

# MONTREAL PHARMACEUTICAL JOURNAL.

VOL. IV—No. 3.

JUNE, 1893.

\$1.00 per annum.

## The Montreal Pharmaceutical Journal.

171 St. James St., Montreal, Canada.

JOSEPH E. MORRISON, Editor

Subscription. \$1.00 per Annum.

Advertising Rates will be made known on application.

All remittances, matters intended for publication, new advertisements or changes should be addressed,

MONTREAL PHARMACEUTICAL JOURNAL.

P. O. Box 1142, Montreal

F. L. BENEDICT, Secretary.

WE give in another column a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Quebec Pharmaceutical Association, held at the Montreal College of Pharmacy, Lagauchetierre Street, on Tuesday, the 13th inst. It was really disappointing to see such a small number of members present. A large meeting was confidently expected, and that which could not fail to be disappointing to the officers of the organization occurred. This issue has been delayed to enable us to furnish our readers the report, and we, for lack of space, will postpone a fuller comment. One regrettable feature of the meeting we will refer to, and that will be found in the President's address. The Tincture question was touched upon by him in a manner certainly not to inspire increased confidence in the leaders of the "drug family" of this Province. The following, which appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* recently, will indicate what called for the President's special reference to Tinctures:—

### ADULTERATION PROSECUTIONS.

Several city druggists have been served with notices from the Department of Inland Revenue calling upon them to pay the cost of analysis for certain samples of tinctures sold by them to the inspector of food for the province, which on examination were found to be adulterated within the meaning of the Adulteration Act. The costs in each case amounts to \$12

One retail druggist states that he was asked for the tincture samples furnished by him to the De-

partment's official—as tincture—B. P. Did the officer ask for B. P. all round or not? This may perhaps affect the question to a certain degree, although custom affords, it has been claimed, the equivalent of law when the latter is deficient in explicit reference. Another question would be:—Did those who were not asked specially for B. P. tinctures furnish tinctures by the formula of the U. S. P. or other standard work on materia medica?

The Dominion "Adulteration Act," chap. 107, 49 Vic., enacts as follows:—

"Every drug shall be deemed to be adulterated within the meaning of the Act;

"1. If when sold, offered or exposed for sale under or by a name recognized in the British or United States Pharmacopœia, it differs from the standard of strength, quality or purity laid down therein;

"2. If when sold, or offered or exposed for sale under or by a name not recognized in the British or United States Pharmacopœia, but which is found in some other generally recognized Pharmacopœia or other standard work on materia medica, it differs from the standard of strength, quality or purity laid down in such work.

"3. If its strength or purity falls below the professed standard under which it is sold, offered or exposed for sale, &c."

The Dominion Government give a distinct line as to standard. The Ontario Legislature recognize the British Pharmacopœia, and in addition to this the various Medical Faculties and the Montreal College of Pharmacy educate students, using the B. P. as a text book or as the source for doses, &c. Doctors may not mark their tincture prescriptions "B. P.," but the question is:—Do they not invariably mean B. P. when they prescribe a tincture named in the B. P.? "Neither the Dominion or the Local Legislatures have legislated on the subject." This statement of the President must fall for inaccuracy, and, later on, in the address, the reference to the General Council of Medical Education of Great Britain will strike any one familiar with