

He was prominent in the Masonic circles of London, and was master of the American Masonic Lodge at the time of his death. In the American Colony he was always conspicuous; he was secretary of the London branch of the American Navy League, and president of the American Society.

Council Business

COUNCIL LETTER No. 13.

Philadelphia, Pa., January 4, 1915.

To the members of the Council:

Motions No. 23 (Approval of General Rules of Publication), No. 24 (Election of Local Secretary for 1915) and No. 25 (Disapproval of Proposed Exhibit at the Panama-Pacific Exposition) have each received a majority of affirmative votes.

The following communication has been received from Frank H. Freericks:

"In voting 'No' on Motion No. 22, I feel the need for making a short explanation: The discussion which has taken place with reference to invitations was in each case an expression of an individual opinion or view, and in no manner can it be regarded as an expression of the Council. If any of those who are directly concerned have read or do read the discussion, they will realize that the entire matter was tabled (if such be the case) purely because of propriety and thoughtful consideration. It does not seem to me that the matter will be helped any by expressing sincere appreciation for unselfish work done, and I do not understand a New Year's greeting to be called for any more this year than any other year. I assume that all brother pharmacists in every one of the countries now at war have been doing their full duty, but frankly I do not know a thing about it, and I cannot well express appreciation for the doing of something which I do not know to have been done. Am sure that it will not harm anyone to send the "greetings" and to express appreciation, but somehow I am inclined to feel that some of the recipients would smile at our expense."

If any of the members of the Council wish to change their votes on Motion 22, the opportunity is open, as the vote has not been announced.

George M. Beringer writes as follows:

"Beyond any doubt the pharmacists of the countries engaged in the present unfortunate European war are suffering many hardships and their privations and tribulations may be expected to be still further increased as the war progresses.

Already there comes to us, through Hol-

land, an appeal for aid to the pharmacists of Belgium, many of whom have lost everything. A similar condition probably exists among the pharmacists of Northern France and in other countries where battles are being fought or have already been waged.

With peace will come even more urgently the need for the rehabilitation, the re-establishment of our brother pharmacists in these foreign countries. Many will need our aid to secure the opportunity to re-engage in their peaceful avocation as a means of livelihood.

I, therefore, recommend and will move that the American Pharmaceutical Association through the Council, appoint a Committee to co-operate with committees appointed for a similar purpose by other pharmaceutical, drug and chemical societies for the purpose of soliciting funds to aid the worthy and needy foreign pharmacists who have suffered by this war, irrespective of their nationalities.

By such a movement, American pharmacists, while maintaining neutrality, can, nevertheless, demonstrate that they are actuated by a true spirit of philanthropy to alleviate the suffering, to mitigate the hardships and to extend a helping hand to our brothers in distress across the seas."

The following communication has been received:

Philadelphia, Pa., January 2, 1915.

Members of the Council:

Gentlemen—It will be recalled that at the Detroit (1914) meeting of the Association the position of Editor of the Journal was not filled, but that the matter of selecting an Editor was left to the Committee on Publication with power to act, subject to the approval of the Council.

The Committee on Publication not being able to decide the question at the Detroit meeting, engaged Ernest C. Marshall as Acting Editor, from month to month, until the Editor could be chosen. Professor William B. Day consented to serve as General Secretary, and on the nomination of the Chairman of the Committee on Publication, was so elected.

The position of Editor was then offered to Professor E. G. Eberle, who promised to decide later. He has decided to accept the position and has presented his application as follows:

Dallas, Texas, December 1, 1914.

Mr. J. W. England, Chairman of Committee on Publication, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Dear Mr. England—Replying to the request of the Committee on Publication for a proposition under which I would accept the editorship of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, my present connection should perhaps be referred to.

In the first place, the consideration came, as you know, through suggestion, and appealed to me as a possibility for service to the Association which might reflect credit upon myself and to this end my best efforts would be directed.

My several positions which will terminate when I leave here bring me about \$4,000 yearly, so that financial betterment is hardly the object with me; however, I must give thought to the financial side as quite a number look to me for support.

Leaving here, I am burning the bridges, some of which have been constructed by long friendships and service in behalf of the druggists in this section. It takes only a short while to give up that which has required years to obtain. You are more or less familiar with my activities.

Leaving now reference to my own affairs and speaking of the Journal; there will be opportunities for business throughout the year, but as advertising contracts are usually made following annual meetings, the most opportune time is in December and January.

I am of the opinion that it would be best for the Association to have the office of Secretary and Editor separate, because this insures two good workers instead of one, though very likely will involve greater expense.

