

being a patent medicine eating and drinking people. In the priceless interest of their own health, in the name of common sense, in behalf of our common humanity, we think it time to ask them to pause and reflect upon what they are doing. * * *

In the interests of the public, we think the above mentioned clause ought to be elided, and the sale of all secret remedies forbidden; or in other words, that no proprietary mixtures or outward applications should be sold by any druggist until he is placed in possession of the prescription for the same.

CANADIAN PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY.

The regular monthly meeting was held on Wednesday evening 3rd inst., at the usual place; the President in the chair. After reading and adoption of minutes, the following new members were elected:

PRINCIPALS.

Arthur Boyle, St. Catharines.
C. McCallum, St. Mary's.
C. H. Kermott, Bell Ewart.

ASSISTANT.

J. F. Hopkins, Dunnville.

With regard to the progress made towards legislation, the President said that Dr. McGill had used every endeavour to obtain the passage of the proposed Act, but not being a Government measure, he had only obtained its first reading; it would, however, come on for an early discussion next Session. The President said that though we might regret the delay, still it would enable us to obtain a wider opinion on the Bill from all our own members, and if required, to make improvements in it.

Mr. Henderson then gave the following notice of motion:—"That on account of the delay in the passage of the proposed Pharmacy Bill, the Third Article of the Constitution be suspended until such time as the Society is incorporated."

The Corresponding Secretary, in giving the notice said that at present we were contravening the Constitution in admitting members without examination, and as it would be inadvisable to appoint examiners before the incorporation of the Society, he gave the notice of motion.

The Secretary called the attention of the members to the advisability of encouraging the junior non-resident members in studying, and thought that the offer of prizes by the Society for suitable essays on Pharmaceutical subjects would be useful for that object. The matter was left for the consideration of the members.

Meeting adjourned.

HENRY J. ROSE,
Secretary.

Communications.

The Proposed Pharmacy Act.

LINDSAY, Jan. 23, 1869.

To the Editor of the Canadian Pharmaceutical Journal.

DEAR SIR,—I send the following, perhaps, useless remarks upon what I conceive to be some imperfections in the proposed Pharmacy Bill.

It seems to me that section 3 compels the druggist to label all the articles in Schedule A with the name of such article, the address of the establishment, and, in addition, the word "Poison."

Would not this be very awkward in the case of a box of blue pills? If sold on prescription of an M. D., would not the patient be needlessly frightened, and the Dr. offended at the character "poison" being given to his medicine? Also, it is not always convenient to put "E. Gregory, Druggist, Lindsay," at the top of a dram pill-box. You may say that blue pills are not "poison"—but the law provides that they shall be so deemed.

Would it not be better to make a more careful distinction between the restrictions under which Parts 1 and 2 of Schedule A may be sold?—perhaps calling one section "poisons," and the other "poisonous."

Should not the Act settle the question as to whether poisons may be sold to women or children? Some druggists are much more careless than others in this respect. Would it not be better, in view of the frequent attempts to procure abortion, now so frequently recurring in Canada, to prohibit entirely the sale of Ergot, and some other articles, except to medical men, or on their prescription?

If these suggestions appear to be valuable, I shall be pleased; if not, the "waste basket" is the proper place for them.

Yours truly,

E. GREGORY.

We think our correspondent is mistaken regarding section 3 applying to physicians, as a subsequent clause provides that nothing in the Act shall interfere with physicians supplying their patients with the proper medicines, nor are the rights, at present enjoyed by the faculty, to be in any wise interfered with.—[Ed.]

CHEMICAL CLEANLINESS.

(From Chambers' Journal.)

One of the most active-minded and ingenious experimentalists in physics, Mr. Chas. Tomlinson, has recently called attention to the importance of a chemically clean surface in the performance of many experiments, and to the influence of dirt in modifying their results. His views were discussed in the Chemical Section of the British Association,

at the late Norwich meeting, and led to an amusing conversation as to what dirt really is; and the conclusion the philosophers arrived at was, that they could not do better than indorse Lord Palmerston's petty and comprehensive definition, that "Dirt is matter in the wrong place." Butter, for example, as one of our leading chemists observed, is matter, and very good matter too, in its proper place—namely, a piece of bread; but butter at the end of one's beard is matter in the wrong place, and consequently falls under the category of dirt. In his most recent article on this subject, Mr. Tomlinson defines a chemically unclean surface as "anything that is exposed to the products of respiration, or of combustion, or to the torch, or to the moles and dust of the air, and so becomes covered with a film more or less organic."—One of the most important discoveries is, that the supersaturated solutions of a number of salts contained in chemically cleaned vessels can be kept for a long time without crystallising, and be even reduced to temperatures much below the freezing point of water, provided they are protected from the moles and dust of the air and other chemically unclean bodies, by closing the mouth of the vessel with cotton wool, which filters the air. Any of our readers can easily repeat the experiment with sulphate of magnesia (Epsom salts), sulphate of soda, or phosphate of ammonia.

The extreme facility with which a chemically clean glass on a water surface may become chemically unclean, is illustrated by the following experiment with the camphor test, which may be thus described: If a few fragments of camphor be scraped from a fresh cut surface, and be allowed to fall upon water, they rotate with extreme velocity, and sweep over the surface, if the water be chemically clear; but if not, the fragments lie perfectly motionless. On a bright and sunny morning, with a dry air, "conditions highly favorable to the camphor motions, which depend as much on evaporation as on solution," Mr. Tomlinson filled four shallow, clean vessels, A, B, C, D, with water from the cistern tap. Camphor was very active on all four surfaces. He put his finger into A, and his tongue into B. Fresh fragments were motionless on A, but as active as before on B—showing that the finger was unclean, and that the tongue, instead of depositing a film, absorbed water and any possible film with it. The water was emptied from C, which was refilled from a so-called clean jug from the kitchen, filled from the same cistern tap; but the camphor fragments thrown on C were now motionless, showing that the jug had imparted an impurity to the water now in C. The water from D was also thrown away, and the glass rubbed and polished with a so-called clean glass-cloth. On again filling D from the tap, and throwing in fragments of camphor, there was no motion, the cloth having imparted a film to the water.

After these appalling revelations regarding the universal presence of dirt in apparently the cleanest of the vessels from which we eat and drink, it is with great satisfaction that we learn that some liquids (as ether and absolute alcohol) carry with them certain purifying influence of their own, and impart them to the water and the vessel; and strong wine (in consequence of the alcohol and vinic ether which it contains) thus possesses the property of making the wineglass into which it is poured chemically clear. If we take off about