

COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. PH. A. COUNCIL LETTER NO. 10.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., November 23, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

GENTLEMEN:

As stated in Council Letter No. 9 (p. 24), Frank H. Freericks has raised the question that *Motion No. 18 (referring N. A. R. D. Resolutions in Council Letter No. 14 to Committee on National Formulary)* is out of order.

Chairman Eberle rules that: "Motion No. 18 is in order, the reference can be made with or without recommendation of the Council, or the Council could deal with the question itself without referring it. The construction of standards for whisky and brandy *may be* scientific matter, but the question of including standards for these articles in the National Formulary is one of general policy with which the Council has a perfect right to deal."

Since Motion No. 18 is in order, it should be stated that the motion has received a majority of affirmative votes.

Mr. Freericks now raises the technical plea that Motion No. 18 and his motion (Council Letter No. 5) are entirely independent—that his motion presents for action by the Council, as coming independently from one of its members, a set of resolutions which happen to be the same as those offered by the N. A. R. D. Mr. Freericks moves that:

"I move that the four separate resolutions as submitted by the National Association of Retail Druggists be also adopted by the Council, substituting the name of the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association for that of the National Association of Retail Druggists. Of course this includes the one pertaining to denatured alcohol."

This motion has been duly seconded by C. T. P. Fennel and will be known as *Motion No. 23 (Adoption of Substituted N. A. R. D. Resolutions)*.

A vote will be taken in two weeks from date on this motion.

Mr. Freericks has sent the following letters, both under date of November 20:

"Yours of the 18th inst. is just to hand, wherein you advise me that Chairman Eberle has held Motion No. 18 to be in order. I

immediately wired you the following letter-gram in answer:

"Upon reflection must agree that Motion No. 18 was in order, since in substance a motion to refer, only the reasons given for making it were objectionable; but they cannot control submission, however, as pointed out Thursday. My motion in Council Letter No. 5 is independent, and respectfully urge its immediate submission."

"As stated in the lettergram, the reasons given for Motion No. 18 were not in order and could not control. For the moment I overlooked that there need be no reason at all underlying a motion to refer, and consequently an insufficient reason can be in no worse position than no reason at all.

"I trust that in my lettergram and letter of Thursday I made clear that my motion offering for adoption certain resolutions as they appear in Council Letter No. 5 was an entirely independent motion, asking the independent action of Council on said resolutions, which I chose to make my own when offering them, though they had been submitted by the N. A. R. D. in the first place. As matters now stand, Motion No. 18 simply means to refer the resolutions submitted by the N. A. R. D. without any action to the Committee on National Formulary. My motion, now duly seconded, presents for independent action on the part of the Council the exact same resolutions which were submitted by the N. A. R. D., but they are not before the Council as the resolutions of the N. A. R. D., but are before it as resolutions offered by me for independent adoption by the Council."

"Your special delivery letter of the 19th inst. reaches me after I again wired you this morning, and after dictating the enclosed other letter. I did not misunderstand the Caspari-Stewart motion, and fully have in mind that it meant to refer the N. A. R. D. Resolutions to the Committee on National Formulary without action on the part of Council. The point I make is that the Caspari-Stewart motion merely undertakes to refer the N. A. R. D. Resolutions as such; it did not undertake to include anything which I had submitted, and, in fact, could not do so,

if I understand correctly, because my motion was not yet before the Council, since at that time it had not been seconded. However, if the Caspari-Stewart motion be adopted it would not preclude me as a member of Council from offering the exact same resolutions as were offered by the N. A. R. D.; in the one instance they would be the N. A. R. D. Resolutions, and in the other instance they would be my resolutions. The Council may for reasons of its own refer resolutions presented by the N. A. R. D. without taking any action, while it may at the same time decide to act upon resolutions presented by me which contain the self-same wording. That the subject-matter of the resolutions offered by me is properly for consideration by the Council is made plain in the ruling of Chairman Eberle on my point of order with reference to Motion No. 18. The Chair there rules, 'The question for including standards for these articles in the National Formulary is one of general policy with which the Council has a perfect right to deal.' Of course, I realize my position is exceedingly technical, but in this instance it serves my good purpose to be technical, though I prefer much not to be driven to the use of technicalities. Again, to sum up my position:

"First.—In Council Letter No. 5 I submitted certain resolutions, and moved their adoption by the Council. Said resolutions contained the same matter as was contained in resolutions offered by the N. A. R. D., but they were not the N. A. R. D. Resolutions, because they were expressly offered as the resolutions of the Council of the A. Ph. A.

