

and size being nearly spherical, ovoid, ellipsoidal or pear-shaped and frequently with a characteristic beak, usually from 0.005 to 0.040 mm., occasionally from 0.045 to 0.060 mm., in long diameter; sclerenchymatous fibers long, thin-walled, non-lignified, with oblique pores, and distinctly undulate on one side; oil secretion cells with suberized walls and containing a light yellowish or yellowish-brown, oily substance; cork cells absent in the Jamaica variety. Non-volatile ether extract not less than 2 percent. Alcoholic extract not less than 4 percent. Ash not exceeding 8 percent.

---

### SOME REFORM MEASURES FOR THE A. PH. A.

---

The Association Has Grown So Fast That Reorganization is an Imperative Necessity—  
Particularly is This True of the Annual Conventions, Which are in  
Need of More System and Method.

---

HARRY B. MASON, DETROIT.

---

The time has come for the American Pharmaceutical Association to undergo a more or less radical reorganization. This statement does not imply that the A. Ph. A. has lost its vitality and is in need of fresh energy. Not at all. On the contrary, indeed, the trouble arises from too much energy instead of too little, and what is needed is that this energy, in its manifold manifestations, shall be harnessed up and co-ordinated in a more intelligent manner. This is particularly true of the annual meetings.

The fact of it is, the A. Ph. A. has undergone a great development during the last ten years. It has spread out in many directions. It is like a growing boy whose original suit of clothes has been lengthened in the legs, extended in the arms, widened in the seat, and enlarged here and there until the result is somewhat grotesque. What is required is a new suit of clothes, cut to fit the A. Ph. A. in its present proportions.

*The Confusion at Nashville.* The situation at Nashville last August was one of confusion worse confounded. There were the seven regular sections of the Association, each holding two or three sessions. There was the annual meeting of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy with four or five sessions. There was the annual meeting of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties. There was the joint conference of the latter two bodies and the section on education and legislation of the A. Ph. A. The Revision Committee of the U. S. P. seized upon the occasion to hold two or three meetings. The Revision Committee of the N. F. did precisely the same thing. The Pharmaceutical Syllabus Committee met every night from 9:30 until 12 or 1 in an effort to complete the second edition of the book. The new House of Delegates of the A. Ph. A., organized the year before, held three sessions, and its Committee on Resolutions one or two in addition. The new Section on Pharmacopœias and Formularies held two

sessions, and the new Women's Section three. The Council met every morning at 9, and the groups of alumni of the various pharmacy schools and colleges grasped the opportunity to have meetings, luncheons and dinners in behalf of their alma maters. Besides all of which there were meetings galore of an indefinite number of committees of one kind and another.

As if all this were not enough, a proposition was advanced to create still another section of the A. Ph. A.—a section on materia medica and pharmacognosy. With it all there was no let-up in the work from 9 o'clock in the morning until 1 or 2 o'clock the next morning. Everybody was tired out. Everybody was more or less befuddled by the multiplicity of business.

*The Need for a Pruning Knife.* Now what ought to be done?

There are several things to do by way of simplifying and improving the annual conventions, and what I shall have to say will touch upon this phase of the subject alone. The first thing is to get a sharp pruning knife and cut out a lot of things from the meetings that do not belong there. Some of these things can well be dispensed with entirely. Others may be taken care of by the *Journal of the A. Ph. A.* and by the Council.

First, as to those things which we can eliminate. What has often been referred to in chaste and elegant language as the "hot air" of the opening session should be tabooed. The day has passed when conventions were such novelties that they had to be called to the attention of state and city officials, and when the members of associations delighted to have welcoming speeches from these notables. Oratory is all well enough, but it bores people to death who go to a convention to transact business and to get something accomplished. Cut it out! Also cut out, or greatly condense, the formal installation of officers at the last session.

Then the standing committees of the A. Ph. A. need some culling. The Committee on the Revision of the Pharmacopœia is useless. The Committee on the Drug Market is obsolete. The Report on the Progress of Pharmacy is a feature of great value and importance, but it ought not to be considered at the annual meeting at all. Print it in a separate volume, or in the *Journal of the A. Ph. A.*, and let it go at that. What can be said about it at the meeting itself is so incomplete that it is of very little value anyway.

