

against the paltry remuneration he has received, and that the training has only formed a portion of what he is expected to possess in order to qualify for the certificate entitling him to registration as a competent pharmacist.

I think that you will agree with me that this is about the true facts of the case, and that such a method of carrying to completion the contract to teach and instruct, or cause to be instructed in the art, trade or business of a pharmaceutical chemist according to the best of our ability, is manifestly unfair to those who have entrusted themselves to our care and guidance without the knowledge we possess that more than we are giving will be required of them. Under this contract, which is definite, it is our duty to see that, in addition to the practical knowledge from routine work, some general course of study shall be pursued which will serve as a ground work for the College course later on. I do not consider that it is necessary for the preceptor to sit down and drill the study into his charge, but that he set apart certain work and indicate what will be well for the apprentice to devote attention to. It is not enough that he do so and order home study. Home study is not in the contract. It is his duty to see that such knowledge is obtained during the hours devoted to his service. If he only insists upon one hour's work each day it will amount to a period of four months' study in the four years, or about equal a College course in time. The knowledge thus acquired will not only serve the future needs of the apprentice, but it will prove of inestimable value to his employer who can depend upon a more intelligent performance of responsible duties. Both will be benefited, and will sever their relationship feeling that each has done his duty to the other.

Apart from this duty, which is one of moral necessity, owing to contract, there are many other ways in which masters could promote the future welfare of their apprentices, which, I fear, are too often neglected. Many young men enter this as well as other professions without possessing the slightest adaptation for the work they have chosen. In all such cases, when their employer is satisfied that they have mistaken their calling, it is his duty to advise them so and to impress upon them the desirability of engaging in something else in which there would be a reasonable prospect of their succeeding. Again, many young men come from country towns and villages to large cities where temptations are greater and where supervision of their conduct is necessarily more lax, and, as a result, in many cases before their apprenticeship period expires, they have formed habits of conduct which are bound to exercise a pernicious influence over their lives, their prospects and their professional standing. Our duty in this respect is certainly not a matter of contract, but we nevertheless owe to ourselves, our employees and our profession such an observance of interest in the moral welfare of our apprentices as will enable them to leave our establishment in every respect bettered by their connection with us. I cannot suggest any better method of restraint in such cases than by the exercise of personal influence in a kindly manner; by showing an interest in matters in which you see they are inclined to interest themselves, so long as such matters would not be likely to prove harmful; to converse with them frequently upon the abstract principles which must determine their success, such as integrity of character, upon which their credit will depend. The necessity for steady, patient effort, free from outside allurements, and the need for economy, good judgment, courage, politeness and good address. Show them, as far as possible, your business experience, interest them in the financial conduct of business—how money is saved by securing discounts and to what extent a credit business can be conducted with safety. It will not do us any harm to impart such information and it will certainly do them good, by showing them that we are interested in their future prosperity. Of course circumstances must largely determine how far it will be necessary for us to act in this way, but I am satisfied that if we exercise proper judgment and treat our apprentices as we would

desire others to treat our own sons we will be sure to perform our duty and exercise an influence for good upon future generations of pharmacists.

In conclusion I desire again to refer to and emphasize our duty to one another in maintaining as far as possible a safe position from which we can together act for our common welfare. We may honestly differ in our views and methods, but such differences should not be permitted to deter us from co-operating with one another. Let us strive to maintain and sustain the high principles upon which we are supposed to act, and if we can do so and succeed we may reasonably hope for an honorable way out of any vexatious difficulties which may beset us. Let our aim ever be, to be what we ought to be, to do what we ought to do, and to recognize and support all influences which will be likely to elevate our standing above that of mere commercial life, and we will have little cause to fear a lack of harmonious unity amongst our members.

Correspondence.

Facts in Reply to Mr. Sanders in Canadian Pharmaceutical Journal.

To the Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—If the letter of Mr. Sanders on College extravagance is as timely as he would fain make Druggists believe, it is to be regretted that he didn't see fit to raise his voice long ere this to check the corrupt practices he now complains of. If the whole truth were known why he now assumes such a belligerent attitude, it would doubtless be seen that the timely character of his letter has a much deeper significance to friends who do not pay \$1 each year than to those who do. The whole letter is a clear piece of by-play and does not deserve a reply, but to show that there are always different ways of exhibiting an analysis I will oblige him this time.

Taking each of his statements as he has presented them I will show how much genuine truth there is in them. Mention is made of the squandering of the annual dues for Druggists and a commitment for all time by the Council for that amount. I may just here venture the remark that the Act demands a payment of \$4 and has done so since its formation in 1871. But I do hope that in the very near future a portion of that amount may be returned to the druggists in the shape of a rebate. The Journal Contract framed in 1883, to which I find Mr. Sanders a consenting party, compels the Council to pay for each druggist in business about \$1 their annual dues for a periodical that many believe is not worth the one-fourth of that amount, and it is said that it is a tax for all time, but it is to be hoped that the said contract will be interpreted in a different way, and it is the duty of the Council to free the druggists from such an incubus; and I was in favor of such a course. Mr. Sanders would lead the druggists to believe that a portion of the annual dues is being used to support the teaching department. I take issue with him on that score and am free to say that the annual dues are not used in that way. Mr. Sanders attacks the Registrar-Treas. and his emolument. Now let us prove his sincerity in that particular. It is true I gave notice last August to amend By-law No. 3, and proposed to make that officer's salary \$1000 per year. The work of Registrar has of late years increased vastly, and his whole time is devoted to the work from nine o'clock in the morning until night each working day of the year. His responsibilities are great, and he needs to be careful, prompt and intelligent, and I hold that his duties are such that he is entitled to such remuneration. His duties cannot be performed by "any druggist's assistant during his leisure hours." However let us see what Mr. Sanders' opinion was (when the work was not nearly so heavy), so long ago as September, 1886. In the minutes of Council held August 4th, 5th and 6th 1886, Mr. Sanders gave notice

