A. G. DuMez, who graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1907, and is now associate professor and director in the Course in Pharmacy at the University of the Philippines, will remain at the University of Wisconsin during the summer session in order to complete his work for the doctor's degree.

Dr. J. H. Beal, of Urbana, Illinois, recently delivered an interesting and instructive lecture to the students of the pharmacy department on "The Burdens of Progressive Legislation."

THE PHARMACIST AND THE LAW

REGISTRATION OF PATENT MEDICINES IN PORTO RICO.

The regulations applying to the registration of patent medicine became effective July 1, and require: That no person, firm, syndicate, corporation, proprietor or administrator of a drug store or pharmacy and no business engaged in manufacturing on the island of Porto Rico, devoted to the preparation of patent medicines designed for pharmacological uses, shall offer for sale such medicines, nor distribute them from house to house, nor give out free samples unless the medical formula for such preparation shall have been previously registered with the Service of Sanitation.

That the application for such registration shall state that the medicine has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906, and also with regulation No. 28, governing such medicines. The other data to be filed at the same time shall include the name of the preparation, of the applicant, where the remedy is made, the form and container employed, the names in English and Spanish of all ingredients except those inactive or inert; the therapeutic effects claimed. The exact text of the advertising matter to be used and of the matter accompanying the preparation must also be given, together with the name of the island agent if the manufacturer is a non-resident of Porto Rico.

With the application must be submitted two samples of the medicine as sold, and copies of the advertising matter to be employed. The form of advertising and the make-up of the package shall not be changed without authorization of the Service of Sanitation.

The Service of Sanitation is instructed not to make known the formula nor the names of the ingredients employed.

All this data will be filed in a book of registration together with the official number given the preparation, and an analysis made by the director of the chemical laboratory of the service, who must give to the applicant as his guarantee a certified copy of the registry, together with a copy of the official analysis.

Manufacturers of such patent medicines are, however, forbidden to use any legend on the package which would infer that the Service of Sanitation either guarantees or recognizes the merits or the therapeutic action of the medicine so registered.

TIME OF REGISTRATION.

The original time for such registration was set at July 1, after which date the advertising and sale of non-registered medicines would be prohibited, but Director W. F. Lippitt, director of the health board, has since stated that "reasonable time" will be allowed for such registration, up to 60 days from July 1. Director Lippitt's original ruling as to registrations was, in part, as follows:

2. In order to give more time to merchants the "'Sanitary Service" will extend said period until the first day of July, 1916, on which date the corresponding solicitations of registration should be presented, and if not, said preparations will be prohibited in sale and advertising.

3. It should be understood, nevertheless, that July 1 is not the limit of time for the approval of such solicitations, nor for termination of the analysis or emission of definite information, only for the presentation of documents required for such ruling. For this reason it shall be clearly understood that petitions for registration of a patented article, does not imply its definite acceptation.

4. The interested parties may solicit copies, in English or Spanish, of said ruling.

5. Pharmacists should exact from the wholesaler some written manifestation that the patented article they are purchasing is registered in accordance with the law, as the presentation of such writing renders the retailer free from the responsibility in regard to fulfillment of this ruling.

REVISED NARCOTIC LAW TO BE TAXATION MEASURE?

There are grounds for the belief that when the Treasury officials take up the question of plans for strengthening the Harrison anti-narcotic law to meet the situation enforced by the decision of the United States Supreme Court they will move along the line of making the law more of a Federal taxing measure than it now is, rather than attempt to patch up the law by a mere change of verbiage in an effort to meet the objections which the high court raised to the statute.

It is recognized among the government attorneys and experts in charge of the subject that the decision of the Supreme Court turned very largely on the question of the inexactitude of the law, which it is well understood will not be permitted in a criminal statute. It is not believed that the law can be strengthened with any amendments having to do with the question whether it covers opium produced or imported into the country, and whether the persons sought to be prevented from having illegal possession of the inhibited drugs are "any other" persons or "all other" persons.

In other words, the Treasury officials will be inclined to favor the plan suggested in the last report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of Secretary McAdoo, for taxing all original packages of these inhibited drugs and eliminating the stamp taxation only in cases where orders for these drugs are filled from stamped packages upon physicians' prescriptions or are given by the physician, or other exempted persons in the course of their practice.

It is the belief of the officials that if the taxing provisions, such as are employed in the oleomargarine law, for example, are applied to these narcotic drugs there would be no objection on the part of wholesalers and retailers who would deal in the stamped goods and that persons who dispense the drugs upon prescriptions or otherwise in legitimate practice would make such records of the dispensing of the drugs as would enable the officials to prevent the inhibited drugs falling into the hands of addicts in unlawful quantities.

While no intimations are given as to the time when the department will take up this subject, and there continue to be suggestions that the matter may not be pressed at the present session of Congress, it is believed that the officials will thoroughly map out a program and confer with senators and representatives as well as with the representatives of the drug trade thereon within a short time.

So far as can be learned the persons in the trade, including wholesalers, retailers and physicians, have up to this time indulged in no comments in correspondence with the department relative to the change in the conditions enforced by the Supreme Court decision.

