

The Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association

Volume IV

JANUARY, 1915

No. 1

Office of Publication, 63 Clinton Building, Columbus, Ohio.

Subscription, \$4.00 per annum, within the United States. To Canada, \$4.35. To other foreign countries in Postal Union, \$4.50 per annum. Single copies, 35 cents.

Entered at the Postoffice at Columbus, Ohio, as Second-Class matter.

3186
L

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. SECOND DECADE.

WILLIAM C. ALPERS, SC. D.

(Continued from December Number.)

When the Association convened for its sixteenth meeting in 1867 at Philadelphia, President Milhau was unable to attend owing to ill health and the First Vice-President, Robert J. Brown, therefore presided the first half of the meeting. There were one hundred and thirty-four members present, the first time that one hundred was exceeded. One of the members of the Association who had died during the preceeding year, was Henry F. Fish, of Connecticut, who had been present at the first annual meeting, who came from his interest in the new Association without having been delegated by any local association or college. He was Third Vice-President in 1855.

The President's address was note-worthy for its many recommendations, nearly all of them affecting the usefulness of the Association and methods for expediting transaction of business. These recommendations were afterwards taken up and caused much debate and exchange of opinion, in which old and new members of the Association participated. At the close of his address, Mr. Milhau made these pertinent remarks:

"I would address you according to my convictions on the true plan, to use the words of the Constitution, 'Of improving the science and art of pharmacy, of regulating the system of apprenticeship, and of suppressing empiricism' with any degree of success—and that is by professional instruction. It will require the whole influence of every member to further the plan proposed or a better one. It will take a long time and require hard work. We must commence by organizing our forces. It would be necessary to appoint 'a central committee on laws and colleges,' and all the members in each state should band themselves together and constitute 'sub-committees' for their respective states. The general committee should publish a full collection of all the existing state laws bearing on the subject, together with comments, followed by an account of kindred laws in Great Britain, especially those lately enacted. They will issue instructions as far as necessary, and drafts of the proposed laws for

the use of the sub-committees. Every member should, by explanation and by all proper arguments, endeavor to enlist the influence of every prominent citizen he can reach,—the state representatives, the ministers, the lawyers, the physicians, his customers, and the editors—so as to bring the legislature and executive of each state over to our views, and never cease, till we have obtained the requisite laws, and founded a college of pharmacy in each state. It was by such means that we succeeded in obtaining the drug law of 1848, when the country was much less prepared for such a step than now.”

He also makes a plea for the official recognition of pharmaceutical colleges and hopes that the time will come soon when a diploma or certificate will be a *sine qua non*. Such a statement from a man who was generally supposed to be a representative of the business part of pharmacy and at such an early date deserves recognition.

Among the delegates there were two from Canada, and Mr. Stearns took occasion to welcome them and offered the following resolution:

“Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association welcomes heartily the presence at this meeting of the delegates from the Montreal Chemists’ Association—the first one credited to us from the Dominion of Canada.”

The two delegates, Mr. Mercer and Mr. Edwards, replied in a happy and pleasing manner.

Among the new officers elected at this meeting, there were Edward Parrish of Philadelphia, for President; Albert E. Ebert of Chicago, one of the Vice-Presidents; and Dr. Frederick Hoffman of New York, Chairman of the Committee on the Progress of Pharmacy. This last election was certainly a high tribute paid to Dr. Hoffman, who had only joined the Association at that meeting.

The question of incorporation again caused a long debate in which all the leading men participated and it is remarkable how nearly every one opposed it. Mr. Procter says: “My own view is in opposition to such a course. I do not approve of it.” Mr. Stearns says: “You could not get it if you wanted it.” Mr. Bedford says: “My views are the same.” Prof. Moore says: “I don’t see any practical advantage in incorporation.” No action was taken.

A long, and sometimes heated, debate took place when the second letter from the East River Medical Association was read with reference to the renewal of prescriptions. Those who are interested in the various views as to the proprietorship of prescriptions and the proper attitude of pharmacists to take, so as to do justice to physicians, as well as to the public should not fail to read these discussions which took up more than twelve pages in very small type and thoroly exhaust the subject. The matter was finally referred to a Committee of five, with Mr. Stearns as Chairman, who at a later session offered the following resolution, which was adopted by unanimous vote. While the question itself was not settled thereby, it is well worth while to reproduce this resolution, so as to show the opinion of the Association on this question forty years ago.

“WHEREAS, The East River Medical Association of New York, through its Secretary, has submitted a preamble and series of resolutions regarding the renewal of physicians’ prescription without the authority for such renewals, for our consideration, and

“WHEREAS, The discussion of this important subject has called forth a free expression of opinion from our members; therefore be it

“Resolved, That this Association regard the pharmacist as the proper custodian and owner of the physicians’ prescriptions once dispensed.

