

## Section on Education and Legislation

Papers Presented at the Sixtieth Annual Convention

### MINUTES OF THE SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION.\*

FIRST SESSION.—Wednesday morning, August 21, 1912.

The first session of the Section on Education and Legislation was called to order by Chairman John F. Wallace, of Pennsylvania, at 11 o'clock A. M., in the ball-room of the hotel. Secretary W. J. Teeters, of Iowa, was present, as was also Associate Philip Asher, of New Orleans. Associates H. D. Knisely, of Oklahoma, and L. D. Havenhill, of Kansas, were not present. Mr. Asher was called to preside while the Chairman read his address. (See September Journal, p. 936.)

The Acting-Chairman called for action on the Chairman's Address, and Mr. F. W. Meissner moved that it be received and referred to a committee of five, to be appointed by the Chair. This motion was seconded by Mr. W. B. Philip, who stated that in California cocaine could not be sold except on physician's prescription—that of a registered physician, in his own handwriting, stating the name of the patient; and the prescription not to be refilled.

Mr. Meissner's motion was adopted, and the Acting-Chairman appointed on the committee of five Messrs. L. A. Seltzer, of Michigan; Louis Emanuel, of Pennsylvania; Wm. B. Day, of Chicago; F. W. Meissner, of Indiana, and Frank H. Freericks, of Ohio.

Chairman Wallace resumed the chair, and called for report of the Secretary as the next order of business. (See September Journal, p. 943.)

The Chair called for action on the report of the Secretary, and Mr. Anderson moved that it be received and referred to the Committee on Chairman's Address. He also asked for a slight correction in the reference made to New York City, in that the report stated that upon completion of a three years' course following two years of high school work the degree of Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy would be given, whereas it should have been stated as following a four years' course instead of three.

This motion was duly adopted.

The Chair stated that the next thing in order was the report of the Committee on Drug Reform, but he had been informed by Chairman Sayre that this report was read before the Section on Scientific Papers on yesterday.

The Chair stated that he had a paper from G. H. P. Lichthardt, of Sacramento, the title of which had not reached him until after the program had gone to the printer. Without objection, he said he would ask Mr. Lichthardt to read his paper now.

Mr. Lichthardt then read his paper entitled "A Quotation," based upon an in-

---

\*Papers and reports which do not appear here will be printed in later issues.

terview with a U. S. Customs Inspector, published in a Sacramento, (Calif.) paper, and dealing with the smuggling of opium into the United States.

The paper was discussed by Messrs. F. T. Gordon, Chas. J. Clayton, Thos. F. Main, Albert Schneider, Geo. H. P. Lichthardt, Wm. C. Anderson, C. M. Woodruff, and F. H. Freericks.

The Chair asked if there was any further discussion of this paper, and none being offered it was referred for publication.

The Chair called on Mr. Cornelius Osseward, of Seattle, Wash., to read a paper entitled, "Trade Marks Pertaining to Medicinal Compounds."

Mr. Osseward's paper was discussed by Messrs. Albert Schneider, Charles M. Woodruff, Philip Asher, I. A. Becker, W. J. Frazier, H. C. Shuptrine, G. H. P. Lichthardt, and the author of the paper, Mr. Osseward.

W. C. Anderson raised the point of order that the discussion had wandered away from the subject of the paper, and moved that the latter be referred to the Council without recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. F. T. Gordon, and after some further discussion it was so ordered.

On motion of Albert Schneider the Section then adjourned to 8 P. M.

#### SECOND SESSION.—Wednesday evening, August 21, 1912.

The second session of the Section on Education and Legislation was called to order by Chairman Wallace at 8:15 P. M., in the ball-room of the Brown Palace Hotel.

The Chair called attention to the large number of papers before the Section, and stated the practical necessity of limiting the discussions.

Thereupon, Mr. Shuptrine, of Georgia, moved that discussions be limited to three minutes, and this motion was seconded by Mr. Frazier and carried.

The Chair called upon Albert Schneider, of San Francisco, to present his paper on "The Status of Pharmaceutical Education and Legislation on the Pacific Coast."

Mr. Schneider stated that he had no paper prepared on this subject, but only a few notes. When speaking of the Pacific Coast, he said he had in mind the three states of California, Oregon and Washington. California, he said, had three schools of Pharmacy: The Department of Pharmacy of the University of California, with which he was connected; the Department of Pharmacy of the University of Southern California with which Professor A. Maas, who was present, was connected, and the Department of Pharmacy of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of the city of San Francisco. The Department of Pharmacy of the University of California gave a two-year course and a three-year course, the two-year course requiring for entrance two years of high school work or its equivalent, and the three-year course conferring the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy upon university entrance and three years of college work. In 1915, according to the ruling of the regents of the University, the degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy would be conferred only upon completion of four years of college and university work. The probabilities were that three years of pharmacy work would be required, plus some work in the academic departments. He was not sure about the College of Physicians and Surgeons, but thought there were no en-

trance requirements beyond what was usually spoken of as a grammar school education. He knew nothing of their laboratories or courses of instruction. The Department of Pharmacy of the University of Southern California had complied, so far as he knew, with the minimum requirements of the Conference of Faculties. They had made application for the first time this year, which indicated that the department was about five or six years old. In addition to this, Mr. Schneider said, there was a quizz course conducted in the city of San Francisco, intended to prepare for State Board examinations. The fees for this course were \$25 and \$50. Those taking the \$50-course usually passed, but those taking the \$25-course did not always pass.

As to state laws, Mr. Schneider said California had a pharmacy law with which many of the pharmacists were satisfied. This law, as far as it went, was excellent, but it did not fully meet the views of the progressive pharmacists of the state, and two years ago they had formulated a law, modeled after the New York law, but adapted to California conditions, and this law was presented before the last State Legislature. The non-progressives immediately made war upon it, and the progressives, in turn, saw to it that the non-progressives got nothing they asked for. So the result of this conflict was *nil*. He thought however the probabilities were that, at the next session of the Legislature, they would secure the enactment of a graduation prerequisite provision, which was the principal bone of contention between the factions. It was the same in California as elsewhere, there were two kinds of individuals, those who made a name for themselves by honest, worthy effort, and those who attracted attention to themselves by attacking those who made such efforts. As far as he could learn, the non-progressives in his state were actuated by no higher motive than the simple purpose of opposing the progressives. They seemed to have absolutely no objection to the proposed legislation, and the spirit of opposition alone seemed to be the influencing factor that induced them to come up to Sacramento and use time and effort in the attempt to nullify any forward movement. California also had an excellent narcotic law, an excellent vendor's act, and a most excellent poison law. The Pure Food and Drugs Law in California was divided into two distinct parts, one relating to food and the other to drugs. The drugs section of the law was administered by the State Board of Health. An effort would be made to turn this over to the Board of Pharmacy, but they had been told that the Board of Pharmacy must first show some evidence that it was competent to administer the law. The progressives had agreed to wait until a competent board was put in office, and hoped that this would happen in a very short time. Mr. Schneider said he did not wish to appear as criticising the California Board of Pharmacy, for it was known as an extremely active one. It had gone after the narcotic evil and had expended a vast amount of money, as shown by the reports published by the State Department of Health, at the direction of the Board of Pharmacy. He believed the California Board of Pharmacy was the most active board west of the Mississippi River, and he thought his State Association was as active as any in the country. The old State Pharmaceutical Society had been dead for fourteen years previous to 1903—but at that time the California Pharmaceutical Association, which this year held its sixth annual meeting at Del Monte, was organized.

Mr. Schneider said that Oregon had one college of pharmacy located at Corvallis—a Department of Pharmacy of the Oregon Agricultural College. The college of pharmacy was maintained by the State and two courses were given, one conferring the degree of Pharmaceutical Chemist, (Ph. C.) and the other Bachelor of Science, (B. S.) The first required four years of high school work—the university entrance—and two years of college instruction. The second required university entrance and four years college instruction. There was no separate school of pharmacy, and the students, as far as possible, took the work with the regular University students and those in academic work. The course of instruction at the Corvallis college of pharmacy was free, with the exception of a matriculation fee of \$5.00, plus a small fee for laboratory breakage, the total perhaps, amounting to \$15 or \$20 a year.

Oregon had, of course, a State Association, perhaps not as large as that of California, but fully as active.

Similar conditions, Mr. Schneider said, prevailed in the State of Washington. There were two active state institutions there, giving courses in pharmacy, under conditions similar to those prevailing at the Corvallis institution in Oregon. Washington likewise had a Board of Pharmacy, and he was pleased to say that under a rule of the board adopted some months ago, beginning with July, 1913, no one would be allowed to take the State Board examination unless he had completed one year's work in a college of pharmacy recognized by the board. On and after July 1, 1914, all candidates appearing before the board for license must have completed a course in a recognized college of pharmacy, and the board retained the right to say what colleges should be recognized; it was understood, however, that students from any and all colleges complying with the minimum requirements of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties would be acceptable. Mr. Schneider said he considered this a wonderful step in advance. He did not know of anything that had come to his notice that had pleased him more than that action of the State Board of Washington. It meant that the Board of Pharmacy, having become disgusted, perhaps, with the dilly-dallying of the State Association and the pharmacists of the state, had simply decided to take things into its own hands. The question now was whether this rule of the board would stand the test; so far as he knew, it did not conflict with the State law. He regarded it as really remarkable that five such men should have been brought together on one board—men having such a clear insight into what was needed in the state, with the courage at the same time to act in so important a matter.

With regard to the State Association in Washington, Mr. Schneider said he could only state that such a body existed, though not so active as the California Association. A notable feature with the latter was its earnestness of purpose. When the California Association met in annual session, "they went to bat at once; there was no horse-play and no potato-races; there was no blind-man's buff, or base-ball, or anything of that sort, but they got down to business at once, and stayed there until the very last session." The entertainments were not allowed to interfere with the business sessions. Mr. Schneider said he had a pardonable pride in the thought that he had perhaps done a little towards the reorganization and revivifying of the California pharmacists, as exemplified in the

new State Association. Continuing, he said they had in California also a branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association, tentatively organized about a year ago. Several meetings of the branch had been held, and one was being held this very night in the office of the *Pacific Pharmacist*.

