

DISCUSSION UPON THE PRECEDING PAPER AND HIGH GRADE CANDY AS A SIDE-LINE.—(Printed in September issue.)

MR. C. W. TOBEY:—"The two papers just read are very interesting and useful ones, but that although, as one of the authors said, 'Cleanliness was next to Godliness,' there is one thing I cannot understand about the candy business, and that is, if you take the ordinary candies and put them in a jar with a card stating the price, they will remain there until they are stale; while if you take a hundred pounds of the same candy and expose it for sale in one of these large, open pails, nine out of ten of his customers would say, 'Give me a dime's worth or a nickel's worth.' This shows that cleanliness is not always appreciated. In the cheap stores, where all kinds of candies are exposed to dust more candy is sold, a hundred times more, than is sold in stores that keep goods in a cleanly condition. Sometimes it seemed as though filth was at par. While I believe in sanitary methods, yet the people will buy the goods displayed in pails when they will not purchase those from jars. Therefore, the way to sell the goods is not the sanitary way."

MR. NITARDY:—"I think Mr. Apple's points are well-made and so was that of Mr. Tobey. There is a compromise between the two methods which our firm has adopted. We buy our candy in bulk and then place it in paper sacks priced at five and ten cents. These sacks are printed with the name of the article and the firm's imprint and price. These we place in trays near to the cash-register and when the customer pays his bill, he will often be attracted to them and buy one. We sell a large amount in this way."

MR. FENNEL:—"The public are not discriminating. They see this candy exposed in these cheap, department stores and they think it is good enough, but when they go into a drug-store they expect cleanliness and a better quality of goods."

MR. HOLZHAUER:—"I believe that the candy-business of the future will be done by the drug-store. The tendency is in that direction. Some time ago I placed in my store a wheelbarrow which I filled with horehound drops. The amount of these which I sold was something incredible. I bought them in five-barrel lots and sold tons of them in that winter. The only objection was that when the candy became a little discolored the loss was high, for people would not then purchase it. People not only want to see the candy, but they like to sample it. Concerning high-priced candy the attention of patrons must be called to it. It will not sell itself. Every druggist can make a good business in high-priced candy if he will devote attention to it."

CHAIRMAN MASON:—"It appears to me that the tendency of the last four or five years has been in the direction of higher-priced goods. In many cases it is the attractive package that sells the goods at a higher price."

MR. WEAVER:—"Mr. Mason is right about the package selling the goods in a great many cases. I do not really believe that the candy of the dollar package is much better, but it is more attractive to the young man who is going to present it to a young lady and wants something nice."

MR. APPLE:—"The particular point I wished to make was as to the unsanitary method of displaying such goods. We must not lose sight of the fact that primarily we are pharmacists and are expected to know more about the dangers of exposing goods to contamination. If pharmacists wish to be termed the hand-maid of medicine, we should, in every way, try to show that they possess a knowledge greater than that possessed by the ordinary tradesman. It would doubtless be very easy for a druggist to secure from their candy-dealers pails with a glass cover and this would protect them and keep them in a sanitary condition."

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR DRUGGISTS TO HANDLE INSECTICIDES, DISINFECTANTS, SPRAYS, ETC.

E. V. HOWELL.

The object of this paper is to present the opportunity of druggists in this line of work, and to lay stress on two points.

First. The commercial advantages of this field of work. Second. To show that *not* to take advantage of this opportunity is a *loss* to the profession in these particulars: First. Loss of the profit that may be derived from this trade; Second. Loss of *other* trade *because* this work, professionally belonging to the druggist, is taken up by others who then naturally add similar products and thus encroach on the legitimate field of trade of the druggist.