to amend By-law No. 3, just what the proposed amendment was it does not state. At the next meeting of Council it is recorded that Mr. Sanders moved his motion, and it is not even there stated what his amendment was, but on the notes of the Council meeting made by his friend, the Editor of the *Canadian Pharmaceutical Journal*, we find the following:—"A considerable portion of the second day was taken up by a discussion on a motion of W. B. Sanders to raise the Registrar's salary from \$600 to \$1000, to take effect the 1st of August next. It was claimed that as that officer devoted the whole of his time from nine in the morning until night to the duties of his office in the College, his remuneration was inadequate to the services performed. "Consistency thou art a jewel." Mr. Sanders' position on this question is no more sincere than his other attacks, and the mean insinuation that the Registrar is corrupt and that the Council seeks shelter on any question is as untrue as his many other misleading comparisons in his letter.

On my introduction to the Council, August, 1889, the question of salaries pertaining to the teachers came before us and the College year 1891, which he institutes as a comparison to the year 1889, and which is considered a remarkably good one, adds no credit to him or his supporters. It will be remembered that the Council determined to cease the mode of payment of teachers that had been in existence for three years, whereby the teachers received \$1000, and fifty per cent. of the income over that amount. The revenue from the lecture fees for the years 1889 to 1891 amounted to \$14,224.40, and the teachers received during that period \$7,091, whereas if the agreement which Mr. Sanders prizes so highly had remained, and which he persistently fought for, the staff would have received \$10,112.20. No thanks to Mr. Sanders for so good a showing for the year 1891. He argued and fought for the old agreement and claimed, along with Messrs. Shuttleworth and Avison, that such a reduction was unequal for, and let it be noted that the course prior to Aug. '88, students only received 400 hours instruction, costing each student \$101.00, or 25 cents per hour. In 1889-90 hours instruction, costing \$105, or 21 cents per hour. Under the agreement effected by the Council, to which Mr. Sanders was opposed, in Aug. 1889, the College course was lengthened to 650 hours instruction costing \$105, or 16 cents per hour. The change of staff took place August, 1891, and the course lengthened to over 800 hours, 300 hours of that being practical work, for which a staff of four were engaged at a total salary of \$1,300. The fees of students being reduced from \$105 to \$82, a difference of \$23 to each student, or 11 cents per hour, which you will observe is less than one-half the cost to each student as compared with 1887-8, under the old agreement which Mr. Sanders so strongly supported.

Now, let us see what the teachers received under the bargain influence of Mr. Sanders and friends for the six months' term, 1887-8. The teachers received \$1010, not four or sometimes five times as stated by Mr. Sanders, but three, viz.: Messrs. Shuttleworth, Avison and Ladie. The teachers' share of receipts for seven months' term 1887-8, was \$4388.01. Mr. Shuttleworth receiving for Dranship and two hundred lectures of one hour each, the sum of \$233.40, although he claimed more. Dr. Avison one hundred and fifty lectures, one hour each, received \$1233.07. Mr. Harrison, for three hundred and fifty hours time as demonstrator, received \$711.53. The course at that time commencing Oct. 1st, and continuing until May 5th, with three weeks' holidays at Christmas time. The amounts received by Messrs. Shuttleworth and Avison at that time were considered insufficient by Mr. Sanders.

Now, sir, let us compare the year that is picked out by our economist as the most glaring one and see how we stand. You will observe he omits in his comparison to mention that \$13 less is demanded from students for the year 1892-3 than for the year 1891, and he would fain lead you to believe that he is so fair. Oh yes! You will observe that the Council have been anxious to furnish the best possible tuition to the student at the minimum of cost without drawing upon the annual revenue fee for any support. And I deem it is the duty of the Council to so maintain the school, and up to the present time, under the new order of things, such has been done. For the years 1892-3, the teachers, four in number, received \$4300, as stated, and are now (1893-4) receiving \$1,900, and gave and are giving over 900 hours' tuition, the whole four, 1892-3, received less than double the sum taken by Mr. Shuttleworth alone for less than one-fourth the amount of work in 1887-8.

I will in this connection give a table of the hours including time spent on examinations, which is now performed by each professor:

	Junior 1893.	Senior 1894.	Total hours.
Dr. Chambers.....	120	182	302
Dr. Fotheringham .	52	173	225
Dr. Scott.....	153	219	372
C. F. Heebner	272	275	547
			1357

STUDENTS FOR PROFESSORS. The supplies for professors he draws attention to and is evidently unaware of the needs of the school when practical work is being carried on. The work done at the College is not performed now in a perfunctory manner, and the student who applies himself during the College course, can take any position in the pharmaceutical line. He is fitted in a practical way to perform his duties and needs not the aid of the middle-man to make his preparations, and that should be the

(Continued on Page 65.)