“Resolved, That however desirous we may be to accede to the request of the East River Medical Association, the restriction of the pharmacist to a single dispensing of a prescription, without the written authority of the prescribing physician for its renewal is neither practicable nor within the province of the Association. Nevertheless we regard the indiscriminate

renewal of prescriptions, especially when intended for the use of others than those for whom they were prescribed, as neither just to the physician nor to the patient, between whom we stand as conservators of the interests of both, and that such abuses should be discouraged by all proper means."

The recommendation of the President to have a committee appointed to collect formulas for un-official preparations, also brought out many diverging opinions, but finally such a committee was appointed. The question of a rather political nature that agitated this country ever since, was that of duties on drugs, and it seems that the members of the Association at that time were not impressed particularly with the value of high tariff, for "on motion of the Business Committee, it was resolved, that in the opinion of the Association the duties on drugs ought to be reduced."

Query 16, presented at the sixteenth meeting, namely, "How far is Pharmacy entitled to rank as a Profession, and what is its true position among the industrial pursuits?" had been left for general acceptance, but, not being answered, it was presented by the President for general discussion. In the course of these discussions the question of the name of "Pharmacal" and "Pharmacist" was again brought up and Mr. Parrish made the remark: "Now for these terms 'pharmacist,' etc., was it not I that read the first paper about it? I shall have to claim that invention. You will find it in the Proceedings of two years ago at Detroit—a paper proposing the general use of the term 'pharmacist'"; to which, however, the following retorts were made: Dr. Squibb said: "You can find it in Worcester's dictionary"; and Mr. Markoe said: "Webster has had it for many years."

In order to settle this claim of Mr. Parrish of the words "pharmacist," and "pharmacal," and "pharmacy," to indicate the place of business of the pharmacist, your historian has taken much pains in tracing these words, with this result: In Webster's Dictionary the word "Pharmacist" appears in the edition of 1865 for the first time, preceding edition of 1857 not having it. In Worcester's Dictionary it appears first in 1866. This shows that it was used in the United States before Mr. Parrish read his paper in 1866. In English literature it appears in Lord Bulwer Lytton's novel, "The Last Days of Pompeii," which was published in 1834. The quotation being, (part 1, pg. 11) "Unskilful pharmacists! pleasure and study are not elements to be thus mixed together." In none of these works does the word "pharmacal" appear, and the word "pharmacy" is defined as the science and art of preparing medicine. It will be seen therefore, that Mr. Parrish cannot claim priority to the word "pharmacist," but is entitled to the invention of "pharmacal" and the application of "pharmacy" to the place of business of the pharmacist.

The question whether pharmacy was a business or a profession was answered by most of them stating that it was neither, it was an art; claiming that the word "art" was more comprehensive, broader and more significant, than either of the others.

The question of a code of ethics was brought up by Mr. Maisch. A code of ethics was drafted at the preliminary meeting in 1851, which gave rise to the American Pharmaceutical Association. It was also printed in the first volume of the proceedings, but after that was omitted. Mr. Maisch asked the question

whether this code of ethics was still in force and whether new members in signing the Constitution also subscribed to this code. The matter was finally referred to a committee under the chairmanship of William J. Procter, Jr., to report at a later meeting. This committee reported that the original code of ethics was afterwards incorporated in the Constitution and that there seemed to be no necessity to continue it any longer. A motion by Mr. Allison that the code of ethics be considered as superseded by, and embodied in, Article 1 of the Constitution, was unanimously adopted.

The regret of President Milhau, that it was sometimes very difficult to obtain the proper information on the life and doings of deceased members, caused the Business Committee to bring forward the suggestion that the members of each state form a local committee to furnish the Executive Committee with proper information. It was also suggested that an obituary committee might be created. Later on another resolution bearing on this question was offered, namely:

“Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the chair to solicit photographs of members of the Association to be kept in an album, to be on exhibition at our future meetings.”

It is to be regretted that the idea of making a card for every new member, on which all facts and details of his life, education, work and activities, inside and outside of the Association were to be recorded, was not established at this time. Such a cabinet of cards, embracing by this time about four to five thousand names, would be more than valuable material for the present or future historian, and would have the undisputed advantage of authenticity.

Dr. Hoffman called the attention of the Association to the fact that Professor Ehrenberg of Berlin, inventor of the microscope, was about to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of his Doctorate, and that it would be proper for this Association to appoint a committee to prepare an address embodying the kind sentiments of the Association, to be sent to Dr. Ehrenberg on the occasion of his approaching jubilee. The Committee consisted of Dr. H. P. Procter and Mr. J. M. Maisch.