These thoughts have had a part in shaping my offers which I submit for your consideration, though I think some flexibility ought to be provided for. I am open to suggestions and will be glad to have every phase discussed frankly and freely, as we are all working for the best interests of the Association.

Respectfully submitted,

E. G. EBERLE.

Application of E. G. Eberle to American Pharmaceutical Association for position of Editor of the Journal of American Pharmaceutical Association, General Secretary, etc.:

To the Committee on Publication of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

(1) I will assume the editorship and general management of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, to include the position of Advertising Manager and also the duties of General Secretary of the American Pharmaceutical Association, for a salary of \$4,000 per annum, payable in monthly installments of \$333.33 $\frac{1}{3}$, to begin March 1, 1915, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable.

I am to be allowed two stenographers, who are to be compensated by the Association. The office expenses are to be agreed to between the Committee on Publication or those in authority and myself to be paid by the Association.

The necessary expenses incurred in attending the annual meeting of the Association are to be paid by the Association, and also all other trips made in an official capacity and sanctioned by the Committee on Publication or those in authority. All expenses, except the salaries provided, shall first be submitted for approval to the Committee on Publication or those in authority.

Or (2) I will assume the editorship and general management of the Journal of the

American Pharmaceutical Association for a salary of \$3,500, payable in monthly installments of \$291.66 $\frac{2}{3}$.

My duties shall include those of the Advertising Manager, to begin on March 1, 1915, as above indicated.

I am to be allowed one stenographer at a salary to be agreed upon between the Committee on Publication or those in authority and myself, and paid by the Association, as also the necessary office expenses.

My expenses incurred by attending the annual meetings of the Association and those made necessary for the transaction of official business shall be paid by the Association. The latter shall always be authorized by the Committee on Publication or those in authority.

Respectfully submitted,

E. G. EBERLE."

The Committee on Publication has given very careful consideration to this application. Professor Eberle is one of the most earnest workers of the American Pharmaceutical Association and one of the most able pharmaceutical journalists. It is scarcely necessary to refer to his work as President of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as Chairman of the Council and as member of the Committee on Publication. It is known to every member of the Association and known most favorably.

The Committee on Publication therefore has unanimously elected (Professor Eberle not voting) Eugene G. Eberle as Editor of the Journal under the conditions of the second proposition submitted in his application above. His engagement as Editor and Advertising Manager is to begin on March 1, 1915, or later, the exact date to be fixed by the Committee on Publication (so as to give due notice of change to the Acting Editor).

The executive work of the Association is growing very rapidly. It is probably too large a task for one man to perform the duties of both Editor and General Secretary. The work of the two offices is dissimilar, and each is of large volume. A good Editor and a good General Secretary by active co-operation can do more and better work than can one man attempting to fill both positions.

Furthermore, at a cost of only \$250 more than was paid to Dr. Beal as Editor and General Secretary, and \$1250 less than was paid to Dr. Beal as Editor and Mr. Marshall as Advertising Manager in 1914, we can have the unusual opportunity of securing two such men as Eugene G. Eberle as Editor and William B. Day as General Sec-

retary, a combination whose enthusiasm and efficiency will be of the greatest service in promoting the interests of the Association.

It will be noticed that no mention is made in the application as to the Home Office of the Journal, but Professor Eberle states that he will leave this "entirely with the Association." The Committee on Publication is of the opinion that Columbus should be retained for the Home Office at least until the annual meeting, when the subject can be considered more fully.

The Committee on Publication asks the Council to ratify its action in selecting Eugene G. Eberle as Editor of the Journal and Advertising Manager under the conditions above stated.

Very truly yours,

J. W. ENGLAND,
Chairman of Committee on Publication.
J. W. ENGLAND,
Secretary of the Council.
415 N. Thirty-third Street.



COUNCIL LETTER No. 15.

Philadelphia, Pa., February 8, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

Gentlemen: After the issuance of Council Letter No. 13, the following motion was received: "Moved by C. A. Mayo, seconded by H. Englehardt, that the action of the Committee on Publication in the selection of Eugene G. Eberle as Editor and Advertising Manager of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as reported in Council Letter No. 13, be ratified by the Council."

Later (January 23), the following letter from Geo. B. Kauffman came to hand:

"In view of conditions which have arisen and of certain statements and charges made respecting the conduct of the affairs of the Association, growing out of the action of the Publication Committee in the matter of the selection of the Editor, which said statements and charges deserve more than passing comment, I move that action by the Council concerning the action of the Publication Committee in the matter of Editorship, be deferred until the next regular meeting of the Association, and that Mr. Marshall, the present Acting Editor, be given a hearing before the Council at that time."

The motion was seconded by E. H. Thiesing.

