

# MONTREAL PHARMACEUTICAL JOURNAL.

VOL. IV—No. 4.

JULY, 1893.

\$1.00 per annum.

## The Montreal Pharmaceutical Journal.

171 St. James St., Montreal, Canada.

JOSEPH E. MORRISON, Editor.

Subscription, \$1.00 per Annum.

Advertising Rates will be made known on application.

All remittances, matters intended for publication, new advertisements or changes should be addressed,

MONTREAL PHARMACEUTICAL JOURNAL.

P. O. Box 2144, Montreal.

F. L. BENEDICT, Secretary.

**CORRECTION.**—In our report of the annual meeting, published in last month's issue, on page 48A and 3rd paragraph from foot of the page, Mr. Gray was made to say: "I do not partake of the opinion that we should have all our tinctures according to the B. P.," whereas it should have read: "I do not partake of the opinion that we should not have all our tinctures according to the B. P." We regret that this error has occurred, and take the first opportunity of correcting it.

**THE LANCTOT CASE.**—Judge Charland has given his decision in this important case, which was taken by the Pharmaceutical Association against R. Mathieu for being registered as a partner with H. Lanctot without being a licentiate of pharmacy. The learned judge decided that, as Mr. Lanctot has sole control over the shop as regards sales, the preparation of all the medicines and of everything relating to the pharmaceutical portion of the business, therefore the requirements of the law, as set forth in clause 4033 of the Pharmacy Act, had been complied with. The judge stated that he could find nothing in the Act which would prevent a licentiate from obtaining the financial aid of his friends or from dividing the profits of the business with any one as long as he has control of the pharmaceutical portion of the business, and consequent-

ly judgment was given against the Association with costs.

We publish the full text of the judgment as given in *La Presse* June 30, 1893.

THE following letter appeared in the *Canadian Druggist* :—

To the Editor of the *Canadian Druggist* :

DEAR SIR,—THE MONTREAL PHARMACEUTICAL JOURNAL, Lyman Sons & Co.'s organ, has, in its May number, an editorial on an item which appeared in the last issue of the *Canadian Druggist*.

I take exception to the paragraph numbered 7 of said article.

The party who presented the now famous circular to the Council, did so on the request of a member of the Quebec Pharmaceutical Association. I hold that every member of the Council is expected to present to the Council in session any communication or suggestion entrusted to him by members of the Q. P. A. The Council represents the whole society, and should receive any and all communications sent it by members of the Association.

The circular in question was presented as a matter of business, quietly and rationally, and the presenter was not "full of wrath and condemnation."

I would like to know who gave the fiery information to the M. P. J., as they had no representative there.

The word "only" in paragraph number 5 is open to criticism. The subject of wholesalers selling to doctors (and consumers) is a matter affecting the business of every retail druggist.

The style of the whole article is rather caustic, and not couched in the meekest of language—"bravadoism" is not always the best way to clear oneself of any imputation.

The only way for retail druggists to judge the matter fairly, and the best defence that the aggravated parties can make, is for the circular in question so be published in *extenso*.

THE ONE WHO PRESENTED THE CIRCULAR.

It has already been clearly shown that there was nothing to "clear oneself" from. Circulars were not sent to doctors, but circulars, as already stated, were sent to druggists and general storekeepers in some new territory which the wholesale house re-