

This is the usual mode of disposing of cases when the offence is considered light, or sufficiently punished by the prosecution itself.

The termination of this case is similar to that of the Eaton prosecution—in which a fine was imposed on condition that it was to be refunded or divided—and is exceedingly unsatisfactory. This is indeed the general character of the doings of the Council when legal or legislative questions are involved. Cases are settled out of court, or decided in such a way that both parties claim the victory, as in the present instance. The principal result is merely an accumulation of costs.

One feature brought out by the trial was the establishment of the fact that Mr. Cruttenden did not receive a promise—as reported—that he would be allowed to pass the examination. Mr. D'Avignon was the acting chairman of the committee when the case was considered, and every one who knows that gentleman will be assured that any transaction of this kind would, in his presence, be an absolute impossibility.

We believe the defendant is continuing business as usual, and will probably stand on his legal rights under his New York diploma, and claim from the Council, at its next meeting, the recognition that has been accorded to others submitting that qualification.

### Tariff Changes.

THE discussion on the tariff amendments finally resulted in the following changes, in addition to those previously reported in these columns as being interesting to druggists:

It was decided that crude opium was to pay a duty of \$1 per pound. Cocoa, in its crude state, was reduced from 25 to 20 per cent. Medicated cod-liver oil will go under the medicine tariff of 25 per cent., while the pure oil will come in at 20 per cent. Castor oil was reduced from 7 1-5th cents per gallon to 6 cents. Antiseptic surgical dressings, such as absorbent cottons, cotton wools, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauze and oakum, prepared and used as surgical dressings, plain or medicated, were fixed at 20 per cent. Salts of zinc and sulphate of quinine were taken off the free list. Tobacco pouches are to be subject to 30 per cent. The item embracing jewel boxes, of plush, wood, paper, etc., was amended so as to include celluloid, aluminum and fibre ware of all kinds. The duty on all is 35 per cent. In the mineral schedule plumbago 10 per cent. was made to read "plumbago crude." The committee stuck hard and fast for ten minutes on the item surgical and dental instruments 15 per cent. Sir Richard Cartwright urged that the duty be removed entirely. Mr. Foster could not see the point. Weren't doctors well paid, and why shouldn't they be

placed in the same position as other people? Sir Richard rejoined that he wouldn't care if the instrument were well tempered. He could vouch for the result if Mr. Foster underwent an operation in the country with the instruments used by many country practitioners. The Finance Minister shuddered at the thought, but would not yield.

The item of nitrate of silver, to which allusion was made in our last issue, was reconsidered, and it was decided to restore this chemical to the 20 per cent. list. As previously pointed out, the committee had for some unaccountable reason placed it on the free list; but, recognizing the mistake, put it among dutiable articles.

ONE occasionally comes across some amusing answers to examination questions, and they much relieve the tedium of very weary work. The examiner himself is not often a funny man, but even he sometimes gets off a little joke which, by reason of being fired off at an inopportune time, is, however, seldom fully enjoyed by candidates. One of the best of these was furnished by a learned professor at a recent pharmacy examination, who, in his first question on *materia medica*, asked the candidate to give the natural order from which *Adeps lanæ hydrosus* is derived. To have asked what kind of a tree the sheep grows on would perhaps have put the matter too broadly and interfered with the fine humor of the question.

\* \*

The unfortunate student is not always let off so easily, and has not only to answer according to his knowledge, but has to give opinions on knotty points which the best authorities have failed in tackling. In a recent examination on prescriptions, the following pharmaceutical nuts were submitted: "State your views as to the ownership of a prescription, giving reasons for same?" "When, if at all, should the renewal of a prescription be refused?" It would be interesting to know what "views" the examiner held on these questions, and whether he allowed any latitude to those who might have differed with him. The next question asked was of another character, but still somewhat puzzling: "Give one or two rules for *approximating* doses." The italics are ours. Did the examiner mean apportioning? From a succeeding question, it appears likely that he wanted the rules of Young, Cowling, or Black, though from a preceding question—"State the relationship which exists between prescribing and compounding?"—it does not seem probable that this is the case, as the application of these rules is not the business of the compounder but of the prescriber, and refers to medical rather than pharmacal students. We have no disposition to be hypercritical, but think it