

it would be dishonorable to sell the goods at cut prices when they were bought under the rebate plan, and, I am sure, Messrs. Evans are of this opinion, and would not do so from the fact that they declare that their refusal to buy under the plan in order to be able to do honorably what they wish with what they have paid for. Now the question arises whether or not Messrs. Evans are acting consistently in selling to cutters, or at a lower rate than the manufacturers stipulate, the goods they obtain from those who have signed the contract, and whom Messrs. Evans know to be acting dishonorably in selling to them. In other words, are not Messrs. Evans encouraging and abetting contract-breaking by buying goods from such people? So much for principle.

Again, Messrs. Evans claim that they are acting in the interests of the retail druggists. How is this borne out by the fact that they are selling to a firm of avowed cutters, who by this practice injure the business of the retail druggists in the same city? All very well to say that the retail druggist does not suffer by the practice and can get the full price for Abbey Salts just the same. It remains that he who sells cheapest sells most, and many a bottle sold by Messrs. Powell & Burgess would have been bought elsewhere had their price not been lower. Some retail druggist has lost the sale and the profit. A third point and I have done. Does the rebate system prevent cutting? There seems to be evidence that it does not. Messrs. Powell & Burgess get all the Abbey Salts they want and if you ask Mr. Evans if they will not have to take this preparation off their list, they will smile and tell you that they can get all the "Abbey" they want and this without any trouble. This is proof evident that the rebate system does not prevent cutting. What interest, then, is it to the retail druggist to uphold the system, when if it were abolished he could doubtless buy many of the most saleable preparations at reduced rates and still get the same price for them as if they were bought at higher prices under the system in question?

I live in a town where cutting is not a very great evil and it would, I believe, be to my benefit were the rebate system abolished since it has now been proved to be inoperative in preventing cutting, and keeps the wholesaler's prices up.

Still, this is a question which affects the whole trade of Canada, and I trust it

will be fully discussed in your journal and elsewhere. It is to "set the ball rolling" that I write.

Yours,

BELLA DONNA.

Nov. 4th, 1898.

The Evans-Abbey Affair.

SIR,—It seems to me that the whole essence of the dispute in the matter of the Abbey-Evans episode lies in the question, "Does the rebate plan benefit the retail druggist?" As you rightly remark in your last issue, all three of these honorable firms (Abbey, Evans, and Burgess & Powell) claim to be acting in the interest of the retail trade. In the case of drugs and druggists' sundries, the successful retail druggist buys at lowest prices and meets competition. In the case of rebate Patents neither of these methods is possible. Since cutting can exist and does exist, and since cutters seem to be able to get all the rebate goods they require, of what benefit to the retail druggists is the rebate plan? Is it not rather calculated to benefit the wholesale trade? I do not say that this should not be, but, if it is so, how can the rebate manufacturers claim that they work in the interest of the retail druggists?

PUZZLED ONE.

Oct 26th.

The British Pharmacopœia, 1898, is to be formally adopted as official in the colony of Victoria, N.S.W., on January 1st, 1899. The Pharmacopœia was generally recognized as coming into operation in Canada, October 1st.

A London (Eng.) consulting physician has made a suggestion through *The Lancet* that all prescriptions should be copyrighted and urging that steps should be taken by the medical men to induce the authorities to take such action as would bring it under the copyright law. Possibly the learned doctor would like the new B.P. copyrighted, on the plea that medical men were very much in evidence in its make-up.

Mr. J. S. Larke, Canadian agent at Sydney, N.S.W., in his report to the Department of Trade and Commerce states that there is a "gratifying increase in the trade" between Canada and Australia. He also says that Australia is about to enter upon an era of prosperity and urges Canadian manufacturers to be prepared for it.

Advertising Criticisms.

Several pamphlets, etc., have been received this month.

H. L. Cowan, Mount Forest, sends us a booklet. The cover is of marbled paper and is very nice. The title, however, does not seem in keeping with the contents. "Pepper and Salt" are not usually indicative of the contents of a drug store, and we do not see what relation they bear to the contents of the booklet. Opening it, we find an abundance, or rather, a superabundance, of matter. One half the matter well said would command more attention. People will not take time to read a long-winded argument about your business. The matter in itself is good, but the arrangement also is defective; for instance, one page has headings, "A War Cloud," referring to business policy, and "Tickets," advertising railway tickets for which he is agent, and "The Way We do Business," advertising a cough syrup. Other pages show an equal lack of arrangement. Another thing that immediately strikes us is the large type used. Smaller type, with about one-half the reading matter, would make it more attractive. This booklet should be a good advertising medium, but with the faults we have pointed out corrected it would be still more effective.

G. M. Petrie, 94 Avenue road, Toronto, publishes a neat booklet. The cover is showy, but not as distinctive as the one noticed above. Mr. Petrie has not only condensed his matter, but also contracted the dimensions of his book, a most essential point, because people do not study these things as they would a work of fiction or, perhaps, an agricultural journal, according to the class of readers. In the wording of this booklet there is the error that frequently occurs of using both the plural "we" and the singular "I," whereas it should be either one or the other, frequently the latter.

Buntin, Gillies & Co., Hamilton, Ont., have issued a circular which is bound to be read. The frontispiece is the head of a football player, evidently just left the surgeon's hands, after a siege of "Rugby." This makes one inquisitive enough to look inside, where we find the football team enumerated, consisting of lines of goods handled by this wholesale stationery house. The whole effect of the circular, although not artistic, is to attract and draw our readers to know what it is all about, and this it certainly does.