

Will Not Supply Cutters.

MONTREAL, Oct. 3rd, 1898.

The Editor CANADIAN DRUGGIST, Toronto, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—Herewith we beg to hand you copies of correspondence that has passed between ourselves and Messrs. Burgess & Powell Company of your city, and request that you be so kind as to lay it before your readers.

Our position with regard to the retail drug trade is already well known, but we wish our retail friends to be in a position to judge our *bona fides* in the contest into which we are entering in the endeavor to protect our preparation.

Yours faithfully,

THE ABBEY EFFERVESCENT SALT CO., LTD.

per Henry Duffell.

Messrs. THE BURGESS POWELL CO., Ltd.,
Toronto, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—We were informed some days ago by our Toronto correspondents that you were selling Abbey's Effervescent Salt at 20 cents and 40 cents per bottle, instead of the regular price, 25 cents and 60 cents.

We requested our Mr Hudson to call upon you, and he informed us that you declined to raise the prices, on the ground that so long as Eaton's are able to obtain our preparation and sell it at a cut price you will do the same, entirely overlooking the fact that these concerns must obtain their goods, either by connivance with some retail druggist, or by paying the full retail price, and not through any fault of ours.

The position that you take in this matter surprises us extremely. In early July we ascertained as a fact that no druggist in the city of Toronto had any difficulty in obtaining a full price for Abbey's Effervescent Salt, although both Eaton's and Simpson's drug departments were able to obtain our preparation in small quantities, and sold it at cut prices. It is quite evident, therefore, that there was no necessity to meet any price that may have been made by these people, and consequently natural that we should have felt astonished that a reputable drug house, doing a very considerable business, should set an example in injuring the sale and reputation of Abbey's Effervescent Salt.

You are doubtless aware that we have taken important steps to protect the retail

druggist, and to maintain our prices, in order to enable the legitimate druggist to reap a legitimate profit, and it is only natural that we should look for hearty co-operation among the druggists, rather than for a direct attack upon the standing and reputation of our preparation.

We take the liberty of laying the case before you, and to request you to be good enough to restore the prices of Abbey's Effervescent Salt to the regular level. We ask this, not alone in your own interest and ours, but also in the interest of your *confreres* in the retail drug trade, and we think that you must be sufficiently familiar with the position of matters in your own business to realize fully how suicidal to the trade would be the playing, by members of it, directly into the hands of departmental stores and the grocery trade, rather than, by showing a firm and united front, to overcome those difficulties in a direct, strong, and straightforward manner.

We shall be much obliged by your early reply.

Yours very truly,

THE ABBEY EFFERVESCENT SALT CO., LTD.

(COPY.)

Montreal, September 16th, 1898.

Messrs. Burgess & Powell Co.,
Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sirs,—We wrote you on the 7th inst., asking you to restore the prices of our preparation, and as we received no reply we wrote you again on the 12th inst., and are now informed by our Mr. Hudson that you have definitely refused to comply with our request, and that it is not likely that you will reply to our letter. We must, therefore, in order to maintain the position which we have taken with regard to the drug trade, request the wholesale houses to cease to fill your further orders for Abbey's Effervescent Salt.

Yours very truly,

THE ABBEY EFFERVESCENT SALT CO., LIMITED

(COPY.)

CIRCULAR LETTER TO THE WHOLESALE
DRUG TRADE.

Montreal, September 16th, 1898.

Dear Sirs,—We beg to inform you that the Burgess & Powell Co., of Toronto, have been for some time past selling Abbey's Effervescent Salt at 20 cents a bottle for the small size and 40 cents per

bottle for the large size. We have written them several times in the matter and have taken every possible means to induce them to restore the price, which they refuse to do. We have, therefore, no other course open but to request you to carry out the terms of our agreement with you, viz., to cease to fill directly or indirectly any further orders for this house or its branches.

We shall be much obliged by your acknowledging receipt of this circular.

Yours very truly,

THE ABBEY EFFERVESCENT SALT CO.,
LIMITED.**The Optical Course.**

To the Editor of THE CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

DEAR SIR,—I would like to ask a few questions for my own information and for those who, like myself, have taken a practical course in optics. (1st) What more right has the College of Pharmacy to teach optics than the Dental or Veterinary colleges? (2nd) Is it not an aggressive if not offensive movement on the part of the College of Pharmacy to interfere with a sister institution such as the Optical Institute of Canada that has done such pioneer and efficient work in teaching optics to those druggists who wished to learn spectacle-fitting? (3rd) Outside of the fact that the College of Pharmacy is a chartered institution has it any more right to teach optics than, say, the Optical Institute of Canada or any other school has to teach pharmacy? (4th) As Canada at present can hardly support one optical institute, what excuse is there for the College of Pharmacy entering the field of optics? (5th) Can the College of Pharmacy ever hope to equal in efficiency the work now being done by the Optical Institute? (6th) The resolution of the Board of Regents seems to leave no uncertain sound as to their intention to make the study of optics compulsory—in the near future. Is it not unwise to force students to study optics just because they wish to study pharmacy? The studies are already sufficiently arduous. (7th) Is there any more relation between the study of drugs and optics than that between dentistry or horology and optics? (8th) Is the College of Pharmacy not intruding upon the rights of the medical colleges?

EASTERN DRUGGIST AND
OPTICAL GRADUATE.

Oct. 10, 1898.