of the professors are the men who receive too much, why do you not write the chairman of the Educational Committee and let them know how you are aware these men are wholly unfit for their positions? Again, the legislation as it now stands was opposed by the council and a large delegation of Ontario druggists, some four years ago. Was Mr. Dettlor one of them? Again, the legislation was opposed two and a half years ago by members representing the council. Did he aid? Did he correspond with his local member on that occasion, asking him to help the thirteen men who go to act for nearly 900 druggists? Lastly may I ask, does he know what the "fat salaries" of the council men are? Their mileage and four dollars daily. Now, say they stay at a hotel costing, at lowest, \$1 per day; they usually sit for four days, there is \$16 less \$4 at hotel, leaving \$12 to pay for any loss of sales they might have made in their own store while away, and pay any extra help required during their absence, or \$24 per year clean over and above. What an awful outrage, is it not? A very fat salary; and this is true. Now ask yourself if the fault is not with (including myself) druggists in not setting our united efforts together, and when the council ask help or seem to need it, we do not stir ourselves and render the necessary aid. I knew a fellow druggist in our district who, when the members had waited on Sir Oliver Mowat and had been unsuccessful, said he would like to have a round with Sir Oliver: he would make him give us better legislation—he would tell him (Sir Oliver) something—now how many of us are there like this man. When we were trying to form a Provincial Association in Toronto, he was in the city buying fancy goods,

and being met on Yonge street by a fellow druggist, and asked if he was going up to the association meeting that day, replied, no, he had not time. Is it wonderful if he would have time to ask Sir Oliver for better legislation? No sir, if Mr. Dettlor sees where the council can make improvement, let him write them and suggest a remedy, rather than find a fault without a remedy. Then when they act, back them up, and if all the Ontario druggists would but do this 900 men can bring a grand influence to bear upon the government—and when success is obtained, you will be proud of your council and your representative. Help your member, write him, go and see him, you will learn, he will learn, and you will know each other better, and you for one will be very sure to see a nomination goes in every time if he is not satisfactory, then for some other person.

Mr. Editor, excuse me for being so long, but while I cannot agree with Mr. Dettlor, I admire him for coming out with what he has to say, for this is the only way to get entanglements unravelled. I hope I may not seem offensive to him, but on contrary, would be glad to aid him in any reasonable proposal he would like to make, and bye and bye we will go along together, business more successful, council more satisfactory, and all happy to gether.

Yours in hard times,

J. M. HARGREAVES.

No 12 district member.

Pharmaceutical Examinations.

The preliminary board of examiners of the Pharmaceutical Association of the Province of Quebec held their quarterly examination in the Montreal College of Pharmacy on Friday, July 2nd, 1897, when thirty-one candidates presented themselves, and of these the following were successful and are named in order of merit, namely: T. A. Swift, Miss N. Cutler, L. E. Vadboncourt, Samuel Kennedy, F. J. McKenna, F. C. B. Wilson, Howard Fraser and J. N. Boileau. These are entitled to be registered as certified apprentices. The following candidates passed on all subjects but geography, for which subject they will be required to present themselves at the October examinations, namely: D. Tessier and W. Dubois. The remainder of the applicants were referred back for further study. The subjects examined upon were French, English, Latin, arithmetic, history and geography.

The examiners were the Rev'd L'Abbe Verreau, Principal of Jacques Cartier Normal School and Prof. Isaac Gammell of the High School, Montreal.

The next examination will be held on October 7th, 1897.

Urisolvin, as its name would suggest, is a solvent for uric acid. Urisolvin consists of urea and acid citrate of lithium.

Ontario College of Pharmacy.

SEMI-ANNUAL COUNCIL MEETING.

The regular semi-annual meeting of the Council of the Ontario College of Pharmacy opened at 2.30 o'clock on the afternoon of Tuesday, the 3rd inst., in the board room at the College building, Gerard Street East, Toronto. This being the first meeting of the new Council elected last month, more than usual interest attached to the proceedings. When Mr. J. H. Mackenzie, retiring president, took the chair, eleven representatives were in their places, and two seats were vacant owing to the failure of the electors to nominate representatives. These vacancies were subsequently filled by the Council, and the completed Council stands as follows:

No. 1 Division, consisting of the counties of Glengarry, Prescott, Stormont, Russell, Dundas, Carleton, Grenville, Lanark and Renfrew—Mr. Henry Waters, Ottawa (re-elected by acclamation).

No. 2 Division, consisting of the counties of Leeds, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, Prince Edward and Hastings—Mr. J. H. Dickey, Trenton (re-elected by acclamation).

No. 3 Division, consisting of the counties of Northumberland, Durham, Peterborough, Victoria and Ontario—Mr. A. J. Davis, Port Perry (elected by Council). The former representative of the division was Mr. John McKee, Peterborough.

No. 4 Division, consisting of the following wards in the City of Toronto: St. George's, St. Lawrence's, St. John's, St. James', St. Thomas', St. David's and St. Matthew's—Mr. Isaac Currie, Toronto (elected by acclamation). The former representative of this division was Mr. C. D. Daniel, Toronto.

No. 5 Division, consisting of the following wards in the City of Toronto: St. Paul's, St. Patrick's, St. Stephen's, St. Mark's, St. Andrew's and St. Alban's—Mr. J. H. McKenzie, Toronto (re-elected by acclamation).

No. 6 Division, consisting of the counties of Simcoe, York (except the City of Toronto), the provisional county of Haliburton, and the districts of Algonia and Parry Sound, Muskoka, Thunder Bay, Nipissing and Rainy River—Mr. George A. Hunter, Sault Ste. Marie. In this division Mr. W. J. Douglass, Collingwood, contested the seat, the figures being: Hunter 36, Douglass 18. Mr. D. H. MacLaren, Barrie, was the former representative.

No. 7 Division, consisting of the counties of Peel, Wellington, Halton and Dufferin—Mr. A. Turner, Orangeville (re-elected by acclamation).

No. 8 Division, consisting of the counties of Wentworth, Lincoln and Welland—Mr. George B. McCullough, Hamilton (elected by acclamation). The former representative of this division was Mr. G. W. Sprockman, Hamilton.

No. 9 Division, consisting of the counties of Haldimand, Brant and Waterloo—