

A fluidextract prepared by this process has been observed during past month, and thus far shows no precipitation whatever, and produces a brilliantly clear syrup, and without the addition of acetic acid.

If this preparation with longer standing remains permanent, it is offered as a substitute for the present U. S. P. process for this fluidextract.

LABORATORIES OF
E. R. SQUIBB & SONS,
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

ALCOHOL: ITS RELATION TO SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY.

BY WILLIAM L. CROUNSE.

*In this presence it would be a waste of words to undertake to emphasize the importance of alcohol in pharmacy. I feel, however, that in view of the extraordinary events of the past year and the conflict of counsels as to the policy the drug trade should pursue in protecting itself against the hazards incident to the enforcement of the unprecedented provisions of the Volstead Act, I am justified in appealing to you to do your bit in securing for alcohol the official recognition to which it is entitled as the most essential chemical raw material known to industrial science.

The man in the street is apt to consider distilled spirits solely as the means of producing a condition of more or less delightful exhilaration, with a dark brown taste the morning after. To the extreme prohibition enthusiast all forms of spirits are anathematized as the Demon Rum. But few persons outside the circle of those who actually employ alcohol in science and industry appreciate its indispensable character or realize that if its supply were cut off thousands of manufacturing plants would cease operations, hundreds of thousands of men and women would be thrown out of employment and the science of medicine relegated to the dark ages.

While, therefore, the law of the land, which we all cheerfully obey, requires that adequate safeguards shall be thrown around the use of alcohol to prevent its diversion to beverage purposes, yet we who realize its value to science and the industrial arts should not hesitate to demand that it shall be available for every legitimate purpose and on terms that represent a minimum of expense and hardship to the user.

USE OF DENATURED ALCOHOL.

No development in the utilization of alcohol is more significant of its great importance to industry than the enormous increase in the consumption of denatured spirits since the passage of the so-called free alcohol law of 1906. It was my pleasant task to assist the manufacturers of the country in the efforts to secure the passage of that statute and it has been a matter of great satisfaction to me to note the rapid development of the use of denatured spirits under its beneficent provisions. Beginning in 1907 with a total consumption of completely and specially denatured alcohol of 1,780,276 wine gallons, the total rose in 1914 to 10,404,975 gallons. In 1914 the World War began and the demand for alcohol, first, for the manufacture of smokeless powder and, second, for the production of our allies and for the United States of various gases, including the deadly mustard

gas, received an enormous impetus, consumption rising rapidly until in 1917 the peak was reached with a total of 55,679,597 wine gallons, of which 10,508,919 gallons were completely denatured and 45,170,678 gallons specially denatured.

The following table shows the production of alcohol both completely and specially denatured by fiscal years, since the passage of the free alcohol law of 1906:

Fiscal years.	Completely denatured. Wine gallons.	Specially denatured. Wine gallons.	Total. Wine gallons.
1907.....	1,397,861.16	382,415.19	1,780,276.35
1908.....	1,812,122.38	1,509,329.35	3,321,451.73
1909.....	2,370,839.70	2,185,579.15	4,556,418.85
1910.....	3,076,924.55	3,002,102.55	6,079,027.10
1911.....	3,374,019.92	3,507,109.94	6,881,129.86
1912.....	4,161,268.56	3,933,246.44	8,094,515.00
1913.....	5,223,240.78	4,608,417.76	9,831,658.54
1914.....	5,213,129.56	5,191,846.03	10,404,975.59
1915.....	5,386,646.96	8,599,821.81	13,946,468.77
1916.....	7,871,952.82	38,807,153.56	46,679,106.38
1917.....	10,508,919.34	45,170,678.29	55,679,597.63
1918.....	10,328,454.61	39,834,561.48	50,163,016.09

Notwithstanding the rapid increase in the consumption of denatured alcohol in this country, at the time of the beginning of the great war Germany was producing ten gallons to our one, a fact which has had an important bearing upon German supremacy in the vast field of industrial chemistry.