"Second.—In Council Letter No. 8 appears the Caspari-Stewart motion to refer the N. A. R. D. Resolutions to the Committee on National Formulary. This motion was not to refer the resolutions offered by me for adoption by the Council, but was to refer the N. A. R. D. Resolutions. The motion could not be to refer the resolutions offered by me, because, not having been seconded, they were not then before Council.

"Third.—Since making the motion that the resolutions as offered by me be adopted, and after the Caspari-Stewart motion to refer the N. A. R. D. Resolutions, there has been a second for my motion to adopt the resolutions offered by me, and consequently my motion should now properly be submitted.

"Fourth.—While the motion offered by me embodies the exact same resolutions as were

offered by the N. A. R. D., yet they are not the N. A. R. D. Resolutions, and the Caspari-Stewart motion was expressly restricted to refer the N. A. R. D. Resolutions. While, for reasons sufficient to it, the Council may see fit to refer without action a certain set of resolutions when offered by the N. A. R. D., they may also see fit at the same time to act upon the self-same resolutions when they are offered by one of its members.

"Am truly sorry that I have to be guilty of finding refuge behind technicalities in this matter, but, in my humble judgment, it will be very wrong not to take action on the important matter which is involved in this entire question."

Motion No. 24 (Approval of Preamble and Resolution of Scientific Section in re Closer Coöperation between Educational, Manufacturing, and Banking Interests). Moved by Dr. F. E. Stewart, seconded by G. M. Beringer, that the preamble and resolution adopted by the Scientific Section at the San Francisco meeting, looking towards a closer coöperation between educational, manufacturing, and banking interests as reported in Council Letter No. 9 (p. 31), be approved by the Council.

In this connection a communication from Dr. F. E. Stewart, chairman of the Committee on Patents and Trade-marks, is of interest. It is as follows:

"I read with much interest the resolution offered by Dr. A. R. L. Dohme at the San Francisco meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association which appears on page 31 of the Council Letter No. 9.

"I agree with Dr. Dohme that it is generally admitted, at least by all students on the subject, that the commercial progress in Germany during the past two decades has been the result of a hearty and complete coöperation between the scientific and individual organizations of that country; also, that good financiers and business men concede that the application of science to the practice of the factory will produce similar results in this country. I agree with him that by applying the scientific training represented by our universities to practical use in our industries it will certainly result in great strides in our commercial growth.

"I also agree with the statement that the factories and the universities in America have stood aloof from one another, to the disadvantage of both, and I am in harmony with his resolution, which suggests calling a special

meeting of representatives of the leading institutions of learning and of leading large manufacturing interests of the country, together with representatives of the leading banking interests, for the purpose of considering ways and means of generating and fostering a spirit of closer coöperation between them.

"One of the questions that such a body would have to consider would be the reason why the factories and universities in this country stand aloof from each other, or, more properly, why the universities stand aloof from factories. As I have devoted almost a lifetime to the study of this problem, and have talked with university men in various parts of the United States for many years past on this important subject; as I am chairman of the Committee on Patents and Trade-marks of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and as the object of the patent law is to promote progress in science and useful arts, I desire to call the attention of the Council to one of the reasons why the universities and factories of Germany coöperate, while the universities of America stand aloof from the commercial houses.

"Medicines and chemical products are excluded from patent protection in Germany, as they are also in France, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Japan, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Portugal, Russia, and a number of other foreign countries. Consequently, the universities and other educational institutions are in position to impartially discuss new medicines and new chemical products, which they could not do if the products were commercially controlled and undergoing commercial introduction by advertising.

