

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE PHARMACY LAWS.

JAMES F. FINNERAN, BOSTON, MASS.

It would be well nigh impossible for any one to cover in one short paper all the pharmacy laws that are or have been upon the books of our various states.

There are certain inconsistencies, however, between the laws of the various states that I believe should be corrected.

In my humble opinion the start must be made in our national drug organizations, and why? Because the most of us have only a limited knowledge of just what is being done in our sister states, and have not the facilities of knowing exactly what the laws are on a given subject in other states. National organizations like the A. Ph. A. have the facilities for getting this information.

It seems perfectly clear to me that boards of pharmacy should have full and complete supervision of the handling and sale of drugs.

Now in many states the collecting of samples of drugs and the analysis of the same are made by either Health Boards, Food and Dairy Commissions, etc. This is a mistake in "past legislation" under which we are working at present and should be corrected in the "future."

Many times persons are prosecuted for selling drugs below the standard, but the effect stops right there. If boards of pharmacy had the proper laws to back them up we would all sell good drugs, or not be allowed to stay in the business. Again it is generally supposed that only registered pharmacists can carry on the business of pharmacy, and I believe that is the intent of our pharmacy laws.

But what are the facts in the case? Simply this, that in practically every state, if not in all, any person can conduct a pharmacy, if he has the price, regardless of whether he is a registered pharmacist or not. He simply incorporates the business and puts a registered pharmacist in as manager. The manager supposedly has an interest in the business, but if he does, it is infinitesimal, when compared with the business as a whole. Getting right down to facts, we are going to do one of two things. Either we shall insist that registered pharmacists only may carry on the business, or continue to allow any one who pleases to conduct a pharmacy. Our duty in this matter must be perfectly clear to all.

The sale of spirituous or malt liquors by pharmacists is another matter of great importance. Shall we sell them as medicines or commodities? There are nearly as many ways of handling these goods by pharmacists as there are states.

I think you will agree with me that this part of our business should be carried on practically the same in all parts of the country. The same comment holds good in regard to the sale of poisons. Another subject of great importance is the sale of narcotics. Shall they be sold as medicines or as commodities, and under what conditions? As in the sale of liquors many states have laws governing such sales which differ greatly from their sister states.

I have mentioned the above matters so that your attention would be more closely drawn to what I have in mind in regard to the laws of the future.

It seems to me that the laws governing the sale of drugs are of vital importance to the manufacturer, wholesaler and retail dealer, for if the retailer is not suc-

cessful then assuredly the other two branches cannot be. There must be a reasonable and honest understanding between the men who carry on the various branches of our business, else there will be endless quarrels and misunderstandings. Let us all get together on this proposition and try and find common ground to work upon. Retailers understand their part of the business better than any one else, and this is equally true of the other branches.

There has been a very strong effort made during the last five years to *restrict* the sale of many articles sold by pharmacists.

I want to say right here that no honest pharmacist ever objected to restrictions that were for the public good. But there are a lot of so-called reformers, whose intentions I am willing to admit are good, who would put such restrictions on us that it would drive seventy-five percent of us out of business. These are not the sort of laws that honest pharmacists desire. What has been accomplished in the way of legislation during the last five years to enable pharmacists to carry on their business in a more lucrative manner? I will leave the answer for you to decide.

Now, what is to be done along the line of bettering our conditions as pharmacists? This question must be answered by men from all parts of the country who will study the question thoroughly and then act upon their conclusions.

In conclusion, I want to boil my remarks down to the following:

That boards of pharmacy should supervise sales of drugs in all stores, and all states should as far as possible have similar pharmacy laws.

That registered pharmacists only should be allowed to carry on the business and that the American Pharmaceutical Association should lend its purse and its influence towards uniform pharmacy laws in the various states.

THE PRICE OF PROGRESS.

The young man nowadays, if he is to make his own success, must positively instill into his efforts some new, out-of-the-ordinary, and absolutely original ways of doing things. It is true that we pay for everything that we get in some kind of coin. Everybody gets about what he deserves in the end. Soon or later every man has to pay. The price of progress resolves itself into the law of growth. And growth is not possible to any one who will not exert painstaking, aggressive, and original effort—not impulsive, spasmodic, temporary effort, but steady, firm, consistent and “thought out” effort; that kind of effort which is, by all means, economical, but highly effective. The most effective efforts are well directed only when prompted by instinct, by intuition and by knowing how, when and where to apply them in order to obtain the best results. Such efforts enable men to accomplish even seemingly impossible things.—*Western Druggist*.