The question then arose as to which motion should be submitted first to the Council and it was referred to Chairman Eberle, of

Dallas, Texas, who replied that, under the circumstances, he felt disqualified to act, and asked that the question be referred to Vice-Chairman Godding, of Boston. The latter has decided that the motion of Mr. Kauffman's should be submitted first.

Do you favor motion of Mr. Kauffman, seconded by Mr. Thiesing, as given in above letter? This will be regarded as *Motion No. 28 (Deferring Action on Editorship until next Regular Meeting of Association, etc.)*

In connection with this motion, the following letter has been received from General Secretary Day:

Members of the Council:

Gentlemen—I understand that a motion is to be presented to the Council moving that the action of the Committee on Publication in the matter of Editorship of the Journal be deferred until the San Francisco meeting of the Association on the ground, practically, that the selection of the Editor has been hasty and without proper consideration of the merits of all the candidates. As a matter of fact, may I say, on behalf of the Committee on Publication, that the subject of Editor has received most careful and serious consideration by the Committee, not only at Detroit, but since. Every candidate has received fair treatment. Injustice has been done to no one. All were weighed in the balance, and the unanimous decision of the Committee was that, in journalistic experience, in official experience in the work of the Association, and in educational experience, Eugene G. Eberle was pre-eminently the best man. It is the opinion of the Committee that the welfare of the American Pharmaceutical Association is or should be superior to the interests of any individual member. The Association is not intended to create or provide a berth for anyone.

So far as the present Acting Editor is concerned, the Committee has nothing but kindly feelings. His interests were fully considered. He was engaged at Detroit as Acting Editor, tentatively, and accepted the position under such conditions. He was not promised the position of Editor, and that he failed of election as such, is not to his discredit, but to the fact that a more experienced man was found.

So, with "malice toward no one, with charity for all," I ask the members of the Council to vote down the resolution to defer, if such be presented, and pass a motion to ratify the action of the Committee on Publication in selecting Eugene G. Eberle as Editor.

I am, yours truly,

WM. B. DAY,
General Secretary.

Chicago, February 4, 1915.

J. W. ENGLAND,
Secretary of the Council.
415 N. Thirty-third Street.

COUNCIL LETTER No. 16.

Philadelphia, Pa., February 10, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

Motions No. 22 (Greetings to Pharmacists and Pharmaceutical Associations of other Nations) and No. 27 (Election of Members; Applications Nos. 59-75 inclusive) have each received a majority of affirmative votes.

In reference to Tentative Program for Fifty-third Annual Meeting (C. L. No. 14), M. I. Wilbert suggests that the time of holding the meeting of the Committee on Nominations (Monday) be made either one hour before the time of the President's Reception or one hour before the Second General Session, and to meet this suggestion, if there is no objection, the time will be made 8:30 p. m.

Wm. J. Lowry, Jr., Secretary of the Baltimore Branch, advises that Henry P. Hynson has been elected Council Representative of the Baltimore Branch, succeeding John B. Thomas.

F. W. Nitardy, Secretary of the Denver Branch, advises that Samuel T. Hensel has been elected Council Representative of the Denver Branch, succeeding John A. Martin.

Jerome A. Wilkerson has been elected Council Representative of the St. Louis Branch, succeeding Wm. K. Ilhardt. (Journ. A. Ph. A., Dec., 1914, 1747.)

A number of communications have been received relative to Motion No. 26 (Reply to Article in Pearson's Magazine), as follows:

M. I. Wilbert—"Motion No. 26: This is neither wise nor expedient."

L. E. Sayre—"Motion No. 26: I would say p. 49, line 6 takes the valuable time, etc."

E. G. Eberle—"Motion No. 26: While my conclusions were to let the article go unnoticed rather than give it further publicity, the answer is well-worded, and I can offer no objection."

F. C. Godbold—"Motion No. 26: In voting 'no' on reply to article in Pearson's Magazine, I believe that it is best for the pharmacist as individuals to answer to their patrons such complaints, and for the Association to keep out of print on the matter. I have been answering this charge for years to individuals, as occasion required, to the satisfaction of the individual. I remember on one occasion a customer 'phoned for 25c worth of Brown Mixture, the XX kind. I sent for the prescription which was Brown

Mixture Tablets, No. XX. Take as directed."

T. F. Main—"Motion No. 26: In regard to the reply to article in Pearson's Magazine, it is very nicely worded but I am afraid it is over the heads of the people who read that magazine.

