

THE COMMUNITY OF INTEREST OF THE DRUG TRADES IN
FOOD AND DRUG LEGISLATION.*

BY J. H. BEAL, URBANA, ILL.

I deem it a considerable privilege to be the bearer of a message of greeting and good-will from the oldest to the youngest pharmaceutical organization of national scope.

For sixty-five years the American Pharmaceutical Association has upheld the best traditions of professional pharmacy, and has justly earned the respectful consideration of every one connected with any division of the many-sided business or art of producing and distributing drugs and medicines.

When the American Pharmaceutical Association was founded the retail apothecary was the principal manufacturer of the medicinal products which he dispensed, and there was no necessity for the separate existence of such a society as yours.

Since that time, and through the operation of causes which I need not discuss, the generalized occupation of the old apothecary has been broken up into groups of specialized occupations, each with an art and technic of its own, and the principal business of the retail pharmacist of the present day is to distribute the products manufactured by others, at best supplemented by the manufacture of simple stock preparations and the dispensing of extemporaneous preparations on physicians' prescriptions.

To attempt to strike a balance between the respective loss and gain of this departure from the practice of the ancient apothecary would require more space than is at my disposal. Whether for good or ill, the change has been made, and we must deal with the situation as it exists.

The American Pharmaceutical Association early recognized the tendency of pharmacy to split up into groups of specialized functions, and, instead of seeking to retain a monopoly of control, has generously encouraged the formation of corresponding special organizations.

The separate existence, then, of such associations as yours, of the National Wholesale Druggists' Association, of the National Association of Retail Druggists, and of other similar national bodies is simply the practical application of the broad and liberal doctrine of the American Pharmaceutical Association; namely, that the special interests of the several divisions of pharmacy can best be conserved by independent organizations especially devoted to such purposes.

The American Pharmaceutical Association is thus fairly entitled to be regarded as the mother association of our national pharmaceutical organizations, and as such retains a lively interest in the welfare and development of each of her children.

The delegation of special interests to the care of special organizations did not, however, complete the mission of the American Pharmaceutical Association. On the contrary, its mission and the reasons for its existence are more important than ever before. Its annual conventions constitute a general congress of pharmaceutical interests, where those who separately represent the various sections of the drug trade can meet upon common ground for the discussion of matters of common concern.

* Address as delegate from the American Pharmaceutical Association to the National Association of Manufacturers of Medicinal Products, New York City, February 3, 1916.

It is the nexus which binds the separate divisions of pharmacy into one family group. It represents and aims to defend the solidarity of pharmacy, or the community of interest of all who are connected in any capacity with the business of manufacturing and supplying medicinal products.

The principal message which I bring from the American Pharmaceutical Association is to urge your fullest recognition of this community of interest of the family group which that association has so long defended, and that you shall, as far as possible, so order your business policies and other activities as to contribute to the professional and commercial prosperity of the whole confraternity of pharmacy.

The Unique Position of Drugs and Medicines in the Popular Mind.—If you were disposed to forget the community of interest of all of those who have anything to do with the manufacture or purveying of drugs and medicines, a list of the bills introduced at a single session of Congress or at a single session of a state legislature should be sufficient to quicken your memory and enlighten your understanding.

The day has apparently passed by when it was necessary only to provide for the scientific organization of your laboratories, and to maintain an efficient system for the distribution of your products. To-day a third necessity exists, and that is to provide machinery and methods to prevent yourselves from being legislated out of business through the efforts of those good-intentioned but poorly-informed persons whose desire to reform the business of other people is usually in direct proportion to their ignorance of the subjects they propose to regulate.

One reason, and perhaps the principal reason, for the constant menace of adverse legislation grows out of the peculiar position given to drugs by the popular mind, and the consequent disposition to deal with them as if they were altogether separate and apart from other things of utility.

The normal and useful employment of drugs may outmeasure a thousand-fold their abnormal or hurtful employment, but when legislation is proposed their common and proper uses are overlooked and only their occasional evil uses are remembered. In dealing with other material agents there is usually a disposition to discriminate between the good and the bad, but legislation with respect to drugs is usually directed upon the theory that they are either always bad, or always especially liable to be put to bad uses.

