

## 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:

DEAR SIR,—Much has been said, through the medium of the CANADIAN DRUGGIST, mostly by editorials, regarding price-cutting, but always with regard to the upholding of old standard prices, and, with your permission, I would like to state a few points from a contrary position, as well as to justify my actions, as reported in a previous editorial of the CANADIAN DRUGGIST, i.e.: "A druggist in one of our western cities, in starting a new business, has used the cut-rate as his drawing card," etc.

Although remote from you in one sense, but yet near in this and others, I have seen the report of the Retailers' Association—a laudable union for purposes of fellowship and thought, but useless in the interest which it is promulgating. It is utterly impossible, as well as impracticable, to imagine that the old-time methods of the drug profession will answer the requirements of to-day. It was once when trades-people and professions could command a higher price for goods sold and services done; but the centralization of trades and increased competition of these times are bound to affect the drug trade, as well as more mundane occupations, and the one who is quickest to adapt himself to this environment is the one who will survive. One will do the business of four or five, as it will require more goods to be sold at a less profit for maintenance; and the surviving ones will have to compete in patent medicines as a medium of advertisement, to be on a par with other centralized or department stores. The evil will not be great, for as many drugs will be sold, and when a man begins to lose he will run off his stock and go at something more profitable, thus remedying two evils—the overcrowding of the profession and prejudices of the public against high prices. The old-time method of charging seventy-five cents for a prescription, fifty cents for time, experience, and water, and twenty-five cents for a good average profit on drug and bottle, will have to be substituted for the honest and better method of charging twenty-five cents for the same. The druggist not entering the arena of protection is the one who will have the start in the survival of the fittest, both by run and advertisement.

It is not protection we want against department stores, but free competition. In the first place, no legislature would prohibit their trading in drugs, and as long as there are druggists whose avarice and cupidity are greater than their professional honor and foresight, so long will we have to compete with such, which virtually means annihilation to the drug trade and a meagre existence; as a profession, likened to doctors' assistants.

Therefore it may be well to exercise a little foresight in establishing a protection, and within this a fabric greater than at present, but which eventually must fall and crush many more than at present.

The drug trade is sure to follow in the evolutionizing of our trade systems, and it only remains for those with clearer perceptions to forestall it, with material profit to themselves.

Yours truly,

J. N. WOODWARD.

622 to 626 Westminster Ave.,  
Vancouver, B.C.

Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

SIR,—An article appeared in your December number in reference to our attempt to stop McKendry & Co. cutting the price of Dr. Chase's remedies. That article is calculated to do us much harm. The reference you lend is that our attempt was not a genuine one, and that the articles which appeared in the various papers were inserted by us as advertisements.

In both your suppositions you err. Our attempt was genuine. You will readily understand that where prices are cut below wholesale figures it must necessarily injure the wholesale business. As for causing the insertion of the items in the press, the annexed documents speak for themselves.

We first observed the article you refer to in the Toronto *News*, and were so pleased at its tone that we asked the *Globe* and *Mail-Empire*, papers in which we advertise very largely, to notice the matter also. That they have charged for these references we do not know. But if they have, they will certainly be paid.

These are the facts of the case and the only foundation for your article. We regret exceedingly that you did not take the trouble to ascertain the real state of affairs before publishing the article in question, and trust you will give this correction as prominent a place in the CANADIAN DRUGGIST as you gave the article against us.

The following documents speak for themselves.

Yours truly,

EDMANSON, BATES & Co.

Toronto, January 4, 1886.

[Copy]

WM. DOUGLAS, Esq., Manager *News*.

SIR,—An article appeared in the *News* early in December re our attempt to prevent J. N. McKendry & Co. selling Dr. Chase's remedies below wholesale prices.

In a comment on that article the CANADIAN DRUGGIST infers that we caused the insertion of it as an advertisement. As far as we know, the first reference to the matter appeared in the *News*.

Will you kindly say whether or not it was an advertisement, and what connection we had with its insertion.

Yours truly,

EDMANSON, BATES & Co.

Toronto, Dec. 28th, 1895.

Messrs. Edmanson, Bates & Co., 45 Lombard Street,  
Toronto:

DEAR SIRS,—In reply to yours of Dec. 28th, I have made full inquiries. The item about your firm and J. N. McKendry & Co. was an ordinary piece of news. It was not paid for by anyone.

The inference the CANADIAN DRUGGIST places on it is wholly without foundation. I regret very much that you should have been unintentionally made the subject of unjust suspicion.

If this letter is not sufficiently strong to satisfy the CANADIAN DRUGGIST, I have no objection to giving an affidavit setting forth the above facts, if necessary.

The News Printing Co.

WM. DOUGLAS, Manager.

Toronto, Dec. 29th, 1895.

[Copy.]

J. J. Crabbe, Esq., Manager

DEAR SIR,—Your paper early in December had a comment on our attempt to prevent McKendry & Co. cutting the price of Dr. Chase's medicines. The CANADIAN DRUGGIST assumed that the article in question was published as an advertisement by us. As we do not desire to rest under this imputation, would you oblige us with the facts in a way that we can publicly use?

Yours, etc.,

EDMANSON, BATES & Co.

December 30th, 1895.

Messrs. Edmanson, Bates & Co., 45 Lombard Street,  
Toronto.

GENTLEMEN,—The article you refer to was not published as an advertisement—was not paid for by you or any other person. It was never charged to your account, or McKendry & Co., nor will it be.

Respectfully yours,

The Evening Star Printing and Publishing Co. (Ltd.)

H. R. H.

Toronto, January 4th, 1896.

The above letters speak for themselves, and any comment on them is unnecessary. Our readers will see that they fully justify our article in the December issue.

"Fellitin" is the name applied by K. Fr. Tollner (*Pharm. Ztg.*) to a "natural" medicinal soap, prepared from bile, and recommended against chilblains. Fresh bile has long been used, in certain portions of Europe, as a domestic remedy against chilblains; but the very unstable qualities of the article, and the difficulty with which it is obtained sufficiently pure, have prevented its more general employment. Fellitin appears to be bile especially prepared as a remedy against this annoying complaint. It is said to be nearly odorless, and very stable. *Merk's Report.*

A new bottle is made which indicates the hour at which the medicine should be taken