I have always given a short answer to those who complained that pharmacists charged one price for an article sold in bulk and a higher price for the same thing when dispensed on prescription, by calling the attention of complainant that the pharmacist's charge did not differ in any way from the practice prevailing in the trades, for instance, if one orders a carpenter to send 12 foot of 1-inch plank, he gets a bill for it, but if he orders him to send up a 12-foot 1-inch plank cut into three foot lengths, the same to be put up in a closet as shelving, he will get a bill for so many feet of plank, so many screws, so many brackets and finally for so much time, and I have always contested that the pharmacist's charge for his professional time was in the majority of cases far lower than the time charged by the ordinary laborer in the trades."

C. T. P. Fennel—"Motion No. 26: In reference to reply to Pearson article I will say that the opening statement is subject to criticism. Dispensing of medicines and their preparation in suitable form was in the hands of the physician. Alchemy next arose as an independent science. Paracelsus was the founder of Pharmacy (that is the preparation of medicine for the purpose of curing disease) by placing Alchemy with Medicine, and eventually the science of Chemistry and Pharmacy as separate sciences were evolved.

Take as a concrete example, etc. I would not use the term Baking Soda as synonymous with Bicarbonate of Soda. Baking Soda need not conform to the U. S. P. requirements, and hence the article usually sold by pharmacists and grocers, etc., is very much inferior and cheaper to the pharmacopœial Bicarbonate of Soda. I would include in the paragraph the fact that there is a vast difference between Alum, Borax, etc., used for technical purposes and those used for prescription work. Epsom Salt, the by-product of the manufacture of CO₂ gas, has no commercial value, but it is sold in immense quantities by certain class of druggists in pound packages. The article does

not conform to the U. S. P., and hence price-comparisons in prescription is not possible."

S. L. Hilton—"Motion No. 26: With reference to Motion No. 26, permit me to say that I for one do not approve of any such action by the Council; there never was or never will be any question that is handled by a newspaper man, no matter how much merit there may be in it, that can be brought to the attention of the public in which the other side will not get the worst of it; we must remember that they have everything to gain and nothing to lose, and they have every means at their command to combat every argument that may be presented, and if it has any merit or justice in it they will resort to ridicule to break it down. 'It is always the hurt dog that hollers,' and I do not want to see the American Pharmaceutical Association placed in this position to be ridiculed, consequently I must vote 'No' on Motion 26.

I might also add that I had the same proposition put up to me to answer shortly after its publication; it took me but a few minutes to decide that it was absolutely useless for the reasons that nothing would be gained as above pointed out and I could not help but losing out."

W. C. Alpers—"Motion No. 26: As to the statement prepared by the Philadelphia Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association every pharmacist will readily subscribe to every word stated there. In my mind, however, the wording of the statement is much too mild. Stronger words expressing indignation rather than complaint should be used and the miserable villifier punished and refuted in a manner that cannot be misunderstood. Why not ask him if the sheet of paper on which he wrote his invectives and the ink that he shamefully spilled in doing so were worth the price that he was paid for his article? Why not make the suggestion that a national board of magazine writers be created and that each writer should pass an examination as to his qualifications just as the pharmacist has to do? Such an arrangement would eliminate the miserable ignoramuses that now write on pharmaceutical, chemical and medical subjects for the purpose of creating sensation with total disregard of facts and truth.

These are only a few of the suggestions that might be made in reply to the article published in Pearson's Magazine."

Frederick J. Wulling—"Motion No. 26:

Concerning the reply to Pearson's Magazine, let me say that I would not dignify the article by any reply at all. I believe the Association should entirely ignore the article, for I believe it has not injured pharmacy in the eyes of fair-minded people. If the reply is published, I would suggest the omission of the poetry because it is not sufficiently clear and apropos for the average reader. The reply would also need editing. I take it that Motion 26 intends to give the Philadelphia Branch the privilege to send this reply. In that case it should appear that the reply is by the Philadelphia Branch and not by the Association. If the reply is to be by the Philadelphia Branch, I would not mind approving the motion, but if the reply is intended to come from the A. Ph. A., then I vote 'No.'"

Professor Wulling's point that Motion No. 26 intends to give the Philadelphia Branch the privilege of sending the reply submitted to the Council and represents only the opinions of the Branch and not the Council will be (if the motion carries) adopted, unless there be objection.

Motion No. 29 (Applications for Membership). You are requested to vote on the following applications for membership:

No. 76. Samuel Cahan, 864 North Tenth St., Philadelphia, Pa., rec. by Harry Seidman and Frank X. Moerk.

No. 77. Louis H. Luck, 198 W. Union St., Burlington, Vermont, rec. by John G. Godding and Wm. H. Zottman.

No. 78. Roy Chester Charron, 426 Newbury St., Boston, Mass., rec. by Hugh C. Muldoon and Theodore J. Bradley.