The part borne by alcohol in the war is worthy of much more space than the limits of this brief paper afford. It is interesting, however, to recall the fact that when the great German offensive was on in 1918 and the British and French armies stood "with their backs against the wall," General Pershing sent an order to the United States for 1,000 tons of mustard gas per day, to be delivered forthwith. To produce a ton of mustard gas requires a ton of alcohol; hence to arrange for the filling of this enormous order, the War Industries Board was obliged to mobilize the entire distilling industry of the United States and turn it for the time being from all other classes of production to the making of alcohol. But for the intervention of the armistice it is probable that the distillers of the United States for many months would have been able to furnish nothing but the raw material for the deadly gas that was so signally aiding the Allies in the winning of the war.

You are all familiar with completely denatured alcohol, which since 1906 has been permitted to be freely sold and used for a variety of industrial and domestic purposes. Few of you, however, have been brought into close contact with specially denatured alcohol which, after distillation, is modified by the use of a large number of different chemical agents for consumption in an enormous variety of industries. A single formula of the thirty-five now in use has been approved for employment in the manufacture of nearly two hundred articles ranging from smokeless powder to artificial flowers, and from transparent soaps to the ink used in the interstate branding of meats.

ALCOHOL IN MEDICINE.

It is not surprising that the average layman should be at a loss to know where to turn for reliable information concerning the function of alcohol in medicine.

This uncertainty is largely due to wholesale misrepresentation, in part deliberate and in part due to ignorance, by overzealous partisans of the cause of prohibition. It has been one of my most exasperating experiences during the past two or three years to listen to statements made before important committees of Congress by certain of these zealots to the effect that, if the supply of alcohol should be immediately cut off, medical science would in no way be embarrassed, the preparation and administration of drugs would in no respect be restricted or inconvenienced, while the science of therapeutics would actually be benefited thereby.

It is usual for these enthusiasts, none of whom claim any knowledge of medicine, pharmacy, or chemistry, to take as a text a statement of some physician or a resolution adopted by some medical society to the effect that the position of alcohol as a therapeutic agent is more or less doubtful, and urging that physicians use a greater degree of restraint in prescribing alcoholic stimulants.

Upon these premises—which, of course, are debatable ground—is based an argument that alcohol is no longer necessary in medicine, and I have heard some of the more extreme advocates of this theory declare that no exemptions should be provided in the Federal Prohibition Act for standard drugs, proprietaries, toilet articles or flavoring extracts.

Of course, what the physicians who are quoted in this connection have said—and there is a wide divergence of expert opinion on the subject—has been confined exclusively to the use of spirits for their direct therapeutic or stimulating effect, and has had no bearing whatever upon the employment of alcohol as an extractive agent, solvent or preservative.

I think it is only fair to say that in the majority of cases these zealous gentlemen have been entirely ignorant of the technical reasons for the employment of alcohol in the manufacture of medicines, and have been honest in their belief that such spirits as are used in the average alcoholic medicinal preparation are deliberately introduced for the purpose of stimulating the patient, the physiological effect of the spirits being counted upon by the manufacturer or prescriber in exactly the same way that the other ingredients are relied upon to produce certain results.

Conceding, however, that these gross misrepresentations have been made in good faith, what shall be said of the arguments predicated upon such ignorance or of law-makers or administrators who permit themselves to be swayed by such influences?

While the efforts which pharmacists and chemists in many lines of industry have been making in recent years to discover satisfactory substitutes for alcohol, especially for purposes of solution and preservation, are in line with the broad basic principles underlying the progress of science, nevertheless they should not mislead us into assuming a timid or equivocal attitude with respect to alcohol, or deter us from defending our right to use it whenever and wherever the rules of pharmacy and chemistry require. The mere fact that there are abuses in the use of alcohol, which nature, for some inscrutable reason, has made intoxicating, should no more deter the reputable manufacturer or physician from employing it in the preparation of drugs than occasional murders or suicides by the use of poisons should operate to eliminate all poisonous drugs from the Pharmacopoeia.