The law very properly prohibits the sale or carrying of daggers and other deadly instruments of the same character, but places no restriction upon the manufacture and sale of edged and pointed tools normally intended for lawful uses, even though they might be used for lethal purposes; nor does the report of a homicide with a butcher's cleaver or of a suicide with a pair of shears produce a demand for special legislation restricting the manufacture and sale of these useful implements. In the case of drugs, however, the disposition is exactly the opposite. Let there be a sensational newspaper report of a homicide or suicide committed with the aid of a drug, and immediately there is a flood of bills to prohibit its sale, or to subject it to such restrictions as amount practically to prohibition.

Moreover, this terror of drugs seems to attach to the name rather than to the things themselves: call the drug a fertilizer or paint, or by some other name indicating its use in the common arts or industries, and its deadly significance begins to fade out of the lay mind. When poison legislation is pending, if the point be made that the substance the sale of which is to be restricted is largely used in the arts or industries, the usual course is to amend the bill so as to exempt its sale

by tons for industrial employment, and to confine the restrictions to its sale in the drug store, where it is dispensed by grains and ounces. And this restriction of its sale by the druggist who knows how to handle the substance safely, and its unrestricted sale by those who know nothing of its properties, are considered to be a quite proper safeguarding of the public welfare.

The host of ordinances and bills directed against mercury bichloride a year or so ago will illustrate this thought. One of these was a bill introduced into the United States Congress, proposing extremely severe restrictions upon the dispensing of mercury bichloride by doctors and druggists, but placing no restrictions whatever upon its sale or use by other persons. Seemingly it never occurred to the sponsors for this bill that the sale of mercury bichloride under other names or by people unfamiliar with its qualities might be dangerous to the public health.

Drugs should not be discriminated against in legislation simply because they are drugs, and restrictions upon their sale should bear a just proportion to their wrongful use. If a drug is properly employed a hundred thousand times for every time it is wrongfully employed, restrictions upon its sale should be neither greater nor less than upon any other object or thing that has the same ratio of proper to improper use.

Legislation by Subterfuge.—A fondness for law-making has always been a characteristic of the American people, and during the past few decades this disposition has developed into a veritable mania. The newly-elected member of a legislative body says to himself, "What am I here for if not to make laws?" and straightway consults the dictionary or encyclopædia for new subjects to regulate. His constituents apparently have the same conception of his duties, and as a consequence the Congress, state legislatures and city councils are fairly choked with bills to amend old laws or ordinances, or to create new ones, and intended to regulate every conceivable subject.

When the ordinary legislative powers of our written constitutions are not broad enough to meet the demand, we proceed to expand them by subterfuge, or by legislating around the constitutional limitations. That is to say, we frame our legislation in such form as to bring it *nominally* within one section of the constitution and thereby accomplish ends or reach results expressly prohibited by other sections, or so as to accomplish that which no section of the constitution directly authorizes to be done.

No doubt some of the laws which are constitutional in form, but which in fact were expressly designed to accomplish results not contemplated by our written constitutions, are very desirable laws. An example of such legislative subterfuges is the recent Harrison law, or the federal law which professes to levy a tax upon the business of dealing in certain narcotic drugs. In form it is a revenue measure; in fact it is a police measure disguised by the levy of a nominal tax, and without the intra-state policing power which it gives to the federal agents, under the pretence of tax collection, would not be worth the paper it is printed upon as a means of regulating the traffic in narcotic drugs.

The united drug trade more than any other one instrumentality—perhaps as much as all other instrumentalities combined—was responsible for the enactment of the Harrison law, and it is a striking testimonial to the public spirit of the drug trade that it deliberately sought this legislation and has cheerfully accepted the burdens and losses which it imposes for the sake of the general public good. The results of the law have been altogether beneficent, but the fact remains that it is a legislative subterfuge, a law specifically framed to bring it within the powers of Congress to collect a revenue which of necessity must

be much less than the cost of collection, and the real intent of which is to regulate the distribution of narcotic drugs within the territorial limits of the several States.

The beneficial effects of the law have been all and more than were anticipated, and its repeal by Congress or its nullification by the courts would be a public calamity. Nevertheless, it must always be a matter of regret that so good a measure with so good a purpose could be enacted only by dodging the evident intentions of the federal constitution.