No. 79. A. Julius Lindgren, 402 Central Ave., West Duluth, Minn., rec. by W. A. Abbott and E. L. Newcomb.

No. 80. Henry Duncan Llewellyn, West Side Square, Mexico, Mo., rec. by H. M. Whelpley and J. W. Mackelden.

No. 81. Roy C. Roc, 709 S. Winchester Ave., Chicago, Ill., rec. by G. D. Timmons and E. H. Wisner.

No. 82. William O. Speer, 458 Greenwich St., Valparaiso, Ind., rec. by G. D. Timmons and E. H. Wisner.

No. 83. W. M. Cordivenus, 653 Sutter St., San Francisco, Cal., rec. by Clarissa M. Roehr and H. M. Whelpley.

No. 84. Clarence Isaac Pendleton, 114 Hillside Road, Watertown, Mass., rec. by Theodore J. Bradley and Hugh C. Muldoon.

No. 85. John L. Hess, 2038 Cherry St., Philadelphia, Pa., rec. by G. H. Mecker and J. W. Sturmer.

No. 86. Maxwell M. Becker, 2465 N. Garnet St., Philadelphia, Pa., rec. by J. W. England and J. G. Roberts.

No. 87. Antonio Caparo 'y Fernandez, P. O. Box 50, Havana, Cuba, rec. by Jose P. Alacan and Jose Guillermo Diaz.

J. W. ENGLAND,
Secretary of the Council.
415 N. Thirty-third Street.

<>

COUNCIL LETTER No. 17.

Philadelphia, Pa., February 22, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

Motion No. 26 (Reply to Article in Pearson's Magazine representing opinions of Philadelphia Branch) has received a majority of affirmative votes.

Under date of January 6, a motion was received from C. A. Mayo "that the action of the Committee on Publication in the selection of Eugene G. Eberle as Editor and Advertising Manager of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as reported in Council Letter No. 13, be ratified by the Council."

On January 23, a motion was received from Geo. B. Kauffman, deferring action on editorship until the next regular meeting of the Association, etc. (Council Letter No. 15). This motion was submitted to the Council, being regarded as *Motion No. 28*.

The results of the vote on this motion are as follows:

Yes—Messrs. Kauffman, Thiesing, Alpers, Packard, LaPierre, White, Schafer, and Hynson—8.

No—Messrs. Godding, Gordon, Gietner, Beringer, McElhenie, Day, Rogers, Seltzer, Diehl, Whelpley, C. E. Caspari, Hensel, Godbold, Wulling, Fennel, England, Osseward, Clark, Hilton, Koch, Claus, Stewart, Wilkerson and Sayre—24.

Not voting—Messrs. Eberle, C. Caspari, Jr., Englehardt, Freericks, Havenhill, Hopp, Mayo, Schneider and Wilbert—9.

Motion No. 28 has therefore not been carried.

The following communication has been received from C. Herbert Packard:

February 8, 1915.

To the Members of the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

Gentlemen—We have received statements regarding the filling of the position of Editor of the Journal, and I believe it is my duty to write in favor of Mr. Marshall,—first, because he has filled the position made vacant by Doctor Beal's illness, in a most acceptable manner.

Secondly, I ought to speak of Mr. Marshall, because I probably know him better than many of the Council.

I first met Mr. Marshall in 1890 or '91, at

a time when he delivered an address to a graduating class of the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy. It was without doubt the strongest and best oration I have ever heard and as such made a lasting impression upon me.

Since that time he has always shown a loyalty to pharmacy, the ability to fill every position given him, working with untiring effort in the discharge of the same.

Our first thought should be to the person filling the position at the time of an election, if his work has been well and properly done. In reference to Mr. Marshall, I have never heard a word of inefficiency, but much of praise.

Regarding Mr. Eberle for the position, will say that there is not a gentleman in the Association better equipped or one I admire greater.

Mr. England and every member of the Committee on Publication have my greatest respect as gentlemen, men of experience and of ability. I cannot help, however, to believe that they have overlooked just as good a man for the work as can be found, "overlooked because he is at hand."

It is not necessary to go abroad when looking for a man without first comparing the ones at home with the best.

In justice to Mr. Marshall for the necessity of moving his home, the expense he has had to meet, his ability to fill the position, and, lastly, his liking for the work, I believe we should consider him first, and I therefore make a motion that Mr. Ernest C. Marshall be elected Editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Fraternally yours,

C. HERBERT PACKARD.

I second the above motion—Elie H. LaPierre.

Mr. Packard's motion is obviously offered as a substitute motion for Mr. Mayo's motion of January 6.

C. T. P. Fennel writes as follows:

Cincinnati, February 10, 1915.

