

SCIENTIFIC SECTION, AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION

MINUTES OF THE SESSIONS.*

FIRST SESSION.

The first session of the Scientific Section was called to order in the Claypool Hotel, Wednesday, August 29, 1917, at 9.30 A.M., by Chairman J. L. Turner, who announced that pressure of work had prevented him from preparing the customary address. The first order of business was the report of the Committee on Research. After discussion, the report was adopted and ordered referred to the Council.

The following were then appointed as Committee on Nominations: W. L. Scoville, F. R. Eldred, Charles E. Caspari.

The following papers were then presented and referred for publication: Biological Products from the Pharmacy Point of View, L. E. Sayre; Magnesium Sulphate—Its Pharmacological and Therapeutic Action, Jacob Diner; Rabies, E. G. Stewart; Vaccine Therapy in the Light of Facts, A. H. Rovin; Biologic Assay Methods of the U. S. P., Paul S. Pittenger; An Improved Apparatus for Testing the Activity of Drugs on the Isolated Uterus, Paul S. Pittenger; The Deterioration of "U. S. P." and "Fat-Free" Tinctures of Digitalis, Paul S. Pittenger and H. K. Mulford, Jr.; Solubility of Phosphatic Kidney Stones, J. F. Geisinger, W. F. Rudd and E. V. Greever; The Significance of Creatinin and Its Colorimetric Determination in Urine, W. F. Gidley; A Separatory Funnel for Ether Extraction, G. D. Beal; The Chemistry of the Heptane Solution, Edward Kremers; Standard Cannabis, W. A. Pearson.

A resolution by Dr. A. B. Lyon urging the revision of the Pharmacopoeial requirements for Cannabis was on motion referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The Committee on Nominations reported nominees for the Section as follows: For Chairman, W. W. Stockberger, L. E. Warren; for First Vice-Chairman, E. V. Howell, G. D. Beal; for Second Vice-Chairman, J. Diner, W. F. Gidley; for Secretary, H. C. Fuller, H. C. Hamilton.

The session then adjourned at 1.00 P.M.

SECOND SESSION.

The second session of the Scientific Section was called to order by Chairman Turner at 9.30 A.M. on Thursday, August 30, 1917.

The following papers were presented: A New Method of Extracting Drugs for Alkaloidal Assaying, W. M. Maske, Jr.; An Improved Method of Assaying Opium, W. M. Maske, Jr.; General Remarks on Solvents in Pharmacy, John Uri Lloyd; Soy Bean Oil, E. V. Howell; Scientific Drug Farming (illustrated with motion pictures), H. C. Fuller; Drug Cultivation (illustrated with lantern slides)

* Papers and discussions thereon are printed apart from the report of the sessions of the Section.

F. A. Miller; Breeding of Medicinal Plants, F. A. Miller; The Cultivation of Henbane, N. R. Mueller; The Estimation of Alcohol, O. C. Haarer.

The next subject was a Symposium on Drug Plant Growing. The discussion was opened by W. W. Stockberger and continued by Edward Kremers, F. A. Miller, H. C. Fuller, R. A. Lyman, J. U. Lloyd, L. E. Sayre and Henry Kraemer.

The meeting then adjourned at 12.30 P.M.

THIRD SESSION.

The third session of the Scientific Section was called to order by Chairman Turner at 9.45 A.M., Friday, August 31, 1917. The Committee on Ebert Prize reported as follows:

To the Scientific Section, A. Ph. A.:

The Committee on Ebert Prize has made a very careful study of the papers presented at the last meeting of the Association and concludes that although quite a number of most excellent and valuable papers were read, none of these seem in the opinion of the Committee, to meet entirely the purposes for which the Ebert Prize Fund was created; namely, an original investigation of a medicinal substance, determining new properties, or for improved methods of determining merit, for the preparation of chemical or pharmacal products. For this reason it is the judgment of the Committee that no award should be made.