If constitutional intentions can be evaded or circumvented for beneficent purposes, may they not also be evaded for purposes the reverse of beneficent? All human experience shows that corruptions of free government have always begun in this way, and the problem is one which we would do well to ponder.

Legislation by Administrative Action.—Another species of legislation probably not contemplated by those who devised our system of constitutional government is the making of laws by the fiat of those chosen to administer them.

That administrative officials should be clothed with reasonable discretionary powers in order to make the law effective will not be seriously questioned, but we of the drug trade have seen this discretion used to extend the law far beyond the intention of the law-making body. Under the name of rules and regulations both new prohibitions and new commandments are read into the statute, and under the pretence of interpretation meanings and effects are added that could not have been within the mind of the author of the law nor within the intention of the legislative body which enacted it.

The attempt to read into the written law that which the administrative official thinks ought to be there in place of what is really there is not a new thing in history, but is more vexatious at the present day for the reason that the subjects of modern legislation are far more technical and vastly more complicated than they were a generation ago.

Almost invariably an official justifies the exercise of arbitrary power by pleading that his efforts are directed solely for the public good. Demagogues are smart people and well know how to pick the subjects of experiment so as to appeal to popular prejudice and command popular sympathy. If they want to attack an entire class of medicinal preparations, they do not select a representative member of the class, but the worst example they can find, knowing that if their action is sustained it can be used as a precedent for attacking all other preparations coming under the same *legal category*, although they may be quite different in other respects and devoid of offensive qualities.

The important matter in all such cases is not the particular object which is made the excuse for the exercise of arbitrary power, but the illegal and unconstitutional method employed. If an individual can be denied the right of trial by jury simply because he is a common drunkard and a known derelict, then it will not be long until the rights of decent citizens will be invaded in a similar manner. Small invasions of rights, if unresisted, grow into greater ones. If we do not resent the arbitrary exercise of power with respect to some medicinal preparation which does not quite meet our standard of professional ethics we may live to see the day when the same arbitrary power will be applied to our own more ethical products.

Let us not be deceived by the specious plea of the public good when it is used as an excuse for the exercise of unauthorized official action. The highest public good is that which can be obtained through the operation of well-considered laws, enacted in obedience to enlightened public sentiment, and construed and administered in strict accordance with the intentions of the legislature.

Labels and Therapeutic Properties.—I do not need to cite to a company of manufacturers of medicinal products any illustration of the perversion of the law's meaning by administrative action, or by a forcible reading into the law of some official's personal theories.

I feel that I am well within the bounds of verity and moderation when I assert that, under present conditions, the pharmaceutical manufacturer, after availing himself of the best scientific information obtainable, and after taking the advice of the best legal talent he can procure, cannot label his products with the certain assurance that when they are placed in interstate commerce he will not be haled into a federal or state court, charged with selling an adulterated and misbranded product.

When such a condition exists, there is something wrong, either with the law or with the method of its administration. That a manufacturer or dealer, acting in entire good faith and utilizing every available source of information, should not be able to insure himself against prosecution is a situation never contemplated in the passage of the food and drug laws, whether state or federal.

Those of you who have carefully followed the rulings of administrators of the food and drug laws and the decisions of the courts will have discovered before this that the contention as to the misbranding of a medicinal product is not infrequently a dispute regarding grammatical construction, or a conflict of therapeutic opinion rather than of law or of fact.

As manufacturers of medicinal products you are in a position to know that in the present stage of medical science the therapeutic value and use of a drug is largely, or mainly, a matter of opinion based upon clinical observation, and that therapeutic opinions differ widely and radically, not only among the different so-called schools of medicine, but among physicians of the same school.

This is true of not merely a few drugs and drug products, but of a majority of them, and especially of those which do not show the presence of constituents of pronounced physiological activity. There is perhaps no single drug known to the profession whose value is so thoroughly established that it has not been denounced either as without value or as dangerous by practitioners of experience and repute, or has not been condemned by works on materia medica and therapeutics which are accepted as authoritative by large numbers of the medical profession. The manufacturer and dealer are not interested in these professional controversies, but claim the right to supply each or all of the contending factions, and the general public, with their favorite remedial agents prepared according to the best dictates of pharmaceutical science.