Chairman Wallace said the Section had before it several papers along similar lines and it might be well to have them all discussed at the same time. The next was one by H. L. Taylor, on "The Standardization of Courses in Schools of Pharmacy." But as the writer was not present, he said the paper would be read by title and referred for publication, without objection, and it was so ordered.

The next paper was by Joseph W. England, of Pennsylvania, and was entitled, "The Misuse of the Term Pharmacology and Other Terms," and was read by the author.

The Chair then expressed the great pleasure he had in now calling on Miss Zada M. Cooper, instructor in the Iowa College of Pharmacy, and said he would call on Prof. Kuener, of that institution, to conduct Miss Cooper to the rostrum.

Mr. Kuener escorted Miss Cooper forward, amid the applause of the Section, and she presented her paper entitled, "Some Suggestions on the Teaching of Pharmaceutical Arithmetic."

The Chairman stated that it was a matter of extreme gratification to have this very interesting and instructive paper from a young lady who was one of the faculty of the Iowa College of Pharmacy, and he hoped that this would be a precedent established, by which the Section on Education and Legislation would have such papers from other Colleges of Pharmacy. Recently it had been his pleasure, he said, to present to Mrs. Charles H. LaWall, of Philadelphia, a prize for the best paper presented before the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association for 1910, out of a list of thirty-nine papers presented. He said he desired to express his appreciation and sincere thanks for this paper presented by Miss Cooper.

The three foregoing papers were discussed by Messrs. H. H. Rusby and Philip Asher, after which it was ordered that the papers be received and referred to the Committee on Publication.

The Chair expressed his regret that the next paper on the program, one by Charles H. LaWall, of Philadelphia, entitled, "When is an Education not an Education?" must for lack of time be read by title.

The Chair said that the same course would be taken with a paper by William Bodeman—"The Sage of Hyde Park"—entitled "Reflections."

The Chair stated that there were two papers on the program by Lyman F. Kebler, of Washington City, but he had not as yet received either paper.

Mr. Rusby stated by way of explanation that there had been some new regulations in the Department of Agriculture, which had made it exceedingly difficult for Mr. Kebler to get away just at this time.

The Chair next called on Frank H. Freericks of Cincinnati for his paper on "A Proposed National Anti-narcotic Law," and Mr. Freericks presented his paper in abstract.

There being no discussion on this paper, it was referred for publication.

The next paper was one by L. L. Walton, on "Legislation Relating to Preliminary Education for Pharmacy Licensure." In the absence of the writer, unless

there was some objection, the Chair said he would take the liberty of reading this paper himself. They had recently had in Pennsylvania a law relating to preliminary education, and quite a little bit of confusion had been developed in relation to this question. Mr. Walton's paper had a bearing on that proposition, and he asked Miss Cooper to take the Chair while he read the paper.

Miss Cooper, as Acting-Chairman, invited discussion on the paper just read, but none was offered, and on motion it was referred for publication.

Chairman Wallace resumed the Chair, and stated that the next paper on the program was a paper by Thomas H. Potts, Secretary of the National Association of Retail Druggists, on "A Few Ideas On The Subject Of Education And Legislation " and that unless there was some objection, the paper would in the absence of the writer, be read by title and referred for publication and it was so ordered.

The Chair stated that the same course would be taken as to a paper by James H. Finneran, entitled, "Past, Present and Future Pharmacy Laws," and also as to a paper by S. L. Hilton, of Washington, on the subject of "Failure of Pharmacy Laws."

The Chair then called on Prof. H. H. Rusby to present his paper on "The Pharmacopoeia and the Law." Mr. Rusby, as a preliminary to the reading of his paper, stated that the subject to which it related was, in his opinion, one of such great importance that he was anxious to have it printed, or at least have the principal facts connected with it, printed quickly and have as wide distribution as possible. He knew that the papers which were presented here were the property of the Association, and must be printed in the Journal, but believed that all the pharmaceutical Journals were permitted to print abstracts. He had several copies of his paper, and the members of the pharmaceutical press could get them by applying to him. (See September Journal, p. 947.)

The Chair called for action upon this very excellent and exhaustive paper by Mr. Rusby, with the eleven recommendations made to the Section.

Mr. Schneider moved that the report be received and adopted, including the recommendations.

Mr. Gordon, in starting the discussion on this paper, stated that it was one of the most important that had been presented before this Section. It spoke of conditions that affected every man in the drug business. With Mr. Schneider's permission, however, he would like to offer the following as an amendment to his motion: "That this Section should receive Mr. Rusby's paper and refer it to the Council, with request that the Council upon approval forward it to the Revision Committee of the United States Pharmacopoeia, with the statement that this Association approved the recommendations made in the paper." In other words, he wished to see this Association go on record as approving these recommendations, and not only as approving them, but that they should be sent to each member of the Pharmacopoeial Revision Committee as approved by the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Mr. Schneider said he would accept the amendment.

Mr. Freericks inquired of Mr. Gordon whether he intended that the Council should first look into the recommendations made. He said that he did not under-

stand it was meant by adopting the motion and amendment as made that this Section approved of the paper and of the recommendations.

Mr. Gordon responded that he was not familiar with the approved method of doing the thing, but, as he understood, the approval of this Section went no farther than that. Therefore, he thought the motion should be to refer the paper directly to the Council—or, possibly, better to the Association in General Session, for its approval, with the recommendation that the paper be sent to the Revision Committee of the Pharmacopoeia, with the approval of this Association of its recommendations. Whichever was the better way was agreeable to him.

Charles E. Caspari said he thought if it went to the Council that body might recommend to the Association in General Session, and that it could be transmitted by the Association to the Revision Committee, with whatever recommendation it had to make.

After some further discussion of the mode of procedure in this matter, participated in by Messrs. Gordon, Schneider and Caspari, and in which the Chairman took a leading part, and after several suggestions and counter-suggestions had been made, a motion made by Mr. Beal "that the paper be received and the recommendations therein made be approved by this Section, and that the paper and recommendations be referred to the Council, with the request that the Council acquaint the members of the Pharmacopoeial Revision Committee of this action," was accepted by Mr. Gordon as a substitute for his proposed amendment, and was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Beal stated he presumed that the sending of a copy of the Journal containing the paper to each member of the Revision Committee would be a sufficient notification, and this was agreed to informally.

The Chair stated that there were two items on the program which, of necessity, had to have attention, namely: First, the nomination, and then the election, of the officers of this Section for the ensuing year. Tomorrow night had been set apart for a joint conference of the Boards of Pharmacy and the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties with the Section on Education and Legislation; therefore, it was necessary to attend to this business at this session. He thereupon called for nominations for Chairman.

W. J. Teeters, of Iowa, the present Secretary of the Section, was nominated for Chairman by Mr. Beal, and Mr. Rusby seconded the nomination. On motion of Mr. Freericks, nominations for Chairman were closed.

Nominations for Secretary were called for, and Mr. Beal stated that he desired to nominate for this office a man who was so modest that when his name was presented he would probably decline, but he hoped his declination would not be accepted. He was a gentleman that he hoped some day to see Chairman of the Section, as he was one of the best qualified authorities on pharmaceutical law and legislation that this Association possessed. He then nominated for Secretary of the Section for the ensuing year Frank H. Freericks, of Ohio. This nomination was seconded by Mr. Rusby and on motion the nominations were closed.

The Chair called for nominations for three associates on the Committee on Education and Legislation and Hugh Craig, of New York City was nominated by Mr. Beal and the nomination seconded by Mr. Rusby. Louis Emanuel, of Pennsylvania was nominated by Mr. Freericks, and the nomination seconded by

Mr. Beal. Miss Zada M. Cooper, of Iowa, was nominated by Mr. Gordon, and the nomination seconded by Mr. Rusby. On motion of Mr. Beal, nominations were closed.

The Chair stated that as there was only a single ticket, he would entertain a motion to direct the Secretary or Chairman to cast the affirmative ballot of the Section electing the several parties named to the positions for which they have been respectively nominated.

Mr. Beal, seconded by Mr. Rusby, moved that the Chairman cast this ballot, and the motion prevailed.

The Chairman stated that he had cast the ballot as directed, and declared those in nomination duly elected officers of the Section for the ensuing year.

The Chair then called on Mr. Beal for his paper entitled "The Best Method of Administering State Food and Drug Laws."

Mr. Beal stated that, in an unguarded moment, he had admitted to the Chairman of the Section that he had some ideas on the administration of food and drug laws. The Chairman had asked his (Mr. Beal's) advice as to the best way to get papers for the program, and he told him the way to do it was to find somebody who had an idea, and then to fasten on him and not let him go until he consented to present a paper. This advice had been his own undoing. He said that he would not read the paper, but would give a brief abstract of it. He also said that he was frank to admit that it would probably be regarded as "rank heresy"; that he did not expect the members to approve of it, and would be very much surprised if they did.

Mr. Beal then proceeded to read his paper in abstract.

The Chair invited discussion of the paper just read, and remarks were offered by Messrs. Albert Schneider and H. H. Rusby.

The Chairman said if there was no further discussion, the paper would be referred for publication, and it was so ordered.

Mr. Beal was called to the chair, while the report of the Committee on President's Address and report of the Secretary, which was referred to the same committee, was being read.

Mr. Freericks presented said report as follows:

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS.

DENVER, COLO., Aug. 21, 1912.