Mr. J. W. England, Secretary of the Council, A. Ph. A.:

Dear Sir—Relative to the selection of Eugene G. Eberle as Editor and Advertising Manager of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association by the Committee on Publication: I can find at this time no valid reason why ratification by the Council of the action of the Committee should be deferred to the general meeting of the Association. The action of the Committee has been deliberate in safeguarding the interests of the national body. Their viewpoint and scope of investigation is far greater than that of any single individual and should therefore receive primary consideration. The sooner ratification by Council of the Committee's action is taken, the better for the welfare of the Journal as well as the national body. Under this view, I must vote "no" on Motion No. 28. Your truly,

C. T. P. FENNEL.

George M. Beringer writes as follows:

Camden, N. J., February 12, 1915.

Members of the Council:

Gentlemen—I have received from Mr. C. Herbert Packard his letter containing the motion seconded by Mr. LaPierre.

In no way do I intend to say anything prejudicial to Mr. Marshall. The members of the Council should be fully acquainted with the situation confronting them. The Committee on Publication have not acted at all hastily nor unfairly. At the Detroit meeting, their report was accepted and they were empowered to do certain things in behalf of the Association. In the discharge of one of their specific duties, they have weighed carefully the availability of the different names that have been presented for the editorship. Their decision in favor of Prof. Eberle appears to have been unanimous and without any prejudice to any of the other candidates whose good parts have been fully considered. It is exceedingly unfortunate that Mr. Marshall should have considered the action of the Committee as a personal affront and charged the Chairman of the Committee on Publication with any unfairness to him.

Mr. Packard himself testifies in no uncertain language as to the fitness of Prof. Eberle in the statement that "there is not a gentleman in the Association better equipped or one I admire greater," and thus confirms the judgment of the Committee.

With no desire to be unfair to Mr. Marshall, the Committee must recognize its responsibility and its duty and, the duty of the Council likewise, to be entirely fair to Prof. Eberle. The latter gentlemen became a candidate for this office at the solicitation of members of the Committee on Publication who considered him to be especially fitted for this undertaking. After due consideration of the suggestion made to him at Detroit, he became a candidate and, doubtless, has severed other connections to take up this work at the time agreed upon with the Committee on Publication.

Prof. Eberle has acted in a loyal and gentlemanly way throughout this entire matter, and I feel that it is but due to him that there should be no uncertainty as to the termination of this question nor as to the loyal support of the membership of the Association to him as Editor. Without unnecessary delay, the Council should settle this question as a business proposition that has been properly placed before the body that is empowered to transact the business for the Association.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE M. BERINGER.

Frederick T. Gordon writes as follows:

February 20, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

Gentlemen—There has been some question about the ratification by the Council of the election of Eugene G. Eberle to the office of Editor of the Journal.

Prof. Eberle was the unanimous choice of the Committee on Publication for this very

important position. A movement has been started to discredit the unanimous report of the Committee by substituting the name of E. C. Marshall for that of E. G. Eberle.

It seems to me that unless charges can be preferred or any evidence of unfitness on the part of Mr. Eberle to serve as Editor can be adduced, the members of the Council should uphold and approve the unanimous vote of the Committee in favor of Mr. Eberle, especially as the original motion on which the power of the Committee rests, reads as follows:

"That the matter of selecting an Editor be left to the Committee on Publication with power to act, subject to the approval of the Council." (Journ. A. Ph. A., 1914, 1397).

It should be noted that *the Council has no power in the matter of selecting an Editor except to ratify the action of the Committee on Publication since the Committee was made the legal agent of the Council with special power conferred upon it.*

In my judgment, the Packard motion to elect Mr. Marshall Editor is clearly out of order, parliamentarily; the nomination or recommendation should have been submitted to the Committee on Publication, and then, if approved by the Committee, acted upon by the Council, in accordance with the decision of the Detroit Convention.

The Committee on Publication would be entirely justified in standing on its rights in this matter, but it is, apparently, willing to waive them and give Mr. Marshall his "day in court," if the issue can be settled quickly by the Council. There has been already too much delay and dilatory tactics. The present condition of unsettled affairs cannot be maintained without injury to the Association, and the sooner Prof. Eberle is elected Editor of the Journal the better.

If Mr. Marshall succeeds, however, in influencing a sufficient number of the Council members to reject the vote of the Committee on Publication, then the Council will be in the position of discrediting a Committee especially ordered to nominate an Editor; and such action will discredit, not only the Council and the Association, but also, the whole work of Eugene G. Eberle, who has served the A. Ph. A. so ably as President, and as Chairman of the Council since 1912. This work has been done without pay and at much personal sacrifice. Further, as Editor of the Southern Pharmaceutical Journal he will be placed in a most embarrassing position. He would be thoroughly justified to protect his own honor by sending in his own resignation as a member of the A. Ph. A.

