

ucts as these were taken from would ever know how utterly deficient in strength and quality they were?

The labels declare the strength, but say nothing plainly about the quality. They are not adulterated drug products, within the meaning of the law, but they are misbranded, which is, also, a violation of the law.

It is evident that there is need for a court decision in this matter and a possibility of a common sense rendition, as to what a plain statement for sub-standard drugs should consist of, is apparent, when we consider what Chief Justice Claybaugh, in the Antikamnia case, says regarding regulations, viz.:

"Conceding for the purpose of the statement of this case, that this is not a quasi-criminal statute, but purely a remedial one, if that be true then it is the duty of the court to construe it as to give effect to the purposes and objects for which it was passed.

"I have no doubt that these secretaries could, with great propriety, make regulations that would more effectually carry into execution the purposes and intent of the law makers. That being so, what is the fair construction of the act, or does it need any interpretation?

"The right to interpret an act in conformity to the purposes and objects of that act applies only where the act is not perfectly plain or is not perfectly apparent.

"Then the courts can give such interpretation to it as will carry out and gratify the purposes of its passage. Interpretation, as I understand it, does not mean that the court can add anything to language which is plain."

This would seem to encourage a hope that the position taken by the Pennsylvania Board may be sustained when properly presented to the courts.

Regarding regulations. The Federal law does not provide for a guaranty and serial number; nor does it provide, that a label shall make reference to a guaranty; nor does it provide that a guaranty shall be filed with the department of agriculture, but the regulations adopted, do provide for, not only the guaranty and serial number, but also the manner in which these are to be stated. It was found when left to themselves, manufacturers misapplied the object of the guaranty and made their labels read "Guaranteed by the U. S. Government."

Now if it is legal and proper to adopt regulations as to the manner in which a guaranty shall be made, and stated, it is reasonable to hold that regulations may be adopted which shall provide for a plain statement for labels on sub-standard drug products, in order that purchasers may not be misled.

SOME PHASES OF A PHARMACIST'S DUTY TO THE PUBLIC.

ZADA M. COOPER, PH. G., IOWA CITY, IA.

It is fair to suppose that all men realize that they owe something to the community in which they live. They believe that it is their duty to be good citizens but the ideas of what constitute good citizenship are as far apart as the poles. It is without doubt too often true that men think it is sufficient to be honest and honorable in their dealings with others, to pay their debts and keep out of the penitentiary. There is a considerable number who do not even feel it a duty to exercise the right of suffrage. In brief, it is a passive sort of good citizenship

that they practice, feeling no compulsion to engage in active service for mankind in general or their neighbors in particular, and, I suspect that pharmacists are not altogether innocent of such inactivity.

Lest such a criticism from a woman seem rank presumption which it probably is, I hasten to say that it is of only one specific point that I wish to speak and that point is just as applicable to myself as to others. I refer to what we as pharmacists should do toward the education of that part of the public with whom we come in contact. We shall all concede that we are our brother's keeper in so far as it is necessary to supply him with only good drugs and medicines and to refuse to sell him dangerous habit-forming drugs, but how many of us feel any necessity to help him to a better understanding of these things, how many of us try to pass on useful knowledge? Do we believe with Huxley that while, "We live in a world which is full of ignorance and misery" it is "the plain duty of each and all of us to try to make the little corner he can influence somewhat less ignorant than it was before he entered it."

Possibly there is no subject of which the public is so ignorant as medicine, unless it be religion. Not even in religion is there more superstition, more absurdity, more need for the exercise of common sense and good sound reasoning.

Little can be accomplished in the way of reform by legislation or otherwise along any line without an awakened public sentiment and before public sentiment can be aroused, the need of reform must be seen, there must be knowledge, education. Take for example, the patent medicine evil. It can never be eliminated without a campaign of education. Just as long as the public reads the alluring advertisements and believes the extravagant claims, we shall have the thing to contend with. Efforts to get restrictive legislation come to naught so long as the people believe in the efficacy of such remedies. Until they learn that most of them are worthless if not dangerous they will continue to use them. Some lay magazines have done much toward exposing them but there is still a vast amount of ignorance and, in my opinion, it is the duty of the pharmacist to do what he can to reduce it. It is not expected that we shall be able to eliminate the sale of patents entirely or that we shall refuse a customer who insists. We cannot bring in the millennium instantly but it is unnecessary to push that branch of the business. Even if we are to consider it only from the mercenary view point, the same effort expended on some other department would bring better results.

Of course we all understand the difficulties that will be encountered. For various reasons, some people resent pharmacists offering information. It may be the implied ignorance, an unusual amount of conceit, or the impression that it is an interference in one's private affairs. Whatever the cause, it involves the exercise of tact but so does the successful conduct of any part of your work. In fact any profession, any business, any trade, in which one must deal with people, I care not what it is, requires that same quality if one is to get on. The ability to estimate human nature is very essential in any branch of the pharmacist's calling, hence there can be no good reason for not bringing it into use here. Then as opportunity offers, should not a pharmacist teach many of the dangers of self-medication?