*To the Section on Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association:*

Your committee has carefully considered the address of Chairman Wallace, and has been much impressed with its progressive spirit and tone, reflecting the high and at the same time practical aims of true pharmacists. We urge upon every member its careful study. In giving consideration to the various suggestions and recommendations we

(1) Endorse fully the suggestion for the need of amendment to the National Food and Drugs Act, and in this connection are agreed that no amendment can be regarded as satisfactory unless it safeguard against false and fraudulent claims, and unless it also provide a single standard for official drugs and preparations, having due regard for the rights of original manufacturers and for the sale of crude drugs and chemicals and finally, unless it do not also provide, in so far as this be possible, that the manufacture and sale of all drugs, their compounds and preparations, be limited to qualified persons.

(2) We are of the opinion that the use of wood alcohol is not advisable in medicinal preparations for either internal or external use.

(3) We heartily agree that a Federal law governing the sale and distribution of habit-



forming drugs in interstate commerce is an absolute necessity, and such law, its details and methods of practical operation, should find the early attention of the proposed legislative conference.

(4) Having reference to the basic principles which should be found in every pharmacy law, we agree entirely with the suggestions made by Chairman Wallace and particularly as follows:

a. That all laws relating to pharmacy should be enforced by pharmacists.

b. That provision should be made for licensed stores, other than pharmacies, for communities remote from pharmacies and where there is a real necessity, to allow the sale only of drugs and medicines in original packages, when prepared by pharmacists, but this should not include the right to in such cases sell narcotics or preparations containing narcotics.

c. We approve the suggestion to require a separate license for each pharmacy, so long as this will not preclude a person, firm or corporation from owning more than one pharmacy when conducted by registered pharmacists.

d. We approve the suggestion that drugs administered or dispensed by physicians should be required to conform to the respective standards of strength, quality and purity.

e. We heartily concur in the recommendation for the establishment of a National Legislative Conference, not necessarily under the auspices of the American Pharmaceutical Association but, if possible, and otherwise feasible to meet at the same time and place, with the understanding, however, that no allied branch or interest be bound by a decision which may be reached by a majority attending such conference.

Your committee has also given careful attention to the splendid and complete report made by Secretary Teeters, touching fully upon the legislative and educational progress of the year, and now recommends that the sincere thanks of this Section be expressed to him for his painstaking labor and study in that connection.

We also recommend that the thanks of this Section be expressed to Chairman Wallace, the appreciation of whose work is fully shown by this report. Respectfully submitted,

L. A. SELTZER.

F. W. MEISSNER,

W. B. DAY.

LOUIS EMANUEL.

FRANK H. FREERICKS, Chairman.

Mr. Beal, as Acting Chairman, stated that the Section had been favored at this meeting with a Chairman's address of more than usual ability and comprehensiveness, and with a Secretary's report to which he gave high praise when he said that it was equal to the report that the same gentleman made to the Section last year. He said the Section was equally favored by the report of the Committee on these two addresses, which showed evidence of very careful and serious thought and preparation. He asked for action upon the report as made.

Mr. Gordon moved that the report be accepted, and this motion was seconded by Mr. Schneider.

Mr. Wallace said he wished to say a few words in relation to two items in the report. He first thanked the committee for their generous expressions and good will in relation to the address which had been submitted. As to the subject of wood alcohol, he was fully convinced that it should be permitted in preparations for external use, and he was ready to discuss that proposition with those who differed with him. He had intended to write a paper on this particular subject, but had been unable to do so. He might be able to present one at the next meeting of the Association. As to the other matter, he believed that the only place for a National Pharmaceutical Conference to be held was under the auspices of the Section of Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Associa-

tion. It had been his privilege, and also the privilege of several members of this Section, to attend two so-called national legislative conferences, under the auspices of that great organization of retail druggists, the National Association of Retail Druggists, of which he was a loyal and active member, but he could say without fear of contradiction that nothing had been accomplished except to reach a sort of understanding to extend the spirit of cooperation to those who could not be reached otherwise. Last year, at Niagara Falls, there was an indefinite program, and this year an attempt was made to get a program, but both sessions were taken up with the report of the Committee on National Legislation, which was a matter of history, and did not touch this subject directly. He agreed with the suggestion contained in the report of the Chairman of the Committee on Legislation of the A. Ph. A. at the Boston meeting, and he thought a conference of this kind covering a period of two or three days could be had to the greatest advantage of pharmacy.

Mr. Freericks, responding to the remarks of Chairman Wallace, stated that the reference to wood alcohol and the inhibition of its use for external purposes seemed to him to be in general keeping with the prevailing opinion at the present time, and he was satisfied that the committee who had in charge the report of the Chairman, as well as all the members of the American Pharmaceutical Association, would only be too glad to have Mr. Wallace convince them that they were wrong. As to the matter of a National Legislative Conference, to be held under the auspices of this Association, Mr. Freericks said he well recalled that this matter was first broached last year at Boston, and it was then, as now, a question of having such conference under the auspices of this Association. At that time the Section, after duly considering the matter, came to the conclusion that it would not be proper for this Association to ask for such a conference, and at the same time to announce that it should be under the auspices of the A. Ph. A. For this reason, it was not approved in that form last year, and the committee this year was taking exactly the same position. They held that it did not matter under whose auspices the conference was held, just so it was held. Speaking also as a member of the National Association, he said it had been no fault of the N. A. R. D. that this conference was not held at an earlier time, and that it did not consider all the various subjects it might have considered. He wished to make this entirely clear. If the proper steps were taken now to bring about such a conference, he believed it could be held with profit to all concerned; and when held, it would be entirely able, in his opinion, to choose its officers and proceed in such way as it deemed best for the benefit of pharmacy.

Speaking again on this subject, Mr. Wallace said he thought all would agree that any conference held must be under the auspices of some particular organization. Exception was taken to holding such a conference under the auspices of the A. Ph. A., or the Section on Education and Legislation of that body. Two conferences had already been called by the N. A. R. D., which were specifically provided to be presided over by the Chairman of the Committee on Legislation of that Association, and he failed to see how any exception could justly be taken to the suggestion to transfer that authority from an appointive officer of an Association composed wholly of retail druggists to an elective officer of a Section of an Association composed of every branch of pharmacy. He insisted that

there was but one place to hold a National Pharmaceutical Legislative Conference, and that was under the auspices of the Section on Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and at a time other than the time of the annual meeting.

Mr. Rusby expressed himself as heartily in favor of the views just presented by the Chairman. He thought the broader the discussion of such questions the more force it gave them. He knew that the National Association of Retail Druggists would be absolutely impartial in such a matter; but even if it had no one interest in sight more than another, people would say that it had, and any action taken would lose in weight and influence thereby. But here was an Association which included everything; there was not a single interest connected with pharmacy that was not represented, and well represented, in the A. Ph. A. He believed that a conference held under the auspices of this Association would be acceptable to everyone, and would carry great weight. All of these allied bodies could be represented in it, and there would be nothing narrow about it. No one could say there was; no one could suspect there was.

Mr. C. M. Woodruff thought that a National Legislative Conference, in which the various interests referred to in the report might be represented upon an equal basis, would be productive of much good. There were many things that all were agreed upon, but some features that were not agreed upon—though the Chairman's paper indicated the possibility of coming to an agreement upon one of the most important features. The manufacturers' association, he said, was ready to enter into such a conference. Mr. Woodruff stated that he did not think such a conference should be expected to accomplish the desired end in a moment, or perhaps in a single session. He had with him all the reports of the different committees in printed form made at the American Bar Association held in Milwaukee last week. One of these reports was that of the Commissioners on Uniform Legislation. After two or three years of conference, they had reported a uniform divorce act, and a uniform act relating to the employment of child labor. They had a report referred to it on uniform drug legislation, and their report on that subject covered about four lines, and simply amounted to a recommendation of adoption by all the States that had not yet done so of a law that was in exact compliance with the act of June 30, 1906, so far as it related to the definitions of adulteration and misbranding. His comment was, that if a body of lawyers could not arrive at a statute in one or two sessions, a body of pharmacists, representing diverse interests, could not be expected to accomplish much in such a short space of time. Mr. Woodruff said he wanted to make this suggestion, with all earnestness: It would not be long until a new Pharmacopœia and a new National Formulary were given to the country, and in his opinion, in order to make that Pharmacopœia and that National Formulary legal, it would be necessary to adopt new drug laws, for, while a Legislature might adopt an existing standard, he doubted whether a Legislature could confer legislative powers upon a body of men to create standards in the future. This would mean difficulty from the very moment the new Pharmacopœia and new Formulary took effect. His suggestion, was therefore, to consume the time from the present to the time when these new authorities should take effect in conference between the different interests, to see

if, by a spirit of compromise here and there, an agreement upon an ideal pure drug law could not be arrived at.

Mr. Rusby, as a substitute for the original motion of Mr. Gordon to receive and adopt the report of the Committee on Chairman's Address, here moved that the same be adopted, with the exception of that part which related to the proposed Conference.

Mr. Craig seconded Mr. Rusby's motion, and Acting Chairman Beal said the question was now on the amendment.

Mr. Freericks, speaking again on this subject, said that he was sure that it was with exactly the same desire and exactly the same feeling entertained by the Chairman of this Section and Mr. Rusby that he expressed exactly the contrary wish. What was wanted was practical results, not theory. It might be all very well to say that these things should be done under the auspices of this Association, but what was wanted was a Conference. In his judgment, it made no difference under the auspices of what association this Conference was held, but he wished again to assert that it had not been because of any fault on the part of either association that such a Conference had not been held in due course and at the proper time in the past. He reiterated that it was a conference that was wanted, a successful conference, and to that end all the various interests ought to be brought into it; and even if they did not agree in all things, free discussion could be had and they would learn from each other.

Mr. Wallace asked if he was not right in the statement of facts that a conference of any kind must be held under the auspices of some body or some commission, and again declared that his loyalty to the National Association of Retail Druggists was not exceeded by any member of that body. But, he said, two conferences of this character, which had been called under the auspices of that Association had not been successful. After these two failures, he said he believed it was up to some other organization to act, and he believed the recommendation made by Mr. Hynson before this Association at Boston last year would fill the bill exactly. It had been demonstrated that the National Association of Retail Druggists could not hold such conference under its auspices at the time of its annual convention, because there was not sufficient time allowed for it. He concluded by stating again that he felt that a National Legislative Conference should be called, and under the auspices of the Section on Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as suggested by Mr. Hynson; and that suggestion of his he intended to incorporate in a report to the Council before they left the city of Denver.

