

many students from coming. He thought this matter should be fully discussed and would like to hear the views of those who differed from himself.

Mr. Petrie, replying, said this matter had been before the Council for nearly two years, and in one report it was recommended as being desirable; in another as being necessary. Then a committee was proposed. That would not evidence any hastiness on the part of the members of the Council. There was no misgiving in the minds of the Committee about going on with the matter at all, but only that they should keep within the instruction of the Council. Three years ago the basement was turned into a laboratory. It was found that the provision made for practical work was so little that no student could conveniently practice. After visiting other colleges the members thought they ought to make some improvements if possible, and a majority of them seemed to feel that if any college in the world could flourish, that in Ontario should. The figures given by Mr. Sanders were a little in error. The amount it cost would not be as large as he represented. As a member of this Council he would like to say that with the increased accommodation and equipment proposed by this committee, and the fees proposed to be charged, this would not only be the best equipped college, but one of the cheapest on the continent, and he had no doubt that it would be more largely attended than ever before. The idea of adding a story to the building would not be suggested to any architect by a sensible person.

Mr. Sanders wished to know what amount it was proposed to expend on the equipment and furnishing of the extension. He thought he was under the mark in placing the whole amount at \$15,000.

Mr. Petrie said the expense would probably be \$3000 or \$4000 more than was at first supposed. He did not think that any legitimate cost connected with the equipping of the College would ever be begrudged by the Council. As to giving figures it did not come within his province as Chairman of the Committee to do that.

The motion was then carried.

Mr. J. J. Hall submitted the report of the special committee, consisting of the president, vice-president, the chairman of the executive and finance committee and of the infringement committee, appointed to inquire into the claims of Mr. J. A. Brown, of Tottenham, as pharmacist under the Ontario Act. As he had a bill in the *Gazette* brought before Parliament, their solicitor was instructed to hunt up evidence about Mr. Brown's claims. Encouraged by the appearance of Mr. Brown's advertisement, G. A. Mason, of Markham, had taken a similar course. The solicitors advised, after looking into the evidence that they had no power to register either of these men, and even if they had, they were not satisfied of Mr. Brown's claim to being a practitioner in the province before 1871. Mr. Mason afterwards withdrew from his position. Mr. Brown's case was taken up somewhat

energetically by the popular member for North York, Mr. J. A. Davis, M. P. P., assisted by a member of this council, Mr. W. B. Sanders, on Brown's behalf. The committee felt that Mr. Brown's claim would be a dangerous precedent, and they were advised to leave no stone unturned to prevent his bill. When the bill came before the Private Bills Committee, the solicitor and Messrs. Hall and McKenzie appeared in behalf of the council, but not having had time to explain to the members of the House, the bill passed the committee by a majority of four votes. As considerable expense was incurred, which would have been lost, otherwise, the whole committee went to the House and interviewed the members, explaining the position and enlisting the support of several members to fight the bill at each step. Finding that the Brown bill was growing unpopular Mr. Davis introduced an amendment to the Pharmacy Act, to accomplish the object of the Brown bill. This bill was pronounced even worse than the Brown Bill. The committee then issued a circular to each chemist in Ontario, inviting co-operation in defeating both bills, with the result that the Brown bill is said to be withdrawn, and the Pharmacy Act amendment so modified as to leave the option of registering any application such as Mr. Brown's entirely in the hands of the council. The committee acknowledge the worth of the services rendered by their solicitor, and also the courtesy extended them by the members of Legislature.

Mr. Sanders did not rise to answer the report or to deal with it. It was done away with as Mr. Brown's bill had been discharged, and for that reason it might be out of place to discuss it. The Committee had found it necessary to go out of its way to use his name as being an advocate of J. A. Brown's registration. If a letter had been read, written by him, would they show him that letter? If it was not written by him, on what authority did they state so? If it was, let them produce a copy of it. It was only fair to him. While discussing this letter he would show Mr. Hall's own report on this matter. He (Mr. Hall) should have put his own name after his (Mr. Sanders). In the February session of 1890 the application from Mr. Brown was submitted to the Board. The Committee on By-Laws and Legislation reported on that application and found in these words, Mr. Hall being Chairman of that Committee. It says regarding the application of Mr. J. A. Brown, of Tottenham, "that clause 15 of the Act of 1884 permitted us to register such cases as Mr. Brown's, but the Act of 1889, cancelled that permissive clause, and although it might appear a hardship, this Council had no power to depart from the Act." If this was not encouragement for Mr. Brown he did not know what it was. He had also written evidence that his friend, Mr. Slavin was in favor of Mr. Brown's application being accepted.

Mr. Mackenzie said while listening to

the former speaker he felt as if they were again before the Private Bills Committee, and the solicitor for Mr. J. A. Brown was speaking. The same argument was used to-day. He might say for Mr. Sanders' benefit that while the Committee heard no letter read from Mr. Sanders to that Committee, he had interviewed members who saw the letter to Mr. J. R. Bond, Mr. Brown's brother-in-law, saying that he (Mr. Brown) might count on all support possible. He knew for a fact that the strongest argument against getting the Brown bill knocked out was the support given through Mr. J. R. Bond in connection with legislation. This was a fact which the druggists should know. If he had written a letter of the kind referred to he thought the Committee would have a right to mention his name in the resolution. The Legislature said the Council was divided on this question. The whole question did not resolve itself into a personal matter, but on the broad basis whether or not such action should be countenanced by this or any future Board.

Mr. Hall did not dispute that Mr. Sanders had the right, as any other member had, to follow his own private judgment in a matter of this kind. The work of the Council was commissioned to a Special Committee, whether or not certain legislation should be passed. And it was as much as suggested that the minority fall in with the majority. It was no argument for Mr. Sanders to make use of words contained in his report why Mr. Brown should be registered. Mr. Brown had represented that he was practicing before 1871, and under the Act of 1884 those in business before 1871 would be registered as pharmacists without asking examination. And for a clerk practicing as such 4 years before 1871, a similar provision was also made. He himself had been a clerk within three months of the five years before 1871, but he had to come forward and pass his examination before the College. In order to afford plenty of time a special clause was in the Act of 1884, inviting all who could to come forward and take advantage of that clause, and the time was extended to March, 1885. Mr. Brown claimed to have been in business during that time. Why did he wait to this late date to put in his application? When he made his application, he (Mr. Hall) instructed the solicitor to inquire into his claims. He produced sworn affidavits to the effect that Mr. Brown was not qualified, and they could not recommend to the Council that he be registered. He allowed his application to go on and we had no alternative but to face it. As a result some 20 or 25 others came forward and asked for special legislation. Members of the Legislature became alarmed, claiming that this would set a precedent for doctors, lawyers, etc. The amendment did not leave it permissive with the Council to register the man, but made it compulsory and imperative. Mr. Sanders' name was brought up as a member of the Council, who had been