The Committee would also call the attention of the Section to the fact that the By-Laws provide that the Ebert prize should be awarded within 6 months after the annual meeting at which the essays are presented. In order that this may be done, it seems to be desirable that the Committee on Ebert Prize should be appointed during the meeting each year rather than later.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) { J. A. KOCH, *Chairman*,
H. ENGELHARDT.

On motion, duly seconded, the report was adopted.

The Report of the Committee on Botanical Nomenclature was then presented by O. A. Farwell. On motion it was ordered that this report be received and referred to the Council.

Moved by H. C. Fuller that a Committee of the Scientific Section be appointed by the Chairman to promote coöperation in matters relative to the cultivation of drugs and to encourage the dissemination of uniform information concerning this subject. Motion adopted. W. W. Stockberger was appointed chairman of this committee, the other members to be named later.

The following papers were then read and referred for publication: Sulphur—Its Production and Use, M. A. Mansbach; Tolu and Sugar Coating in the Disguising of Medicines, Bernard Fantus; Borax and Boric Acid, H. L. Harris; The Analysis of Borax Soaps for the Borax Content, K. F. Ehmman and Joseph Harrison; Tincture of Cantharides (Fourth Paper), W. L. Scoville; The Constituents of Senna Beans, W. L. Scoville; The Microanalysis of Malted Milks, C. W. Ballard; The Relations of the U. S. P. and N. F. to Food Standards, C. W. Ballard; On the Deterioration of Crude Indian Cannabis, C. R. Eckler and F. A. Miller; Apparent Deterioration of Donovan's Solution, Joseph Rosin; Emetidine (Kryptonine) A Study of Its Pharmacology, Howard S. Browne; Permanence of Pepsin Solutions, C. F. Ramsay; The Inversion of Sugar in U. S. P. Syrup, C. W. Lloyd

Plette; Standardization of Digitalis, H. C. Colson, Jr.; Some Color Changes in Solutions Containing Citro-chloride of Iron, W. R. White; The Microchemistry of the Alkaloids of *Datura stramonium*, Chas. O. Lee.

Officers of the Section for the ensuing year were then elected as follows: *Chairman*, W. W. Stockberger; *First Vice-Chairman*, E. V. Howell; *Second Vice-Chairman*, W. F. Gidley; *Secretary*, H. C. Fuller.

A vote of thanks was given the retiring officers of the Section for their work during the year, after which the Section adjourned.

W. W. STOCKBERGER,
Secretary.

BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE PHARMACIST.*

BY L. E. SAYRE.

Pharmacy, like medicine, is extending its boundaries. In the period of a few generations it has passed from the crude drug, through elegant pharmacy—the “Elixir Period”—through the organic-synthetic period, and now has fully entered the biologic period. I shall take the liberty of using the term “biological” in its broadest sense.

It is needless to say, perhaps, that the medical profession regards biological products as constituting one of the most important groups of drugs with which the physician has to deal; this is the language of the volume, endorsed by the American Medical Association, entitled *Useful Drugs*.

The literature relating to this class of agents is extensive and of such a character as to invite the attention of the pharmacist, yet there is a lamentable ignorance of their production, application and of the valuable findings in this field of research. Taking the pharmacist as a class, they are satisfied to know how to cater to the business created by the physician and the manufacturer—to know how to “stock up” in a fair assortment, how to preserve and how to sell them. Since the varieties have become so numerous, this stocking up requires knowledge and judgment, it is true, because there is more or less of an individuality in products. Yet the criticism still remains. We know less than we should, and if we would keep abreast, as pharmacists, with the development of medical practice, it is incumbent that we should be as familiar with this part of our *materia medica* as with other portions. The physiological action of these agents should be known, and, with the relation that some of them have to specific infectious diseases, we should be acquainted. The potency and safety tests employed in their standardization are likewise important. We should at least be as familiar as the detail man who periodically visits the physician. Above all, we should know enough to have confidence in what we dispense as public servants.

This criticism is not made in the spirit of faultfinding; the writer can be censured as well—he, too, has not taken full advantage of the opportunities so available to meet the responsibility. It would be unfair to assume that many druggists would not make the same confession.

* Read before Scientific Section, A. Ph. A., Indianapolis meeting, 1917.