"In all the foreign countries referred to, exclusion from protection of inventions relating to medicines or foods does not generally extend to those relating to processes or apparatus for their manufacture. In all foreign countries which exclude chemical products from protection, except Switzerland, inventions relating to chemical processes may be patented, and in nearly all such countries it is expressly provided by law that a patent for a chemical process by which a new chemical product is made shall in effect cover such product, unless it be shown that such product was made, in fact, by some other process. In other words, when a new product is discovered, and a process of manufacture is patented, no person is per-

mitted to compete with the original patentee until he is able to show that the process he is to employ for that purpose is not an infringement upon the patented process. The object of this proviso is, of course, perfectly apparent.

"I find that the medical scientists connected with our universities in this country are divided into at least two general classes; namely, those who take the same position as that of Lord Camden in his celebrated speech in opposition to copyrights, occurring in what is known as the 'Copyright War,' in Europe, about a century ago; namely:

"'Glory is the reward of science, and those who serve it scorn all meaner views. . . . It was not for gold that Milton, Bacon, Newton, and Locke instructed and delighted the world. When a book-seller offered Milton five pounds for his "Paradise Lost" he did not reject it and commit his poem to the flames, nor did he accept the miserable pittance as the reward of his labor; he knew that the real price of his work was immortality, and that posterity would pay it.'

"Medical scientists who take this position hold themselves aloof from anything that has to do with commerce in *materia medica*. They claim that they are working for 'pure science,' and that any coöperation with commercial interests on their part would destroy their judicial position, and, consciously or unconsciously, they would become mere advocates.

"The other class of medical scientists agree with Terrill, who, in his treatise on patent laws, says:

"'The theory upon which these laws rest is that it is to the interest of the community that persons should be induced to devote their time, energies, and resources to original investigation for the furtherance of science, the arts, and manufactures. This was recognized from the earliest periods which can pretend to be described as civilized. It is to the advantage of the whole community that authors and inventors should be rewarded, and no measure of reward can be conceived more just and equitable and bearing a closer relation to the benefit conferred by the particular individual than to grant him the sole right to his writing or discovery for a limited period of time.'

"This class of medical scientists would be glad to coöperate with the laboratory work-

ers of the great commercial houses engaged in the chemical and pharmaco-chemical industries, provided the individuals, firms, and corporations engaged in these industries would conform to professional and scientific requirement in relation to the practice of these vocations and introduction of new materia medica products to science, and brands of the same to commerce.

"Professional and scientific requirements demand that the source or genesis, physical, chemical, physiological, and therapeutic properties, methods of preparation, standardization and uses of all medicinal drugs and chemicals, used for the prevention of disease and healing of the sick, shall be published, scientifically classified, and protected by a changeless nomenclature. Scientific and professional requirements also demand that this knowledge shall be impartially discussed and officially verified by competent observers; that the same shall be taught in the medical and pharmaceutical schools and embodied in scientific literature, including pharmacopœias, dispensatories, and text-books, which shall teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

"Scientific and professional requirements also demand that the practice of medicine and pharmacy shall be conducted by persons properly educated, trained, and licensed by Boards of Examiners.

"It is evident that conformance with these scientific and professional requirements is positively necessary to secure coöperation between professional and scientific bodies on the one side and commercial bodies on the other. It is also evident that under such a system of coöperation new materia medica products can be introduced to science and brands of the same to commerce simultaneously through the professional channels of the medical and pharmaceutical societies and press, and the laboratories of the great commercial houses.

"It is also evident that so long as products themselves are commercially controlled and introduced by advertising such coöperation can never be secured. Commercially-controlled products cannot be freely or impartially discussed in the medical and pharmaceutical journals during the time they are being introduced to commerce by advertising, because those engaged in their manufacture and sale are opposed to the publication of

anything in the journals that might injure the sale of their controlled products.

"Germany and most other foreign countries have realized this fact and its bearings upon medical and pharmaceutical science and education, and also upon the practice of medicine and pharmacy, and have consistently excluded from patent protection medicines, chemical products, and foods.

"I am sure that I am voicing the sentiment of our Committee on Patents and Trademarks when I say that one of the first subjects for such a committee as that proposed by the resolution of Dr. Dohme to consider should be that of materia medica monopoly, as related to our copyright, patent, and trademark laws, for unless the educational institutions can be protected from the dangers of commercial exploitation, on the one hand, and capital invested in original investigation by the manufacturer engaged in the chemical and pharmaco-chemical industries, on the other, there can be no coöperation between professional and commercial interests."