Possibly as part of its inheritance from its ancient affiliation with theology, the medical profession still retains something of a spirit of intolerance, so that certain factions or schools are inclined to deny to their competitors the same freedom of opinion and practice which they claim for themselves, and, unable to prevail by force of argument, endeavor by force of law to suppress the opinions with which they do not agree. If our labels conform to the therapeutic opinions of one school or faction, then the products are considered to be misbranded, and consequently false or fraudulent, from the standpoint of those who hold to an opposite or different opinion.

Laboratory experiments with animals have thrown a small degree of light upon the properties of drugs, but the light is still wavering and uncertain, and in some respects the results of tests upon animals are equally as conflicting and contradictory as the results of clinical observation.

The makers of the food and drugs law never intended to interfere in the

conflict of medical opinion, or to place the stamp of official approval upon the medicines of one school or set of physicians in preference to others, or to restrict the free manufacture and sale of medicinal agents representing every shade of medical opinion.

The administrator of the law may not consciously intend to be a partisan, but this is exactly what he becomes when he undertakes to decide that a medicinal product is misbranded for no other or better reason than that its label or literature makes a therapeutic claim not accepted by the particular school or class of physicians with which he affiliates. If, for example, he rules that a label is incorrect because it ascribes to a preparation of cactus or of echinacea the medical properties which thousands of competent and successful physicians claim for these drugs, which claim he does not himself accept as true, and that the preparation is therefore falsely and fraudulently misbranded, he is guilty of an unwarranted interference with the freedom of medical practice and with the rights of manufacturers and dealers to supply physicians and the public with the remedial agents in which they have confidence.

The proper attitude, and the attitude which I believe the American people endorse, in so far as they are informed upon the matter, is that a preparation is not misbranded when either the label or the accompanying literature describes it as efficient for the treatment of an affection, or class of affections, in fair accordance with the views of any considerable number of practitioners of any school of medicine, even though its efficiency for such purpose be stoutly denied by other schools or by other practitioners.

If physicians cannot agree among themselves as to the therapeutic usefulness of drugs, how in the name of logic and common sense can food and drug officials, or even judges and juries, be expected to decide correctly?

Our works on materia medica are full of drugs once popular but now generally abandoned, and of drugs once considered of no value but now popular and largely used.

The history of the use of ipecac is a case strikingly in point. This drug was originally introduced as a remedy for dysentery, as denoted by its early name of *radix antidysenterica*, but gradually lost its repute and passed nearly out of use for that purpose, except with some so-called "irregular" practitioners and a few proprietary remedies. Within recent years it has been found that its alkaloid emetine is by far the most efficient remedy known for certain forms of dysentery, and the drug is now so popular with the medical profession that it is becoming difficult to supply the demand.

If one of the above-mentioned proprietary medicines had been seized during the period when ipecac was in disfavor for the treatment of dysentery it would undoubtedly have been declared misbranded, upon the ground that it did not contain any ingredient capable of producing the effects claimed for it.

Does not this example—and it is only one of many that could be cited—show the frailty of that official cocksureness which undertakes to decide offhand as to the value or lack of value of medicinal preparations, in opposition to contrary opinions based upon observation and experience?

At some distant day we may be able to determine the therapeutic value of drugs by laboratory tests with some approach to the certainty with which we can determine their chemical constitution, but until that enlightened period arrives there can be no better warrant for legal interference with medical opinions honestly held than for legal interference with political and religious opinions.

In conclusion, whenever you exert your influence as an organization or as individuals to prevent oppressive legislation or unreasonable administrative action, in defence of the just rights of even the smallest retailer of drugs and medicines, you are helping to realize the great ideal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and to defend the community of interest of which that association is the chief exponent.

On behalf of that association, and in my own behalf, I wish you a most successful convention, and one fruitful of good results, both for your own members and for the larger drug fraternity of which you are an important section.

DOPE LAW REDUCES SALE OF NARCOTIC DRUGS 80 PERCENT.*

The question as to whether the Legislative Committee of the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association shall have a bill drafted providing for state anti-narcotic regulation to supplement the Harrison Federal Act and afford still further protection to the public will doubtless come up for discussion at the annual meeting at Reading this year, especially in view of the statements recently made in the newspapers that the number of drug *habitue's* has not decreased.