There are several committees which are appointed by the Council and which make their reports in the *Journal*. They ought not to take up the time of the Association at the annual convention. If any other report is needed than the one printed in the official organ, let it be rendered to the Council itself. The time of the annual meeting is valuable and precious. It should be husbanded. It should be devoted to business that cannot be attended to by the Council or in the official publication.

Still more in the way of elimination may possibly be done. Some members of the Association think we have gone too far in the creation of separate sections. They would have us return to the days of two or three sections. I do not agree with them. I do think, however, that the proposed Section on Materia Medica and Pharmacognosy should not be established. I think further that the Section on Pharmacopœias and Formularies, created three or four years ago, should be abandoned. Its work can be taken care of elsewhere.

All the other sections, unless it be the one given up to history, should be retained. They are devoted, respectively, to commercial papers, scientific interests, education and legislation, and practical pharmacy and dispensing.

These are all needed. To go any further in the direction of specialization, however, would be folly. The Association isn't big enough, even if there are enough subjects. If we have too many sections, there won't be audiences enough to go around.

Still continuing the subject of elimination, so far as the annual gatherings are concerned, it is at least an open question whether the meetings of the two auxiliary bodies, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, should not be held either late the week before, or early the week following, the convention of the A. Ph. A. These bodies add somewhat to the confusion of A. Ph. A. week, and to a certain extent take away from the attendance upon the various sections.

*A Rational Program.* So much, then, on the subject of elimination. Now for what is left. After all possible eliminations have been made, there inevitably remains a great mass and variety of work. There is no objection to this, *but there is a vital need of classifying and co-ordinating the work intelligently.* It is perfect folly to have a hit-and-miss program that nobody knows anything about, and that keeps people on the jump pretty nearly twenty-four hours every day for six working days.

The first thing to do is to keep the evenings free for rest, recreation, and social intercourse. Condense the work into the morning and afternoon periods. Start the section meetings in the morning at 9 o'clock, or not later than 9:30. In order to do this it will be necessary to have *the Council meet in the evening.* This august body, by prolonging its meetings so far toward noon every morning, delays and postpones the regular work of the sections, and nothing seems to me more important than that this evil should be eliminated. By starting the sections at 9 or 9:30 in the morning, a lot of good work can be done during the hours when people are fresh, unwearied and interested. This would make powerfully for added zest and profit.

But if you permit no section work in the evening, and if you restrict it to the morning and afternoon periods, you practically limit the number of work periods to eight. With five or six sections, each holding two or three sessions, making a total of twelve or fifteen sessions altogether, the present scheme of concurrent meetings will of course have to be retained. To this there is no possible objection. Indeed, the concurrent session idea can perhaps be developed more in the future than it has been in the past. Perhaps it can be extended so far as to condense the period of the annual meeting from six days into three or four, as is done by the American Medical Association. Many people are in favor of such a change.

*Co-ordinating the Sections.* What is needed, though, is a far better and more perfect co-ordination among the sections. As a man sits in one room, listening to the business of one section, he should know precisely what is going on across the hall or upstairs in other rooms at the same time. This will enable him to hear all that he wants to hear. It will likewise prevent him from being bored

to death in one section when something is going on in another that would hit his particular taste.

There are two ways of accomplishing this co-ordination. In the first place we have never worked out a printed program of the right sort. It ought to be possible to print one united program containing the detailed programs of all the different sections. It ought also to be possible to assign a paper arbitrarily to a definite session, and to its proper place in the program of that session, so that members can know approximately when certain subjects are coming up for attention. To supplement this, however, there should be established a system of blackboards, with two or three hotel "pages," so that the members in any one room would be notified what is simultaneously going on in the other rooms, and kept in touch perfectly with the multifarious work of the association. I am glad that Leonard A. Seltzer, local secretary this year, is going to systematize this blackboard scheme and see what can be done with it at the Detroit meeting in August.

