

CORRESPONDENCE.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions or statements of our correspondents. All druggists are invited to use these columns for anything of importance to the trade. Every communication must be accompanied by the writer's real name and address, but not necessarily for publication.

Editor of THE CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly listen to my "Tale of Woe," and if you think it of sufficient importance to the "Brethren of the Mortar," publish it in your next issue.

I had an instance the other day of how much the manufacturer wishes to keep the good-will of the retail druggist: A country storekeeper came in and asked me what I could let him have Ozone for per bottle. Knowing he wanted it for stock I quoted him 75c. per bottle, \$9 per dozen. Now what do I find in the course of conversation—he had written the Ozone Co., whose answer was that they would be glad to supply him at \$8 per dozen—the regular wholesale price to retail druggists.

In your article on co-operative buying direct from manufacturers you give the retailers some soundbites which they do not altogether deserve. Rather let your condemnation fall upon the manufacturers who tempt the retailer to buy from them direct instead of through the jobber for they always do give retailers extra inducements. Take Shiloh's Cough Cure, for instance. If they can secure you for a \$100 order, they give you about three dozen free besides the usual advertisement schemes. Hutch people also did the same thing.

Let the jobbers get after the manufacturers, if possible, not the retailers. If I know that I can buy three gross of an article which is a good seller from the manufacturer direct and get either ten per cent. and five per cent. off and five per cent. for thirty days, or if not a discount a free gift of one, two or three dozen, while, on the other hand, I know I could not get either of those inducements from the jobber, is it not human nature and also good business to buy from the manufacturer? Therefore give the manufacturer his due and let him bear the blame.

Again, how can manufacturers expect us to be friendly to them when they advertise their goods "for sale at all druggists or from them on receipt of price," while on inquiry the druggist finds that any Tom, Dick or Harry of a little four-corner grocer can get the goods

direct at wholesale prices? This is not confined to the manufacturers alone for I know perfectly well that the jobbers, as a rule, do the same thing. I do not care whether these country storekeepers get their goods direct or from the jobber, but what I do object to is their getting them at the same price we pay. The jobber and manufacturer would sell just as many at \$9 a dozen as at \$8, and if that were done it would give us a chance to "live and let live" as you advise under co-operative buying.

Yours truly,
RETAIL DRUGGIST.

Barrie, Oct. 26, 1900.

Editor of THE CANADIAN DRUGGIST.

DEAR SIR,—A correspondent (?) in the issue of last month of one of your contemporaries, by virulent innuendos attacks not only the college faculty, but also the council and examining board, and thereby reflects upon every graduate and medallist who claims the "O.C.P." as his *alma mater*.

Since this correspondent is looking for a prototype of the "Heathen Chinee," I think he might be cast for that character himself, as he is certainly playing at a game he doesn't understand.

First, he blames the dean for the shortcomings of the council in not providing sufficient reading material and seating accommodation for the class, although I believe he has repeatedly urged this matter on the governing body. This takes up one column of most valuable space.

He then takes exception to the way assistants are appointed, and while he has not the courage to charge any wrongdoing on the part of the dean or the examiner in dispensing, suggests several reasons why the students apply for the several positions in the gift of the professors. It is with these I wish to deal, and let it be understood that during my college days I did not apply for any of the assistants' help (pharmacy, practical chemistry, theoretical chemistry nor materia medica), so that it cannot be charged that I have myself and actions to defend. After expressing fear lest the dean think them lazy if they do not apply, he says, or wishes us to infer, that no assistant ever fails on the examination in junior term. How many students of the whole class ever do? Yet I know of six assistants in pharmacy who have been ploughed under.

"And, thirdly, that the dispensing medal always goes to one of the dean's assistants." And this is where Mr.

"Heathen Chinee" shows a lamentable ignorance of the game, for in nine years only one pharmacy assistant landed the prize, viz., in 1899.

While I am speaking of failures and successes, I would like to say that the percentage of failures is just as great among the assistants as the percentage of the whole class. When were 33 per cent. of the class plucked? Yet in '94 and '95, the year preceding my own, that happened to the assistants; also in the year "Hamilton, 1900," honored with his august presence.

"Among the assistants are always some of the class officers." Whether he wishes us to take this as merely a coincidence or as the result of design, he does not say, but lest the latter be the case, I would point out that in the nine years preceding '00 there were but five class officers—three presidents and two secretaries—who were also assistants in pharmacy. It is but the summing up of what I have already pointed out, and what I am prepared to substantiate, to say that not one single charge in this two column letter has any foundation in fact.

In conclusion, let me suggest that prudent editors sometimes verify the correctness of their correspondents' statements before admitting them to their columns.

Thanking you, I am,

Yours sincerely,

W. J. GREENSHIELDS.

Guelph, Oct. 31, 1900

The "German Bill."

There is war in the province! the doctors all
arm!

The noble profession shows fear and alarm!
They demand legislation—the great "German
Bill,"

Which the druggists must swallow as neat as a
pill.

Yes, 'tis war to the knife! for the doctors have
found

That the druggists are treading on sanctified
ground,

And are drawing the dollars from Tom, Jack and
Jill,

Without a prescription for tonic or pill.

This great "German Bill" contains powder and
shot

Which the medicos mean to rain savagely hot
On the druggists who advertise, sell or expose
Their own preparations for physical woes.

The languishing Sawbones, a law they would
make,

And from each hardworked druggist a thousand
would take

For a license to sell our own tonics or pill,
For the cure of a headache or commonest ills.

Shall we endure this oppression? obey their
command?

Or relinquish our rights guaranteed by the land?
Or shall we go forth to the battle with zeal,

To give them a taste of our strength and our
steel?

Our members of Parliament should come to our
aid,

And smother the bill that the doctors have made
To make vassals of people who now are free
And as happy, contented, as people can be.

—DRUGGIST