There are some sound reasons why scientific research should be directed toward the discovery of substitutes for alcohol. High cost is one of them. This

consideration alone is steadily operating to reduce the amount of spirits employed in every preparation in which it is feasible to make any reduction whatever. Never before in the history of the drug trade has it been so difficult to obtain a supply of alcohol, and the mounting price and difficulty of procurement have constituted incentives that would have stimulated experimentation in a much greater degree if the prospect for the discovery of satisfactory substitutes had been more encouraging.

Every retail druggist will welcome the effort made by the Pharmacopoeial Committee to reduce the alcoholic content of official preparations. Any substantial reduction attained will tend to curtail the cost of production and to render official preparations less liable to be diverted by degenerates to beverage purposes, but the standards finally fixed by the United States Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary should be promptly accepted as irreducible minima, and pharmacists the country over should unite in demanding the right not only to employ alcohol in accordance with these standards, but also to obtain an adequate supply with the least possible difficulty and expense.

HOUSE-CLEANING OF DRUG TRADE.

The retail drug trade may well congratulate itself upon the splendid job of house-cleaning it has done in casting out fake alcoholic proprietary medicines, in putting out of business whiskey sellers thinly disguised as druggists, and, more recently, in confining the sale of wines and liquors to strictly legitimate purposes. In this movement the retailers are now enjoying the hearty coöperation of the drug jobbers who appreciate that if the trade is to be kept clean-handed the wholesalers must support the highest standard adopted by the retailers and refuse to sell alcoholic preparations to anyone under circumstances which would justify the suspicion that they are to be diverted to beverage purposes.

In liberalizing the original House draft of the Volstead Act for the purpose of providing adequate exemptions for the drug and allied trades, the proviso that exempted articles must be "nonpotable and incapable of being used for beverage purposes," was stricken out, and the phrase "unfit for beverage purposes" was substituted. In view of this concession, the Congressional leaders, at the instance of the representatives of the drug trade, inserted as a corollary an additional provision, in part as follows:

"Any person who shall knowingly sell any of the articles mentioned in paragraphs *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* of this section for beverage purposes, or any extract or syrup for intoxicating beverage purposes, or who shall sell any of the same under circumstances from which the seller might reasonably deduce the intention of the purchaser to use them for such purposes, or shall sell any beverage containing one-half of one per centum or more of alcohol by volume in which any extract, syrup or other article is used as an ingredient, shall be subject to the penalties provided in section 29 of this Title."

While this provision makes it incumbent upon every house in the trade, whether manufacturer, jobber or retailer, to use the utmost care to prevent the diversion of alcoholic preparations to beverage uses, in my opinion it imposes a special obligation upon the jobber, for it is in his power to control the distribution of alcoholic medicinal preparations, toilet articles, etc., to a marked degree. As illustrating my own view of the jobbers' duty in the premises—a view which I am confident has been quite generally accepted throughout the wholesale drug trade—I will quote the following extract from an address which I made before the

National Wholesale Druggists' Association at its convention held in New Orleans last November:

"Under the provisions of the Volstead Act it becomes the duty of every manufacturer or distributor of an alcoholic preparation which might be diverted to beverage purposes to carefully scan every order for such goods he may receive and to refuse to sell such articles in quantities in excess of what he believes to be the reasonable requirements of the purchaser for strictly legitimate purposes. It is, of course, impossible to lay down any hard-and-fast rule with respect to the quantities of various articles which may properly be sold. No two purchasers necessarily have exactly the same requirements, but it is believed that every jobber is in position to know if an order for any of the articles in question is in excess of the actual needs of the buyer for legitimate purposes. In no case should an order be filled for the maximum quantity called for if the jobber is in doubt as to the purpose for which the goods will be used.