Mr. Freericks asked if it was possible to get information at this time as to whether any request went to the National Association from this Association at its Boston meeting last year for the holding of such a conference.

Mr. Wallace said he could answer this question by saying that, in the illness of Mr. Johnson, of Seattle, Chairman of the Section on Education and Legislation last year, he was called to preside over the second session, and at that time exception had been taken by Messrs. Anderson and Freericks to the conference being held under the auspices of this Section. The matter, with that exception, was

referred to the Council for action, but no action had ever been taken on it, notwithstanding that he, as a member of the Council during the past year, had directed the attention of the Secretary of the Council to that particular resolution which had been referred for its action, and which he believed was of vital importance to pharmacy.

Mr. Freericks said that this justified him in stating what he had twice said before, that if there had been no successful conference held because of failure of action on the part of this Association, the fault should not be placed elsewhere. Therefore, he again made the point that it would be to the advantage of pharmacy generally in the country if this Section did not adopt the amendment as proposed.

The Acting Chairman said the question was still on the adoption of the amendment proposed by Mr. Rusby, and a vote would be taken thereon.

A *viva voce* vote failing to decide the matter, a division was called for, and resulted in a tie vote. The Chair being called upon to decide the matter, cast his vote in favor of the amendment and declared the same adopted.

The report as thus amended was then adopted.

Mr. Wallace resumed the chair.

On motion of Mr. Craig, seconded by Mr. Freericks, the following papers were read by title only:

"Vegetable Drugs Employed by American Physicians," John Uri Lloyd; "Food for Thought for State Boards of Pharmacy, I. Result of Examinations," Otto Raubenheimer; "The Pharmacist vs. Legislation," Fred A. Hubbard; "Pharmaceutical Degrees," Otto A. Wall; "The Relation of Drug Standardization to Pharmaceutical Education and Legislation," F. E. Stewart; "The Evolution of Laws Regulating the Sale and Use of Poisons," M. I. Wilbert; "The Need for Uniformity in Laws Regulating the Sale and Use of Poisons and Narcotics," M. I. Wilbert; "The Effect of the National Pure Food and Drugs Act On the Wholesale Drug Business," John R. Thompson; "International Cooperation in Pharmacy," J. J. Hoffman, Secretary of the "Federation Internationale Pharmaceutique."

The Chair stated that he had in his hands the report of the Committee on Patents and Trade-Marks, F. E. Stewart, Chairman, which was a very long one, and asked what disposition should be made of it.

Mr. Beal said that he had had the pleasure of reading this paper, and that it was a most excellent report. There was not time to consider it now and give it the amount of attention it deserved—it would take at least an hour's time to do that—and solely for this reason he moved that the paper be read by title and referred to the Committee on Publication. This motion was seconded by Mr. Freericks, and carried. (See September JOURNAL, p. 1034.)

The same action was also taken upon the "Report of the Committee on Weights and Measures," Geo. C. Diekman, Chairman.

On motion of Mr. Rusby, duly seconded, the Section then adjourned to meet in joint session with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, on Thursday evening at 8 o'clock.

THIRD SESSION—Thursday Evening, August 22, 1912.

(Joint Session with the Boards of Pharmacy and Conference of Faculties.)

The program called for a joint session of the Section on Education and Legislation with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties at this time, and the session was presided over by Chairman Wallace, who called the meeting to order at 8:30 p. m. in the ball-room of the hotel.

The Chair stated that he believed the action taken by the Section on Education and Legislation on yesterday, in referring Mr. Osseward's paper to the Council without recommendation, was an injustice to that gentleman, and he thought that portion of his paper exclusive of the subject of phylacogens, upon which he had expended so much time and labor, should be referred for publication, the action of the Section to stand as to the remainder of his paper, and he would be glad to entertain a motion to reconsider the action by which the paper was referred to the Council without recommendation.

Mr. Anderson asked if this would be possible, in a joint meeting of this kind, and the Chair responded that it was, to begin with, a session of the Section on Education and Legislation, and that a few matters of business applying particularly to the work of the Section would first be taken up and disposed of, before the work of the joint session began.

Mr. Frazier said he had listened to Mr. Osseward's paper with a great deal of interest, but did not think of making a motion to refer the first part of it for publication until it was too late. He said the Chairman had voiced his sentiments in regard to the matter, and he moved that the vote by which the paper was referred to the Council without recommendation be reconsidered.

This motion was seconded by Messrs. Day and Freericks, and the latter by way of explanation of his second said it was not a question of whether the members held the same views as the writer, but simply one of whether that part referred to by the Chair showed work and was of real value. He believed that it did, and he thought Mr. Osseward was fairly entitled to have that part of his paper referred for publication in the Proceedings.

The Chair said that he had discussed the subject with the author of the paper, and he had agreed to the proposition suggested.

The motion to reconsider the vote by which that portion of Mr. Osseward's paper outside of his discussion of phylacogens should be referred to the Council without recommendation was then put to a vote and carried.

The Chair announced that the paper was now before the Section for disposal, and he would be glad to entertain a motion that that portion of the paper preceding the author's discussion of phylacogens be referred to the Committee on Publication, and that the balance of the paper be referred to the Council without recommendation.

Mr. Shuptrine so moved, and the motion was seconded by Messrs. Frazier and Anderson and carried.

The Chair stated that the Secretary would now read the report of the Syllabus

Committee, which had come from Chairman H. L. Taylor, who was not able to be present.

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL PHARMACEUTICAL SYLLABUS COMMITTEE.

ALBANY, N. Y., July 30, 1912.

*To the American Pharmaceutical Association (Section on Education and Legislation):*

GENTLEMEN: Your Syllabus Committee beg to submit the following report of the activity of the National Committee for the year and to offer resolutions for your approval.

The National Committee met at Boston, Mass., August 17, 1911 and on formal motions proceeded to elect officers to approve their reports and to act upon their recommendations.

After a spirited discussion regarding the extent of the revision, the time of issue, the number of copies and the method of financing the revised edition, it was on formal motion

*Voted:* That the revised edition should number at least 1,000; that it should be published by the National Committee on the initiative of the Executive Committee; that its financing should be referred to the Executive Committee with power; that the Executive Committee enter at once on the task of revision for the present period and call for revised copy from the chairman of the sub-committee, October 1, 1911 manifold and distribute the copy to the members by January 1, 1912; the suggestions, amendments and corrections to reach the Executive Committee by February 1, 1912.

By the courtesy of Meyer Brothers Druggist and the Pharmaceutical Era, reprints from the December, January and February numbers appeared as leaflets, 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Leaflet 1 gives a brief account of the Pharmaceutical Syllabus and the workers engaged on its revision. Leaflet 2 describes the editions, in the type it is proposed to use in the edition, and was addressed to State Boards of Pharmacy in the United States. Leaflet 3 invited criticism, the suggestions and amendments that will make a second edition an improvement on the first, and was addressed to the Schools of Pharmacy in the United States.

The delays in printing and the difficulty of securing, by correspondence, prompt action by the sub-committees, led to the conclusion in December that the instructions of the Boston meeting could not be followed. During December, a conference of the Executive Committee was held, which resulted in affirmative action on the following resolutions:

(a) That the Secretary submit to the Committee of Twenty-one for ratification the assignment

(1) To materia medica of 400 hours in a 2-years course recommended by Chairman Rusby;

(2) To pharmacy of 400 hours in a 2-years course recommended by Chairman Beal;

(3) The additional 100 hours each in materia medica and pharmacy be elective with the faculties with alternative questions by the boards, and that the proposition of a 1200 hour syllabus be presented for approval to the three national bodies represented by the committee.

(b) That on the adoption or rejection of a, with or without amendments, the sub-committees modify copy in accord therewith and forward revised copy to the Secretary, who shall see that the revised copy with chemistry is submitted to the Committee of Twenty-one.

(c) That the Secretary prepare specifications for an edition of 1000, with provision for additional numbers by the 100; secure estimates thereon by responsible publishers; submit the same to the Executive Committee for ratification; prepare a contract for signature by the Executive Committee and publisher, and push the publication for delivery to the committee not later than July 1, 1912, contingent upon the securing of advanced orders of a total of not less than 400 copies.

(d) That the Secretary canvass the boards and schools to secure advance orders for delivery by August 1, 1912.

Under Item a, the recommendations were submitted to the Committee of Twenty-one and a vote thereon is in process as this report is made. Under item b, the sub-committee on Chemistry has reported recommendations and amendments. Under item c, the Secretary has prepared specifications and they have been approved by the Executive Committee and

submitted to responsible publishers. Under item d, the Secretary canvassed the boards and schools and has received the first of July nearly 450 advanced orders.

May 17, 1912, a meeting of the Executive Committee was held in Albany; Messrs. Bradley and Anderson appearing as proxies for Messrs. Engstrom and Beal respectively. Among the twelve motions adopted at this meeting, the following are of special interest to you:

Motion 5. That 100 copies of unbound syllabuses be set aside for the use of the committee in its preparation of the third edition.

Motion 6. That in the second edition, body matter be set in uniform type and leaded.

Motion 7. That supplementary matter be set in smaller type and single spaced, with a formal explanation that such supplementary matter is not included in the 1200 hour course and consequently not to be examined upon by boards of pharmacy.

Motion 8. That it is advisable to ask the supporting associations to meet the expense of complimentary copies of the syllabus for similar bodies of other countries; the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties to the schools (100 copies), the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy to the examining boards (100 copies), and the American Pharmaceutical Association to the associations (200 copies).

Pursuant to these resolutions and the rules of your Association, your committee respectfully recommend the following action:

1. That representatives on the National Committee be appointed to succeed those whose terms expire by limitation or resignation.