A number of honorary members, living in Europe, were appointed at this meeting, namely:

Daniel Hanbury	London, England
Henry Deane	London, England
A. T. De Meyer	Brussels, Belgium
Norbert Gille	Brussels, Belgium
Dr. F. A. Fluckiger	Berne, Switzerland
Dr. G. C. Wittstein	Munich, Germany
Dr. Frederick Mohr	Bonn, Germany
Dr. Hermann Hager	Berlin, Germany
Dr. G. Dragendorff	Dorpat, Russia
Dr. Arthur Casselmann	St. Petersburg, Russia
Mr. Robinet	Paris, France
Mr. Boullay	Paris, France

From the reports, the one on Progress of Pharmacy, written by C. Lewis Diehl, comprised one hundred and fifty-seven pages, more than one-third of the whole book. In this report, as well as in nearly all others handed in at this meeting, the word “pharmacist” is continually used in place of “pharmaceutist,” but the official reading of the Constitution still adheres to the old name. The most remarkable report of the year was the report of the Committee of Drug

Market, signed by Daniel C. Robbins. It seems that Mr. Robbins was somewhat displeased with the condition of Pharmacy in the United States, and this spirit of dissatisfaction and unfavorable criticism pops out more or less in all parts of the report.

The first part again reviews the different terms and compares the words "druggist, chemist, apothecary, pharmacist and pharmacist" coming to the conclusion that

"the two words, 'druggist and pharmacist,' will probably come into general use, the one as the most fitting term for all dealers in druggists' articles, and the other, as the only word, unless we invent some new one, that can include a knowledge of combinations of all kinds, chemicals, and what we call compatible combination, for the want of a more precise term, the first implying a knowledge of the laws of chemical affinity, and the last, a knowledge of those controlling forces which crude material substances exert over each other in determining combinations. A good chemist may not understand pharmacy, but an accomplished pharmacist must understand chemistry, but hence while we cannot define pharmacy as we can chemistry, we must accord it a superior position, from the fact that the greater includes the less."

After deploring the want of respect for most of the professions in the United States, he makes a strong plea:

"But we must remember that it is not good for us to be forever in the chamber of suffering or always attendant on death, no constitution can endure it and no pursuit can stand it; we *must* renovate ourselves, *must* fill our empty shelves; the apothecaries *must* go out anew into life and catch the beat of its pulse forever renewed, and fill themselves with all the light of the day, take a look at the ocean of life and feel the breath of its sea.

"What we most want is a just estimate of ourselves, of our resources, of our obligations; and the true policy of the druggist and pharmacist is, to make his pursuit or his profession as useful as possible in all ways. We do not want less range, but more education, more character, because in our pursuit, more than in any other, there is a demand for character in the individual, for quality in the article, and for a better standard of morals in trade."

Mr. Robbins then goes into a classification of drugs and chemicals and favors greatly the French method in preference to the German or the English. Then comes a long record of the imports and exports of drugs of the United States, which more or less are based on the wants of the wholesaler than the retailer. He regrets that it is almost impossible to get pure drugs of any kind, and becomes more severe when he speaks of secret remedies.

"It is generally conceded by our apothecaries that about one-half of all their sales, in amount to customers is derived from this source, and if it were possible to obtain reliable statistics of the per capita or total consumption of these compounds within the Union, the American people would wake, and put in chains a traffic that panders to many vices, that seldom hesitates to any imposture, and as a rule considers the deception of the public to be a legitimate business." And again he says, "The proprietor of a secret remedy should have no more right to protection under the law as applied to trade marks than the freebooter of the ocean has to protection under the flag which has been so long recognized as the mark of his trade, and of the poison bottle; but we want a law to confirm this. The secrecy of any medicinal preparation should be *prima facie* evidence of fraudulent intent."

The report closes with a complete list of importations, giving the quantity, value and duty and the revenue, and advocates the cancellation of all revenue laws and inspection of imports.

It can easily be understood that a report of this kind caused some discussion and gave rise to a great many remarks. While, in a general way, Mr. Robbins was supported by the older members of the Association it was yet thought that his language in some places was too strong and that his demand that all drug laws should be repealed could not be well supported by the entire Association.

It was pointed out to him that the desire to have drug laws gave rise to the formation of the Association, and that no other body of men in the United States had been more active in inducing Congress to enact these laws than the American Pharmaceutical Association. Now to demand that all these laws be repealed would be to annul the whole history of the Association, and even if some of the laws were bad or badly executed,—if some of those entrusted with their carrying out had proven to be dishonest, and turned them to selfish purposes,—it must yet be admitted that an enormous amount of good had been done by these laws and that the demand for their repeal would not be in harmony with the history of the Association. After a lengthy debate the matter was referred to a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. W. A. Gellatly, who later on brought in the following resolution, which was adopted:

“Resolved, That in accepting the valuable and interesting report of the Committee on the Drug Market, this association does not endorse the portion referring to the utility of the law requiring the examination of foreign drugs before entry at the custom house (a law intimately connected with the origin of this body), believing that, however imperfect the law may be, its comparative fruitlessness has mainly arisen from the inability and unfitness of the agents appointed to execute its provisions.”

Another very interesting report was that of the Committee on Legislation, regulating the practice of pharmacy, consisting of the President and other officers of the Association.