*Leave Time for Discussions!* With the section work co-ordinated in this way, and with the members kept in touch with what is going on everywhere, it would easily be possible to give each section more sessions and thus provide time for the proper discussion of papers—a thing which has not been practicable now for many years. The discussions are often more important than the papers themselves. If a man only goes to a meeting to hear papers read, he might as well stay home and read them in the drug journals, with pipe and slippers, and with his feet on the mantel.

To recapitulate: If we eliminate from the annual convention what can easily be dispensed with, as suggested in the first portion of this paper, and if we work out a better co-ordination of the work of the different sections, we shall make an enormous improvement in the annual meetings. We shall get rid of what is unessential; we shall enable a member to hear everything that he really wants to hear; and we shall provide time for debate and interchange of opinion.

*A Censor Required.* At least one other thing is necessary. There should be some censorship exercised over the papers accepted for the different sections. One great objection to increasing the multiplicity of sections is that the different chairmen promptly begin a competition with one another to secure as many papers as possible. It becomes a matter of pride to see how long a list can be secured. The inevitable result is that a large majority of the material is poor and ought never to be prepared at all. Another result is that papers frequently get into the wrong section.

There ought to be some individual or some committee with authority over the different sections. Who can better serve in this capacity than the general secretary? He is really the general manager of the association, and he knows more about its activities than anybody else. I believe that the chairmen of the different sections should report to the general secretary; that he should have the authority of a censor; that he should eliminate papers if he thinks best; that he should re-assign papers if he deems such action necessary; and that he should get up, or have someone else to do so under his supervision, a co-ordinated program of the meeting. He should be general manager of the association in

name and in effect, and he should have all the functions of a general manager of a private corporation.

*A Great Past—A Greater Future.* Now I do not want to be misunderstood in making these criticisms. I do not want any reader to get the notion that I think the A. Ph. A. is all wrong. On the contrary, the A. Ph. A. is the one great catholic organization in American pharmacy—the one organization acting like a parent to all the others—representing every phase and branch of the calling, and doing foundational work of an indispensable character. It is an association with a great past. It is an association with a still greater future. My only point is that it has outgrown the clothes of a growing youth and now needs the equipment of the adult it has come to be. Particularly are the annual meetings in need of reform if they are successfully, intelligently, and efficiently to handle the vast amount of work undertaken by the association.—*The Bulletin of Pharmacy.*

---

#### SYRUP OF FERROUS IODIDE.

---

W. C. ALPERS, SC. D., CLEVELAND.

---

There are few preparations in the Pharmacopœia that have given more annoyance and caused more difficulties to the pharmacist than the syrup of iodide of iron. The literature on this syrup, from the first day of its appearance, is very voluminous and hundreds of writers on pharmaceutical subjects in all civilized countries have recommended various methods for its preparation and given direction for its preservation. The history of this syrup, as shown in the various editions of our own Pharmacopœia, demonstrates the gradual development of its understanding.

A liquid preparation of ferrous iodide appears first in the second edition of the U. S. P. (1840) under the name of *Liquor Ferri Iodidi*. It was made of iron wire and iodine and contained 5 fluidounces of honey in a finished product of 20 fluidounces. In the following edition, the third (1850), the honey was replaced by 12 ounces of sugar, but the preparation was still called a solution. The name syrup appears for the first time in the fourth edition (1860). The formula directs the addition of two troy ounces of iodine to a mixture of 300 grains of iron wire and water, and filtration of the resulting green liquid into simple syrup heated to 212° F. The syrup is to be preserved in well-stoppered two-ounce bottles. Here we see that the value of applying heat is recognized. No change in the formula was made in the fifth edition (1870). In the sixth revision (1880), of the Pharmacopœia, which shows throughout many marked improvements over the preceding ones, weights were replaced by parts and the finished product brought to 1000 parts, which designation afterwards gave way to cubic centimeters. Syrup of ferrous iodide is here described as a syrupy liquid containing 10 percent of ferrous iodide. It is made from 25 parts of iron and 82 parts of iodine. The liquor is filtered into 600 parts of sugar and the