"For their own protection, members of the National Wholesale Druggists' Association should make and preserve such records as will clearly show their intention to observe the spirit as well as the letter of the law, and their daily practice pursuant thereto. No intricate system need be adopted, but it is suggested that such records should be kept as will enable jobbers to compare incoming orders for the alcoholic preparations in question with those previously received from the same customers to determine whether by increasing quantities, or purchasing more frequently, such customers are accumulating unnecessarily large stocks. A record should certainly be made of all orders the quantities of which jobbers find it necessary to reduce, as such data constitute the best possible evidence of an intention to coöperate with the Government in the strict enforcement of the law. It will also be well to preserve in the same file, copies of correspondence relating to reductions of orders, together with copies of all circulars or other memoranda that may be sent out to the trade; also copies of instructions to salesmen, office employees, etc., etc.

"It should be borne in mind that the fact that an article is made in accordance with the United State Pharmacopoeia or the National Formulary does not take it out of the category of alcoholic preparations which may be improperly diverted to beverage purposes. Nor does the high alcoholic content of a preparation necessarily include it within the suspected category, for it is conceivable that a preparation might be nearly all alcohol and yet contain a small quantity of a drug so powerful as to render it impossible to drink it. The test is whether the goods are likely to be used as substitutes for intoxicating beverages; if so, everything possible should be done to prevent their sale in quantities exceeding the demand for the legitimate purposes for which they are intended."

REGULATIONS UNDER VOLSTEAD ACT.

The entire drug trade, and in fact all users of alcohol who are thereby subject to official supervision, are to be heartily congratulated upon the present personnel of the Prohibition Unit of the Internal Revenue Bureau. Mr. Kramer, the Prohibition Commissioner, is discharging his duties with an intelligence, an impartiality and a resourcefulness that have already inspired the confidence of every one who has had dealings with him. In Deputy Commissioner Gaylord, we have one of the most experienced, far-sighted and progressive men in the entire Government service. Mr. Gaylord is an expert not only in Internal Revenue law and regulations and in the administration of statutes requiring tact as well as skill, but he is probably the best-informed man in the Internal Revenue Bureau with regard to the industrial position of alcohol. His technical knowledge and his keen appreciation of the necessity for administering the Prohibition Law in such a way as to minimize the restrictions and annoyances imposed upon manufacturers who are obliged to use alcohol, render him not only an exceedingly useful aid to Commissioner Kramer, but an official who can be counted upon at all times to give the fullest possible consideration to legitimate interests while executing this difficult statute in accordance with its spirit as well as its letter.

That there is much room for improvement in the present code of regulations

the officials of the Prohibition Unit will be the first to concede. The present code of rules was framed to cover uncharted ground. There were no precedents for supervision of the character and extent required by the Volstead Act, and much that has been done will doubtless be undone; nevertheless, the regulations as a whole have thus far disclosed as few faults as have been developed in the case of any similar code which the Government has heretofore adopted under any other statute, and it has already been demonstrated that the officials feel no pride of authorship, but stand ready to modify any regulation when it can be shown that it can be improved in any important respect without sacrificing the validity of the statute.

The present method of obtaining alcohol upon permits known as Form 1410 leaves much to be desired. It is clumsy and costly and its use frequently involves indefinite delay. It does not adequately protect the Government, but discriminates in favor of unprincipled persons seeking to exploit the statute and against the honest, conscientious manufacturer or dealer.

I recently had the honor to be chairman of a committee representing the drug and allied trades, which after extended conferences with representatives of all branches of our industries, recommended to the Bureau the abandonment of Form 1410 as applied to all purchases of original stamped packages of alcohol, and the substitution therefore of a "floating" permit similar to that used successfully for many years in the procurement of specially denatured alcohol. Such a permit would bear upon its face a statement of the maximum quantity of alcohol which the holder would be allowed to purchase during a ninety-day period under his outstanding bond and could be lodged with any distiller and drawn against from time to time, by mail, telegraph or telephone, until the limit of the bond should be exhausted. The distiller or dealer making shipment on this floating permit would enter the amount thereon and at once mail a notice of the shipment to the Prohibition Director of the district and to the Prohibition Commissioner in Washington.