Declarations have been made by the jobbing and manufacturing interests through whose hands these narcotic drugs originally pass that the total amount imported and sold has been reduced about 80 percent; therefore the conditions referred to must be local and not general.

As the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association was prominently identified with the passage of the Pennsylvania Cocaine Law of 1909, one of the forerunners of the Harrison Act, and has energetically worked for years to aid in the passage of federal legislation, it gives the members much satisfaction to learn from the First Annual Report of the Internal Revenue Commissioner on the administration of the Harrison Act that out of 52,187 druggists registered in the United States under this act, only 216 violations of the law were reported, and most of these were of a technical character and not violations of the spirit of the law.

These figures show that over 99.6 percent of pharmacists are found to be complying with a law which, so far as they are concerned, is full of hardships, pitfalls, and arbitrary requirements. For instance, it is perfectly legal and proper to sell over the counter to any customer certain household remedies or medicines containing minute amounts of narcotic drugs too small to become habit-forming and specifically permitted by the exemption clauses of the act, but if a prescription is presented calling for any quantity, however small, of one of these preparations compounded with another medicine, that prescription is subject to all of the restrictions which a really habit-forming prescription calls for and therefore cannot be renewed.

The multitudinous records and reports and the extraordinary care which must attend all handling of narcotic drugs fall with greater force upon pharmacists than upon physicians.

As the primary object of the law is the benefit of the public, and as reports show that this object is being achieved, there is no disposition on the part of pharmacists to do more than protest against such inconsistent rulings as that of Treasury Decision No. 2213, the practical effect of which is explained above. The ruling should either be modified or withdrawn, or else all exemptions should be abolished. As the latter would necessitate the amending of the law itself, it would seem more practical to modify the ruling.

* This is copy Bulletin 2, issued by the Publicity Committee of the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association; reference to this work is made in Editorial Notes.

MODERN METHODS.*

There is probably no other business that has undergone more changes in the last twenty years than the retail drug business, and in order to meet these changed conditions new methods are constantly being developed.

One of the first and most pointed aggressions was from the professional side in the rapidly-growing tendency of the physician to do his own dispensing.

Conditions, however, are far from being irremediable. Don't fight or slur the dispensing physician; get acquainted with him, use tact, interest him in your work. Convince him of your skill and integrity and knowledge of the goods you handle. The particular man does not buy ready-made clothing when he can find a dependable tailor and is sure of a fit. Just so the conscientious physician, assured that his prescription is safe in your hands, will not be tied to ready-to-use formulæ, and will appreciate your coöperation. Much is possible on these lines.

Another outlet for your professional knowledge and skill will be found in the compounding of preparations for the many emergencies of the household and farm. The field is sufficiently broad without attempting to compete and antagonize the doctor in the curing of physical ills. Demonstrated ability in these lines will create an increased confidence that will aid greatly in the building up of other departments of your business. The knowledge that any goods you prepare or recommend have quality and merit gives weight to your claims to dispense pure drugs, pure spices, pure soda water, or any other item that needs a backing of personal integrity. You can profitably become the expert professional adviser of a community in all matters involving chemical problems.

Expert analytical work is another field of growing importance. It is becoming the basis of modern diagnosis. It will put you in close touch with the physician, who will welcome trustworthy coöperation in this direction. Surely the pharmacist who considers the securing of a diploma, with the legal right to sell drugs, the *finis* of his technical education, and who is satisfied to limit its exercise to what few prescriptions may stray his way, has missed the inspiration of a high calling.

Aside from the above, we have other influences making decided inroads into the profession of pharmacy, not the least among these being the department store and the cut-rate chain store, with their deceptive bargain sales of the other fellow's preparations. Then the mail-order houses which have come into new life through parcel-post legislation and department regulations, not to forget the wagon peddler, who, it appears, cannot be eliminated in this State. Even the soda fountain, once never looked for outside of the drug store, now flourishes in the most unexpected places, cigar stores and billiard halls being some of the latest to adopt it. Seemingly there is no line in which there is not the sharpest competition to be met, and with it all there is no business so surrounded by legislative regulations and restrictions as the drug business in the State of Iowa.