J. W. ENGLAND,
Secretary of the Council.

415 N. 33rd St., Philadelphia, Pa.

A. PH. A. COUNCIL LETTER NO. 11.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., November 29, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

GENTLEMEN:

Motions No. 21 (Presentation of Proceedings to Denver Branch) and No. 22 (Additional Appropriation of \$100 for Printing, Postage, and Stationery) have each received a majority of affirmative votes.

Treasurer H. M. Whelpley writes (November 25, 1915) that: "Please send this statement out as a part of the next Council letter. When published in the Journal it will be convenient for reference by the entire membership."

The statement is as follows:

A. Ph. A. Income from Annual Dues.

Payments made for each fiscal year from 1900 to 1916 inclusive.

Compiled from the reports of Treasurer S. A. D. Sheppard for 1900-1908 and Treasurer H. M. Whelpley, 1909-1916.

The receipt of the annual dues during a fiscal year is influenced by the success of the treasurer in collecting delinquent dues, current dues, and the manner in which members pay dues in advance (for the next fiscal

year). The amount of money received for dues in 1912 (Journal A. Ph. A., 1913, p. 1051) was comparatively large, because the fiscal year had just been changed to run even with the calendar year. The treasurer took advantage of the opportunity of collecting at one time \$2.50 for the last six months of 1912 and also \$5 for the fiscal year 1913. This saved postage and secured some payments that otherwise would have been lost.

The payment of dues for each fiscal year gives a comparative record of the actual supporting membership and demonstrates the fluctuations in the same.

The number of members paying for each year shows a general increase during the past fifteen years. In spite of the general business depression in this country, more members have paid dues for 1913, 1914, and 1915 than for any previous three years in the history of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Fiscal year	Amount of dues paid for the year
1900 (July, 1900-June, 1901)	\$4970.00
1901 (July, 1901-June, 1902)	5125.00
1902 (July, 1902-June, 1903)	5925.00
1903 (July, 1903-June, 1904)	6300.00
1904 (July, 1904-June, 1905)	6445.00
1905 (July, 1905-June, 1906)	7415.00
1906 (July, 1906-June, 1907)	7485.00
1907 (July, 1907-June, 1908)	8305.00
1908 (July, 1908-June, 1909)	8590.00

H. M. Whelpley was elected treasurer September 11, 1908.

Fiscal year	Amount of dues paid for the year
1909 (July, 1909-June, 1910)	\$9435.00
1910 (July, 1910-June, 1911)	9760.00
1911 (July, 1911-June, 1912)	9390.00
1912 (Jan., 1912-Dec., 1912)	\$1350.00
Dues only	28.50
	<u>\$1378.50</u>

The fiscal year was changed to run even with the calendar year.

1912 (July, 1912-Dec., 1912)	\$ 4137.50
1913 (Jan., 1913-Dec., 1913)	\$10760.00
Dues only	59.25
	<u>10819.25</u>
1914 (Jan., 1914-Dec., 1914)	10497.00
Dues only	24.00
	<u>\$10521.50</u>
1915 (Jan., 1915-Dec., 1915)	\$10265.00
Dues only	52.00
Miscellaneous dues	9.25
	<u>\$10326.25</u>
1916 (Jan., 1916-Dec., 1916)	880.00
Total	<u>\$127 208.00</u>

"Dues only" members do not pay for the Journal.

"Miscellaneous dues" were received from members who paid up to the month they resigned.

H. M. WHELPLEY, Treasurer.
St. Louis, Mo., November 24, 1915.

It may be added that the Treasurer's statement gives the income from the annual dues only; it does not include the income from other sources, such as National Formulary, Proceedings, Journal advertising, subscriptions, etc. In 1913 and 1914 the income from such sources was over \$6700 yearly.

Under date of November 26, 1915, the following communication had been received from Frank H. Freericks:

"Pertaining to Council Letter No. 10, and to my motion with reference to the deletion of brandy and whisky to be known as Motion No. 23: Am particularly grateful that a vote on this matter has been deferred by the secretary for two weeks. Just a word about the apparent contradiction which might be found in now adopting resolution offered by me, when the self-same resolutions coming to Council from another association have been referred without action thereon. It is plain that the resolutions as offered by me, and kindly seconded by Professor Fennel, will for all practical purposes appear as a reconsideration of the earlier action to refer, and I would ask all who are interested to look at it in that light. May I add that if two weeks' time had been given before calling a vote on the motion to refer, that then there is just a slight possibility that such motion would not have carried.