2. That the annual appropriation for the routine expenses of the committee be authorized.

3. That the following recommendations of the National Committee be approved:

(a) The assignment of 400 hours in a 2 years' course to materia medica, as recommended by the chairman of that sub-committee.

(b) The assignment of 400 hours in a 2 years' course to pharmacy, as recommended by the chairman of that sub-committee.

(c) The additional 100 hours each in materia medica and in pharmacy be elective by the faculties with alternative questions by the boards.

(d) The minimum 2 year course leading to the degree of Ph. G. become a 1200 hour course for the second syllabus period 1915-1920.

4. That the American Pharmaceutical Association become responsible for advanced subscriptions to the number of 200 copies of the syllabus for distribution through the Secretary of the National Committee to similar national or state associations in other countries.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY L. TAYLOR,

Of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Asher moved to receive the report as read.

Mr. Anderson seconded the motion to receive, provided it was not a motion to adopt. He said the report showed that the revision of the Syllabus was in a very complicated state. Some progress had been made during the past year, but much remained to be done. The trouble was that no meeting of the Committee of Twenty-One had been held since the meeting last year at Boston, and an attempt had been made to revise a book of this importance—a work that was of such moment to the colleges of pharmacy, the boards of pharmacy and the pharmacies themselves—without such a meeting. He said he supposed most of the members were familiar with the result of the attempt made to do this work by correspondence between the members of the Committee of Twenty-One, and the motion made six months ago that matter for revision of the Syllabus be gotten together by the different Sections—that on chemistry, materia medica, etc.—which matter had never been put before the Committee of Twenty-One for action. Motions had been made and sent out with a voting-sheet to the members of the Committee of Twenty-One, without any opportunity for argument; and then when the members had sent in their reply or vote on a motion, an attempt had been made to declare



the motion carried, without giving any chance for amendment, vote for reference, or anything else. The whole system as practiced during the early part of the year was entirely unparliamentary, and no regard for the proper rights of the members had been shown.

For these reasons, Mr. Anderson said he did not think this report purporting to show a revision of the Syllabus was in any condition to warrant its adoption by this joint session. For illustration, one thing the members were asked to adopt was the proposition to make a 1200-hour Syllabus, instead of 1100. This proposition had never been passed on by the Committee of Twenty-One, to his knowledge, and received an affirmative vote there. Mr. Anderson said his claim was, that this matter was of such great importance that final action on the revision of the Syllabus should be had at a regularly called meeting of the Committee of Twenty-One, convened expressly for that purpose, and that nothing that was to go into the Syllabus should be declared adopted until the committee had acted on it in actual session. If this course was not followed, he believed the revised Syllabus would be just as unsatisfactory, and subject to the same criticism, as the present work. In conclusion, Mr. Anderson said he had been informed that it was the intention of some of those concerned in this work of revision to submit the newly revised Syllabus at this meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association and ask its ratification, without taking the trouble to say what it contained, but simply have the Association accept it when finished, without question. He did not think that this was justice either to the organizations working in the interest of a revised Syllabus, or to the Syllabus Committee. For the reasons given, he offered the following:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the joint meeting of the Section on Education and Legislation with the Conference of Teaching Faculties and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy that, while much of the preliminary matter in reference to the Pharmaceutical Syllabus can be arranged by correspondence, final action on all matter which will constitute the revised edition shall be taken at a meeting or meetings of the Syllabus Committee called for that purpose.

Mr. Anderson explained that this was the same resolution he had offered in the Conference of Teaching Faculties in regard to the same report.

This resolution was seconded by Mr. Shuptrine and carried.

The Chair asked the Secretary to read a communication which had been received from Otto Raubenheimer.

The Secretary then read the following:

#### FOOD FOR THOUGHT FOR STATE BOARDS OF PHARMACY.

OTTO RAUBENHEIMER,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

##### I. RESULT OF EXAMINATIONS.

The writer, a former member of a State Board of Pharmacy, does not wish to tread upon the corns of any special board, but merely gives his personal ideas in a series of papers on different subjects, and he hopes that the same will provide food for thought for some of our state boards, and that this food will be properly digested and will generate energy and not result in apathy or indifference.

The subject of my first paper is

##### RESULT OF EXAMINATIONS.

1. Above all, I beg to point out that the examination questions of all State Boards of Pharmacy should be published. These questions should become public property and should

not be kept secret. They are for the information of the students, candidates, teachers and pharmacists in general. I am greatly surprised, in fact amazed, to learn that the pharmacy boards of Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Vermont and Utah *refuse* to publish their examination questions.

2. The secretary of each State Board of Pharmacy should also publish the number of candidates taking each examination, the number who pass successfully and the number who fail.

3. The names of those who pass should be published in justice to the successful candidates.

4. Furthermore, it should be the duty of the State Boards of Pharmacy to prepare *annual statistics* showing the number of candidates who are college graduates, together with the names of the colleges, and also the number who passed and the number who failed from each college.

These statistics should be given for each examination and for the entire year, too, and have the object of showing how the graduates of each college pass the board examination. Such tabulated statistics would have a great influence on pharmaceutical colleges, which at present are perhaps unaware of the weakness of their teaching, by showing them how frequently their graduates fail. As no college would like to remain at the bottom of such a published list, this would bring about marked improvements in the equipment of the colleges, in securing better teachers and adopting better and more up-to-date methods of teaching. Such information, therefore, would be of very great value to the students, the candidates, the pharmacists, the colleges, the state boards, the educational department, and the public in general.

5. These statistics of all the state board examinations in the United States should be collected and tabulated for the entire year by the Section of Education of the A. Ph. A. or a committee appointed for this purpose, and should be presented at the annual meeting and should be published in the Journal.

Undoubtedly a great deal of interest would be taken in this novel feature of pharmaceutical examination statistics. As a model along these lines, the writer begs to point out the *Yearly State Board Statistics* presented by the Council of Medical Education of the American Medical Association.

The writer, whose unselfish interest in professional pharmacy is undoubtedly known, has at present no connection with a college or a board of pharmacy, and therefore being impartial, has taken it upon himself to bring forth this subject, even at the risk of being criticised.

The Chair stated that, without objection, the communication would be received.

Mr. Freericks stated that he had with him a number of resolutions which had been adopted at the Milwaukee meeting of the National Association of Retail Druggists, all touching upon the subject of legislation, and many of them of vital importance. So far as he was informed, neither this Association nor any of its Sections had as yet taken any action in reference to any matters of this kind, and if in order he would like to present these resolutions, and, if possible, have action upon them this evening. He explained that the resolutions were on many different subjects, and he thought it would be well to read each one separately. The first was:

*Resolved*, That alypin be added to the list of drugs recommended by our conference committee to be specified upon the label of preparations containing the same.

Mr. Freericks said he hardly needed to say anything by way of explanation, as it was a requirement of the Food and Drugs Act to show the content of certain drugs in preparations containing them. The question was whether the Section wanted to go on record as including alypin in this list of drugs.

The Chair stated that without objection the resolution offered would stand approved, and it was so ordered.

Mr. Freericks then read the following:

*Resolved*, That we disapprove and use our efforts to defeat the Owen bill in its present form.

On motion of Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Richardson, this resolution was carried.

Mr. Freericks then read the following:

*Resolved*, That where physicians are allowed to dispense, the same law should regulate the practice as does the law concerning the pharmacist, especially in reference to narcotic and habit-forming drugs.

Mr. Asher moved to adopt, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Shuptrine and carried.

Mr. Freericks then read the following:

WHEREAS, The future and continued existence of retail merchants throughout the country depends upon a change of the Sherman anti-trust act, which will allow the smaller business interests to cooperate against the growing evil on the part of a few to monopolize entire branches of the retail trade; and

WHEREAS, The Honorable Mr. Clapp, senator from the state of Minnesota, has introduced in the senate of the United States, senate bill 7017, providing for supplementary legislation to the Sherman act, which will permit the smaller interests, inclusive of the smaller merchants and laboring people, to cooperate with each other, without being in violation of the Sherman act, such legislation being by us deemed imperative for the future prosperity of our country; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we heartily endorse and approve senate bill No. 7017 as introduced by Senator Clapp of Minnesota.

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senator Clapp.

Mr. Asher, seconded by Mr. Richardson, moved the adoption of the resolutions as read.

At this point, Mr. Caspari, Jr., said it had occurred to him that these resolutions should go either to the Association in general session or to the newly-appointed House of Delegates, which had been formed for the very purpose of considering resolutions and bringing them before the Association at its final session for action. He did not think this joint session was competent to adopt these resolutions and offer them as the action of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

The Chair expressed dissent from this view, and held that it was entirely competent for this Section to vote upon the resolutions offered, as there was nothing in the By-Laws requiring that they be referred to the House of Delegates.

Mr. Chas. Caspari, Jr., appealed from the decision of the Chair, and Mr. Asher made the point of order that the Chair could not properly preside while the vote on such an appeal was being taken, but the Chair held that the point was not well taken.

A vote by division was taken on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, with the result that the Chair was overruled by a vote of eighteen against to twelve for the decision. Thereupon, the Chair announced that, his decision having been overruled, the resolutions would have to go to the House of Delegates for action.

Mr. Chas. Caspari, Jr., explained that he did not wish to have his action in

appealing from a decision of the Chair misunderstood; that his object was simply to have the resolutions take their proper course. He was present when the subject of a House of Delegates was proposed in the Council, resulting in the adoption of a set of resolutions on the subject, afterwards ratified by the Association in general session, and by the adoption of which a House of Delegates had been formed, one of the chief objects of which, as stated, was to take charge of all resolutions presented, and put them in shape for the action of the Association. This was the reason of his motion.

Mr. Freericks said he thought it was only proper that the Section on Education and Legislation should at least hear the resolutions coming from the N. A. R. D., even though they were referred to the House of Delegates. Mr. Caspari, Jr., and Chairman Wallace both indicated their acquiescence in this view.