Not only are our national or federal laws pertaining to the drug business numerous and exacting, but our State laws particularly are complex in this direction.

* Abstracted from an address by F. Junkerman, of the Churchill Drug Company, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, being one of a number of interesting addresses delivered January 18 and 19, and part of the "Short Course for Pharmacists" under the direction of the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association and the Department of Pharmacy of the University of Iowa. The value of this work for pharmacy can hardly be overestimated, and was prompted by the desire of the University to be helpful to pharmacists.

Among these are the Pure Food and Drug Laws, Insecticide Laws, Weight and Measure Laws, Narcotic Laws, Poison and Liquor Laws, and many others. It occurs to me that the value and efficiency of the pharmacist as he emerges from his course in our universities would be greatly enhanced by including in his studies the principal laws pertaining to his profession.

Is the druggist, then, waging a hopeless battle? Not by any means. The requirements of the profession insure a higher educational training to start with than will, on the average, be found in most any other line of business. And, furthermore, that training gives him from the start a standing in the confidence of the community which his competitors in other lines lack. With these advantages, he should readily hold his own if he has the foresight and adaptability to adjust his business to the changing conditions. This education, however, is purely scientific, and leaves untouched a large share of the problems of his future commercial activities.

Particular attention should be paid to the promotion of the many side lines which have proved so profitable in many localities where they have been given some thought, such as toilet articles, paints and wall-paper, stationery, sporting goods, photographic supplies, holiday goods, cigars, soda water, etc. In fact, up-to-date merchandise should be the keynote of every practical druggist, and without it the business under ordinary conditions would be unable to maintain itself. Much study and thought should be given these particular lines to see that the right ones to fit the locality are selected.

Purity and sanitation are the slogan of these days. The drug store, of all places, should emphasize these ideas. Cleanliness should be apparent from front to back, with ample light. The fixtures should be in keeping. Old-style counters should be discarded. The dark spaces underneath are apt to be a catch-all for rubbish and dirt. To sell goods, they must be displayed, and the fixtures should be selected with that end in view. And don't be afraid to take a lesson from the department store. Mark all goods displayed plainly, with the selling prices, otherwise your display loses much of its value.

Use the show window to its limit. How many people pass your store daily? By what other means can you reach the same number of people, and reach them as effectively, as by striking window displays frequently changed? Note the space provided for window displays in every modern building. Is that not evidence of the value now placed on them as a factor in making sales?

Service is another great factor in the drug business. You cannot be too particular about the service given. It is the making or the wrecking of the business. The services that the druggist renders without charge have provided the funny paragrapher with unending material. But don't let that worry you. That reputation for generous service is your biggest asset. Build on it, regardless of the few who impose, or who seemingly lack appreciation.

And your clerks! Note how the big business educates and trains them; how in certain stores, you can judge the policy and character of the management by the atmosphere—the subtle impression given by the service. In certain stores the service fairly inspires confidence and good-will. All your efforts to bring people to your store may be worse than nullified by poor service. When you have hired a clerk you have just begun. Neatness, alertness, patience, courtesy, tact in making suggestions—your standard in these matters will inevitably be reflected by your force. Personal example, as well as careful training, is essential.

The soda fountain and cigars—what other lines will bring customers so regularly and frequently into your store as these two? Here, also, the equipment

must be up-to-date. There are cases built now for cigars and tobacco that will harmonize perfectly with the modern sanitary fixtures, and they are equipped for the proper keeping of stock. As an advertising feature alone they are worth all they cost. And the fountain! The confidence of the community in your training to standards of purity brings this business naturally to your store. Thoughtful people will not go themselves, nor let their children go, where there is any question as to sanitary conditions or the purity of the products. The alpha of the fountain is neatness. The omega of the fountain is neatness. It is not a job for the kid who, between times, sweeps the floor and washes windows. It is a man-size job, and the more care and brains put into it the better it will pay. With the growth of the temperance sentiment and the knowledge of the purity and high food value of the products served at all first-class fountains, the possibilities of this business are just beginning to be realized. The modern fountain is built on labor-saving, sanitary lines. Only through grossest carelessness can it become unsanitary. There is no fixture that adds so to the beauty and attractiveness of the store.