I earnestly trust that the Council will vote down the Packard-LaPierre motion.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK T. GORDON.

Do you favor the motion that E. C. Marshall be elected Editor of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as made by C. Herbert Packard, and sec-

onded by Elic H. LaPierre. This will be regarded as *Motion No. 30 (Election of E. C. Marshall as Editor of the Journal)*.

J. W. ENGLAND,

Secretary of the Council.

415 N. Thirty-third Street.



COUNCIL LETTER No. 18.

Philadelphia, Pa., March 4, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

Motion No. 30 (Election of E. C. Marshall as Editor of the Journal), a substitute motion for the Mayo-Engelhardt motion of January 6, has not been carried.

The results of the vote on this motion are as follows:

Yes—Messrs. Packard, LaPierre and White—3.

No—Messrs. Beringer, C. E. Carpari, Claus, Day, Diehl, Engelhardt, England, Fennel, Gietner, Godbold, Godding, Gordon, Hensel, Hilton, Hopp, McElhenie, Osseward, Rogers, Sayre, Seltzer, Stewart, Whelpley, Wilkerson and Wulling—24

Not voting—Messrs. Eberle, Alpers, C. Caspari, Jr., Clat., Freericks, Havenhill, Hynson, Kauffman, Koch, Mayo, Schafer, Schneider, Thiesing and Wilbert—14.

The vote will now be taken on the motion of C. A. Mayo, seconded by H. Engelhardt, of January 6, which is as follows:

Motion No. 31 (Election of E. G. Eberle as Editor of the Journal). Moved by C. A. Mayo, seconded by H. Engelhardt, that the action of the Committee on Publication in the selection of Eugene G. Eberle as Editor and Advertising Manager of the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as reported in Council Letter No. 13, be ratified by the Council.

The following communication has been received:

Dallas, Texas, February 26, 1915.

To the Members of the Council, A. Ph. A.:

It was my intention to maintain silence in the matter of electing an Editor of the Journal, and while I now deem it necessary to write, I will be very brief.

I desire every member to act, without prejudice or personal favoritism, that is, only in the interest of our Association. I have not nor will I be offended by any action any member may take, my desire is intense that the best interests of the Association should be kept in mind—to this end only, I plead with you.

I have never sought office in the Association nor asked any one to vote for me, unless yielding to the request, my application for the position of Editor be so considered.

I have never made a sacrifice for the Association that I regret, and this applies to the present situation, nor will I take exception to any action the Association may take regarding myself.

I hope no one will be influenced by personal favor or prejudice. If these few lines have had such effect, forget them, let us all work for whatever promotes harmony and tends to enhance the value of our own association, for its members and pharmacy in general. So far as I am concerned, change of mind, amendments and substitute motions give no offense, and your action will not offend me.

It would be a source of keenest regret to have any one say justly that I had directly or indirectly been hurtful to the Association or that by word I might have prevented dissension and injury. Sincerely yours,

E. G. EBERLE.

J. W. ENGLAND,

Secretary of the Council.

415 N. Thirty-third Street.



COUNCIL LETTER No. 19.

Philadelphia, Pa., March 16, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

Motion No. 29 (Election of Members: Applications Nos. 76 to 87 inclusive) has received a majority of affirmative votes.

In re *Motion No. 30*, Frank H. Freericks writes:

"Please find herewith my vote on *Motion No. 30*, which I would ask to briefly explain: In voting "No" I do not in any manner mean to reflect upon the ability of the Acting Editor, and I would even say, that in so far as I have been able to judge the work of the Acting Editor as evidenced by the Journal issued under his direction, has been good. However, it has been my understanding right along that the Publication Committee was charged with the duty of selecting the most suitable man for the permanent Editorship, and believing the Publication Committee as a whole to be best fitted to decide upon the most suitable man, I would regard it to be distinctly wrong on my part to vote contrary to their decision and recommendation."

C. Herbert Packard writes:

"March 6, 1915.

Mr. Joseph W. England, Secretary of the Council, American Pharmaceutical Association:

Dear Mr. England—I have received Council Letter No. 18 and note that my motion has lost by a great majority.

My loyalty to Mr. Marshall was due not only to a strong friendship but a belief in his ability. We of the East, Mr. Marshall's home, know him better than members of other sections and, in working for him, believed his election would not only be advantageous to him but to the Association as well. We have witnessed his work and have known of his capabilities for years.

It is now my desire, having lost after a

fair statement, to have Motion No. 31 carried unanimously for the election of Professor Eberle.