The report comprised forty-one pages and gives a complete history of the various legislations in the States as enacted at that time. It also gives a history of the various colleges, of the Boards of Pharmacy and their method of examination and their appointments. It then touches the question of adulteration and poison law; illicit selling and handling of liquor in drug stores and gives a number of letters from representatives in Congress, judges, and other members of importance, with reference to this matter. It finally offered a resolution:

“Resolved, That the President and ex-Presidents of this Association, attending this meeting, be appointed a committee to take into consideration,

“First, The propriety of drafting a law regulating the entire practice of pharmacy, to be presented to the legislatures of the different states and territories for their adoption, together with a memorial setting forth the duties of the profession to the public, and its actual and contemplated status;

“Second, The propriety of inviting the co-operation of the American Medical Association, and of the local Medical and Pharmaceutical Societies;

“And that the committee thus appointed be requested to report at a subsequent session.”

After some debate the resolution was adopted without the second clause. Later on a new committee on the same subject was appointed by the President consisting of William Wright, Jr., of New York; Frederick Stearns, Detroit; J. Faris Moore, Baltimore.

It seems that the Association missed one great chance of usefulness in not taking up this question in a broader and more general sense. It is well known that since those days the physicians have applied to the legislatures and Congress for laws helping them in their practice and strengthening their position in the community and in law. If the pharmacists in those days had also undertaken to make pharmacy legislation a national issue, many of the difficulties that later

on arose and a good deal of the indifference that was shown in later years in various states towards the working of the American Pharmaceutical Association could now have been avoided.

From the many papers of a scientific nature that were presented at this meeting, we will mention the paper on "Commercial *Hydrargyrum Cum Creta*," the first paper read in the Association by Joseph P. Remington. Mr. H. W. Lincoln read an interesting paper on the Coat of Arms of Pharmacists, called "*Opiferque Per Orbem Dicor*"—(And I am called a bringer of help throughout the world.)

A very interesting and exhaustive paper was that of Dr. E. R. Squibb on "Carbolic Acid," at that time a new and almost unknown article. It strikes us to-day in almost a humorous way to notice in the debate that one member praised carbolic acid as a great invention, as a solution of it had cleaned his dog of fleas, while another one claimed that he had used it in the same way and found it entirely useless. Other papers related to the practice of pharmacy, the prescribing and preparation of various drugs, syrups and elixirs. They all showed a deep interest taken in this work all over the country and present a valuable record of the history of various preparations.

Mr. Parrish in a paper on "The Means of Improvement for Young Pharmacists," who were prevented from attending college, lays down three rules which will give them ability to practice their profession.

"First. Observation—The cultivation of the senses of sight, touch, taste and smell is of prime importance to the pharmacist, as it is indeed to every dealer in merchandise.

"Second. Experiment—The little word 'try' conveys a lesson which every one should learn at the very outset of his course.

"Third. Reading—Blessed agencies are good books in every scheme of education. What wonderful facilities for improvement do these furnish in the present day, as compared with any previous period."

The proceedings of this meeting, comprising about five hundred pages, is one of the most interesting and instructive books of the series. The observant reader, however, cannot avoid two general impressions. The first, the tedious and somewhat clumsy way in which the business of this now national Association is conducted, and what an enormous amount of time is wasted in reproducing and reading of reports that were of no use to the members and other unnecessary formalities. That a change in the method should soon take place is evident. Another impression of a more serious nature is that, sooner or later, dissension or difference of opinion of serious kind, must break out in the Association. The time of construction and building-up had almost passed. So far there was nothing but friendliness and the desire to accommodate each other's opinions, but the time had come when it would be necessary to step out, speak sharply and define the proper and most important objects of the Association in clear and precise words. Mr. Parrish, in one of his remarks, says: "We started out on a different basis from that in which we now conduct the Association. The ideas of those who originated it were more restricted in regard to membership and many other questions." Through the whole proceedings there go the rumblings of a distant thunder, announcing the storm that was soon to come.

The seventeenth meeting of the Association was held at Chicago in 1869. President Parrish being absent, the First Vice-President, Ferris Bringham,

presided in the first half, and the newly elected President, Ezekiel H. Sargent, at the second half of the meeting. There were one hundred and thirty-one members present at this meeting and many new members were elected, among them George W. Kennedy of Pottsville, Penn., who afterwards, was for many years the Secretary of the Council.

The report of the Committee on Progress of Pharmacy was presented by Dr. Hoffman, and while in a general way it follows the method of the former reporters, it differs particularly in so far as Dr. Hoffman added at various points criticism and suggestions. The report contains one hundred and sixty pages, being more than one-third of the volume and shows an enormous amount of zeal and arduous work. At the end, the reporter makes a strong appeal to divide the work among several members, claiming that it was too much for one. The Business Committee, in consequence of this suggestion, proposed a resolution making the committee to consist of three members, to be elected every three years and to divide the subjects among them, also that the report of the committee, in addition to being printed in the proceedings, should be published separately in book form. No action was taken on this proposition.