Under existing conditions, and especially because of the scarcity of alcohol, it is difficult to procure spirits promptly and in the great majority of cases orders on Form 1410 have to be returned to the holder of the permit for the purpose of reducing the quantity ordered. Thus vexatious delays occur and holders of permits to use alcohol for manufacturing purposes frequently find themselves without any of this very necessary material at hand. The existing requirement that all the copies of Form 1410, of which a large number are required each month, shall be sworn to, is, of course, a wholly unnecessary expense, for if a manufacturer holds a permit no further evidence of his right to use alcohol should be required.

The importance of the reform that would be effected by the substitution of a single floating permit for the numerous copies of Form 1410, is suggested by the fact that at the time of the recent conference of our trade committee with the officials of the Prohibition Unit, One Prohibition Director was being called upon daily to sign 12,000 individual permits to purchase. Relieved of this purely clerical work, the entire supervisory service could be devoted to the investigation of applications for permits, a task of crying necessity in view of the large number of permits perfunctorily issued during the days immediately following the taking effect of the Volstead Act. Many unscrupulous persons, seeking to reap a harvest in a short time through the diversion of alcohol and other intoxicating liquors to

beverage purposes, procured permits which they could not have obtained upon full investigation, manufactured quantities of fake medicine or toilet articles or spurious liquors, and after marketing them at enormous profits decamped for parts unknown, leaving nothing behind them but a smirch upon the good name of legitimate industries and an acute heart-ache in the Prohibition Unit. I am glad to say that these cases are being most carefully investigated and large numbers of permits will undoubtedly be cancelled.

There are many incongruities in the law and regulations that I am confident will be corrected in a short time. For example, what would be more ridiculous than a rule which permits the house physician of a hotel to prescribe a pint of whiskey for a transient guest staying perhaps but a night in a place, but which renders the guest a criminal, liable to serve a term in the penitentiary, if he attempts to take the whiskey with him when leaving the hotel, thus making it necessary for him to consume the entire pint at a sitting to keep out of jail. I am glad to be able to say that the Bureau is now considering the feasibility of authorizing a special label to be attached to containers of spirits regularly prescribed by physicians, showing the name and permanent address of the patient, the name and address of the physician and of the druggist from whom the spirits were purchased and any additional data that may be deemed advisable. Of course, it hardly need be said that it would be next to impossible to convict of a crime a person who, having regularly received a pint of spirits upon a physician's prescription, should be detected in the attempt to convey same from the hotel where he chanced to be stopping to his permanent home; nevertheless, it is important that such a matter should be provided for by regulation and not left to the variable judgments of special agents, district attorneys and courts in a hundred different jurisdictions.

Retail druggists of late have been rendered apprehensive by persistent reports, current for some time, that the Prohibition Commissioner is preparing to issue an order limiting to 100 gallons the amount of alcohol in all forms they will be permitted to procure in any 90-day period. These reports are erroneous though they have a basis in the fact that the Commissioner has been giving considerable attention to the problem of the practicability of determining the maximum quantity of spirits which a retailer can legitimately use in the course of three months.

Up to the time this was written, no hard-and-fast rule had been adopted and there appear to be sound reasons why it is impracticable, if not impossible, to fix a limit that would not work great hardship if it were made at all restrictive. For example, an amount of alcohol which would be ample for a small druggist with a limited prescription business who is in the habit of purchasing rather than making the bulk of his alcoholic preparations, would be wholly inadequate to meet the needs of another druggist with an equal volume of business who stood well with the doctors, because of his careful methods and who, like the old school pharmacist, makes his own tinctures, two or three successful little proprietaries of his own and other articles which are now commonly purchased of the wholesaler.

I feel confident that the Prohibition Commissioner will take a reasonable view of this whole matter and that if any limit, other than the size of the druggist's bond, is adopted, it will be sufficiently elastic to avoid all hardship.

Manufacturers, jobbers and retailers, alike, have been put to a great deal of trouble and considerable expense by the Bureau's ruling requiring monthly reports concerning all alcohol consumed. In view of the fact that the only parties allowed to employ nonbeverage alcohol for manufacturing purposes or for sale are presumed to have been carefully investigated by the Bureau, and of the further fact that unscrupulous persons would have no difficulty in falsifying these reports in such a manner as to escape detection, it is natural that the casual observer should jump to the conclusion that the time and the money they cost the trade are out of all proportion to their practical value to the Bureau.

