

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondence is invited from all members of the profession. We do not hold ourselves responsible for opinions of correspondents. All communications must have the name of the writer attached, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith. Any nom de plume may be used for publication. Write only on one side of the paper, and be concise.

To the CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

Wanted by the Druggists of Canada, a Universal Price Book.

Why?

It will give the lowest price that an article can be sold at to yield a fair profit after paying for it and the expense connected with its preparation and delivery to the customer. It will enable all who get that price to handle the same quality of goods, which will be the best. It will discourage selling any article at less than five cents, because when cost is reckoned up it takes all of two or three cents to hand any article to a customer without anything for cost of article or profit. It will inspire confidence in the minds of our customers that as the price is uniform so will the quality be. It will enable the store in smaller towns to get the same price as charged in large cities, and they require it, as quantity of goods sold being less, makes proportionate cost equal.

I believe it to be quite practical and with very little trouble could be introduced and carried out.

Would suggest that one druggist from each territorial division be instructed by their association to prepare such a book, giving the minimum price all having pledged themselves to carry out what they settle on as a fair price.

Trusting this will meet the approval of my fellow druggists, and that some action may be taken soon,

I am,

Yours very truly,

A. B. PETRIE.

The Attack on the Principal.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

Under the above heading Mr. D'Avignon, of Windsor, has a long article in a recent issue of this journal, the whole tenor of which seems to be to impress on the minds of the druggists of the Province, that the recent action of the council in reference to the faculty of the college is wholly due to a personal animus in the mind of the president of the council towards the principal of the college. Before being influenced by any such argument let us look at the vote as taken on the motion of Mr. McGregor, and therefrom deduce our own opinions. The vote stood 8 to 4 in favor of the dismissal of the professors, W. B. Sanders, of Stayner, being absent, but who would have voted nay I understand. So the feeling of the council is 8 to 5 in favor of the motion. Who are these eight men who for the sake

of a personal animus of one of them, are false to their friends and the confidence placed in them?

Among them we find John J. Hall, Esq., of Woodstock, than whom a more honorable man cannot be found, a man who has filled with credit to himself and to his town an honored position at its municipal board, and to whom his fellow-citizens look up for his integrity of purpose and business ability; J. W. Slavin, Esq., Mayor of Orillia, ex-Warden of the County of Simcoe, a man whom the citizens of his own town and county delight to honor and one who honors the council board of the O. C. P.; Messrs. McKee, of Peterborough; Hobart, of Kingston; McKenzie, of Toronto; Petrie, of Guelph, and McGregor, of Brantford, are all men well known in their respective communities and who are held in high esteem by their fellow-citizens.

Does Mr. D'Avignon expect us to believe that these men, who have been chosen in their respective districts by their fellow druggists to represent them at the council, are mere puppets in the hands of Mr. Clark?

Mr. Clark is to them a comparative stranger and they the one to the other. All that is common between them is the affairs and welfare of the college. They have nothing to gain but rather everything to lose by such action. The president of the council is not like the Premier of either the Dominion or the Province with fat offices in his gift. Granting that the president himself was animated by such a motive—I do not for one moment admit or believe such to be the case—can any reasonable man think that these men whose names I have mentioned could possibly be influenced by such an unworthy motive? I think not. Mr. D'Avignon by inference asks us to believe that he and those who voted with him are the only men of honor in the council. If we give them credit for voting according to their convictions, must we not do likewise for those who differ from them? I would here ask the druggists of the province to weigh well the arguments of this question. Do not accept assertions for facts, nor insinuations for charges. The interests of the college are dear to us or should be. It behooves us then to know both sides. That of the faculty has been freely aired in the Toronto press during the past few months. One writer signing himself "A Toronto Druggist," makes insinuations worthy of the man, which he dare not formulate into a charge over his own name.

There is the other side of this matter. The council have not yet spoken. They surely have something to say in defence of their actions. Let us wait then till we hear it. Thanking you for space in your valuable paper and wishing the CANADIAN DRUGGIST every success,

I am,

A COUNTRY DRUGGIST.

St. Marys, Nov. 8th, 1890.

"What the Students Say."

To the Editor of the CANADIAN DRUGGIST:

The *Canadian Pharmaceutical Journal*, which by the way is a misnomer, in recent issues gives a place to one or two communications with the above title. One of these students, a Mr. Douglass, of Collingwood, very kindly offers to be a mentor for those unfortunate druggists, who are not capable of seeing and judging for themselves. He offers us the benefit of his long experience, (he has been in business some two or three months,) and his valuable personal knowledge of the affairs of the Ontario College of Pharmacy, and of Pharmacy Colleges in general. Pray, where did he get his personal knowledge of the affairs of the Council and its relation with the College? Did he ever attend a meeting of the Council, or a meeting of any of the committees? Is he in the confidence of any of the members of the Council? I think not. Verily, the ways of our modern youth are beyond the comprehension of ordinary country druggists. We notice that in his first sentence he has seen in the public press, the attempts of the Council to justify their recent action in dismissing the present teaching staff—so called professors—of the College. I have before me all letters written for the press, by any member of the Council since that time, and only one of them, Mr. D'Avignon, of Windsor, deems it necessary to apologize to the profession for his vote and subsequent action. In the next paragraph he states that "Every druggist knows that the students should be and are the most deeply interested, &c." Who made Mr. Douglass the spokesman for every druggist? I do not know. I can speak for scores of active druggists who will not concede that the students are the most deeply interested parties, for why? The interest of the student centres in the result of the prescribed examination; the interest of the druggist in business centres in the thorough education and practical training that his son or apprentice may receive at that College, or of the graduate to whom he entrusts his business. To which of these, I ask, is the true welfare of the College more dear? I freely grant that it is from the faculty that the student directly receives his training, &c., but who are the faculty, but the employees of the Council, who in turn are merely the representatives of the druggists of the province? It is not with the students' money that the salaries are paid, but with the money of the druggists generally that do contribute, and have contributed, to the establishment of the College. Were there no students, nor students' fees whatever, the salaries would still have to be paid. True, the fees of the student go to swell the funds at the disposal of the Council, but as value is given by the Council, the money is no longer the students'. Without saying anything as to the ability or capabilities of the faculty, let us apply Mr. Douglass' own words about men who have never