At this meeting, the most detailed and interesting report on the Pharmacopœia, was presented by Dr. Squibb. It embraced forty-eight pages and was an exhaustive review of all the enormous investigations and examinations that had been made by members of the Association and others, tending to improve the methods of the Pharmacopœia. Many articles were recommended to be dropped and others to be added, and the report bristled with many suggestions to the physicians in reference to the method and way of conducting the revision. As the Association was not an incorporated body at that time, this report could not be presented as coming from the Association, which had no representation in the Convention, but it was ordered to be printed, and no doubt had an important influence with the members of the Revision Committee.

The report of the delegates from this Association to the third International Pharmaceutical Congress held at Vienna this year was presented by John Faber, the only one who attended this Convention. It treated to some extent on the same questions as the previous one, and the following resolution, being the third one is of particular value:

"That the superintendence of the medical profession is incompatible with the present status of pharmacy, the pharmacist of our modern times being beyond what he was a century ago, and that he is entitled to self-government."

The 4th question, "Which way is to be adopted in order to obtain the most possible uniformity in the formulas and preparation of methods universally used?" was a continuation of the question about a universal codex. Faber reported as follows on this:

"A committee at Paris being engaged in working out a conspectus containing the different formulas of active remedies, with the view to have the Pharmacopœia of the different countries adopt uniform formulas in course of time; Congress expressed wishes for the committee to continue their labor in this direction, and to communicate with other pharmaceutical corporations about that subject."

The president in his annual address, which was a very able review of the activities and growth of the Association during the last year, dwelt at length

on the law to regulate the practice of pharmacy in the different States of the Union and to prevent the adulteration of drugs and medicines. He says:

"I cannot too highly commend this law to your serious consideration. Originally opposed to any attempt to prevent by legislation the evils which are so perceptible under our present unrestrained system, I have gradually arrived at the conclusion that the effort should now be made to exhibit to the legislatures of the several states such a law as, if it could be carried out, would be of immense advantage to the public, and would at once place pharmacy in its true position. The committee are aware of some imperfections in this draft, although it is the result of much careful study. I confess to grave doubts of its proving available in states in which our profession is not well organized."

His recommendation to fix the salary of the permanent secretary at \$400.00 and that of the treasurer at \$200.00 was later adopted. The Committee on Drug Market failed to bring in a report. The Business Committee recommended a number of changes of the Constitution, most of them relating again to the vexed question of raising funds. All the propositions and remarks relating to this subject were referred to the Committee for further consideration. This Committee prepared a lengthy report which was accepted and was to be acted upon at the following meeting in 1870. A great number of very interesting and instructive papers were presented at this meeting, most of them showing the great interest that the druggists of those days took in the investigation and determination of indigenous plants and articles of the Pharmacopoeia in general. At this meeting also Mr. E. L. Milhau presented the first gelatin-coated pill and read an interesting paper on the same which was listened to with great interest and caused a very animated debate.

The two most important subjects, however, that made the meeting of 1869 a very remarkable one, were the reports of the Committee on the Law to regulate the practice of Pharmacy, and the expulsion of one of the most active and highly respected members of the Association.

Mr. W. Wright, Jr., as Chairman of the Committee charged with framing a law regulating the practice of pharmacy, reported verbally, that the Committee had attended to that duty and had the draft of the law printed in sufficient numbers to be distributed among the members present.

This draft of a proposed law which was printed in the proceedings is a very comprehensive and deep draft of a general pharmacy law. It is true there were some errors in it owing to the novelty of the work and the lack of experience of which the drafters of a later law of a similar kind could dispose, but it showed the deep thought and care that had been devoted to this work and would have been a good and serviceable model for the many State laws that were about to be formed and enacted in those days. It was hailed by some as the beginning of a new era, but it utterly failed of acceptance on account of the strong opposition of Dr. Squibb and a few of his friends who looked upon it from the standpoint of a physician, forgetting entirely that they were there as members of a Pharmaceutical Association and that the interests of the pharmacists should count first. At no other place in the proceedings, was the influence that Dr. Squibb exercised in those days at the Association, more pronounced than at this one, and while his remarks and his action do not detract at all from his reputation and great recognition as a pharmacologist, it is to be regretted that the older members of the Association did not muster courage

enough to oppose him in this one matter. It appears, to the historian, that the Association, in this one instance, missed its vocation. One of the greatest chances or possibilities to do good for American Pharmacy, was allowed to slip by, on account of this opposition and instead of framing a strong and forcible model-law for the various states, weak, compromise resolutions were passed.

