

The reply constantly confuses the efficiency of cacodylate in anemia and in syphilis. The Council's report on "Arseno-Meth-Hyd" does not discuss or even touch on the question of cacodylates in anemia. It is confined to a discussion of the disappointing results obtained with cacodylates as such (i. e., without mercury) in the treatment of syphilis. This attempt on the part of the New York Intravenous Laboratory to confuse the issue and to attribute to the Council an opinion that it has never stated or held is an inexcusable misrepresentation. The company in its reply said:

"We believe that you have previously stated that a solution cacodylate of soda possesses no more action than so much water. In other words, it was inert. Now you try to show that it produces renal injury."

The Council has never declared that cacodylates are inert. In the report it is merely stated "that doses so large as to produce renal injury were almost totally ineffective against syphilis." Neither has the Council stated that cacodylate is "peculiarly dangerous." In fact the absolute toxicity of cacodylates is low but Cole's results were quoted as a caution that "effective" doses are not harmless. A great portion of the remainder of the reply is devoted to disparaging arspenamin—a product that is not involved in this action of the Council, and one about which the physician is amply informed.

As regards the editorial on intravenous therapy, a concession may be made the New York Intravenous Laboratory: intravenous injections are no longer quite as "impressive" as in 1916, but that does not alter the fact that they should be used only when a distinct advantage is to be gained.

"ACCEPTED BY THE COUNCIL ON PHARMACY AND CHEMISTRY"

Under the caption given above, the *Journal of the Missouri State Medical Association*, in its July issue, speaks editorially as follows:

The Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association is a department of our national organization that has not received the plaudits and encomiums of a wildly joyous medical profession nor the grateful praises of the enthusiastic manufacturer of pharmaceuticals. The Council seems indeed to be the unloved child of the entire family of subsidiary bodies of the association. Perhaps the reason for this may be found in the character of its duties, for the Council must expose fraud, sometimes in high places, and protect the physician from being duped by avaricious persons and by persons who are themselves sometimes the victims of their own credulity. It thus happens that the sale of some proprietary article previously held in high esteem by the practitioner proves valueless, perhaps even fraudulent. The practitioner, however, may have credited much of his success in treating certain conditions to that preparation and the maker has had success in accumulating dollars from its sale and both parties emit a loud and vicious roar against the Council, because they both lose money. Nobody wants to be "protected" against making money—make it honestly, if possible, but make it—but this black sheep among the Councils of the American Medical Association insists on their making their money honestly!

Despite many obstacles thrown into its path, the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry has serenely pursued its allotted tasks, corrected its mistakes, improved its methods, and today stands as the only medium to which the honest physician may turn for information—not misinformation—regarding proprietary articles. During the war the Council and the chemical laboratory were in close cooperation with the Surgeon-General's Office, testing and investigating every article offered to the government for the treatment of the sick soldiers. The variety and the number of fakish and fraudulent stuff offered to the Surgeon-General was a pitiable exhibit of the mental gymnastics of some people. Just now the Council and the laboratory have a new and important field before them, i. e., to protect the physicians against worthless and useless serums, vaccines and synthetics. It will be the Council's unpleasant duty to expose the fraudulent and useless among these articles and stamp truth on those found worthy.

We seem to have wandered from the topic in our caption but not so in reality because the burden of our thought is to

lend our influence to the spread of the motto of the Advertising Clubs of the World, namely, "Truth in Advertising." It is our purpose to stimulate a larger degree of enthusiasm for the work of the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry and the Chemical Laboratory, a more generous flow of inquiries concerning articles unfamiliar to the physician, and particularly to urge that the words "accepted by the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association" be printed on the label and on all advertising circulars of proprietary articles that have been admitted to New and Nonofficial Remedies. Then, when pamphlets and circulars are received by physicians they will read the statements of manufacturers with sympathetic understanding and with full confidence in the verity of the declarations. The importance of creating just that sort of receptivity in the mind of the prospective buyer is so well known to the astute publicity expert that it is needless for us to dwell on its advantages. Every proprietary article advertised in our journal, in *THE JOURNAL* of the American Medical Association, and in the other state association journals, as well as in several well-edited privately owned journals, does in effect say to the reader that the articles so advertised are accepted by the Council because only proprietary articles so accepted are accepted by us. The fact is further acknowledged when these firms are permitted to exhibit their goods at our annual sessions for again the rule is enforced that only proprietary articles which have been approved by the Council may be placed on display.

Why not complete the circle of ideas—it would not be a "vicious circle"—by printing on labels, in advertisements and circulars, the words: "Accepted by the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry"?

Correspondence

"USING VARICOSE VEINS FOR INTRA- VENOUS INJECTIONS"

To the Editor:—I agree with Dr. Rosenheck's statement (*THE JOURNAL*, July 19, 1919, p. 214) that physicians who administer arspenamin occasionally encounter a case in which the veins in the cubital space are difficult to locate. I do not, however, agree with his suggestion to select the varicose veins of the legs. Varicose veins, from a pathologic standpoint, are in a state of subacute or chronic inflammation. This explains the frequent occurrence of acute phlebitis in the lower extremities of females after slight or no trauma. The introduction of an irritant drug, such as arspenamin, into the veins is sufficient to excite an acute exacerbation resulting in thrombosis and complete obliteration. This, perhaps, does not generally follow after the first injection, but will appear in one of the later ones. To improve on this, I have found the dorsal surface of both hands and wrists convenient places to locate veins without any difficulty. A tourniquet is placed over the lower third of the forearm, and within a minute several veins can be seen to stand out prominently.

CHARLES WOLF, M.D., New York.

OPERATION VERSUS ROENTGEN-RAY TREATMENT OF UTERINE MYOMA

To the Editor:—The paper of Dr. Arthur Stein on this subject in *THE JOURNAL*, July 12, p. 95, needs further comment on the other side of the question. Dr. Stein questions the propriety of radiation instead of operation in the first place because of the risk of mistaking a sarcoma of the uterus or ovary for a myoma; and he cites as an instance the case of a young girl in her twenties in which a proposed radiation was abandoned in favor of operation. He then reveals that the resulting operation did not cure the patient. My impression is that the indications in this case pointed to radiation as the most hopeful treatment, particularly at this age. The question of the prevalence of sarcomas among supposed fibromyomas of the uterus has received undue prominence. The differential diagnosis, moreover, is by no means difficult if the patient's history is considered, bearing in mind