"Now very briefly as to the merits of the question: Brandy and whisky are substances of very frequent legitimate medical use. They have been recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia for many years. Such substances, or substances of a similar character and virtue, have been recognized by the pharmacopœias of most all, if not all, of the enlightened nations.

"Because of the tendency in our country toward a laughable narrowness concerning the legitimate use of such articles there is more and greater reason for their recognition here than anywhere else, and while I cannot speak from experience, I have very great doubt as to the quality of brandy and whisky which floats about in so-called Prohibition States. It is inconceivable that a body of intelligent men, having first decided that brandy and whisky should be recognized as heretofore, then turn about and decide upon their deletion, on the ground that they cannot agree upon a standard. Why should it be more difficult to agree upon a standard for them than it is to agree upon a standard for any

other article regarding which there may be difference of opinion? Why should the Revision Committee of the Pharmacopœia and all honorable pharmacists of this country, who each of them is interested and in a measure responsible, be made the laughing stock of future generations, as having agreed or submitted to the deletion of these articles, when their legitimate use as medicines is at least fully in keeping with any other substance that is recognized, and only because it is made to appear that such will serve the cause of Prohibition?

"Since a course has been decided upon by a national representative body of retail druggists, which, at least in a measure, will tend to save pharmacy and pharmacists from ridicule, it seems but proper that, having failed to initiate a course of our own, we should at least give support to the other, all of which may still result in an even more satisfactory solution of the entire difficulty."

Under date of November 27, 1915, the following communication has been received from George M. Beringer:

"I am advised that at San Francisco the Council decided to expunge from the minutes the discussions relating to the discontinuation of Prof. C. Lewis Diehl as Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy.

"Since that meeting there has been considerable correspondence and discussion in the Council relating to the election of Professor Diehl as Reporter Emeritus, and I am constrained to believe that we should now take an action similar to that taken at San Francisco. My regard for Prof. C. Lewis Diehl is such that I would not want to see his feelings hurt in the least degree, nor anything be published that might, at any time, be misunderstood.

"I believe that the best interests of the Association will be served and our regard for our former Reporter demonstrated if we leave in the published records only the record of the motions that have been adopted, without the comments or preliminary actions proposed.

"I will, therefore move that there be stricken from the minutes of the Council all reference to the discussions on this subject, and that there be retained simply a record of the motions made thereon and adopted."

The above motion is seconded by C. H. La Wall and will be regarded as *Motion No. 25 (Expunging Discussion on Discontinuance of*

Prof. C. Lewis Diehl as Reporter on the Progress of Pharmacy from Published Minutes in Journal).

Motion No. 26 (Expunging Discussion from Minutes Published in Journal on Financial Affairs of the Association). Moved by Dr. F. E. Stewart, seconded by C. H. LaWall, that all references to the financial affairs of the Association as given in the Council letters since the annual meeting at San Francisco in August, 1915, be expunged from the minutes of the Council, when published in the Journal, except the motions.

Motion No. 27 (Election of Members). You are requested to vote on the following applications for membership:

- No. 22. Arthur Dussault, 268 Lisbon St., Lewiston, Me., rec. by M. L. Porter and J. W. England.
- No. 23. Albert Falkenhainer, Algona, Iowa, rec. by G. Scherling and William B. Day.
- No. 24. Fred Orville Blaylock, 1027 Mississippi St., Lawrence, Kan., rec. by L. D. Havenhill and G. N. Watson.
- No. 25. Charles Joseph Innocent Charles, Cash and Sixth Sts., Colon, Republic of Panama, rec. by Anna G. Bagley and William B. Day.
- No. 26. Robert Gordon Watson, 1103 Cook St., Denver, Col., rec. by W. T. Hover and F. W. Nitardy.
- No. 27. James S. Potter, 138 Maple St., Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., rec. by Otto Raubenheimer and E. E. Wyckoff.
- No. 28. Boris Boxer, 1412 Washington Ave., New York City, N. Y., rec. by Jacob Diner and Gustave Horstmann.
- No. 29. Frederick G. Dillemath, M.D., 411 East 153rd St., New York City, N. Y., rec. by Jacob Diner and Gustave Horstmann.
- No. 30. Philip Eichler, M.D., 1787 Washington Ave., Bronx, New York City, N. Y., rec. by Jacob Diner and Gustave Horstmann.
- No. 31. Lurayne E. Kline, 703 East Thirteenth St., Indianapolis, Ind., rec. by Paul S. Pittenger and J. H. Beal.
- No. 32. William H. Arndt, 4624 Fifth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y., rec. by William C. Anderson and Jacob H. Rehfuß.