These are some of Dr. Squibb's words with reference to this law :

"The pharmacist's vocation is entirely supplementary to the vocation of the physician; yet, here is a law that ignores physicians, and does not recognize the physician's diploma as entitling him to practice pharmacy, or to register as a pharmacist, while he is the only competent authority of the pharmacist and uses the medicines which the pharmacist prepares. I am willing to admit that the pharmacist knows more about preparing and compounding medicines than the physician does—not more than he should, but more than he does; that the pharmacist is the abler of the two in his profession, but that can never change the fact that the pharmacist is naturally and properly subordinate to the physician."

There were two ways open for the Association at that time, if they had understood the importance of the subject before them. They should either have come out boldly in direct opposition to the physicians, claiming that theirs is a profession of equal value and equal importance and that they were ready to deny and fight the assumed superiority of the medical profession or they should have made a strong and honest attempt to work in harmony with the physicians, who at that time were also framing new laws for their profession, and thereby make this harmony of the two professions one of the fundamentals of all new laws relating to medicine and pharmacy. The first standpoint was advocated by a number of members present at this meeting and from their remarks there can be no doubt that the animosity between pharmacists and physicians was much stronger and more pointed in those days than at any other time. It would have provoked a serious fight between the two professions, which however, would have resulted in the end in mutual respect and friendship.

Another way would have been to meet the physicians as friends and fellows. It is true many of them would have laughed at such an idea of recognizing a pharmacist as their equal, but those of better education and understanding, would have accepted the hand of friendship; laws would then have been framed far superior to those with which most of the States have struggled along, and by which the pharmacists failed to obtain the respect and acknowledgment of the public and medical profession. Looking back to those days, we now know that the physicians succeeded, for instance, in presenting their claims to the authorities of the army and navy, and that the highest physician in the army has the rank of General. If Pharmacy had joined Medicine in those days, we might to-day have a chief pharmacist with the rank of a Captain or Colonel. But the opportunity was lost, for the importance of the subject was not recognized and in place of presenting a working model law, resolutions of the following type were adopted :

"Resolved, That the difficulties of constructing a form of a law proper to be endorsed and recommended by this Association for general application in all states, are such that we must be satisfied with enunciating the broad principles which in our judgment should direct all legislation upon this important subject.

"Resolved, That we see with alarm and regret the rapid increase in the number of accidents which occur from mistakes and mismanagement in dispensing medicinal substances, and that we earnestly desire to see these casualties checked and controlled."

A compromise law was also adopted and it was resolved to send a copy of same to the governors of the different States of the Union.

The second great subject that came up at the meeting in 1869 was the proposition to expel Mr. Frederick Stearns, an ex-President of the Association, an active member at all the meetings and a man of the highest standing among pharmacists and the citizens of his home. Mr. Stearns had brought into the market a medicine for which he had adopted the name of "Sweet Quinine." The medicine, however, did not contain quinine, but cinchonine. The label did not state that it contained quinine, nor was the claim made, anywhere in the circulars, that the medicine contained quinine, the word "cinchonine" with an addition of being a good substitute of quinine was always used. In his explanation Mr. Stearns stated that he had adopted the word "Sweet Quinine" after long and careful consideration. That the medicine contained an alkaloid of the same tree, that the public did not know anything about cinchona, but knew what quinine was and that therefore it was no offense against ethics to use this word, particularly if all the circulars stated what the medicine contained.

The leading men of the Association, however, construed this offence as a direct violation of the code of ethics and claimed that he willfully practiced sophistication and fraud. It will be seen that the question simply turned on the value that is attached to the trade-mark as such. It is well known that in those days, and even afterwards, tradesmen of all kinds hunted for proper and catching names for their products, and it was not generally supposed to be necessary that the name of a trade-mark should be that of its contents. The debate which took place when the proposition to expel Mr. Stearns was brought forth, is one of the most interesting and touching readings of the proceedings of the Association. Everywhere the great service that Mr. Stearns had rendered the Association, his high virtues as a man, his amiability and faithfulness as a friend were extolled,—but he had not been ethical. The address that Mr. Colcord, this old veteran and stern representative of high professional ethics, made at this occasion is apt to bring tears to the eyes of even those that knew nothing of the intimate and true friendship, that up to that time, had existed between the two men. It reminds us of the deep patriotism and stern determination of Brutus when he plunged his dagger into the heart of his foster father; "Not that I love my friend less, but that I love Pharmacy more."

Mr. Stearns could have cleared himself easily if he had made the promise to discontinue the sale of the medicine; but he declined to make any promises. He too, was a man of high honesty and stubborn convictions. He said: "Judge me by what I have done, not by what I promise," and so he was expelled. The Association lost one of its most faithful and active members. During the fifteen years of his membership Mr. Stearns had, at every meeting, helped to uplift Pharmacy, to advocate what was good or right; he was no idealist or enthusiast like Colcord or Parrish; he went about the elevation of Pharmacy with a practical mind and his services were recognized by the Association by electing him to the highest honor of President. That we think more mildly of these things to-day is shown by the fact that he was elected a member some years later and it also shows how deep-rooted his admiration and love for the American Pharmaceutical Association were, when a year or two before

his death, as a successful and wealthy business man he again asked to become a member.

