

amount of \$290. The committee had further found four instances where drug stores were being run without the knowledge of the college, all of which had been promptly brought to account. While the work of the committee had been prosecuted at a small loss financially, yet the committee submitted that, considering the perfect condition of affairs in this connection, the results had been most gratifying, indeed. "Your committee," the committee continued, "respectfully request all druggists who are aware of any infringement against the act to promptly notify the registrar or chairman of the committee. Your committee begs leave to congratulate the council on the satisfactory condition of affairs in connection with infringement work, as we are of the opinion that few, if any, infringements exist. We would recommend that the committee be authorized to further continue to prosecute its work along the same line as during the past term."

Mr. Karn said that there was hardly a case of infringement in the province. There were, of course, some cases in general stores, but the proprietors of these stores were aware that they were watched, and so took care to trust none but their most intimate friends. He was gratified that there was so little infringement, and felt better satisfied than if he had to report twenty or thirty cases.

The report was adopted as read.

President Watters announced, amid general applause, that he had induced Mr. Mackenzie to represent the council at the meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association, which meets this year in Baltimore.

It was moved by Mr. J. H. Mackenzie, seconded by Mr. G. A. Hunter, and carried: "That the Dean of the college refuse the attendance of any student unless he be furnished with a ticket from the registrar-treasurer that his fees are paid; said ticket to be produced by the student a few days after attending."

It was moved by Mr. W. A. Karn, seconded by Mr. Isaac Curry, and carried, "That whereas doubt exists in the minds of some members of the college as to the dual liability for fees in connection with partnership in branch stores, therefore be it resolved that the council hereby authorize the chairman of the Infringement Committee to secure the opinion of the college solicitor in the matter."

This concluded the business of the meeting, and an adjournment was made till February.

Pharmacy in England.

Withdrawal of the Poisonous Substances Bill—Company Pharmacy Alarmed—A Canadian Pharmacopœia—Exhibits at the British Medical Association—Drop in Phenazone and Antipyrin.

From our own Correspondent.

Only a month has elapsed since the Government, at the instance of the Privy Council, introduced a bill to regulate the sale of poisonous substances that directly attacked British and Irish pharmaceutical interests. Already it has been announced that it will not be proceeded with, and pharmacists will naturally consider this to be the result of the stern opposition which they offered to a most injudicious measure. Ostensibly the object of the bill was to prevent the indiscriminate sale of carbolic acid and cresylic disinfectants unless in proper packages and duly labelled. The poisonous nature of these articles was admitted, but instead of using the proper machinery of the Pharmacy Acts which allows the Privy Council to admit new poisons to the various schedules, from time to time, and safeguard the public by allowing only qualified pharmacists to sell them, this bill would have created a new order of things. Qualification of the seller was ignored, and departmental regulations replaced personal responsibility. This is not the first occasion that a government has attempted an attack on pharmaceutical interests with similar fatuous results, and perhaps the departments concerned will learn wisdom. It is a special point of congratulation that, at the same time as the objectionable bill received its quietus, the Pharmacy Act Amendment Bill, introduced by the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, passed both Houses of Parliament. It is a most modest piece of legislation, merely permissive in its action, and not calculated to have any special bearing upon pharmacy, but to consolidate the society.

In the last stage of the bill the Lord Chancellor was responsible for a most momentous amendment, quite outside the scope of the bill, which, if accepted, would have probably dealt a heavy blow to company pharmacy. At the last moment it was withdrawn, the eminent jurist having recognized that it would be out of place in such a bill. It is eminently satisfactory that no less a personage than the Lord Chancellor should admit the anomaly that an unqualified person is liable to penalties if he assume the

title of chemist and keep open shop, but a limited company can do so with impunity. A former chancellor, Lord Herschell, quoted a case where a man and his family, all unqualified, formed themselves into a company and thus evaded the Pharmacy Acts. It is to be hoped that these strong expressions of opinion may lead the society to again take up the subject, but, if so, it is obvious that the present right of a chemist's widow to carry on the business, provided she employs a qualified chemist as manager, will have to be dropped. If personal qualification in the owner is to be the factor of the future another point will have to be considered, viz., branch shops. The fact that at present a chemist may open shop in his own name in widely separated towns, provided he employs a qualified manager, is not much removed from the position taken by a limited company. The question arises, therefore, whether chemists will agree to give up so much in order to stop company pharmacy.

The suggestion made in your columns by a correspondent that Canada should have a Canadian pharmacopœia is somewhat retrogressive. Surely, of all pharmacists in the world, Canadians have already too many pharmacopœias. What with the B.P., U.S.P., and French Codex it is surprising that anybody should desire a C.P., even if it were compiled. In fairness to Dr. John Attfield, too, it must be stated that no time will be lost in the production of the Addendum based on colonial suggestions and I know as a fact that the committee are hard at work. Does your correspondent imagine that a Canadian pharmacopœia could be produced more quickly, and that it would be sure to give general satisfaction? With his brief criticisms on the B.P., 1898, I am in close accord, but it is no use supposing that any number of pharmacopœias will prevent medical men prescribing just what they please. The number of special preparations that fill the druggists' shelves are not a reflection upon pharmacopœias but upon the education and pharmaceutical knowledge of the doctor. If the leaders of the medical profession would