J. W. ENGLAND,

Secretary of the Council.

415 N. 33rd St., Philadelphia, Pa.

A. PH. A. COUNCIL LETTER NO. 12.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., December 6, 1915.

To the Members of the Council:

GENTLEMEN:

Motion No. 24 (Approval of Preamble and Resolution of Scientific Section in re Closer Coöperation between Educational, Manufacturing, and Banking Interests) has received a majority of affirmative votes.

Two weeks having elapsed since the submission of Motions Nos. 19 and 20 (Council Letter No. 9, p. 30), a final vote is now called for, the provisional vote having been taken on November 16. A voting card is enclosed for those who have not voted or wish to change their vote.

The following communication has been received from Frederick J. Wulling:

"Council Letter No. 9: Professor Fennel's contention that the Branches should hold meetings more frequently, etc., is, on the whole, proper. I would like the suggestion embodied in his motion discussed in the light of practicability and the association rules, and possibly a less drastic requirement could be agreed upon.

"Concerning Motion No. 19, I am not certain, but believe a motion such as this should originate in a general session of the Association. This should be determined before asking the general membership for expression. The replies, too, might swamp the Journal.

"I would not object to Motion No. 20 if the special committee of five were omitted. Otherwise, I vote in the negative, because I have no evidence that the services of the Finance Committee have been or are unsatisfactory.

"If the custodian of the Proceedings approves Motion No. 21, I vote 'Yes.'

"Record my affirmative vote on Motion No. 22.

"Concerning the Scientific Section resolutions referred to by Dr. Dohme and Editor Eberle, I would like to talk the matter over with our president before writing further. Personally, I favor both resolutions—at this writing, at least."

The following communication has been received:

COMMITTEE OF REVISION

of the

PHARMACOPŒIA OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., December 4, 1915.

To the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

GENTLEMEN:

I have been requested by the Acting Chairman of the National Formulary Committee, Professor Scoville, to state to the Council the reasons for deleting whisky and brandy from the new Pharmacopœia. The action was taken after many months' consideration and debate. It would take a long time and much space to review all of the arguments. Forty members of the Committee of Revision out of the whole number (fifty) are members of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and they voted upon the question of deletion. In the Committee of Revision there are twenty-two members who have been retail druggists, and some are still active in the retail drug business; the views of retail druggists were ably presented. For these reasons it would seem proper for the undersigned to make a brief statement.

Spiritus Frumenti and Spiritus Vini Gallici, as we all know, are official in the present Eighth Revision of the United States Pharmacopœia. These standards were rendered inoperative by the act of President Taft, whose decision as to "What is whisky?" overruled the standards of the U. S. P. and admitted what are called "blends," while the present U. S. P. standards declare for "Straight whisky." President Roosevelt decided that the U. S. P. VIII standards were right, and they were approved by him. President Taft reversed the decision of President Roosevelt, and, as the question stands to-day, the U. S. P. standards are null and void.

It will thus be seen that if the President of the United States can rule out the standards for two articles in the U. S. P., why could he not rule out ten, fifteen, or twenty others if he was so disposed? What would be the use of retaining two articles in the Pharmacopœia, knowing that they would not be accepted by the Government? The establishment of a precedent for a book of standards is an important consideration from a legal point of view. The deletion of whisky and brandy from the Pharmacopœia does not interfere in any way with the sale of whisky throughout the United States. The laws of the United States and of the various States which govern primarily are not based in any way on the retention or deletion of whisky in the United States Pharmacopœia.