I think we should suspend judgment on this matter, for a while at least, and give the report system a fair trial. It is possible that it may prove of sufficient value to the Bureau to justify its permanent retention. If so, it may be practicable to simplify the reports somewhat and perhaps to require them to be rendered quarterly instead of monthly, which, in many cases, would substantially reduce the labor of the permit holder.

I know that our friends in the Internal Revenue Bureau would give even greater consideration to the question of demanding additional reports or of requiring additional records to be kept if they could see the cold figures representing their cost to the business men of the country. I have in my possession letters from three large manufacturing and jobbing houses in the drug trade in which the extra cost of the narcotic and alcohol regulations is put down in one case as exceeding \$10,000 per annum, and in another as more than \$12,000, while in the third case it is estimated that the cost exceeds 10 percent of the value of the entire output of all classes of commodities. While the extra cost to the average retailer is not very much as measured in dollars and cents yet, multiplied by the many thousand dealers now doing business in the United States the aggregate must run far into the millions.

In this connection I would bespeak your patient consideration for any personal eccentricities that may be developed by Mr. Kramer's staff of Prohibition Directors. You who are accustomed to deal with the veteran experts of the Internal Revenue Service may frequently be tempted to become a bit testy over the super-zeal or lack of knowledge on the part of some of these new officials. I am confident, however, that none of you have had as comprehensive an experience in dealing with these gentlemen as has fallen to my lot since the 16th of January, and I take pleasure in testifying to their general intelligence, their impartiality and their uniformly good intentions. Mr. Kramer is following their movements with a keen eye and will not hesitate to put them on the right track whenever they go wrong. I am certain, however, that within a reasonable length of time you will find them discharging their duties with tact and discretion, as well as with properly directed zeal. There will necessarily be a few exceptions to this rule, but whenever you encounter one you have only to remember that Mr. Kramer's permanent address, 365 days in the year, is 1330 F St., Washington, D. C.

PHARMACISTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD ALCOHOL.

Action taken during the past year by organized retailers and many informal statements made by individual druggists indicate that the retail drug trade is now divided into three separate camps with respect to a definite attitude toward the question of selling or handling any form of intoxicating liquors.

The members of one contingent have decided that it is the function of the retail drug trade to provide anything that a reputable physician may order on prescription, and, therefore, they do not hesitate to carry and sell whiskey and other intoxicating liquors to be dispensed solely on prescriptions. They also carry nonbeverage alcohol which they use for prescriptions and general manufacturing purposes and sell in medicated form in small quantities in accordance with the regulations.

The second class, while handling and selling nonbeverage alcohol, have decided that they will not dispense whiskey or other intoxicating liquors even on the prescription of a physician. They sincerely believe that doctors as a class are in the habit of prescribing too much whiskey and other intoxicating liquors, and would use less if it were more difficult to obtain.

The third class have determined to handle and to sell neither whiskey nor other intoxicating liquors, including even nonbeverage alcohol, for any purpose whatever. According to certain members of this class they not only desire to be rid of the inconvenience incident to the supervision of dealers in intoxicating liquors, but they believe that refusal to sell them, even on a prescription of a physician, or to handle alcohol in any form, for any purpose, will be approved by the general public and especially by the officials of the Government charged with the supervision of this traffic; also that the refusal to handle intoxicants of any kind will aid materially in advancing the ethical position of the retail drug trade and go far toward correcting false impressions that have found lodgment in the public mind as the result of the acts of a few unscrupulous members of the trade.

Without attempting an analysis of the attitude of these three sections of the trade, it may be well to call attention to certain important considerations. It is an incontrovertible fact that a large and eminently respectable contingent of practicing physicians believe that intoxicating liquors are of decided value in the treatment of certain diseases and physiological conditions. Their right to prescribe them is specifically conceded by the provisions of the Volstead Act, which thereby imposes upon the Internal Revenue Bureau the exceedingly difficult task of policing their production, distribution and administration.

