

Probably no one would claim that the physician ever deliberately purchases inferior or deteriorated drugs. When he does purchase them it is because he has been careless in selecting the source of supply, or because he has permitted some smart salesman to convince him that his cheap drugs are the equal of the higher priced ones of the well known manufacturer. Before the enactment of food and drugs laws, pharmacists sometimes "took a chance" on such propositions. If they do so now the chances are that they will be sorry.

There is no reason why the physician cannot have the best of everything if he is willing to pay the price and deals only with manufacturers or retailers of established reliability, and there is also no reason why the incautious ones among them should not be discouraged from taking chances, the same as pharmacists have been discouraged.

The only sound and permanent foundation for the satisfactory adjustment of the relations between pharmacy and medicine is the creation of mutual respect and mutual confidence between the members of the two professions. All that the statute law can do is to act as a palliative or as a corrective of the grosser abuses. Laws should not be specially constructed by physicians to curb pharmacists, nor by pharmacists to curb physicians. Measures designed to define the limits between medicine and pharmacy should be draughted by joint committees chosen from both—committees composed of men who are broad enough to realize that such a boundary line cannot be drawn as sharply as the lines on an architect's blue print, and who are ready both to give and to take in the compromise of disputed points.

J. H. BEAL.



UNITY OF EFFORT.

WE live in an age of activity. Everywhere there is the bustling movement of mankind, engaged in the desire for more business, for changed conditions in almost every walk of life,—in ethics, in politics, in social conditions and in every possible outlet for superabundant vitality, until one is almost tempted to ask at times, "*Cui Bono?*" Is it for betterment that the whole world is seething and fretting and fuming for change, some of these changes being those upon which the staid and sober citizen looks with askant eye?

For change does not always mean improvement and all activity is not for the best, all speed does not always win the race. We have Biblical authority for the statement that, "The race is not always to the swift," nor is excessive activity even in trade matters always for the best. In these, as in all other things of life, moderation accomplishes most in the end. It is of little service to the betterment of our profession to seek with confused effort to accomplish real and valuable things. Attempts looking toward reform should be made with calm, deliberate thought by which only the best results can be achieved. The cause of much confusion to-day is the lack of correlation between the minor organizations of the trade and the two great national bodies. Local organizations have a most useful place but would they not be more useful if they were organized as co-ordinate parts of a greater whole, and if all these bodies were striving for a common good? Con-

sider the strength which would be exerted by these various organizations if they were united in support of a common purpose, such as a model liquor law or a poison law such as might be framed by the able men of the national associations. See what a bulwark of defense would be a model law proposed by these men of national reputation and supported zealously all along the line by the united organizations of the trade. Now we fritter away our efforts in small-arm firing, but united we would wage our battle with the mighty projectiles of modern artillery.

See the good which has been accomplished through the unity of effort of the National Drug Trade Conference, and this same good would flow from any effort backed by the united trade in a like way. We would then have no such freak-legislation as cumber the statute books of many of our states to the great vexation of the members of the profession, but there would arise a sane and safe legislation which would result in good for all.

Why should not all these local organizations be parts of a greater whole? Be auxiliary to the A. Ph. A. and the N. A. R. D. and closely identified with them? Each of these bodies having its A. Ph. A. section and its N. A. R. D. section and each attracting to their meetings those interested in the special work of its sections? These two great national bodies are nobly doing their work in the advancement of pharmacy. But beneath these organizations there is confusion in which there is no unity of effort, from which lack, there results no wise progress. He who reads the reports of the various state associations, even with a careless eye, will hardly fail to observe that some give all their thought to the development of but one side of our profession, while others devote themselves almost entirely to the other side, few of them working for the harmonious development of the whole body, for that development which makes for the all-around good of the profession. Why should these associations so neglect the other side and seek for but the development of the one side? To be a pharmacist in these days requires a development along both of these lines. One must be commercial as well as scientific to be an all-around pharmacist. The pendulum must swing in sure and even beat for the clock to mark true and accurate time; if "out of beat" it may run, but without accuracy. So should we all endeavor to have the pendulum of pharmacy swing true for the proper development of the profession as a whole; for the development of its science and the development of its commerce and these can go hand-in-hand for the making of a nobler Pharmacy, a Pharmacy of the highest ideals and purpose.

ERNEST C. MARSHALL.