The charge has been made that the foundation of this action lay in commercial competition and envy, and that Mr. Stearns's success prompted a leading man from New York to present these resolutions. But how carefully the reader may look for any proof of this charge, it cannot be shown nor supported by records as they appear in the proceedings.

The question has often been asked why the Association was so severe with one of their best members, and many reasons more or less unsatisfactory have been assigned to this action. The real cause for this severity, however, lies in the peculiar psychological forces that sometimes move the human mind. Every leading man at that meeting felt that the action with reference to the pharmacy law, was unworthy of the lofty standing of the Association. There was that unconscious feeling that a mistake had been made, and that they had failed in the high vocation of the Association. Now, they wanted to assuage this feeling of dissatisfaction by being the severer in the following action. This swinging over, from leniency to severity, and the impression that an error committed in one direction, might be pardoned by extreme methods in the other direction is a human experience, not to say frailty. It shows itself daily in the individual, it appears in societies, in nations.

The history of the great men of the ancient Grecian republics is full of such sudden changes from admiration to contempt, from exalting to condemning. We, too, have had many instances of it in our own history. The treatment of the hero of Manila in the last Spanish war furnishes a good example. If the proposition made and earnestly urged by some members to censure Mr. Stearns and lay the matter over for a year had prevailed, Mr. Stearns would not have been expelled. The psychological excitement would have worn off and a cooler and quieter judgment been passed. But no matter in what light the individual may consider this action of the Association, it established one great fact, the importance of which overshadows everything else, and it is for this reason that your historian has given this subject so much time and investigation. The expulsion of Frederick Stearns impressed a character on the American Pharmaceutical Association that has not been effaced 'til to-day and never will be effaced. It declared to its members, to the pharmaceutical profession, to the whole world, that strict adherence to pure ethical honesty was its leading and most important feature; that neither long and faithful service, nor success in business, nor personal friendship could interfere with this principle, and that no sacrifice was too great to uphold it. The Association was here put to the most crucial test in its history, the temporary disagreement nearly disrupted it, but it came out of the severe trial victorious, purer and stronger. That the expulsion cast a gloom over the meeting, can easily be understood, and the next day, without further business of any importance, the members adjourned to meet again in Baltimore in 1870.

It must be considered a fortunate incident for the Association that the following meeting in 1870, the eighteenth, became more than anything else a business-meeting, under the influence of the excellent address of the President Ezekiel H. Sargent. He reviewed the affairs of the Association, not only the financial ones,

from the standpoint of a cool, sober, business man, eliminating from his address everything that might look like visionary ideals or enthusiasm. This was fortunate in more than one way; for it turned, for once, the minds of the members from the pursuit of scientific matters and a conception of their high vocation, back to solid facts and put before them the affairs of their work, their efforts and their hopes in sober and concise, even if dry, language.

Through the President's influence, the Association escaped the fate of so many noble and great enterprises, that they lose touch with reality, and, in the pursuits of high and lofty aims, forget the demands and cold facts of common life. President Sargent made a great many recommendations, the majority of which were accepted in the course of the meeting. For instance to supply money for the Committee of Progress of Pharmacy to purchase necessary journals; to create a new committee on adulteration and sophistication, consisting of such rising and enthusiastic men as Joseph P. Remington, Albert E. Ebert and William T. Wenzell; to have a general index of the proceedings of the last decade compiled; to direct the President to appoint authorized agents in the different States for the propagation of the Association; to appoint a Committee to take into consideration the invitation of the International Congress of Pharmacy to meet in the United States in 1876; and to create a committee of five on legislative action in pharmacy and the drug trade in general.

But the most important action of this meeting was the thorough revision of the Constitution and the providing of funds to put the Association on a firm financial basis. This new revision of the Constitution differed from the old one in many points.

It is this revision of the Constitution which, in essentials prevails to-day. Many changes became necessary through the growth of the Association and the establishment of different sections. An exchange of greetings with the Pharmaceutical Conference in England, that met at the same time in Liverpool, took place and an address was also sent to the North German Apothecaries' Association that met in the same year in the City of Dresden.

In the nomination and election of President, for the first time a break was made in the accustomed habit of selecting a new president from the place of meeting. Mr. R. Stabler of Alexandria, Virginia, was nominated and elected for the nineteenth meeting which was to assemble in St. Louis in 1871.

The committee on unofficial formulas was continued and Professor J. Faris Moore appointed president.

Among the many new members who joined at this meeting we notice the name of Charles Rice of New York, who afterwards became such a shining light of the Association.

The report of the committee of Progress of Pharmacy by Dr. Frederick Mahla, was as usual about one-third of the proceedings, and was a worthy continuation of the preceding ones. The committee on legislation in pharmacy in the different States, which had been continued from the previous meetings, reported the enactment of laws in the States of Rhode Island, Maryland and Pennsylvania and while these laws must be hailed as a decided progress in the development of pharmacy, they yet fell short of what they might have been, for reasons stated before.