Thereupon Mr. Freericks read the following:

WHEREAS, At a conference of the legislative committee of the N. A. R. D. and the A. Ph. A., held at Washington, certain well-founded objections to the proposed Richardson bill were pointed out and changes therein demanded, resulting finally in the drafting of a bill by said committee, which appears in the hearings before the committee on interstate and foreign commerce, House of Representatives, Sixty-second Congress, second session, Part II, page 433.

WHEREAS, The said bill as drafted by the conference, aims to effectively reach wrongful practices in the sale and distribution of drugs and medicines, preventing fraud upon the public and restricting the manufacture and sale of many dangerous drugs and their compounds to qualified persons, at the same time being eminently fair to all interests concerned; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we heartily endorse the changes in the Richardson bill recommended at said conference, as they appear in the hearings referred to herein, and as so changed, we advocate the enactment thereof as a measure which will be of immense benefit to the welfare of the public.

*Resolved*, That this Association favors an amendment to the pure food and drugs act that will protect the public against unwarranted claims of nostrums, and will provide that the manufacturing of medicinal preparations be in the hands of licensed pharmacists.

*Resolved*, That this Association favors interstate anti-narcotic legislation that will prohibit all illegitimate traffic in narcotics and habit-forming drugs and confine their sales to proper channels and uses to strictly medicinal purposes.

WHEREAS, Section 7 of the food and drugs act permits the sale of U. S. P. and N. F. preparations of various strengths, providing such strength is designated on the label and,

WHEREAS, Such provision causes much confusion in the enforcement of pharmacy laws providing for the use of U. S. P. and N. F. names on the drugs of standard strength alone,

*Resolved*, That this section should be repealed or so amended as to provide that all drugs sold to the public under their official names or recognized synonyms, shall be of standard strength.

Mr. Freericks said this ended the list of resolutions to be presented to this Section by the delegates of the N. A. R. D. He expressed his entire approval of the course decided upon by the Section with reference to the resolutions offered, as they involved subjects that in many instances needed consideration.

The Chair stated that these resolutions would all be referred to the House of Delegates, unless there was objection.

Mr. Anderson announced a meeting of the House of Delegates for 8 o'clock tomorrow (Friday) night. He said the only way it could consider these resolutions was to have another meeting.

The Chair asked if the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy or the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties had anything to bring before the joint session now.

Mr. Day suggested that it might be well to call on one of the gentlemen representing the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy to make a statement as to what the boards had accomplished. As he understood the matter, this was the idea of having a joint session this afternoon, to bring up matters of common interest. He thought Mr. Sala, as Secretary of the Association of Boards of Pharmacy, ought to be able to enlighten the joint session on the work of the board.

Mr. Sala modestly suggested that Mr. Wm. Mittelbach, the new president of the Boards of Pharmacy, was present, and could do that better than he could.

Mr. Mittelbach said he was hardly sufficiently posted upon the work of the Boards of Pharmacy to give a complete synopsis of their work, as he was not present all of the time. However, he said the boards had been very busy, and had accomplished a lot of work. Most of their time had been given to the problem of registration. As he understood, they had been invited to this joint session with the understanding that matters would be brought up here that might affect the boards in which they would be interested.

Mr. H. C. Shuptrine said that one proposition which occupied a good deal of the time of the boards, and one which received the most earnest consideration was, not so much the question of reciprocation *per se* as between the boards of different States, but that of the higher education of the applicant for registration—that stress was particularly laid upon the absolute necessity of higher education. During the discussion of reciprocity, that one point was very prominently featured, and, speaking for himself, and not for the National Association of Boards, he expressed the conviction that a uniform standard of educational requirements was the one real solution of the reciprocal movement. It could not be hoped to have the licentiate of one State go into another State and receive in exchange for his certificate the certificate of that State until there was a uniform standard of educational requirement for all the States. "You can talk and discuss and theorize on the elevation of pharmacy all you wish," said Mr. Shuptrine, "but in my opinion you can never hope to raise pharmacy to the elevation to which it justly belongs until we ourselves establish an educational requirement that will put us there. In other words, we can never hope to take a boy, however deserving, from between the plow-handles, give him six months' experience at the soda-water fountain, six months at a quiz-school, then give him a certificate to practice pharmacy, and by this means expect to raise pharmacy to the standard to which it justly belongs."

"We can never hope to raise the standard of pharmacy, until we fix it so that he who has not the proper education will not be able to pass the examination and be licensed to practice pharmacy. We need cooperation, and I feel satisfied in speaking as I have that I voice the sentiments of the large majority of the delegates to this meeting of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

Mr. Cornelius Osseward said that, as the representative of the State of Washington, he had been sent to Denver for the purpose of obtaining all the information possible pertaining to the working of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. He had listened to the deliberations of that body, and had become convinced that a prerequisite law setting a standard of education was the only solu-

tion of the problem of an interchange of certificates between the States. A recommendation had been made by the Committee on Legislation that a National Committee be appointed to formulate questions to be sent out to each Board of Pharmacy throughout the United States, each board to take its examinations, and the answers to be sent back to the National Committee, this committee to issue a National certificate, so-called, which would hold good in every State of the Union. The State of Washington accepted none but graduates now, and if the proposed standard was established his State would be glad to co-operate and recognize such certificates of interchange. Under the present conditions, his State would refuse to recognize any man coming in from another State who was not a college graduate, but if this standard was established they would accept anyone that held a certificate issued by the National Committee. He believed this movement was a step in the right direction, and would prove an incentive to young men to seek a higher education.

Mr. Jones, of South Dakota, suggested that as the Secretary of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was not now present, and as ex-President Walker of that body was also absent, it might be well to call on Mr. Dodds, of Illinois, who was present at all the sessions, to give a concise statement of the work done by the Associated Boards. He said he would make this as a motion.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Clark and carried.

Mr. Dodds responded to this call, and said that as to the business that was done, the most important, as he understood it, was the question of reciprocal registration between the States. A resolution had been adopted providing, in substance, that reciprocal certificates should be interchanged between the different boards that were members of the National Association, where the boards could do it under their laws; and that each applicant for a reciprocal certificate should pay to the National Association the sum of \$5. This sum would go to the National Association, in addition to the reciprocal fee which was required by each of the States. For illustration, if the reciprocal fee in Missouri was \$10, the applicant would have to pay that \$10 into the Missouri Board treasury, and in addition pay \$5 into the National Association treasury. This \$5 fee, it was estimated, would create a fund of approximately \$1,500 a year.

Another resolution that was adopted provided for the election by the National Boards of what was to be known as an Advisory Examining Committee, but, unfortunately, the Associated Boards had adjourned without electing that committee, and the matter would have to go over until next year. The impression had gotten out that this committee would be appointed by the Executive Committee, but this was not correct; the resolution provided for the appointment of the committee by the Associated Boards. The resolution further provided that, of the members of the committee, one should be well versed in pharmacy examinations, another well versed in chemistry examinations, and that the third should be well versed in materia medica examinations. It provided, further, that the members of the committee should be taken, one from the Western States, one from the Central and Southern States, and one from the Eastern States. The member from the Western States was to visit the different boards of pharmacy in an advisory capacity, see the work they were doing, observe carefully the papers prepared for examinations, and offer suggestions where, in his judgment, they were needed; the idea being

to get the examinations in the Western section of the country as nearly uniform as possible. The same thing would be true of the Central section, to make the examinations there as nearly uniform as possible; and the same thing would be true of the Eastern section. The resolution further provided that the expenses of the members of this Advisory Committee should be paid out of the fund created by the \$5 fees paid to the National Board.

In addition to these things, Mr. Dodds said a great many reports were adopted, and the Executive Committee would, during the ensuing year, formulate and draft a new constitution and by-laws, to be presented at the next annual meeting.

Continuing, Mr. Dodds said he would like to allude briefly to the subject touched on by Mr. Shuptrine in regard to higher education. In Illinois, he said, a college diploma was not necessary at the present time as a prerequisite for taking the examination for registered pharmacist. Under their law, while they could give credit for it, it was not essential. There was a great deal of discussion at the time that feature was incorporated in the law as to what was a recognized College of Pharmacy. Some of the States used the word "reputable" college, but the State of Illinois used the word "recognized." It was difficult for five members of a Board of Pharmacy, who were not entirely familiar with the colleges, their courses of study, the hours required, their laboratory equipment, and the character of professors engaged in these schools, to determine what was a recognized school or college of pharmacy. They got around that question in Illinois by adopting as recognized schools or colleges of pharmacy only such schools or colleges as complied with the requirements of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

Another movement that was on foot in Illinois, Mr. Dodds said, was to enact a law that would hereafter require all applicants for examination as registered pharmacists to be graduates of a recognized school or college of pharmacy. That matter had been discussed for a number of years at the annual meetings of the Illinois Pharmaceutical Association. They had gone on record as recommending that feature at meetings in the past, but at the next succeeding session they would rescind that action, while at still another session they would adopt it again. It was a case of "on again, off again." Finally, to have something definite done in the matter, the Chairman of the Legislative Committee got out a voting-card, and sent it out to the 5,700 registered pharmacists in good standing in the State of Illinois, asking the point-blank question, "Do you favor the enactment of such and such a law, or do you disapprove of it?" and the result was that the vote was four to one in favor of the requirement of a college diploma as a prerequisite to the taking of the examination for registered pharmacist. So at the next session of their Legislature, which would be in January of next year, a bill would be prepared and introduced requiring that hereafter every applicant for examination in the State of Illinois must have a diploma showing his graduation from a recognized school or college of pharmacy. If this bill became a law, with the understanding they already had that a recognized school or college of pharmacy was such as was recognized by the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, he believed they would have about as good a law as it was possible to have.

The Chair asked Mr. Dodds if he understood him to say that the National Boards of Pharmacy had provided that a fee of \$5 should be payable to the National Boards for an interchange certificate, and Mr. Dodds replied that the pro-

vision was that the applicant for a reciprocal certificate must pay \$5 into the treasury of the National Association.

