

in Toronto or elsewhere may, *yes, and are urged*, to sell at whatever prices they like. We know of cases where goods are being sent to country towns by retail druggists, not to say anything of the department stores who send out immense quantities, at the same prices as they are sold at in these cities. Is this fair? Should the city druggist be allowed to sell goods at anything he pleases and the country druggist who manfully tries to act in good faith with the society, suffer for his honesty of purpose? Certainly not, and unless prices are made uniform for *all druggists throughout the province* the scheme is a failure, and if any other plan can be adopted let it be done without delay. The druggists of Ontario, irrespective of their locality, and for that matter, all of Canada, should be on the same footing—and as representing the entire drug trade, we must insist on a reform.

The Department Store.

The agitation against the department stores is rapidly spreading, and with the whole country aroused to the immense influence that these stores have in mercantile affairs, there should eventually be a remedy found to counteract, in a measure at least, the evil consequences of their policy on the mercantile world. The *Toronto Saturday Night* has had a number of excellent articles on the subject, and this has been followed by the *Evening Star* in the same strain. A bill was introduced in the Ontario Legislature by Mr. Middleton, of Hamilton, aimed at these stores, and which was very much of the same nature as that being discussed in the State Legislature of Illinois. This bill provides for the granting of power to town or city councils by a two-thirds vote of its members to impose an additional license tax on all stores handling more than two lines of goods. The bill, however, has been laid over until next session, and it is understood that the Provincial Government will in the meantime consider the matter and bring forward a scheme at the next session of the House.

Legislation is now being sought in the same matter in the different legislatures of the States of Illinois, New York, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Missouri, and Arkansas.

An Unwarranted Statement.

An article appeared in the April number of the *Canadian Pharmaceutical Jour.*

entitled "Can this be true?" which displays an animus towards the Ontario College of Pharmacy altogether uncalled for. The facts of the case we find to be as follows: One of the students in attendance at the college enquired from a bookseller on Carlton street the price of a blank book, and he was told forty cents, but that if he could sell a number of them for him they would be supplied at thirty cents each. He asked how many students were in attendance, and was told about 100. This student afterwards told him that the students all bought their own books, and that he could not sell them for him. This student, in company with a few others, were in the department store of The R. Simpson Co. a day or two later, and found a book there which suited him at twenty-five cents, and bought one. The members of the class assure us that they do not believe that altogether one-half dozen of these books were bought at Simpson's. Now, what this can have to do with the statement made, "That any institution in any manner connected with pharmacy should patronize and encourage a corporation whose avowed object is the destruction of their profession, passes comprehension."

It clearly means that the "institution" referred to is the College of Pharmacy, but we can see no connection whatever between the college and anyone else in this transaction. The scholars have to provide themselves with the needful books, they are at liberty to buy them where they please, but to their credit let it be said they avoid, except in the case mentioned, patronizing the departmental stores. As will be seen in our correspondence column, they have insisted upon and received a retraction of the article as far as they are concerned. It is now due to the council and the teaching staff of the college that a full retraction should be made to them.

Editorial Notes.

The Proprietary Articles' Trade Association of Great Britain, which was formed in January, 1896, is growing in numbers and in the various sections which are becoming federated with it. The primary object of the association is "to secure the establishment of fixed minimum re-selling prices which would show remunerative profits to both wholesale and retail traders." The plan upon which the associa-

tion works, says the *British and Colonial Druggist*, is to secure from all wholesale or direct buyers an agreement undertaking to maintain wholesale and retail prices, and also to withhold supplies of all the articles on the list from any firms named by the association, as cutting any of them below the minimum price. It will thus be seen that they do not attempt to enforce the sale at the regular advertised price, but place a minimum price, below which they must not be sold. Negotiations are in progress to bring in the Grocers' Federation and also the Photographic Dealers, as both of these handle goods which are also kept by many druggists.

At the recent conference between the Newspaper Publishers' Association and members of the Proprietary Association, held in New York, Prof. Munyon, of homœopathic remedy fame, proposed that publishers refuse to accept advertisements from druggists or department stores that handled goods of their own manufacture which might be substituted for advertised goods. As the *Era* very aptly remarks, "the newspaper men did not see the force of an argument to throw overboard \$20,000 worth of department store advertising for \$2,000 worth of homœopathic advertising." We think Prof. Munyon has also the drug trade to reckon with, when he proposes a boycott against them because they feel qualified to manufacture remedies of their own.

"The Present Situation of the Retail Drug Business" is the heading of the leading article in *The New Idea*, No. 1, vol. 9, just received. It deals forcibly and intelligently with the methods now being adopted by the proprietary medicine manufacturers, as a result of the recent conference with the Publishers' Association at New York. These methods must only serve to antagonize the retail drug trade, and to still further encourage those who have come to the determination regarding "patents" to "let them severely alone."

By the recent amendments to the Liquor License Act passed by the Ontario Legislature, druggists may sell alcoholic liquors in quantities not exceeding six ounces, and only then on the written order of qualified physician. Physicians who are also druggists, are subject to the same regulations.