Although this meeting was principally devoted to practical purposes, there were a long series of excellent papers by some of the leading men of those days. Mr. Joseph P. Remington read a very interesting paper on "Glycerin;" Mr. Squibb again reviewed the process of making fluid extracts and also continued his investigation on Rhubarb. His remarks on the manufacture of "Chloral" were highly interesting and received with great favor. Mr. Diehl pointed out that the indigenous drugs collected in the various parts of the Union were all shipped to New York; that it was sometimes impossible to find goods in Louisville that had been collected in its immediate surroundings and that much difficulty and delay was caused by this. Another paper devoted to "Medicinal Plants of Canada" was that of William Saunders. William Procter, Jr., read a very interesting treatise on "Morphiometric Process for the Pharmacopœia." He reviews the different methods proposed by different investigators and while his investigations lack that perfection which this work has attained at the present time, it yet showed a remarkable progress since 1862, when the committee reported that it was nearly impossible to make such investigations.

It had been customary since 1863 to add to the proceedings a short report on the social features of the Association, a custom that is continued to the present day. Another report that was handed in every year in those days, was a report on exhibits and specimens. It is to be regretted that the interest in this part of the annual meeting has disappeared, and that for many years such exhibitions have not taken place. The reason for it, if the historian is correct, is that these exhibitions took the feature of strictly commercial enterprises, while, in the beginning, specimens of all kinds of indigenous and foreign drugs, samples of rare plants, chemicals of special appearance or combinations, in fact, articles that tended to instruct and educate, were the main features of these exhibitions. The efforts to display living plants collected in the vicinity of the place of meeting that have lately been made, are good substitutes for these old exhibits and it is to be hoped that through their influence, the exhibits of educational subjects will gradually be revived. It was customary in those days for the Association to adjourn at a certain time that was fixed beforehand, for the purpose of visiting the exhibits.

With this meeting the second part of the history of the American Pharmaceutical Association may justly be closed. There is a remarkable difference between the first and the second decade. In the first part the minds of the members soared on high. The meetings were conducted by their founders and the lofty ideals which had prompted these noble men to found the Association, were the leading inspirations of the meeting. The great political upheaval in the beginning of the "60s" naturally checked this ideal tendency in many respects and plain business considerations and sober thought took their places. This condition of affairs far from having injured the Association, was of enormous benefit and gave it strength and firmness. It was now not only well known and established in the United States but it had created attention and congratulations in other countries and it had boldly reached out for the International Congress of Pharmacy to be held on this hemisphere.

Another good feature in the development of the Association must be noticed

The old members who founded the Association were not jealous of the younger; with pride they saw the young men come in, they welcomed them cheerfully, they willingly gave them an opportunity to show their mettle and take active part in the workings of the Association. We have, therefore, in this decade, the first papers, the first words of mental individuality and scientific thought of so many new men, and it is a pleasure to notice how their sometimes impetuous and radical desires, were wisely checked and guided by the older men without any desire or effort to suppress their individuality.

Thus the Association was ready to reach out further and do greater and nobler work.

JOHN B. BOND, M. D.



Doctor Bond, the Chairman of the State Board of Pharmacy of Arkansas and a member of the American Pharmaceutical Association since 1883 attained the ripe age of seventy-eight years in November. He was born at Gettysburg, Pa. in 1836, but made an "early escape,"—as he gleefully terms it,—to Missouri where he was educated and grew to manhood. His early life was spent upon his father's farm, after which he "tried his luck" in California for three years. He then returned to Missouri and joined the Confederate Army being attached to the Medical Corps of the Division of General Sterling Price, his qualifications for that position being that he had studied medicine in the St. Louis Medical College, now known as Washington University. He attained the rank of Chief Surgeon of Little's Division, Price's Corps, then serving in Mississippi, and while acting as such officer, he saw General Little receive his death-wound at the battle of Iuka. Soon after this lamentable episode, Dr. Bond was made Medical Purveyor on the staff of General Holmes, and was assigned to duty in Arkansas. Here he met "his fate" in the "Belle of Little Rock," whom he espoused, and thereupon transferred his citizenship from Missouri to the "Bear State."

At the close of the Civil War he practiced medicine until 1872 when he embarked in the drug business, being the senior member of Bond's Pharmacy Co. of Little Rock.

He occupied the Chair of Chemistry of the Medical Department of the University of Arkansas for three years.

He was one of the organizers of the Arkansas Association of Pharmacists and was prominent in the enactment of the Arkansas Pharmacy Law, which is considered a most equitable and satisfactory law for a frontier state requiring but some additions concerning the enforcement of the law to make it a model one. For twenty years Dr. Bond has been the President of the Arkansas State Board of Pharmacy.