

like and opposition to the amendments of 1889 to the Pharmacy Act, on the theory of disappointed candidates for office, and others claiming for themselves to be the fathers of the Pharmacy Act were only after nine years of fruitless attempts at amendments to the first pharmacy law of 1871, as various fruitless attempts at amendments were made from 1875 to 1884, and the amendments of 1889 were obtained in a few months after being considered and adopted by the Council, and so look upon our successful efforts to push legislation as a reflection upon their slow and class legislation.

Possibly the opposition of others again might be accounted for if the veil is lifted that covers the interior working of the college. Certain individuals have been exercising almost absolute despotism regarding the manner of conducting the school and handling the fees obtained from students.

By referring to the *Canadian Pharmaceutical Journal* for September, 1886, page 23, under the heading, "Report of Special Committee appointed to devise a method for the regulation and government of the teaching college," the following clause appears regarding the payment of the teachers: "They were to receive 'all' sums up to \$3,000 and all over that amount to be equally divided between the teachers and the college, all sums to be divided amongst the several lecturers in such proportion as the 'board' may determine having in view the work performed by each lecturer."

Now, we found that the Principal of the school had been demanding and receiving "all" the money that should have been paid to the several lecturers according to the work they performed. He, however, paid whatever he chose to give and they would accept for their work. In other words the Principal took all the money belonging to the lecturers and turned the work out to the cheapest and most obedient laborers that he could obtain to do the work. The difference in cash he put into his own pocket. This continued until the fall of 1888, when the writer was elected along with other district nominees to a position on the Council Board of the College, and honored by being chosen as its presiding officer, and required in that capacity to sign all checks for payment of money. He inquired into the system for payment of the several lecturers and found it should be as the resolution of the council defined it, and as published in the *Phar. Journal* for Sept. 1886. I refused to be a party to the paying of all the money to the Principal, such an unjust plan and so distinctly at variance with the resolution of the Council. This cute manner of manipulating the fees from students to be paid to the lecturer is certainly as bad, if not worse, than what has been so strongly condemned in England and known as the "sweating system."

We also supposed, and the published reports of the work of the council would

lead us to infer, that the Council Board engaged and appointed the teachers, but the demonstrator in the practical department was engaged in 1888 by the Principal of the school and his salary fixed by the same under a very peculiar arrangement. The report of the Chairman of the Committee of Education in February, 1889, would lead us to believe that the committee had considered and appointed the Lecturer. The true motive of the arrangement was only learned by a dispute arising between the demonstrator and the Reg. Treasurer when the money for his work of two courses was offered to him, and on his declining to accept the amount, claiming a larger sum, which the Principal of the school said should not be paid to the demonstrator, as he claimed it as his own. This smaller amount the demonstrator declined to accept. The Reg. Treasurer would not issue checks without a receipt in full payment was given by each lecturer. I instructed the Reg. Treasurer not to pay the balance as some money on account had been paid to each, until the Council should meet in August, 1889, and they would define the amounts to be paid to each lecturer.

The matter appears to have been settled shortly after the elections in July, 1889. Why did the principal wait until after the election of members to the Council Board in July?

How have the students fared? We find that in 1887, March 8th, June 11th, the students received 360 lectures of one hour each, and paid for such \$10. In 1886, arrangements were made to divide the course into two terms, junior and senior, and under this plan from Oct. 1th 1887, to March 16th, 1888, the students received 400 lectures of one hour each, and paid for this \$96 and \$5 more for matriculation, so called, or over double the amount per lecture that was charged in the previous term. The instructions given were purely didactic, and the teachers received for delivering these 400 lectures of one hour each the sum of \$4,010. This was all paid to the Principal, and he paid the other teachers, we can suppose on the plan of the school by dividing the marbles, "two to me, one to you," or as a minstrel combination is arranged, the star or big end man receiving the lion's share, the rest of the company anything they can get. Also from Oct. 1st, 1888, to May 8th, 1889, the teachers received the sum of \$4,388.

It is also known that the Principal of the school and editor of the *Journal* has been able to make for the past five or six years a sum from \$3,500 to \$4,000 per annum, and one half or less of his time given to the work. This is a very neat sum to make out of a little druggists' society. What retail or wholesale druggist can do the same out of a business, with little or no capital invested?

Would it not be better to apply the funds after a fair payment to the teaching staff, to their proper use, viz., to equip the school with the apparatus required to

make it for educational purposes second to none, and set apart sufficient money to carry out the provisions of the Pharmacy Act and give better protection to those engaged in the business. We have not had sufficient funds for either of these purposes, and have been compelled to proceed very carefully in the expenditure of money.

We had quietly to submit to this unsatisfactory condition of affairs until we obtained the amendments to our act in 1889. The Council were then in a position to readjust the plan for payment of teachers and to see that the college received justice. The amendments to the Pharmacy Act required and received first attention.

I have written on this one point (and there are several others) of the work of the college to show to the members some of the reasons for the manifest dislike exhibited by the editor of the *Canadian Pharm. Journal*, and a few others (merely tools to carry out his work) for the members of the Council Board who are carrying forward the work necessary for the advancement of the college.

The men on the present Council who were members of the Council Board previous to 1888 being very strongly opposed to any changes that would place the affairs of the college under the control of the Council, and you can see that the Principal of the school would strongly oppose any measure that would in any way conflict with his great pecuniary advantages, and he has men who appear to be willing to do anything he may desire.

The members of the Council are aware that efforts are being made to discredit the Pharmacy Act, that unimportant flaws are being discovered that have existed for nineteen years and now being prominently brought out with a hope to alarm and arouse the druggists to ask for another amendment, not that they care about these flaws which are of their own making, but that they hope if the question is once reopened before the Legislature they may be able to strike out the clauses providing for district representation and formation of divisional associations, and also the clauses in the act defining the position of the Council regarding the control of the education department of the college.

The clauses of the act are of great importance to the retail druggists of Ontario, and when fully in operation we will receive greater benefits than have heretofore been derived from the Pharmacy Act.

As a writer in your journal states, "to the council we look for advancement. To us they (the council) look for encouragement." The advancement that has been made in such matters has been made in spite of strong opposition, and in some cases the work has been rendered exceedingly unpleasant by reason of this miserable, narrow-minded, selfish actions of the coterie of obstructivists.

JOHN A. CLARK.

Hamilton, June 31st.