Should we not go a step farther and try to explain that self-medication usually

involves self-diagnosis. If they can be made to understand that standard remedies of well known therapeutic value are best, perhaps they can be taught also that they cannot diagnose their own ailments and that that is just what a physician is qualified to do. Attention can be called to the fact that a prescription is a safeguard against error because at least two people, the physician and the pharmacist see it before the medicine gets into the patient's hands. The public should know that if a dispensing physician makes a mistake, it is difficult to prove and so there is less chance of recourse. Perhaps we hear it said, "The Lord giveth and the Lord hath taken away" when as a matter of fact the Lord had nothing to do with it. In the case of the physician who prescribes, errors are much more easily located and the prescription itself is evidence. What is still more important than being able to trace mistakes is the fact that error is much less likely to occur. If it be the physician's the pharmacist should detect it, if it be the pharmacist's the checking systems usually employed in reliable pharmacies reduces the chances to a minimum. I am sure that pharmacists have no desire to antagonize physicians but these are a few of the things the public has a right to know, things upon which they have thought little but knowledge of which would materially affect the attitude of intelligent thinking people. Another of these little known facts is that the pharmacist's stock must conform to the requirements of pure drug laws but physicians may dispense what they please and no one is the wiser.

I believe that teachers of salesmanship agree that one of the essentials is a knowledge of the stock. If the sale of ordinary merchandise is helped by knowing all about it and subsequently passing on to the customer at least a part of that knowledge, surely the principle is just as applicable to the sale of many things handled by the pharmacist, even to many drugs themselves. I believe the old idea that the less a man or woman knows about medicine the better, is all wrong. We shall grant that technical and professional information is only for those educated in the profession but outside of this there are a great many interesting and helpful facts about even the common household remedies that can easily be passed on to the customer. In an article by Mr. Raubenheimer published not long since he gives an excellent example of how historical information about sulphur, cream of tartar and Rochelle salt displayed on placards in the show window aided in the sale of lozenges compounded from these ingredients.

Having good laws regulating the practice of pharmacy is a benefit to us but many of the laws were enacted primarily for the protection of the public. So what is good for the public in the end benefits us—the knowledge we pass on to them brings returns. "Cast thy bread upon the waters" is not without its application here. Some one will say that it does not pay to go to so much trouble, that it is a thankless task. I believe not, I believe it will react to benefit us either as druggists or as citizens. The simple fact that you know increases the respect for you and your calling. Every man owes it to himself to bring his vocation to a higher plane of honor and usefulness. As educated men and women we owe the community more than the uneducated. Some one has said that, "Education is the development of power to bring things to pass for the common good." If that be true, we do not know that we are educated, we have no right to the

title until we make use of our power, latent though it may be, to do something for the common good.

There is no lack of opportunity to exercise this sort of good citizenship. If there seems to be none, it is because we are so self-centered as to be blind to our opportunities. In advice about sanitation and methods of disease-prevention we should be able to do much toward assisting public health departments. It has been said by one of our own number that "no trade or profession of the present day presents greater opportunity for serving the human family by relieving suffering and causing the dissemination of useful knowledge than that of the pharmacist."

Apparently physicians themselves believe that the public needs information and have claims that those who possess the information have no right to ignore. Not long since an editorial in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* emphasized the people's right to a thorough education in the "essentials of public and personal hygiene and sanitation" and "to correct information about medical progress." Another physician writing recently says that "the education of the laity on medical matters is daily becoming a subject of wider interest and greater importance. Preventive measures are based in great part upon a thorough medical education of the public." Among those who are most likely to be asked to express opinions concerning medical questions, he includes the druggists and thinks that druggists who are asked for advice or to express an opinion as to the meaning or seriousness of any symptoms can be of much assistance to physicians, that he has done as much perhaps as the physician himself if he advises against the use of remedies that may be of doubtful value and succeeds in bringing the case to the physician's care.

INTRODUCTION TO THE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PATENTS AND TRADE-MARKS.

F. E. STEWART, M. D., CHAIRMAN.

In June, 1881, your chairman, then attending the annual meeting of the American Medical Association for the first time read before the section dealing with the *Materia Medica*, a paper entitled, "The *Materia Medica* of the Future," and in connection therewith he laid down as a declaration of principle the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is contrary to the spirit of the code of ethics for a physician to prescribe a remedy controlled by a patent, copyright, or trade-mark. This, however, shall except the use of a patent upon a process or machinery for manufacture. It shall also accept the use of a trade-mark if the article so marked is provided with a technical name, and a working formula, under which any person may manufacture and sell it.

This resolution was rejected by the Judicial Council on account of its exceptions, it being considered contrary to the spirit of the code of ethics for physicians to habitually prescribe, or in any other way endorse the commercial control of anything required for the prevention, cure or mitigation of disease. It is unnecessary to add that if the medical profession had been true to its obligations,