

Legislation in the absence of Mr. Turner, the chairman, who had been called home that morning. The report dealt with a large number of applications from druggists and students for the various exemptions, special privileges, extensions of time, &c., so familiar to the council. The only case of much general interest was that of a druggist who had been in business from 1859 to 1864, since which he had only been intermittently engaged in business. Now he asks to be registered as a druggist on the ground that the Pharmacy Act passed in 1884 made provision for the registration of druggists who had been engaged in the business prior to that time. It was pointed out by the committee that such registration must be made within twelve months of the date of the passing of the act, but several years had elapsed in the case of the present application; the request was, therefore, refused. The matter of the London druggist who protested against being charged full fees because his money was not received until May 6, although he claimed to have sent it off April 27, was again reported on, and this time the committee reversed its former recommendation and now reported against the allowance of the rebate. With reference to the departmental store case (R. Simpson Co., Limited) the committee reported thus: "Re position of limited companies we recommend that in view of the opinion of our solicitors, if possible, the Infringement Committee be instructed to procure a similar action in another part of the province before a different magistrate in order, if possible, that an opinion may be obtained from the High Court on this issue."

Before allowing the report to pass, Mr. Karn called attention to the last quoted clause, and pointed out that the Infringement Committee had already searched the province through for a test case, but so far without success. He called attention to this fact that the druggists might be seized of the actual facts of the situation and not consider the council lax in its duty.

Mr. Karn then presented the report of the Infringement Committee, which is so interesting and important that we quote it in full:—

Toronto, August 5th, 1897.

To the president and members of the Ontario College of Pharmacy.

Your committee on infringements beg leave to submit the following report:—

Re communication of Mr. R. W. Elliott, we recommend that the request be granted, upon the Registrar endorsing the change upon the certificate.

Re communication of M. R. H. McNally, of Elmwood, the committee are of the opinion that fly pads come under the exemptions recorded in sec. 24 of the Pharmacy act, so long as the provisions of the said act is complied with.

Re communication of W. Bowers, J. P., Thessalon, concerning the conviction of D. A. McAlpine, your committee would

recommend that the college proceed to recover the fine.

Your committee have pleasure in reporting that they have used every endeavor to prosecute the fight against all parties who have been infringing upon the rights and privileges of the college. In every instance when any violation of the act has been discovered we have done our utmost to bring the transgressors to account. The work of our inspector has, upon the whole, been eminently satisfactory to the committee, inasmuch as he has at all times shown an earnest disposition to carry out the advice and instructions of the committee. Through him we have visited every portion of the province during the past six months, and endeavored to ferret out all the violations of a serious nature and to prosecute them, and in other cases of unconscious minor infringements to adjust matters in the simplest possible manner, until now we can assure the council and members of the college generally that the provisions of the act are being very well observed in every portion of the province.

Your committee instituted a trip of inspection from Toronto to the eastern portion of the province during February last, a visit to the south and western portion during March, another visit to the east in the first part of April, a trip from Toronto along the north shore as far as Rat Portage, lasting from April 27th to June 14th, and a trip through the west and northern portion of central Ontario during June and July.

The result of the work has been the examination of 144 cases, most of which were cases of arrears of fees. Fifty druggists were interviewed who were over one year in arrears, from among whom we have succeeded in collecting \$310, that would have been difficult to secure in the usual way. Some cases were many years in arrears and one in particular who paid over fees for 9 years and who had never been registered on the books of the college.

We found two cases where druggists were conducting a business without a graduate in charge but who promptly complied with the law.

In two instances we found druggists endeavoring to run two stores for one fee, both of whom were brought to account.

Your committee have succeeded in securing convictions against seventeen parties for keeping open shops, and otherwise infringing the act, from whom we have collected in fines \$280, while three cases are still in abeyance in the matter of payment of fines. The receipts through this source, however, are reduced by \$20 through two "moieties."

The following is a list of convictions:

A. B. Carscallen, Enterprise, fined \$20	
Clayton Copeland, " " " " " "	20
W. T. Earl, Athens.....	20
R. A. Rappell, " " " " " "	20
John P. Foley, Westport.....	20
E. J. Hart, " " " " " "	20
F. H. Pearsall, Port Rowan....	20

—Shire, Wiarton (moiety), fined \$10	
G. R. Fraser, Thamesville.....	20
S. Stewart, M.D., " " " " " "	20
Fred. Canniff, Rat Portage....	20
Michael & Levesque, Smith's Falls (moiety).....	10
Herbert Oliver, Springvale....	20
Jas. Torrance, Milverton.....	20
D. A. McAlpine, Thessalon....	20
*Jas. Fitzgerald, London.....	..

\$280

\*Convicted, but no fine imposed on condition the store be closed, which was done.

Three other informations have been laid, two of which stand, the other having been withdrawn on payment of back dues in full.

Your committee have further to report that the cost of prosecuting this work during the past six months has been large, amounting to \$734.65 as per following statement:—

Travelling expenses....	\$374 85
Inspector's salary....	280 00
Extra law costs....	35 00
Analytical Works, &c....	22 80
Chairman's expenses,	
'96-'97.....	22 00

\$734 65

While this amount may appear large, yet, when the amount of territory covered and the results accomplished are taken into consideration, your committee feel satisfied that the money has been well spent. After deducting \$280 in fines and \$310 of long standing fees, our work shows a loss of \$144.65, which we submit is a small outlay, when the results of increased protection to the members of the college are considered. Your committee are of the opinion that a much larger sum could be spent to advantage along lines that are now under consideration, and it is our hope that the committee on By-Laws and Legislation will be aggressive in the matter of legislation, in order to strengthen our hands in the work, and secure that protection to the members of the college which they are, or should be, entitled to under the act.

Your committee, in prosecuting their work have found eleven instances where no diploma was exhibited as required in sec. 21 of the act, and would respectfully warn all such transgressors of their liability as prescribed in sec. 28, and which it is the intention of your committee to have enforced.

We beg further to report the receipt of many enquiries re the sale of fly pads, by unqualified persons, and would here refer them to the opinion expressed in clause 2 of this report. We have also to report many enquiries re the sale of Paris Green, the clause referring to the sale of which seems to be less and less understood as the years roll by. Your committee regrets that they cannot find means of protecting the trade in the sale of such dangerous poison and refer them for consolation to the latter part of sec. 21 of the act as amended professedly in the public interest,