It would be an ideal condition, in view of the fact that more or less intoxicating liquor is certain to be sold on physicians' prescriptions pursuant to the Volstead Act, if some quasi-official dispensing system could be adopted, possibly under the supervision of the Public Health Service, but the Government appears to be taking no steps looking to the organization of any such system and it seems to me that the retail drug trade might well take this matter up vigorously and pursue it with the greatest possible energy until some adequate system has been devised. Physicians are contending with considerable emphasis that the retail druggists owe it to the medical profession, to which they are the recognized purveyors, and to the public which they must be ever ready to serve, that they shall do more than merely determine that they will not sell intoxicating liquors on physicians' prescriptions; they should use the great influence, which collectively they wield, to aid in working out a solution of this problem in a thoroughly practicable manner.

Under existing conditions, and in default of a semi-official dispensing system, an anomalous situation prevails. The Internal Revenue Bureau, so far from being benefited by the acts of retail druggists who refuse to handle intoxicating liquors for the filling of prescriptions, is likely to find itself somewhat embarrassed. It is greatly to the advantage of the Government that, inasmuch as intoxicants may lawfully be sold for medicinal purposes and, therefore, will be sold, they should be handled by the most reputable merchants in the country and that the traffic should not be turned over to persons of doubtful character. But does not every honest, highminded retailer who, in any community, refuses to fill prescriptions

for intoxicants, assist in concentrating the business in the hands of a smaller number, some of whom may be less conscientious, and thus add to the difficulties experienced by the Internal Revenue Bureau in preventing abuses?

Furthermore, even assuming that there are none but honest and reputable druggists in a given community, and that, because there is no central dispensing system, a few of them conscientiously determine it to be their duty to shoulder this burden, is it not apparent that if the filling of all the local physicians' prescriptions for stimulants devolves upon a fraction of the number of the local druggists, their business will soon assume a character that will bring them under undeserved suspicion?

I regret that I cannot sympathize at all with those retail druggists who have refused to take out permits to handle or use nonbeverage alcohol as distinguished from whiskey and other beverage forms of spirits. I cannot see how a modern pharmacy can be conducted without the use of alcohol. Of course, a retail druggist may become a peddler of toilet articles, tobacco, stationery, confectionery and soda water, but it seems to me that he must put his professional pride in his pocket and voluntarily scrap a large part of his education as a pharmacist when he decides that he will not use alcohol in any form. Pussyfooting should be beneath the dignity of men boasting a scientific training.

To my mind, the retail drug trade in this connection presents a clear case of *noblesse oblige*. Because of the high standing of the educated pharmacist, individually and collectively, it is his duty to assume, in addition to the ordinary burdens of citizenship, the extra load which his intellectual equipment and his special knowledge fit him to carry. He cannot conscientiously sidestep it nor impose it upon another.

If, therefore, you will shoulder your burdens like men and, like men, discharge your obligations to your trade and your country, you will earn the right, whenever your acts are called in question or whenever you find yourselves facing a difficult situation, to come to Washington and, in the tones in which real men speak, demand a square deal at the hands not only of the executive departments but, if necessary, of that august body the Congress of the United States itself.

THE FUTURE OF THE WAR VETERANS' COMMITTEE.*

BY CLYDE L. EDDY.

The War Veterans' Committee of the American Pharmaceutical Association may well become one of the most important and influential forces in American Pharmacy.

Its members are veterans of a war whose lessons were too well learned ever to be forgotten. They know the steps by which, against its will, this country became involved in the controversy, and, too, they know that conditions might easily arise which would compel us again to take up the sword in defense of our rights as a nation. They know the disadvantages under which pharmacists were compelled to serve in the Army and they know something of the inefficiency which existed for a time in some branches of the service because of a failure to utilize pharmaceutical resources to the best advantage.

* Read before House of Delegates A. Ph. A., City of Washington meeting, 1920.