

## Correspondence.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the opinions of correspondents.  
Correspondents must in all cases send name and address, not necessarily for publication.

Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—Your article, "A Retrograde Movement," should, I think, find a responsive chord in the sensibilities of every Canadian druggist who thinks enough of his occupation to seek to put it on a higher plane. If there is one weakness in our standing more conspicuous than another, it is in the very particular which induced your comment. The druggists of our province, your humble servant amongst the rest, hold a somewhat exalted opinion of their qualifications, yet totally fail to create the least impression in the pharmaceutical world outside of their territorial divisions. It is time that we were all aroused out of our lethargy, and shown that the highest aim for a druggist's ambition is something beyond a seat in the council chamber, with the privilege of voting ourselves senatorial rates of mileage and *per diem* allowances.

Hoping that our new initiates on the council will think twice before they act once in future, I remain,

Very truly yours,

WESTERN DRUGGIST.

Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—Referring to the letters of "An Apprentice" in your paper, I endorse all he says, and more too. What has higher education done for the drug business? What has our college ever done for the druggist? The fanatical men that have been running our college for the past few years have not improved things much. They have sought legislation to protect—what? Some of the most practical and successful druggists are the least educated. I work from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. each day for the small pittance of \$7 per week, not enough to keep body and soul together. What protection has a retail druggist? I think, Mr. Editor, if these head rulers of our affairs had done more to elevate and protect our profession, and cared less to advance their own selfish aims—as it appears to me that they have used the college for this purpose—no doubt druggists would have ere this seen some needed reforms in our college legislation.

JOHN SUMMERS.

Guelph, Aug. 19th, 1895.

### Counter Prescribing.

Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—Since the medical detective has been very busy of late among us, would it not be well to have a look into this Medical Act?

As near as I can ascertain, a druggist is not allowed to recommend anything unless the medicine so recommended be some proprietary medicine. Now, the point comes up as to what constitutes a proprietary medicine.

Certainly this act greatly handicaps a druggist, who, according to it, cannot recommend a dose of castor oil, Epsom salts, or any such simple remedy.

To a customer of limited means such a law is arbitrary in the extreme. According to it, a person must go before a medical man and pay his fee for every little ill to which his flesh is heir, or else go at it by reading patent medicine advertisements *ad libitum*, until he or the druggist arrives at what is wanted.

Now, Mr. Editor, is such a law just? Why is it that a man cannot go to a druggist for a very nominal price (not fee) and purchase what the druggist can conscientiously recommend to him?

I am sure, sir, that the public in general are in favor of a reform along this line; and I believe if druggists were to unitedly and honestly state their case before the Local Legislature, their wishes would be complied with. Surely we are asking for nothing more than what we are duly entitled to, and we have the public on our side.

For my own part, perhaps all the druggists are aware of my having been fined; but I would also state that I am not particular how much the public are aware of it, as I consider I have committed no moral wrong.

Allow me to propose that all the members of our business take this matter up and use their influence with the representative from their constituency to bring about a reform in this matter. I am willing to help any man or body of men to do all possible. I can see no reason why we cannot have a law similar to that which obtains in Great Britain.

ANDREW P. STIRRETT.

Toronto, Aug. 30th, 1895.

### Selling to Department Stores.

Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—Pursuant to your esteemed request that we express ourselves in the columns of your journal upon the subject of supplying department stores with pharmaceuticals to be sold in competition with the regular drug trade, we beg to say:

Without assuming to speak for manufacturers in general, it is our individual opinion that the supply of pharmaceuticals to such stores is not only entirely inconsistent with the best interests of pharmacy and medicine, but also the highest good of the general public. For this reason we never knowingly entertain orders coming from such sources, or from any source when we have good reason to believe that the items ordered are intended for such stores. Pharmacy and medicine have to do with the most important interests of human existence—health, and even life; and therefore both should occupy a plane much higher than mere barter and trade can ever attain. The physician is actuated by a nobler motive than merely obtaining a living and competence, and because he is inspired with a love of his calling and humanity he is,

by common consent, regarded as a professional man rather than as a tradesman. The same considerations dignify the functions of the pharmacist. But it is absolutely impossible for a department store to be inspired by any such high motive. On the contrary, the distinctive feature of the department business, from beginning to end, is barter. It is doubtful if the existence of a department store can be justified with reference to any branch of it, for every trade requires a certain degree of *esprit de corps*, which it is impossible for the proprietor of an establishment dealing in everything to feel. The department store is indeed becoming a very serious problem in large cities with reference to every trade and industry.

The remedy undoubtedly lies in the proper education of the public, for when consumers come to realize that department stores cannot procure fresh stock from jobbers or manufacturers, but must depend upon brokers gathering up old stocks, whether at sacrifice sales or otherwise, and wherever they can find them, they will certainly not be inclined to pass by the regular pharmacist for the sake of the slightly reduced price obtainable at their counters. We remain,

Yours very truly,

Parke, Davis & Co.

Detroit, Mich., Aug. 24th, 1895.

### The Educational Question.

Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—My chief purpose in again replying to "An Apprentice" is to correct some errors which he made in taking extracts from my last letter; and as he boasts of such perfection from the model education which he has received as to be beyond making mistakes, I cannot attribute such misquotations to carelessness, but to a desire to falsify my statements.

He quotes me as saying, "It would not be right to have the profession open to all," and then he adds, "Thus he shows his selfishness and fear of competition." What I said was that "the drug profession ought not to be brought so low that any one, whatever his educational qualifications might be, could enter its ranks." There is a vast difference in the meaning of the two quotations. The latter prohibits no one from entering the drug profession, but simply protects the public from impostors by providing that those who do enter the profession must qualify for it. As to my selfishness and fear of competition, any man of average intelligence, and possessing an ordinary amount of that commodity known as common sense, can easily see there is nothing to fear from the competition of such men as my friend would have to be pharmacists. The only reason, as far as I can see, why even he would allow such men to enter the profession is because it would then be easier for men such as himself to become shining lights. But I would ask him whether it is more honor to be a shining light among a lot of ignorant men, or to