The Chair and Mr. Dodds continued this discussion at some length, the Chair taking the broad position that where a State statute required that a certain fee be paid by the applicant for an interchange certificate the National Boards of Pharmacy could adopt no rule in conflict with that which would stand the test of the courts, and Mr. Dodds holding to the view that not only was the National Association of Boards not subject to State law, but that, in the exercise of that discretion which was necessarily inherent in it, it could refuse to grant such certificate until the required fee was paid, besides which, however, he was satisfied that no objection would be raised to the rule by those making the application, for the fee was small and the benefits too great to the recipient of such certificate to justify the assumption that he would raise an objection thereto.

Mr. A. H. Clark, of Chicago, said the discussion between the Chairman and Mr. Dodds reminded him of the old story of the man who had been put in jail for a certain offense, and who, when his lawyer told him that he could not be put in jail for that offense, replied, "Well, I am here anyhow." So the practical question in this matter was, if the National Board got the money for issuing these reciprocal certificates, it did not make much difference about the finer points that were raised. Proceeding, Mr. Clark said he had the honor of being President of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, but on his own responsibility, and not as a representative of the Conference, he wanted to say that he was very glad to hear the expression of opinion here from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy regarding its position on making college education a prerequisite for examination. Of course he, as well as every other member of the Conference of Faculties, was heartily in accord with this sentiment. The Conference of Faculties was working very industriously along these lines. They had had before them during the last two or three days a large number of resolutions bearing on this very subject of increasing the entrance requirements, graduation requirements, etc., and the tendency was to increase these. To do so, he said, would undoubtedly place pharmaceutical education upon a much higher plane than it had been in the past. The Conference had increased the number of hours which constituted the course. They had also considered a number of changes in their courses, such as increasing the high school requirement. Likewise, they had considered the question of raising the standard for other departments, and had a committee appointed on this subject. Next year, he had no doubt, a great deal more would be accomplished in the line of advancing the requirements. As a member of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, he could pledge the cooperation of the entire Conference with the Boards of Pharmacy in their efforts to secure higher education and better conditions, and a closer cooperation between the pharmaceutical faculties and the Boards of Pharmacy. This was what the Conference of Faculties wanted. Some of the boards claimed they could not have a prerequisite requirement, because the schools were not up to the standard. The schools, on the other hand, claimed that they could not get up the standard, because the boards would not require anything higher. There was a cross-fire here, and it was a subject upon which cooperation was needed more than anything else.

Mr. H. C. Washburn, of Colorado, said he wanted to speak briefly on this ques-



tion of defining what should constitute a recognized school or college of pharmacy. He did not know that a better definition could be given than that the gentleman from Illinois had given. So far as he was aware, there never was a law enacted that did not do an injustice to somebody. The situation that the Department of Pharmacy in the University of Colorado found itself in was an illustration of the injustice that might be worked by a law or rule good enough in itself. The school of pharmacy in the University had only been established one year, and no such school in the United States had a higher requirement for entrance or graduation; yet, under the rules of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, that school would not be eligible to apply for membership in the Conference for four years to come; and, therefore, it would not be a recognized college of pharmacy for four years to come, notwithstanding that it had the highest requirements in the United States. Mr. Washburn said he was not a member of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, but he desired to bring this matter up here, in the hope that the Conference would find some way to adjust this situation.

Mr. Wallace said that, for a number of years, he had felt that he knew a little about matters relating to pharmaceutical legislation, from having made a study of such laws; and he desired to say that the interchange of certificates between states having the same requirements was a matter of vital importance at this time, and one which everyone interested in pharmaceutical legislation agreed should be enacted. From the information he had been able to gather, all such laws required that a specific fee should be paid by the applicant to the board of pharmacy. In some cases that fee was \$15, and he knew of one case of proposed legislation where such fee was placed at \$25. In order to get an exchange or reciprocity in certificates, it was necessary for the General Assemblies of these states to enact a law providing for this particular thing, and in that enactment they must stipulate the fee to be paid for this interchange of certificates; and any action taken in the matter by the National Boards of Pharmacy would be absolutely worthless. The statute enacted by a commonwealth would be supreme in that particular state, and would control in such matters.

Mr. Dodds' reply to this was, that the Illinois law specifically provided for an interchange, but did not say whether the fee should be five cents, five dollars or twenty-five dollars.

Mr. Shuptrine said he was not a lawyer and was not familiar with interstate laws, but had been told that law was a matter of reason. In that view it seemed to him that the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy would have the same right to charge \$5 for a national certificate that the national government had to go into any particular state and say that that state had to pay for the privilege of selling a certain commodity. The state would have no right to say to the United States that it could not make that charge. While he was not comparing the National Boards of Pharmacy with the United States Government, it seemed to him that the principle involved in the two cases was identical, for this question affected every state in the Union. As to the proposition to charge a fee of \$5, Mr. Shuptrine asked if all were in favor of it, who would question it. He was sure the Chairman would not question it, because he was in favor of it, and the American Pharmaceutical Association had gone on record as favoring a prerequisite law and reciprocal registration. The Conference of Faculties was also

in favor of it, and he could not see where the opposition was to come from. Any man who wanted this National Boards certificate would have no hesitation in paying the \$5-fee, and he would have no patience with the man who opposed it, whether it was legal or illegal. He could not see how anybody could object to it, and he did not believe any objection would be made. Many of the states provided a fee for examination, but most of them had no statutory provision as to an interstate exchange of certificates. His position was that the National Boards could charge \$200 for such a certificate, if they wanted to, although the charge for examination in the first place might only be \$15. This was a movement for the elevation of pharmacy, and was one that the American Pharmaceutical Association, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, and everybody else who was interested in the welfare of pharmacy, had at heart.

Mr. Clark said this reminded him of the situation in Illinois. A lot of druggists in Illinois thought that their pharmacy law was unconstitutional, but they paid their dollar every year just the same. He knew some lawyers of the highest standing who insisted that the National Pure Food and Drugs Act was unconstitutional, but the government was nevertheless enforcing it and making everybody toe the mark.

Mr. Freericks indicated his support of the position taken by Chairman Wallace on this question, and thought the Boards of Pharmacy should be very careful not to take any action not warranted by law. Personally, he was anxious that the National Boards of Pharmacy should have the necessary means for its work, but he thought the principle involved here was of importance to the Boards. While it was true that one desiring to obtain such an interchange certificate would not "kick" when he applied for it, after he got it, it might be a different matter, and he thought the boards of pharmacy of the respective states should bear in mind that they were accountable somewhere and some time for their acts, and if they lent themselves to a scheme for the exaction of a fee for which there was no warrant in law, a proceeding could be filed against the offending board, and it was only too well known that there were many who stood ready to file such charges. In his judgment, a board could not successfully defend itself against the charge of exacting, directly or indirectly, a fee for the support of a national organization, where the laws of the state did not provide for such, and they would invite a great deal of undesirable notoriety by attempting to do so, as no doubt the newspapers would entirely misconstrue the action taken.

Mr. Day asked Mr. Freericks if he thought these charges would be filed under the Sherman Act, and Mr. Freericks replied in the negative. But, he said, assuming an applicant had complied with the demand for payment of the fee of \$5 in order to secure an interchange certificate, after he had secured that certificate he could file in any proper court a *quo warranto* proceeding against the Board of Pharmacy, claiming that this sum had been exacted from him unlawfully, and the board would have to defend itself against the charge.

Mr. Dodds asked Mr. Freericks whether, in his judgment, it would be legal for the boards of pharmacy in the several states to contribute to the support of the National Association of Boards. Mr. Freericks replied to this that quite a

different proposition was presented here, if the state statute allowed some discretion in reference to the matter. But where such statute declared that an applicant having the proper qualifications to practice pharmacy should be granted an interchange certificate upon the payment of a certain fee, no board could refuse him a certificate unless he agreed to pay an extra fee of \$5 for the support of an institution outside of the state board.

Mr. Shuptrine said he had learned "early in the game" not to argue with a lawyer, unless he had the lawyer on his side. So he would not attempt to argue with Mr. Freericks on the legal phase of this matter. He had raised this same point, he said, in the convention of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. This was not a selfish move, but a cooperative move, where everybody received a certain amount of benefit, and everybody at all interested in pharmacy should be vitally interested in it. For these reasons they had decided that it was a pretty good thing. And then, too, it would help to get the United States Government to establish a national board. This movement was bound to result in something definite, sooner or later, and if it could not be accomplished through the cooperation of the Conference of Faculties, perhaps it could be done by making the requirement that an applicant for such certificate could not obtain it, unless he was qualified to practice in every state—which was, after all, what was wanted.

Mr. Anderson said he thought the Section on Education and Legislation and the Conference of Teaching Faculties would have to "take off their hats" to the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. As had been said by one of the members, the Conference of Faculties would have to "wake up," in order to keep pace with the National Boards. Many times it had been said that retail pharmacists were not good business men, but here was presented the spectacle of nearly every member of the National Boards, who are also retail pharmacists, coming to this meeting and talking over this matter of interchange of certificates. They gave their ideas, and said "Yes, that is a good plan; we can do it—collect \$5 for the National Association for each certificate issued. But is it legal?" Then these business men proceeded to forget about electing their Advisory Examining Committee, and thus laid the matter over one year. Then they came here and made a report, received applause on the floor and got their legal advice for nothing.

Mr. Williams, of Wisconsin, said that in his state they assumed the authority to charge a larger fee for a reciprocal certificate than the examination fee, and he thought this was the case in the larger number of states at the present time. The law of Wisconsin provided that a fee must be paid by the applicant when he took the examination, and the Board took that as authority to charge a larger fee for a reciprocal certificate. Mr. Freericks' comment on this was, that if there was nothing in the law that specified what that fee should be he thought the board would have the discretion to say what should be charged for an interchange certificate issued to somebody applying from another state, and there would be no objection to having this in the charge.

