

torical collection and library, but it should have at its command suitable laboratories where the formulas proposed for inclusion in the National Formulary could be tested out, and where many of the mooted questions of U. S. P. importance could be considered. Outside of the field of official preparations, there are also a number of investigations of importance to the dispensing pharmacist which could receive attention. Formulas in pharmaceutical publications are as "thick as hops," and are no doubt selected from the best available sources, but often, very often, they are either unworkable, or yield unsatisfactory products. Evidently some of them, like the German's camel, have been evolved wholly from the inner consciousness of their authors.

With the aid of a properly equipped experimental laboratory the proposed A. Ph. A. recipe book might be expected to contain only tested and workable formulas.

A building sufficient for the purposes outlined should, of course, be located in some city where there are facilities for the publication of the Journal and National Formulary. It should be a fireproof structure, and should be architecturally in keeping with the purposes for which it is intended.

At a rough guess, the cost of the completed structure should not exceed \$50,000.00, though it should be erected in such a way as to permit of additions and expansions as needed.

With its rapidly growing membership and revenues, the Association could without much effort provide for the maintenance of such a plant, but the first cost of its erection and equipment would have to be met otherwise; and since the A. Ph. A. has given its services freely to the whole of American pharmacy, why should not the whole of American pharmacy contribute to a plant which would enable the Association to greatly increase its usefulness to the cause which it represents?

In the erection of such a structure pharmacy would not only be making provision for the satisfaction of its present and future needs, but it would also be providing a memorial for the many noble spirits, as Procter, Parrish, Maisch, Ebert, and a host of others who have enriched and dignified American pharmacy.

The *Journal* will be glad to publish the thoughts of the members upon this subject.

J. H. BEAL.



HOW SOME DOCTORS VIEW U. S. P. AND N. F. PROPAGANDA.

IT might perhaps be of advantage to pharmacists to become acquainted with some of the objections raised by doctors to the U. S. P. and N. F. Propaganda, as they have become apparent to one who has busied himself in behalf of these efforts.

Some doctors object to the therapeutic information that is gratuitously administered to them by the druggists. What, they say, do druggists know about therapeutics? And, I must confess, that some of the therapeutic ideas advanced by pharmacists in this connection, though taken from text-books, are antiquated and not in keeping with advanced conceptions. Would it not be better if pharmacists confined themselves in their literature intended for doctors to the discussion of

things that druggists really know better than doctors, e. g., pleasant administration?

Quite a number of doctors feel that the druggist is in this movement merely for the sake of dollars and cents, that the same commercialism lies behind it that leads him to "counter-prescribing," to indiscriminate refilling of prescriptions, and to substitution. To antagonize this objection, propaganda for *ethical pharmacy* should accompany the U. S. P. and N. F. propaganda. By the way, what is ethical pharmacy? Does anyone know of a code of pharmaceutical ethics? And if not, is it not time that such a code be devised?

Some doctors believe that the "get-together" movement should mean a declaration of willingness on the part of the druggist to advance the interests of doctors, just as he desires the doctors to advance the interests of the druggists. Should not the larger aims of pharmacists and physicians be the same? Should they not be united in battling for the most efficient treatment of the sick, and the greatest possible protection of the health of the well? I am sure pharmacists would find the physicians willing and powerful allies in any effort to raise the educational requirements of pharmacists, should the pharmacists desire advance in that direction. Why should not pharmacists take active interest in the efforts of the medical profession toward higher medical education and the diminution of the baneful activity of the quack? The better educated the doctor, the less will he be in need of U. S. P. and N. F. propaganda.

Prevention of disease is the highest and most altruistic aim of the medical profession. Every case of disease prevented means a loss of money to the doctor as well as to the druggist, and yet doctors have ever united their efforts toward the prevention of disease. Why should not druggists join them in these efforts? Would it not be more nearly in keeping with the "get-together" spirit if druggists aided instead of combatting the establishment of a national department of health; if they united with the medical instead of the anti-medical forces in this fight?

BERNARD FANTUS, M. D.