

for clinical purposes. The Fehling test is superior to the phenyl-hydrazine test in ease of execution. The phenyl-hydrazine test is superior to the Fehling test in the non-fallacious character of its findings. We advocate the habitual use of the Fehling test to disclose the freedom of urine from dextrose. If, however, any urine be encountered which reacts positively with the Fehling test, said urine should then be subjected to the phenyl-hydrazine test to make certain that the positive reaction obtained by the Fehling test was caused by dextrose and not by one or more of the many substances which may be present in urine and react toward Fehling's test like dextrose.

In conclusion I desire to express my appreciation of the excellent services rendered during the conduct of the work by my assistant, Dr. C. J. Stamm.

MEDICO-CHIRURGICAL COLLEGE, PHILADELPHIA.

---

#### ALWAYS BLAME THE BOARD.

Boards of pharmacy are made up of human beings pretty much like the ordinary citizen. As individuals, they are liable to make mistakes and even in council, with the exercise of the best of care and judgment, errors are certain to occasionally occur. The interesting question, however, comes when it must be decided who shall be the judge of right and wrong acts and who shall set up the standard by which the board of pharmacy is to be measured. Our editorial experience, which dates back almost as far as the average board of pharmacy, and the experience of other pharmaceutical journals shows that pharmacists are always ready to judge of the acts of a board of pharmacy and are quick to give their decisions, particularly when, in their own minds, it calls for criticism. We have seen boards of pharmacy blamed for the scarcity of drug clerks, for the high price of salaries, for the number of drug stores for sale, for the close proximity of drug stores, for cut rate prices, for the low wages paid clerks, for the number of clerks out of employment, for the annual or bi-annual re-registration fee, for the necessity of attending a college of pharmacy, for interchanging certificates with other boards, for not adopting reciprocity in registration, for paying the secretary of the board a salary, for letting women in pharmacy through, when men making the same average would not have been passed, for having it in for women in pharmacy and denying them registration on the required percentage in examinations and for a long list of other things that need not be mentioned here. Our experience with boards of pharmacy convinces us that as individuals and in their official capacity the board members are anxious to do the very best they can for the welfare of pharmacy in the state concerned.

We are not calling attention to the criticism of boards of pharmacy with a view of having the practice discontinued. If anything, it should be encouraged. It acts as a safety valve for disgruntled pharmacists and does not harm the board. The board member who cannot stand criticism is unqualified for a position as a state officer. The board which escapes criticism must be inactive and the law under which it exists a dead letter.—*Meyer Brothers Druggist.*