

out the agreement more honorably. They went farther and refused goods to parties who were suspected of acting as go-between for the cutter. The orders thus declined of principals and agents amounted to thousands of dollars, upon which a good margin of profit could have been made. We might ask if the retailers were as conscientious in living up to their undertaking. On the question of the advance in price of patent medicines made by the wholesalers after the agreement was entered into, we can very well afford to be fair in dealing with the matter. In a few words, then, the primary object of the organization was, *to secure a paying margin of profit in the sale of patent medicines*. Surely the retail druggist is manly enough to accord to others what he demands for himself. It cannot be that while putting forth efforts to protect himself *and asking the wholesaler to aid him in the struggle*, he would deny to his ally in the warfare a share of the benefits which were expected to result from their combined efforts. Yet that is exactly what all this cry about the "combine" to raise prices amounts to.

We have made an examination of those patents upon the prices of which advances were made and find that in almost every case the manufacturer was forcing the wholesale jobber to handle them, not at a *small profit*, but at an actual loss. Now we ask any fairminded man in the retail trade if it is reasonable to expect any wholesale jobber to turn aside from his door a large volume of trade upon which a good profit could be made and still keep on selling patent medicines at a loss to satisfy the avariciousness and greed of the men who own them? This talk of combine in prices is traceable to a certain clique of manufacturers who from the first have done nothing to aid the retail druggists in the time of their need but on the contrary have put forth efforts to break up their organizations. Representatives of these firms have gone through the country dealing in innuendoes where open statements would not be wise; inducing, where possible, retailers to break faith with wholesale men by buying jobbers' lines of their goods to be divided up amongst themselves; going from the presence of these same retail men and selling goods to departmental stores at a price which permitted the latter to dispose of them to the public with a profit, when sold even below what the retailer paid for them. We propose "speaking right out in meeting" regarding the actions of some of those would-be-friends of the retail men. No "herring across the trail" of their double-dealings will turn our attention aside from their doings.

Regarding the internal causes which brought about the disruption of the Wholesale Association we have no remarks to offer. We believe the Messrs. Evans & Sons to be too honorable a firm to make the statement which appears over their name without first

having satisfied themselves as to its correctness. In withdrawing from the association they are following out the policy laid down by the parent house in England "to belong to no organization having as its object the interference with or controlling of matters of trade."

In interviewing the heads of firms constituting the defunct association, they one and all express their determination to adhere strictly to the agreement made with the retail men and refuse the trade of departmental stores and cutters, so that, as we say, the disbanding of the association will have but little effect on the retail trade.

The course of the Wholesale Association since organization may not have been without mistakes. The same can also be said of the retail society, but any trifling differences between these two branches can easily be adjusted without the aid of parties who up to the present are not open to the charge of having discommoded themselves one iota for the benefit of others than themselves, and are now crying "Wolf" when none exists.

THE COMMITTEE ON DIVISIONAL ASSOCIATIONS.

There has been a pretty general complaint from members of the Ontario College of Pharmacy that too much attention has been given by the Council to the questions of teaching and examinations, and too little to the welfare of its members. The questions most frequently propounded by the said members are, "What are we paying our money into the Council for, anyway?" "What good has it ever done us?" "How much better off are we with a Pharmacy Act than we should be without one?" These questions have always appeared to us pertinent and worthy of attention by the Council. The very persistency of their iteration afforded evidence of the need for action on the part of some organization to extend protection to the druggists in the sore straits to which they were driven. As a result of this urgent demand for action The Ontario Society of Retail Druggists came into existence some two years and a half ago and since then strenuous efforts have been put forth to better the condition of the pharmacist. These efforts have not resulted in unqualified success, although much has been accomplished in preventing the spread of cutting and restraining cutters. Almost from its inception the society has been hampered by lack of funds to carry on the work. It was believed by the executive who undertook the task that the druggists of the province would willingly contribute at least \$5 each for the protection of their commercial interests. In this they were sadly disappointed as only about one third the number responded when the appeal was