

ing that it might well have been conferred upon an older man in the profession. He assured them that he would do all in his power to promote the interests of the Association and of the profession, and he hoped their proceedings in the meeting would be characterized by harmony, and that the work upon which they had entered would be crowned with success.

A resolution was carried providing for an evening session. The convention adjourned until the evening.

On resuming after recess

Mr. Hall moved that the reports from the districts be referred to the Council. Carried.

On resolution the order of the proceedings was varied from that given in the printed programme, so as to permit the consideration of the amendments in the Pharmacy Act proposed by the Council of the Ontario College of Pharmacy.

Mr. Petrie, Chairman of the Council Committee on By-laws and Legislation, gave a verbal statement of the changes proposed. The first amendment was to clause 4 of the Act and would have the effect of restricting membership in the Council of the College to the retail trade. It was proposed also to make clear the time of election and character of those voting by fixing it for the first Wednesday in July every second year, and those to be entitled to vote who were carrying on business in their own name. A change in section 8 was proposed affecting the number of meetings, the two meetings at present fixed coming at awkward times in respect to the examinations. It was felt also that having only two meetings a year the business could be transacted only by the members of the Council sitting longer and later than they could reasonably be expected to do. Therefore it was proposed that the Council should meet in January, June and October of each year. The cost of the additional meeting would be only from \$150 to \$175. It was proposed also to vest in the Council and the staff of the College more authority over the students with a view to repressing any improprieties. This power was held by Colleges as a rule. The Council proposed that hereafter one desiring to be apprenticed must remit \$1 to the Council with a certificate showing that he has taken his degree in arts or has matriculated in arts, or has passed the first examination for a second or third non-professional certificate. It was now the custom of the Registrar under instructions, to keep a register of apprentices. It was proposed that this should be made a part of his statutory duties. Owing to the non-acceptance of the Ontario diplomas by the English College it was desired to strike out the special mention of that College in clause 15. It was desired that clause 18 should be amended so as to provide that a manager of a branch store shall pay \$4 a year to the College. No change in other sections was proposed until section 24 was reached, and in that a radical change would be asked. It was intended to make this section cover "Any person who

shall sell or keep open shop for the retail selling or dispensing of poisons, or selling or attempting to sell any of the articles in schedule A of this Act, or any mixture or compound containing any of the articles in said schedule A, or assuming or using the title of chemist or druggist, &c., unless registered." It was provided, however, that sale of poisonous insecticides might be made by any person not within five miles of a drug store. By this clause it was hoped to place in the hands of the druggists, where it ought to be, the sale of such dangerous poisons as Paris green and London purple. It was proposed to amend section 25 so as to enable the Lieut.-Gov.-in-Council, on it being shown by the report of a public analyst that any preparation for the treatment of disease or injury or for use as a cosmetic contains poison, to prohibit the sale of it save by a licensed druggist. In reference to physicians carrying on business as druggists it was proposed to amend the Act so as to prohibit any physician in a town or city from carrying on business as a druggist except by passing the examination and by ceasing to practice as a physician. A proviso was added excepting those already in business in such cases. An additional clause was proposed more clearly defining the nature of a chemist and druggist under the Act.

Mr. Smith, of Guelph, moved that this association approve of the proposed amendments and that a committee consisting of the Officers and Council of the Association be appointed to assist in having these amendments incorporated in the Act.

Mr. Petrie, replying to a question, explained that there was no desire on the part of the Council to make an invidious distinction as between cities and towns on one side and villages on the other in respect of the licensing of physicians. But there was a precedent in Quebec for the step here proposed, and the belief was that if this point was granted a future amendment would make it general.

Mr. Muir expressed doubt of the advisability of expressing concurrence in these amendments *en bloc* after a mere verbal statement of them. Before he voted he would like to have the privilege of reading them.

Mr. Gibbard objected to the amendment confining the right to vote to those doing business in their own names. There were some members of the profession who would be excluded under such an amendment.

Mr. Petrie thought this an argument for the amendment as it would tend to have those in business carry on business in their own name. What was wanted was to have those as voters who were carrying on business in their own name.

Mr. Gibbard contended that it was not reasonable to ask the association to accept these amendments merely because they had been considered by a committee of the Council and approved by the Council. Not all the amendments to the law which had been secured by the Council had been in the interest of the druggists. One instance was the listing of carbolic acid.

This provision of the act was unjust, and as a matter of fact it was violated by all who sold carbolic acid. (No, no.) He contended that those in this very room violated this part of the law. It was unreasonable to list phenacetine among the poisons. He thought also that there was no good reason for increasing the expense of the Council by adding to the number of meetings. He thought there were occasions when a meeting might be omitted without material injury to the College or the profession. As to the five mile limit, they need not expect to get that while the present Premier held his place.

Mr. Mackenzie said he thought Mr. Gibbard had lost sight of the retail interest in his remarks. He (Mr. Mackenzie) believed it was to the interest of the retailer to have as large an interest in the schedule as possible, for it gave the retail druggists control of the sale of those articles. Mr. Gibbard's objection to the clause relating to persons carrying on business in their own name seemed to indicate a desire on the part of that gentleman to have the clause so written that it would allow the re-opening of pharmacies which were among the worst things the profession ever had to contend against. If Mr. Gibbard had succeeded in being elected to the Council he probably would not have spoken as he had about the Council meetings. He did not want to stand as a pleader for the Council men, but he knew that members of the Council were called upon to devote a great deal of time to the business of the College and that the short reports of results arrived at were not a fair indication of the work involved in achieving those results.

Mr. Everest said the majority, like himself, could not vote intelligently on the changes. As the Legislature does not meet until January delay is advisable. He suggested that a copy of the amendments be sent to every pharmacist in Ontario asking for an expression of opinion.

Mr. Hall favored the resolution and the adoption of the amendment. Mr. Muir's idea of reading them could not well be carried out as they had not yet been reduced to the exact form that would be necessary. That was work for the solicitor to do, but the Council guaranteed that they would be substantially as Mr. Petrie had explained them. As to the five mile limit and not being able to get it under the present Premier's administration, he had only to say that it was the Premier himself who had suggested it in 1889 as a way out of the difficulty. This and other amendments were passed by the Government, but were not accepted by the House. He believed that with the support of the united body of druggists they would be successful next session. As to Mr. Everest's objection he dwelt upon the importance of having a resolution of endorsement from the Association to show the Government, and not the approval merely of a number of pharmacists. He argued that the Association should come to a decision on the matter.

Mr. Edmondson thought the five mile