—*Paint, Oil and Drug Reporter.*

A CHECK NOT ALWAYS A RECEIPT.

A depositor claimed that the bank had wrongfully charged his account with $900. The bank sent a check for 65 cents to him, with a letter stating that this was his balance in full with the bank and was in settlement of his account. The depositor accepted the check. The bank set up that the depositor had no further claim upon it. The court held otherwise and said:

"We can see no just ground upon which the acceptance of the 65 cents inclosed with the above letter and general statement of plaintiff's account at the bank could have constituted an accord and satisfaction of the disputed item of $900. That the plaintiff was disputing the correctness of the charge of $900 against him cannot be denied, because he had already filed his suit for this item. The 65 cents sent him was an amount in addition to this about which there was no controversy. It is inconceivable that the plaintiff intended to settle his claim for $900 in consideration of the payment of 65 cents of his own money. It is true the plaintiff retained the 65 cents mailed him; but he had a right to do this, as it was his own money, and there was no controversy with reference to this small balance.

"The attention of the plaintiff was not directed by the above letter to the controversy with reference to the $900 item. The $900 item was charged on the account; but it only signified that the bank still had him charged with the $900 item which he disputed. Not only must an offer be made in full settlement of a disputed claim, but it must be accepted as full settlement. There is nothing in the letter above quoted to call plaintiff's attention to the fact, if it were a fact, that the defendant bank was offering this 65 cents in money in full settlement of defendant's claim for $900." (Collins vs. Union and Farmers' Bank; 70 So. 581. Miss. Sup. Ct.)

THE PARK CASES SETTLED AFTER TWENTY YEARS IN COURT.

The Park suit against the National Wholesale Druggists' Association and a number of wholesale druggists named as co-defendants originated at a time when trade conditions were vastly different than now, and also laws and views of the judiciary.

The action brought by plaintiff charged conspiracy in restraint of trade and the most recent of the Park Company actions to reach the courts was what is commonly known as a tort case, alleging conspiracy on the part of several wholesale drug houses which are members of the National Wholesale Druggists' Association, especially directed against the Park Company, including in its specifications "black-listing," spying on that concern's operations and an effort to prevent that company from obtaining business.

This case was set for trial before Justice Clarence A. Shearn and a jury in the Supreme Court at New York for June 2, but was later transferred to a part of that court in which Justice Gavegan was sitting, and was scheduled for trial on June 5.

During this adjournment the compromise was effected by the lawyers for both sides, Norman B. Beecher, of Burlingham, Montgomery & Beecher, and Leo Everett, of Everett, Clarke & Benedict, as the attorney and associate counsel for the defendants, and former Judge Alton B. Parker and Arthur B. McCausland, representing the Park Company.

The other suits have likewise been settled, and the sum involved is, $125,000.

Those in position to know say that these suits might have been continued in court for twenty years longer and possibly then not be nearer a conclusion. The settlement is costly, but even at the price, everyone concerned is to be congratulated on the termination of this case with an interesting and expensive history.

ONE CENT DAMAGES IN CARDUI CASE.

The jury in the case of Chattanooga Medicine Company against the American Medical Association for libel, brought in a verdict of one cent damages in favor of plaintiff, June 22, after six days' consideration.

Damages were sought as a result of the publication in the *Journal of the American Medical Association,* describing the Wine of Cardui, manufactured and sold by plaintiffs, as a "booze, a tipple, a worthless fraud and a cheat."

It was stated in the press that the counsel for plaintiffs had said, "that the suit would probably never have been brought had not the accusation been made that the manufacturers of Wine of Cardui knowingly perpetuated a fraud and used the Methodist Church as a means to further their business."

An editorial comment on the verdict in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* of July 1, 1916, p. 41, concludes with these words: "Viewing all the facts in the case and remembering the heavy damages asked by the plaintiff, the medical profession may interpret the verdict thus: Technically guilty; morally justified! To the Association a moral triumph: to the 'patent medicine' interests a Pyrrhic victory."

WAR DEPARTMENT

List of changes of stations covering period ending June 30, 1916, in the cases of Sergeants First Class and Sergeants, Medical Department.

SERGEANTS FIRST CLASS.

Ivan N. Karlson, from Jefferson Barracks, to the U. S. Transport "Kilpatrick."

Jason D. Byers, from the Augusta Arsenal, to the Field Medical Supply Depot, Washington, D. C.

Samuel Marcus, from Fort Ward, to the Augusta Arsenal.

Chester L. Thomson, from Fort Bayard, to the Remount Depot, Fort Keogh.

William J. Freebourne, from the Remount Depot, Fort Keogh, to Fort Caswell.

Richard E. Humes, from the Walter Reed General Hospital, to the U. S. A. Transport "Sumner."

Harry L. Reiter, from Fort Levett, to the Southern Department, for assignment.

SERGEANTS.

Sam K. Leming, from Jefferson Barracks, to the Letterman General Hospital.

Charles K. Aikin, from the Southern Department, to Fort Barrancas.