

\$1000 rental has to pay \$60 business tax to the local government in addition to the \$65 to \$70 which he pays to the civic corporation, and \$5 to the Pharmaceutical Association. This has to be paid on the 1st of October in each year and about the same time the water rates and assessments fall due. It is hard for a pill maker to be jolly under such circumstances.

### Prince Edward Island.

On November 22nd the Druggists of Charlottetown each received the following communication :

DEAR SIR,—I enclose a copy of the resolution passed at a meeting held by the medical men of this city.

If you intend to comply with the same please forward answer to me in writing before Monday next.

Yours, etc.,

S. R. JENKINS, M. D., Secretary.  
Charlottetown, Nov. 21, 1892.

### COPY.

WHEREAS, we, the undersigned medical men of Charlottetown, being aware that the druggists of Charlottetown have been accustomed to prescribe for patients by selecting medicine for them and dispensing medicines prescribed by us to persons other than those for whom they were originally prescribed, we consider such practices as very improper, contrary to law and very unjust to us as medical practitioners.

THEREFORE, Resolved: That we request each druggist in the city to relinquish such practices and give us his written promise to that effect, and that a copy of this resolution shall be forwarded to each druggist.

P. Conroy, M. D., (chairman); F. P. Taylor, F. R. C. P., Edin.; Richard Johnson, M. D.; Frank D. Bear, M. D.; Jas. Washerton, L. R. C. P. & S., F.; Fred. F. Kelly, M. D.; H. D. Johnson, M. D.; Jas. Handralan, M. D.; Jas. McLeod, M. D.; S. R. Jenkins, M. D., Secretary.

The Druggists were naturally very much perturbed by this bomb-shell, and, with the public, wondered how their business could possibly be carried on if they could no longer "select medicines" for their customers. Correspondents in the newspapers and editorial comments were strongly against the doctors' request, and all deprecated the inauguration of a new and crippled state of affairs. The Druggists all wished to conciliate the medical men, but they did not see how they could do so if the request not to select patent medicines and simple remedies for common ills were to be urged, and for a time it looked as if it was to be a choice between prescription trade and general patronage. So they hid themselves to a meeting to discuss the question. Dr. Dodd declared that "the meeting did not interest him," and it after transpired that he had written a willing assent to the Physicians' request. Mr. George Hughes attended the meeting with all the other Druggists, but his stand upon the question was publicly taken next day when he printed the circular in the newspapers with the following remarks:—

A Card.

AS I have a legal right to select medicines for my customers, I shall continue as heretofore to supply their wants to the best of my

ability—with the best goods that money can buy, and my long experience in the business, (extending over twenty years, with four years spent in the study of medicine with a practising physician), I feel justified in asking for a continuance of your liberal patronage. The Apothecaries Hall is not run in the interest of any physician, directly or indirectly. You are not charged 25 or 30 per cent. extra on prescriptions for the doctors' benefit. Therefore, bring them to me and save money.

All prescriptions and family recipes shall receive my personal attention.

Your obedient servant,

GEORGE E. HUGHES.

Apothecaries Hall, DesBrisay's Corner, Queen St., Ch'town.

The result of the Druggists' meeting was the unanimous adoption of the following:—

Charlottetown, 26th Nov., 1892.

To S. R. Jenkins, M.D., Secretary of the Medical Profession in Charlottetown.

SIR,—At a meeting, called to-day, of all the Druggists of Charlottetown, the following resolution was passed.

"We, undersigned Druggists of the city of Charlottetown, beg respectfully to submit to the Physicians of Charlottetown, in reply to their circular letter, received by us during the present week.

1st. That our disposition towards the Medical profession is friendly and respectful.

2nd. That we recognize the rightful provinces of both the Medical Faculty and the Druggists.

3rd. That while we wish to consider fully the rights of the profession, we deem it our duty to uphold our own.

4th. We repudiate the accusation that we have been in the habit of dispensing prescriptions for others than whom they were originally prescribed for.

5th. As regards "selecting medicines" we submit

(a) That the practice is not illegal, inasmuch as the majority of us have been so practicing for the prescribed term of five years previous to the passing of the Medical Act of last session of Provincial Parliament.

(b) That we could not reasonably be expected to sign away our right so to do as it does not unduly interfere with the practice of the Physician, and

(c) As it forms an indispensable factor in our business, we would in relinquishing it, sign away a considerable part of our means of gaining a livelihood in our legitimate business.

(d) Further we submit that public opinion is already so strong against the proposed change, it would most assuredly lead to the repeal of the Medical Act of the last session of Provincial Parliament.

(e) Also we contend that as in no other city does any such restriction obtain, as is now suggested, we Druggists would present ourselves as willingly and unnaturally under undue coercion and as seemingly ridiculously ignorant of our business. We therefore ask the Medical men to re-consider their resolution, to modify their demands, and if they will, to submit to us, for further consideration, any such modifications as they may deem fit; and we assure them that we will do everything reasonable to establish more firmly, if possible, the proper reciprocal protective relationship between the Medical Profession and the Druggists in our respective relations to the public.

C. D. RANKIN,  
REDDIN BROS.,  
WM. R. WATSON,  
ARTHUR JOHNSON,  
F. DE C. DAVIS.

As was anticipated, the Druggists were asked to have a friendly talk over the matter with the Physicians, for which purpose a meeting was called and attended by all the Druggists who had signed the above reply, and five of the Physicians. Here it transpired that the Physi-

cians' Circular had been worded differently from what was intended. They had no intention they declared of opposing the druggists in giving any medicine asked for, or in selecting one of several similar preparations for symptoms mentioned; their wish was merely to protest against the Druggist treating diseases which should be under the Physician's care, and enquiring symptoms, diagnosing the case, and as a result *compounding* medicines such as a physician would direct. They did not wish to interfere with the druggist giving sample remedies for ordinary troubles which the customer could name and say definitely that he suffered from.

Had the circular letter to the druggists asked them to refrain from diagnosing in uncertain cases, and compounding complex mixtures for the cure of the supposed disease, all misunderstanding would have been avoided. As a matter of fact, the Doctors' explanation proved that they, too, wished—in the words of the Druggists' reply to their circular—to establish the "proper, reciprocal, protective relationship between the Medical Profession and the Druggists in their respective relations to the public."

### Notes From England.

(From our own Correspondent.)

The various societies more or less connected with pharmacy have settled down in earnest for their winter sessions.

The first evening meeting of the Pharmaceutical Society was held this month and was principally remarkable for a paper on the sale of poisons to medical men and chemists by the President, Michael Carteighe, Esq.

Mr. Carteighe saddled his paper with a cumbersome title, but the matter was excellent and the advice contained eminently judicious and sensible. Whilst stating that he had had the subject in his mind for years he partially acknowledged that it was the public interest excited by the Neill case, that had caused him to present the paper. The whole subject of the retail supply of doctors with poisons is hedged in with difficulties. In the larger towns it is impossible for the chemist to know half the doctors by sight and the handwriting of a much smaller portion. Yet Mr. Carteighe would decline to supply a medical man with poison or a preparation containing poison unless known to the seller or introduced by someone known to the seller. Even in those cases he would require the poison register to be signed. Most chemists recognise that the responsibility and risk attached to the sale of poisons is so great that they would gladly assist in rendering their sale more difficult—the recompense being totally inadequate when it is remembered that the wholesale houses, however, are quite ready to take this risk—it being a matter of impossibility for them to check the bona fides of all their customers, although some attempt is generally made—it does not seem