

CANADIAN DRUGGIST.

WM. J. DYAS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

SEPTEMBER 15th, 1890.

THE letter of Mr. John A. Clark in our July number has rather stirred up our contemporary, the *Pharmaceutical Journal*. No doubt Mr. Clark's object was to give publicity to his views on college matters and he knew that the only drug journal that was read carefully and thoroughly by the trade was the CANADIAN DRUGGIST.

WE HAVE been called the "organ" of the President of Ontario College of Pharmacy. Query: Who or what is the *Pharmaceutical Journal* the organ of? Certainly not of the Council under whose auspices it is supposed to be published, and with whose actions it is continually finding fault, nor of the druggists who sent those men to represent them at the Council Board.

As to being the organ of Mr. Clark, we will admit the fact in so far as that Mr. Clark being a druggist, and the CANADIAN DRUGGIST being the organ of the druggists of Canada, we may be properly styled an "organ," but outside of our representative capacity as the mouth piece of the Canadian drug trade, we disclaim any such term as "organ," neither being that of any college or society, or even what is termed by our neighbors across the border a "house organ," meaning a price list of some wholesale house under the guise of a trade journal.

WHAT the CANADIAN DRUGGIST assumes to be and what it is, is an independent journal published by a druggist for and in the interests of the druggists of this Dominion, and we will at all times be prepared to act independently, finding fault where occasion demands it, and bestowing praise where and when deserved, feeling that unbiased criticism is the only real check on wrong doers and encouragement for the worthy.

Notes on the Council Meeting.

The August meeting of the Council of the Ontario College of Pharmacy, reported in our last issue, shows that financially the college is in good shape, having a large balance to its credit, the mortgage debt also being reduced to \$8,000.

The employment of a salaried detective or prosecutor will we hope lead to a more systematic and persistent effort to weed out those who are illegally carrying on the drug business to the detriment of the trade.

A motion on the lines proposed in this journal some time ago, viz., to open negotiations with the Pharmaceutical Association of Quebec in relation to a mutual recognition of diplomas was carried, and we trust this much desired object will be accomplished.

The most startling action of the meeting was perhaps the passing of the motion notifying two of the professors that "their engagements would terminate at the end of twelve months." This is no doubt the outcome of the friction that has existed for some time between the principal of the college and a majority of the Council. Prof. Shuttleworth by his actions, as also by his articles in the *Journal*, evidently was of the opinion that the Council should not dictate to him, while on the other hand the Council, feeling that they were the employers, expected a courteous and willing acquiescence to the wishes of the Council from their employees. It is a matter of regret that any unpleasantness of this kind should arise, especially when it is considered that Prof. Shuttleworth was in one sense the originator and one of the prime movers in forming what is now, we believe, one of the leading pharmaceutical colleges on the continent. Still, it must be remembered that the Council are bound to do everything in their power to the advancement and well being of the college and profession, and should anything prove to them that a change was necessary, be it in the teaching staff or in any other detail of management, they would certainly be culpably negligent in allowing any such obstacle to retard its progress or check its usefulness.

This matter has caused a good deal of feeling amongst the druggists of the Province, but, we trust, that whatever has been done, and what may yet be done in the appointment of new professors and in the general management of the college, may result in giving an additional impetus to what is conducive to its best interests and the interests of pharmaceutical progress.

British Columbia News.

Business during the past month was rather quiet, both in the retail and wholesale way, but September opens out somewhat improved in tone.

W. E. McCartney, of Kamloops, sold out to A. W. Harding, of Vancouver, formerly of Welland, Ont.

J. A. Teepoorten and G. Jessop have opened a drug store in Chilliwack, under the name of the "Chilliwack Drug Co." and are doing a fair business. Chilliwack is in a good farming district, and hitherto has been without the needful druggist.

Commercial men are very much exercised just now with regard to the \$50 semi-annual license, which is imposed by the Corporation of Victoria. It was formerly \$10, and was paid without much protest. The druggists of that City are afraid that they will miss the genial faces of many of their old friends, who claim that they are "selling so close" they cannot stand the pressure.

Aristol in suppositories is prescribed in 5 to 15 grain doses.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To THE EDITOR:

The July number of the "CANADIAN DRUGGIST," contained a letter from the President of the Ontario College of Pharmacy, making some statements that are untrue, and others that are misleading.

The undignified attack upon the Dean of the College, is largely untrue and malicious, and no doubt Prof. Shuttleworth will take steps to prove the falsity of the statements made.

The assertion that members of former councils were slow—and as Mr. Clark hints, incapable—is not supported by the facts. Such men as Benjamin Lyman, William Elliot, William Saunders, Edmund Gregory and others, to say the least, possessed quite as much ability and energy as Mr. Clark and his followers, and he has no right to make such reflections on them.

Mr. Clark says, that the Amendments, 1889, to the Pharmacy Act, "Have been clearly demonstrated by the most impartial authorities to have been steps in the right direction." It would be interesting to know *who* are the impartial authorities quoted.

It is untrue that the Principal of the School paid "To the Lecturers whatever he chose to give, and they would accept for their work." The Principal was paid 10 per cent. of all fees, (excepting the one for matriculation) for his services as Dean or Principal, and the balance was equally divided among all the lecturers (including the Principal) in proportion to the number of hours' work given, and according to the agreement made with the Council in 1886. See *Can. Ph. Journal* Sept., 1886, page 23.

The charge that the Principal "farmed out the work to the cheapest and most obedient laborers that he could obtain" is false, as Mr. Clark well knows, and is an insult to the lecturers, and an injury to the college, inasmuch as it is calculated to lower the reputation of the college in the opinion of readers of Mr. Clark's letter, i.e., if they place any faith in his statements. Mr. Clark's remarks on the engagement of the demonstrator are misleading, and would convey the impression that the report of the Educational Committee in February, 1889, was deceptive. I was then Chairman of that committee and the demonstrator was temporarily engaged by my instructions, under authority of the Council meeting of August, 1888, as shown by the committee's report of February, 1889. There was nothing to be concealed in this matter, as might be supposed from Mr. Clark's letter. I do not think that Prof. Shuttleworth has made as much money out of the school as Mr. Clark states, but why should he *not* be well paid? The reputation of the Principal and the work he has done brought about the success of the college, and the remuneration received by him was only what had been agreed upon with the Council in 1886, when the school was not