Mr. Charles Caspari, Jr., said he did not think it was well to prolong this discussion as to the legality of the \$5-fee in question, and he would not say a word about it. But he did wish to say a few words in regard to the report coming

from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, in regard to the step they were about to take as to an advance in preliminary educational requirements before admitting applicants to examination. He thought this was one of the most auspicious movements in the history of the times. The statement had frequently been made that some of the boards paid too little attention to the subject of preliminary education when they came to consider the qualifications of applicants. A great many members of the National Association of the Boards of Pharmacy were aware of the fact that for some years past the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties had had a requirement of admission to a school of pharmacy equivalent to at least one year of high-school work. That showed what the Conference had done up to the present time. Of course, it was not possible to advance or increase these requirements very rapidly, as in such evolutions as this the progress was necessarily slow. A great deal had been done already along this line, and in the next few years he was satisfied a great deal more would be accomplished. If the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy would come up a little higher and meet the Conference in the position it had taken, he thought a great point would be gained. As to prerequisite laws which demanded of an applicant for registration that he should be a graduate of a school of pharmacy, reputable or otherwise, he thought that was a question that would have to be settled by the courts, just as in the case of medical practitioners. Up to the present time, the question of the legality of a prerequisite law had never been tested in the courts. It had been suggested, but had never been brought up to any appellate court of a state, and never to the Supreme Court of the United States. In his opinion, such a law was unconstitutional, for it could make no difference where a man got his education, so long as he had it. He did not think the boards of pharmacy could make that requirement. This was simply his personal view. Mr. Caspari said it might look strange for a teacher in a school of pharmacy to make such an announcement, but it was in keeping with his views. Prerequisite laws in the states where they had been passed had operated well, and had done a great deal of good—simply because nobody had attacked them. But the question was, What would become of such a law when the Supreme Court of the United States took hold of it?

Mr. Albert Schneider asked why they should be attacked, and Mr. Caspari replied, "To test their legality." It was easier to comply with the requirements of a certain law than to spend \$500 to carry it to the State Appellate Court, or probably to the Supreme Court of the United States. His position was, that it made no difference where a man got his education, provided he had it when he applied for examination. The board would have the right to put the most searching questions to the applicant of course, but if he stood the test he had complied with the law.

In answer to a further question by Mr. Schneider as to where such education could be better had than in a well-equipped college of pharmacy, specially prepared to impart such knowledge, Mr. Caspari replied that there were other ways of getting it, though he granted that the easiest and best way was through a college of pharmacy, which he was heartily in favor of, and always had been—and naturally so, as he was a graduate of a school of pharmacy, and had turned out many graduates in his life. But the members knew very well, for instance, that

a man could become proficient in analytical chemistry without going to a university. All he had to do was to put himself in the hands of a competent instructor and he would become one.

Mr. Williams asked Mr. Shuptrine if a registered pharmacist in Pennsylvania, say, could take his certificate and be registered in the state of Georgia. Mr. Shuptrine replied that he could if he had made a general average of 75 per cent. on examination. Mr. Williams suggested that this would not be an interchange of certificates. An interchange of certificates was an interchange without examination. Amplifying his statement, Mr. Shuptrine said that where a man holding a certificate from the Board in Pennsylvania submitted that to the Georgia Board of Pharmacy, along with the statement that he had made a general average of 75 per cent. on his examination before the Pennsylvania Board, he would be given a Georgia certificate on the payment of \$15 in advance. Their state law did not authorize such an interchange, but, like Mr. Clark's story of the man who was in jail whether they could put him there or not, they did it.

Mr. John Culley said the Utah statute provided that the Board might, in its discretion, grant registration to such persons as passed a satisfactory examination, on the payment of a fee of \$25; and if the Board, in the exercise of its discretionary power, decreed that the applicant for registration must apply for registration upon blanks furnished by the National Boards, and not otherwise, in order to secure registration, if the National Boards wanted to charge \$5 for that certificate they could do it, and he thought it would be a legal charge.

Mr. Anderson here took occasion to suggest that this was a joint meeting of three bodies, the Section on Education and Legislation, of the A. Ph. A., the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the American Conference of Teaching Faculties, and before any definite conclusion could be arrived at in this matter, or it was decided just what should be done or approved, it would be necessary for the members to get together, and not be divided among themselves.

The Acting Chairman asked if there was any further discussion on this subject, but none was offered.

Thereupon Mr. Wallace resumed the chair, and asked if there was any further business to bring before this joint session.

Mr. W. B. Day said there was another interesting matter that had not been mentioned, and he thought perhaps the members of the Boards of Pharmacy would be glad to know about it. Sometimes the charge had been made in a friendly way, that the Conference of Faculties was too exclusive. At the present time, he believed, there were 32 out of the 81 schools in the country that were members of the Conference—three new schools having been recently added. He thought all were agreed that it was important that a school should have been maintained for five years before admission to the Conference. When the proper time came, he had no doubt but that the Colorado school—which, so far as he could learn, was a very excellent one—would be admitted. He thought the Conference had a right to see how a school was going to get along, how it would be governed, what faculty it would have, and what equipment it would provide—and perhaps what support it would receive from the pharmacists of the state in which located—before that school should be admitted to the Conference. It was much easier to admit than it was to get rid of members. This was a wise pre-

caution, therefore, and he hoped that Mr. Washburn would not feel that the Colorado College was being discriminated against, because this rule applied to all schools alike.

Mr. Asher said that no doubt if the prerequisite law carried, although the Colorado College could not yet become a member of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, owing to the limited time it had been in existence, the Boards would provide a means for interchange, if that question came up.

The Chair asked if there was any further business to bring before this joint session, but there was no response.

The Chair thereupon stated that the installation of officers of the Section on Education and Legislation was now in order, and appointed Mr. Shuptrine, of Georgia, a committee of one to bring forward the Chairman-elect, Mr. Teeters, of Iowa for installation.

Mr. Shuptrine said in introducing Mr. Teeters that he was reminded of the story of the stump speaker who, on one occasion, undertook to introduce Andrew Jackson to an audience, and dwelt upon his qualifications for office to such an extent that a fellow with whom patience had ceased to be a virtue, exclaimed, "We all know Andy Jackson, but who are you?" He felt that the new Chairman of the Section was much better known to its members than he was, and needed no endorsement from him. All pharmaceutical progress, and everything pertaining thereto, hinged on education, and he was sure there was no one more capable of presiding over the deliberations of this Section in an educational way than the gentleman who had been chosen as Chairman for the ensuing year.

Mr. Teeters, in acknowledging the honor conferred upon him, said that the first thing he wished to do was to congratulate the retiring Chairman, Mr. Wallace, upon his excellent address and the large number of excellent papers that had been presented before the Section this year. His own speech, he said, would come at the next meeting, and he could only hope that he might in a measure be able to make the work of the Section as successful as it had been during the past year.

Chairman Wallace expressed the extreme pleasure he had in introducing into the high office of Chairman such a man as Mr. Teeters. He felt that the work of the Section would go right on, and expressed the earnest hope that it would exceed that done under his predecessors. In turning over to Mr. Teeters the gavel as the emblem of his office, he said he did so with the sincere wish that he would never have occasion to use it in quieting a tumultuous assemblage.

Mr. Teeters took the chair, and called for Mr. Freericks, Secretary-elect, but he was not in the room. Likewise, Associate Louis Emanuel, of Pennsylvania, was not present.

The Chair then called upon Mr. Chas. Caspari, Jr., to escort to the platform Miss Zada M. Cooper, of Iowa, one of the new Associates on the Committee.

Mr. Caspari gallantly performed this duty, and introduced Miss Cooper to the members.

Mr. Wallace could not resist this opportunity to pay tribute to the fair sex, and stated that Miss Cooper's election as Associate on the Committee was distinctly the reward of merit. One of the greatest gratifications he had had during the past year, in his capacity of Chairman, was in being able to place upon the pro-

gram a paper from a lady pharmacist, an instructor in a college of pharmacy. He expressed the hope that this prompt recognition of the merits of the paper presented by Miss Cooper would stimulate others of the gentler sex to contribute, for certainly this paper had proven that the ladies were fully as capable as the men of making contributions of real merit to the work of the Section.

Miss Cooper briefly expressed her sense of the honor conferred upon her by her election as one of the Associates on the Committee, and said she would be glad to do all in her power to further the work of the Section.

Mr. Shuptrine then brought forward Mr. Craig, of New York, and introduced him as one of the Associates on the Committee who was able to speak for himself. Mr. Craig, being a modest man, was inclined to repudiate this suggestion, and said that he had been overlooked by the Chairman. He thought perhaps the reason he had been overlooked was because he had been too quiet. It had been his disposition to get up and talk upon the \$5-fee proposition, recently under discussion, because he always liked to discuss financial (!) matters. He assured the members that they would not have another chance to overlook him, because, if he had the good fortune to be present next year as Associate, they would certainly hear from him.

The Chair asked if there was any further business to come before the Section, but none was offered. Thereupon, on motion of Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Sass, the Section, in joint session with the National Boards and the Conference of Faculties, adjourned *sine die*.

---

## THE MISUSE OF THE TERM PHARMACOLOGY AND OTHER TERMS

---

JOSEPH W. ENGLAND.

---

Times change, and the meanings of words change with them. There is a growth and development in words just as there is in the sciences and arts. Words which had a certain meaning yesterday have come, through human progress, to have a different meaning today. Especially is this true of technical and chemical terms, which, with the development of the sciences and arts, broaden in meaning, or become more limited in meaning, or, sometimes, lose their original meaning entirely.

It is for this reason that the definition of such terms in the usual dictionaries do not give their full and true meanings as understood by technical and scientific workers.

"The term fermentation was first applied to the fermentative process which leads to the formation of alcohol, the knowledge of which goes back to very remote antiquity. The name fermentation probably arose from the copious evolution of gas which accompanies the production of the spirit, and which gives the liquid in which it is taking place the appearance of a gentle ebullition." (J. Reynolds Green.)

Today the term fermentation is applied to any enzymic change, or any change