The Committee of Revision, I am sure, viewed this question from its technical point of view, and was nearly divided upon the question of retaining the standard for straight whisky. Others wanted a standard

which would not exclude "blends" or various standards now in the Pharmacopœia. The N. A. R. D., of course, had a perfect right to question the judgment of the Committee of Revision and ask for a reconsideration. The third resolution of the N. A. R. D.—"That we ask the Board of Trustees of the United States Pharmacopœia to investigate fully the rumors which are afloat relative to the action of the Committee on Revision in deleting these two substances"—was undoubtedly passed in the heat of an argument at Minneapolis and without due consideration. If the N. A. R. D. had any definite charges to make of any wrong-doing on the part of the Committee of Revision, they should have been preferred.

On the other hand, the publishing of this resolution hinting at wrong-doing on the part of the Committee of Revision looks very much like vindictiveness. The Chairman of the Revision Committee was visited by the solicitor of the National Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association immediately after the decision of the Committee of Revision. He desired, on the part of his association, to have the decision reversed. The Chairman promised to receive any communication from this association and place it before the Committee of Revision, but no communication has been received and no action was taken. The Chairman informed the solicitor that the vote was final, unless a reconsideration in parliamentary manner was voted upon by the committee.

The Committee of Revision cannot afford to rest under any intimation of wrong-doing based upon "rumors." The undersigned deeply regrets that the hasty passage of the resolutions and subsequent publication throughout the pharmaceutical press should have been made. The Chairman of the Revision Committee is satisfied that no charge of wrong-doing can be sustained, and he is unwilling to believe that the decision to delete whisky and brandy from the Pharmacopœia was based upon anything else but the honest judgment of each member.

Very truly yours,
 JOSEPH P. REMINGTON.

The following communication has been received:

CAMDEN, N. J., November 27, 1915.

To the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

GENTLEMEN:

On behalf of the Committee on Unofficial

Standards, I submit the following supplemental report:

We have adopted monographs covering the following titles and these have been sent to the Editor for publication in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

- Æther Aceticus.
- Calcii Lactophosphas.
- Lithii Salicylas.
- Malvæ Folia.
- Mangani Sulphas.
- Potassii Sulphas.
- Scoparius.

I believe that the above titles complete the list of substances not contained in the United States Pharmacopœia, for which standards will be needed in the National Formulary.

Respectfully submitted,
 GEO. M. BERINGER, Chairman.

The following budget of appropriations for 1916 is submitted by the Committee on Finance:

Proposed Budget of Appropriations for 1916.

Appropriations for general expenses:

No. 1. Salaries.....	\$6150
No. 2. Printing postage and stationery.....	1000
No. 3. Clerical expenses secretary's office.....	416
No. 4. Miscellaneous expenses.....	200
No. 5. Stenographers.....	350
No. 6. Travelling expenses.....	200
No. 7. Committee on Membership.....	250
No. 8. Committee on Unofficial Standards.....	100
No. 9. Year Book.....	2500
No. 10. Premium on treasurer's bond.....	50
No. 11. National Drug Trade Conference.....	100
No. 12. Journals for reporter.....	35
No. 13. Section on Scientific Papers.....	25
No. 14. Section on Education and Legislation.....	25
No. 15. Section on Commercial Interests.....	25
No. 16. Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing.....	25
No. 17. Section on Historical Pharmacy.....	25
No. 18. Women's Section.....	25
No. 19. National Syllabus Committee.....	25
	\$11 526

Appropriations for open accounts:

No. 20. Journal.....	\$5750
No. 21. (a) Publication.....	\$4500
(b) Clerical expenses.....	800
(c) Postage and stationery.....	300
(d) Freight drayage and miscellaneous.....	150
No. 22. National Formulary.....	1000
No. 23. Badges and bars.....	50
No. 24. Certificates.....	50
	6 850
	\$18,376

Do you approve of budget of appropriations for 1916 as above proposed? This will be regarded as *Motion No. 28 (Approval of Budget of Appropriations for 1916)*.

J. W. ENGLAND,
 Secretary of the Council.
 415 N. 33rd St., Philadelpha, Pa.