

ated oil may be sold only by a registered pharmacist, while veronal, barbital, amytal and many others may be sold by anyone. In most states, no distinction is practiced, and patent and proprietary products and the usual domestic remedies are freely available from any and all kinds of retail dealers. The mere fact that the evident and obvious legislative intent was to permit free sale of patent medicines and the commonly used household remedies has not prevented dangerous proprietary preparations from being just as freely sold and distributed.

It must be apparent to all that such a condition is certainly not in the public interest. In fact, it seems greatly inconsistent with the main purpose of all pharmaceutical legislation.

As I see the matter, our whole system of pharmacy laws should be carefully studied. Many of the provisions should be entirely rewritten. An intelligent and earnest effort should be made to make them more stringent, and thus more effective. The broad, general exceptions in favor of general merchants should be removed and reconsidered in the light of prevailing needs and prevailing conditions.

I urge, as a beginning, that the Conference approve the appointment of a committee to carefully study the significance of the terms, "proprietary preparations" and "patent medicines," so that these may be defined in the light of present scientific knowledge, and with due regard to the demands of public health.

Upon motion of Mr. Childs, seconded by Mr. Milne, a motion was adopted that the incoming chairman appoint a committee to draft a suitable definition for patent and proprietary medicines.

Secretary and Treasurer M. N. Ford, of Ohio, presented his report as follows:

THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER.

BY M. N. FORD.

Since the last annual meeting of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Law Enforcement Officials, your chairman, Mr. Swain and the secretary, have had numerous requests for information regarding enforcement of pharmaceutical laws and to each request, we have lent all possible aid.

On December 17, 1932, upon the request of Chairman Swain, we sent a letter to each Secretary of every State Board of Pharmacy as well as other departments having to do with pharmaceutical law enforcement, with regard to the sale of drugs and medicines by vending or slot machines. From the response that we had, it seems the letter was very timely in that a number of states have sought opinions and amendments to the law that would bar the distribution of drugs and medicines through vending machines.

On January 31, 1933, Chairman Swain also directed me to send a letter to all State Boards of Pharmacy, as well as other state departments having to do with pharmaceutical law enforcement, the letter dealing with amending the pharmacy laws to use the term "packaged medicines" in preference to the term "patent or proprietary medicines." The fact that the exemption clause of the law permitting the sale of patent or proprietary medicines by general dealers is sufficiently broad, we should exert every energy to see that the law is not changed to grant further exceptions.

We received numerous acknowledgments of receipt of this letter and assurance that no such legislation proposed would be sanctioned by enforcement officials.

The report of our last annual conference as you know, appeared in the JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION in the December issue and contained thirty-one pages of printed matter, and on February 17th, we obtained 300 reprints of the proceedings which were mailed out as first class mail, to the members of the Boards of Pharmacy, as well as others interested in pharmaceutical law enforcement.

On February 21st, we wrote to all the secretaries of the State Boards of Pharmacy, as well as other pharmaceutical law enforcement officials, regarding the annual five-dollar contribution to the Conference. This request was followed up by a letter on June 8th, and up to this time, the following 25 states have contributed the usual five-dollar fee. I list the states in the order in which the fees were received:

Ohio, Indiana, North Dakota, Kentucky, Colorado, New Jersey, Iowa, Georgia, West Virginia, New York, Alabama, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Arkansas, Michigan, Delaware, New Mexico, Kansas, Vermont, Oregon, Florida, Idaho, South Dakota, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

In addition to those already contributing, we have had acknowledgments from some of the States, stating their contributions would follow a little later on.

FINANCES.

Receipts.

Balance on Hand.....	\$243.94
Receipts from 25 states at \$5.00 each.....	125.00
	\$368.94

Disbursements.

12/29/32 to L. A. Engel, letter heads and reprints.....	\$ 7.50
2/17/33 Postage for Secretary's office.....	50.00
3/18/33 to JOURNAL A. PH. A. printing proceedings.....	115.77
8/15/33 to Dr. R. P. Fischelis for work on.....	25.00
Synonyms report	

Total Disbursements..... \$198.27

Total Cash Balance..... \$170.67

Upon motion of Mr. Milne seconded by Mr. Costello, the report was approved.

Upon motion of Mr. Childs, seconded by Mr. F. C. A. Schaefer, the Chairman was to appoint a Finance Committee of five to provide for the finances of the Conference in the future.

At this time the Chairman called upon Secretary Kelly of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION and his remarks concerning the Conference were very encouraging and greatly appreciated.

Chairman Swain next called upon Walter F. Meads of Iowa for a paper upon "The Value of Annual Renewal of Pharmacists' Certificates in the Enforcement of Pharmacy Laws." The paper was received and discussed by Messrs. Fischelis, Pierce, Henry, Hankins and Swain.

THE VALUE OF ANNUAL RENEWAL OF PHARMACISTS' CERTIFICATES
IN THE ENFORCEMENT OF PHARMACY LAWS.

BY WALTER F. MEADS.

In presenting this paper at this session of the Conference of Law Enforcement Officials, I will attempt to show you the analogy between the annual renewal of the pharmacists' license and law enforcement. How in the State of Iowa, with whose workings I am most familiar, the enforcing of laws governing the practice of pharmacy is dependent on, or closely allied to, the renewal of certificates.

In 1880, the first pharmacy law was enacted in Iowa. It provided regulations for the sale and distribution of drugs and medicines, as well as for the establishment of a commission of pharmacy, which was given authority to administer the affairs of the profession. This included the enforcement of the laws governing the practice of pharmacy and the licensing of pharmacists by examination.

In order to place the profession and the distribution of drugs and poisons under State regulation, with its added protection to the druggists and to public health, it was agreed by the pharmacists that the expenses of the department and of the law enforcement would be paid through the collection of license fees and the annual renewal of certificates. That this was a wise agreement can be shown by the benefits accruing from the annual renewal of certificates.

The greatest value of the annual renewal is perhaps that it provides funds for law enforcement which might be obtained if the Board was dependent entirely upon funds raised by a general taxation. While it is true that the money we collect is paid into the State Treasury and an appropriation must be made by the legislature for our expenses, the fact that the Board is more than self-sustaining is a valuable argument when requesting funds for the operation of the department. This has also been a valuable argument, when on several occasions, the pharmacy board has been faced with consolidation. The fees are largely responsible, I believe, for the fact that we have always been independent and have held the administration and enforcement of the pharmacy laws in the hands of members of the profession, the value of this independence can be appreciated by all of us here.

It was the provision of the annual renewal and its ensuing independence that placed the