

found to have been elected unanimously. Fifty-five votes were recorded.

"Alderman Gibson signed the necessary declaration, and said he was one of those who thought that to be elected an alderman for the second city of the empire—(hear, hear)—which, if not second in the number of heads, was at least second in commercial importance—was a position of which any man might be at least reasonably and justifiably proud. When that position had been conferred by the unanimous vote of his colleagues he need hardly say that so far as it pertained to himself the position was very much enhanced, and he begged to tender them his most sincere thanks. His connection with the Council had been a happy one. He followed two gentlemen who had held distinguished positions in the Council. In 1882, when the late Mr. Schofield was elected an alderman, he (Mr. Gibson) stepped into his shoes as a councillor. Alderman Schofield was a man of whom it might be said he had a host of friends and not a single enemy. (Hear, hear.) Time rolled on, and it had now fallen to his lot to put on the mantle of a most distinguished alderman, the late Alderman Heywood, upon whom every honor which the Council had the power to bestow had been conferred. Alderman Heywood had worn that mantle unsullied and unspotted for 40 years. (Applause) While he could not hope to occupy so distinguished a position as his predecessor, he would endeavor to fulfil his duties to the best of his ability, and with no aim but that of the welfare of his fellow-citizens. (Hear, hear.)

THE Montreal contributor to the *Canadian Druggist* appears thoroughly opposed to the action of the Ottawa Government in their effort to protect the physician and the public against druggists who wilfully or through ignorance have been selling tinctures, etc., of other than of the well-known standard of strength and purity. He says:

"It seems absurd for the Government to be fussing about the strength of tinctures when people are swallowing daily tinned fruits, vegetables, etc., containing lead, etc., etc., etc."

The following gives the idea that a noted authority does not agree with the basis of his argument, which is altogether weak and unsatisfactory, as against the sale and supply of pure drugs and medicines:

PROFESSOR ATTFIELD, F.R.S., ON CANNED GOODS.

During the last fifteen years I have frequently examined canned foods, not only with respect to the food itself as food, and to the process of canning, but with regard to the relation of the food to, or the influence if any of the metal of, the can itself. So lately as within the past two or three

months I have examined sixteen varieties of canned food for metals, with the following results:

| Name of Articles Examined. | Decimal parts of a grain of tin (or other foreign metal) present in a quarter of a pound. |
|----------------------------|---|
| Salmon..... | None |
| Lobsters..... | None |
| Oysters..... | 0.004 |
| Sardines..... | None |
| Lobster Paste..... | None |
| Salmon Paste..... | None |
| Bloater Paste..... | 0.002 |
| Potted Beef..... | None |
| Potted Tongue..... | None |
| Potted "Strasbourg"..... | None |
| Potted Ham..... | 0.002 |
| Luncheon Tongue..... | 0.003 |
| Apricots..... | 0.007 |
| Pears..... | 0.003 |
| Tomatoes..... | 0.007 |
| Peaches..... | 0.004 |

These proportions of metal are, I say, undeserving of serious notice. I question whether they represent more than the amounts of tin we periodically wear off tin saucepans in preparing food—a month ago I found a trace of tin in water which had been boiled in a tin kettle—or the silver we wear off our forks and spoons. There can be little doubt that we annually pass through our systems a sensible amount of such metals, metallic compounds, and other substances that do not come under the denomination of food; but there is no evidence that they ever did or are ever likely to do harm or occasion us the slightest inconvenience. Harm is far more likely to come to us from noxious gases in the air we breathe than from foreign substances in the food we eat.

HANCE, BROS & WHITE say: "It is a question whether profit of high prices or the goodwill of low price is worth more to you. We think the goodwill is worth more than the money to us, but you must judge for yourself. We want your goodwill; we show that we want it by giving you a double money's worth. And then we go out of our way to help you get double for it. No, it is not out of our way. It is our way to make our preparations as profitable to you as possible. Here we are paying the printer to tell you how to make five times as much as we do on our own merchandise. This is one of our 'Helps,' 'Frog in Your Throat, etc,' is another, the 'Sugar Blocks' are another, another sort. If these work well for both of us, we shall not be strangers."