In conclusion, permit me to offer a few practical suggestions on the business side.

With a jobber at your elbow, interested in your welfare, dependent for his success on the success of his customers, you have a friend worth cultivating. Get personally acquainted with him, and you will find your business relations moving more smoothly. See as frequently as possible what he has to sell. He knows what is new and salable, and can give you valuable pointers. He is interested in selling you, not only to-day but to-morrow, and he will not abuse your confidence, for he wants your good-will.

Be kind to the jobber's salesman. Take time to see the goods he has to show you. He usually carries only the latest and best. It will pay you to see what they are, even if you do not care to buy at the time. And if he is the right kind of a salesman, he can often give you good business ideas, for he constantly sees what a hundred or more druggists are doing, and he is interested in not only selling goods to his customers, but also in seeing them successfully disposed of, so that he can sell more.

Buy carefully; don't overload; the jobber is near. Let him carry the stock, and buy only as you need. A well-diversified stock will make you more money than you can save by buying heavily of staples, if by so doing you cramp your buying ability in other directions.

Beware of the salesman who comes never to return. His glittering promises, glowing prospects, and special discounts will not sell the goods. All he wants is the order. It would surprise you to know the amount of goods so bought that the jobber is solicited to help out with later on. A quantity discount is not profitable unless you can sell the goods and sell them quickly. The cost of carrying will soon eat up the extra margin. You could make a lot more with the same money in the same length of time by using it in taking advantage of cash discounts.

The neglect to take all cash discounts is a great mistake. This is one of the biggest and commonest profit-leaks. You can not afford it. Look over your bills, see how much it means and how little it would take to handle it. Even if you have to borrow money, it would pay you well to do it. It establishes your credit, without which you cannot conduct a successful business.

Above all, know your business from A to Z. Don't guess at anything. Take inventory at least once a year, and analyze the figures. Find out just what it is costing you to do business, and figure the margin of profit accordingly. Keep the records of each department of your business distinct so far as possible. It will

show you where and when a boost is needed. Drugs at bargain prices do not inspire confidence.

After your inventory is completed, see to it that you are properly covered by an adequate amount of insurance. To sum it up, a pharmacist, to meet the competition of to-day, must study business conditions and methods just as carefully and thoroughly as the principles of his profession, and it pleases me to note that your University appreciates this condition, as is evidenced by the program of this course.

AERIAL OR GASEOUS DISINFECTION.*

BY SEWARD W. WILLIAMS, PH.C., F.C.S.†

The term aerial disinfection is employed to mean the use of the air as a vehicle for diffusing, to all exposed surfaces of the room and its contents, a gaseous germicide. The disinfection of the air itself, more or less loaded with germ-laden dust particles as it usually is, may be regarded as incidental, just as would be the case with water used in making a disinfectant solution. Air and water are the natural agencies for cleansing an infected apartment. Why should we not render the former germicidal as well as the latter? A room, subjected to gaseous disinfection and aired, should be a safer place for a scrub woman, paperhanger, or painter to work in than if not previously fumigated, and these workers¹ deserve consideration as well as future occupants.

The subject is timely because of the recent decision of the New York City Health Department to abandon gaseous disinfection after most of the communicable diseases.

As fumigating devices and materials are handled by the pharmacist, and as, in his position of "Chemist to the Medical Profession and the Public," he is likely to be asked numerous questions about gaseous disinfection, an effort is here made to give him an idea of its present status among sanitarians.

FACTS ABOUT FUMIGATION IN NEW YORK CITY.

The following letter was addressed to Dr. M. C. Schroeder, bacteriologist, New York City Department of Health:

As the number of cases of measles, for an equal period of time before and after abandoning fumigation in Manhattan, is given as evidence that fumigation did no good, the following questions suggest themselves:

1. Did the board always fumigate after *measles*, during the period in which fumigation was generally practised?
2. Was the method of fumigation as efficient as it could easily have been made with more disinfectant material?

* Read before Chicago Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association, November 16, 1915.

† Scientific Department, Bauer & Black, Chicago.

¹ Even if we had tests for determining natural immunity to the principal communicable diseases, such as the recently-introduced Schick test for determining susceptibility to diphtheria, no one would probably think it practical to apply them to those about to clean up infected apartments.