

lectures largely occupied with metallurgy, ore-extraction, &c., and seemed better fitted for School of Mines students. (3) That the proper study for a student in Pharmacy was Pharmaceutical Chemistry on the lines of the text-books prescribed in the regulations, namely, Atfield's Chemistry and the British Pharmacopœia. (4) That until the governing bodies arranged that the course (indicated in 3) could be taught in a reasonable time and at a reasonable expense, their work was still before them.

It was resolved that educational matters should be considered by a committee, and that Messrs. Whitbread (representing the Board), White and Young (Council) should be constituted a committee for the purpose.

[This is further dealt with by our correspondent below.—ED.]

Education.—The matter contained in Mr. Hill's letter to the Board, and which was referred to the Council, was probably intended to be not so much by way of complaint as of friendly admonition. Nevertheless, it was of sufficient importance to warrant inquiry. On no account must defects in our educational system be tolerated. The students' difficulties are quite heavy enough in regard to long hours, &c., without the additional burden of an imperfect training, and if the Council has any practical means of ensuring a perfect system they should be put in operation. The accented points of Mr. Hill's letter (see "THE CHEMIST AND DRUGGIST OF AUSTRALASIA," April, page 108) are (1) dissatisfaction, (2) expense, (3) the wide scope of the lectures and work, and (4) text-books.

Mr. Hill simply generalised on what appears to be fragmentary conversation; he furnished no data upon which to base a reform, yet, on such imperfect premises, in order to obtain evidence for the Council, inquiries were made, individual cases investigated, and interviews with the University professors were held on the points concerning that part of the question. The result was that, with one exception, no real ground for dissatisfaction was discoverable. The exception was that owing to the somewhat subdued tone of voice of the Assistant Lecturer he was inaudible at times. Even this possible defect, as a reason for complaint, had to be dragged from the persons most strongly affected—the students, one of whom generously added, by way of compensation, that the Lecturer was perhaps so familiar with his notes that he probably forgot that his audience was hearing them for the first time. One successful student said that he had no complaint to make, but that he often had to guess what the Lecturer was saying, and then read up at home. That student, however, obtained all the certificates of the University, and at the Qualifying Examination was examined in only three subjects, instead of seven, and as under the present system no candidate presents for the Qualifying Examination who has not already received one, two, three, or four University certificates, the dissatisfaction complained of is groundless, indeed. As to the expense, meaning no doubt the fees, comparisons show that they are altogether in favour of our students at the Adelaide University, and when it is considered that they are allowed to take two or three years to do the work, which in other centres is required in one; and, further, that they have the privilege of "dividing the Minor," that is, of sitting for terminal and grade examinations, and obtaining, if they can, certificates which are honoured by the Board, honoured by the University in future studies, and honoured to some extent where other Universities exist, well, then, "dissatisfaction" and "expense" are terms which can have no possible meaning in this connection.

As to the scope of the work, this is precisely the same as that of the College of Pharmacy, Victoria, and of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, but note the difference. In Victoria, and at Bloomsbury Square, students have day work, and time in which to do it. In Adelaide they do what they can in the time allowed them, and according to their diligence so is their completion of the syllabus. As to Metallurgy and Ore-extraction, the Lecturer deals with no more of this to

science, medical and pharmaceutical students as forming one class, than is dealt with in Atfield's Chemistry. Certainly in Assaying and Metallurgy, which is a special subject for School of Mines students, the points are more fully gone into, but this affects only those students and has no reference whatever to the Pharmaceutical students. The scope of work, then, as far as concerns our students, who must keep abreast of the times, needs no alteration.

With regard to the text-books, it is necessary to go back a little. When the Board appointed under the Act drafted the regulations, it was thought desirable, by way of giving effect to regulations 40, 41, 42, and 43, to notify intending candidates as to the books most convenient for immediate study, and these were the British Pharmacopœia, Squire's Companion, and Martindale's Extra, with Atfield for Chemistry (reg. 44). It will be remembered that at the time of the passing of the Act, the Board had no affiliated school, and the inclusion of the books mentioned was influenced by the great prominence they then held in medical and practical pharmacy. It was but a beginning, however, and certainly not held to be a complete list. For State and inter-State purposes Botany was added, Chemistry became definitely taught and examined upon, Materia Medica and Pharmacy likewise, but owing to their unsuitability, the two latter were discarded. But the point is this, seeing that no text-books were prescribed for Botany, Materia Medica, and Pharmacy, how can regulation 44 be particularly pointed to at this late day? The text-books tacitly recognised by the Board are those of the institution which it recognises, entirely regardless as to whether their covers be labelled Atfield, Remsen, Winter, or Newth, except in this, that whereas Atfield's Chemistry—general, medical, and pharmaceutical—is a growing book accordingly as medical chemistry goes, and that the Pharmacopœia is for the same reason variable and shifty, Remsen, Winter, and Newth advance only as general chemical science advances. Further, as Atfield (editor of the Pharmacopœia), in his preface, distinctly presupposes the extensiveness of the knowledge of chemical principles, and gives that as a reason for the deletion of working formula, how can it be said that our present system of chemistry (inorganic, organic, and volumetric) is expensive, unsatisfactory, or irregular? The magic words "text-books," therefore, alterable as they are, need not be too much relied on. At the Council meeting it was decided to place the matter in the hands of a committee, with a view of thoroughly considering the education question.

PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY OF TASMANIA.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

The ordinary monthly meeting of the Council was held at Miller's Chambers, Murray-street, Hobart, on Tuesday, April 2, at 11 a.m.

Present—Mr. J. T. Weaver (in the chair), H. T. Gould, W. J. Clewer, and J. B. Hickson (Secretary and Registrar). An apology was received for the absence of Mr. Ash.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The following correspondence was dealt with: Hon. J. H. M'Coll, M.L.C., March 18: Commission of Police, Superintendent of Police (Scottsdale), P. M'Creary (Waratah), March 23.

The syllabus of the College of Pharmacy, Melbourne was received, and laid on the table.

The following account was passed for payment:—The Registrar (salary) £5; do., petty expenses, 4s. 1

THE REGISTRAR AGAIN VISITS ENGLAND.

Mr. Hickson then asked for six months' leave of absence, as he was going to England again on business and would be leaving per s.s. "Ortona."

The Council gave the necessary leave of absence, the motion of Mr. Gould, seconded by Mr. Clewer.