I believe I can say for Professor LaPierre, as well as for myself, that it is our earnest wish that perfect harmony and good feeling shall exist and all members of the Council work with one thought,—the best interests of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

With highest regards to you and all our members, I am, Yours very truly,

C. HERBERT PACKARD."

Motion No. 31 (Election of E. G. Eberle as Editor of the Journal, etc.) has been carried.

The results of the vote on this motion are as follows:

Ycs—Messrs. Alpers, Beringer, C. E. Caspari, Clark, Claus, Day, Diehl, Engelhardt, England, Fennel, Freericks, Gietner, Godbold, Godding, Gordon, Havenhill, Hensel, Hilton, Hopp, Koch, LaPierre, McElhenie, Osseward, Packard, Rogers, Sayre, Schafer, Seltzer, Stewart, Whelpley, White, Wilbert, Wilkerson and Wulling—34.

No—Mr. Hynson—1.

Not Voting—Messrs. Eberle, Mayo, C. Caspari, Jr., Kauffman, Thiesing and Schneider—6.

Relative to Motion No. 31, H. P. Hynson writes as follows:

"In voting 'No' on Motion 31, I would like it to be placed on record that I do so, because I think the adoption of this motion would be unsound from a business standpoint and would entail imprudent obligations upon the Association, by accepting personal sacrifices from Mr. Eberle, which are not justified and which, in all probability, will be, finally, embarrassing to the Association.

I neither vote for or against Mr. Eberle, personally, nor for or against his abilities. I am, however, fully convinced that a much younger man should be selected as editor of the Journal, one who may develop with the publication and continue useful to the Association for a greater number of years than can possibly be Mr. Eberle's good fortune."

John G. Godding writes as follows:

"General Secretary Day referred to the Chairman of the Centennial Fund the application of Prof. Edw. Kremers for \$100 from the fund, the amount to be used in connection with his work on the cultivation of medicinal plants and such related subjects as the curing of cultivated and wild plants.

The application has been approved by the

Committee on Centennial Fund with the understanding, if granted by the Council, it is to be handled as other appropriations made by the Council."

The above application for appropriation has been approved by the Committee on Finance.

Motion No. 32 (Appropriation of \$100 from Centennial Fund for Research Work on Medicinal Plants, etc.) Moved by W. B. Day, seconded by J. G. Godding, that \$100 be appropriated from the Centennial Fund to Prof. Edw. Kremers for research work on medicinal plants and cultivated and wild plants.

Motion No. 33 (Applications for Membership). You are requested to vote on the following applications for membership:

No. 88. Irvin Simpson Zeluff, 75 Barrow St., New York, N. Y., rec. by Romaine Pierson and Frank L. McCartney.

No. 89. William S. Smetana, 916 Excelsior Ave., Hopkins, Minn., rec. by John F. Danck and Edw. L. Newcomb.

No. 90. Charles Edgar McConkey, Etowah, Tennessee, rec. by J. O. Burge and Wm. B. Day.

No. 91. James David Fields, Lewis Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., rec. by C. W. Johnson and Edith Hindman.

No. 92. Forrest Omo Snyder, 423 W. 60th St., Chicago, Ill., rec. by Wm. B. Day and E. N. Gathercoal.

No. 93. Frank E. Bogart, 15 Larned St., E., Detroit, Mich., rec. by Wm. A. Hall and N. H. Jones.

No. 94. Emile Frederick Krapf, 1068 Steuben St., Pittsburgh, Pa., rec. by J. A. Koch and John H. Wurdach.

No. 95. Carl Julius Goltz, P. O. Box 1273, Havana, Cuba, rec. by Jose P. Alacan and Jose Guillermo Diaz.

No. 96. Cornelius Wm. Dore, 119 Martin Ave., San Jose, Cal., rec. by J. G. Munson and N. A. Pellerame.

No. 97. John Harper Long, 2421 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill., rec. by C. W. Patterson and M. A. Miner.

No. 98. Omar Harwell Whittington, Van Buren, Arkansas, rec. by J. H. Beal and W. B. Day.

No. 99. Milton P. Givens, Jr., 425 Franklin St., Denver, Col., rec. by W. A. Hover and F. W. Nitardy.

No. 100. Ray David Dame, Stratton, Nebraska, rec. by H. C. Newton and I. Curtis Arledge (nomination for membership and 1915 dues awarded by Professor H. C. Newton in recognition of excellent work at Creighton College of Pharmacy).

No. 101. John Philip Schaupner, 399 Linwood Ave., Detroit, Mich., rec. by N. H. Jones and A. A. Wheeler.

J. W. ENGLAND,
Secretary of the Council.

415 N. Thirty-third Street.