

**THE SECRETARY:** Chairman, C. B. Jordan; for Associates, R. A. Kuever, F. W. Nitardy and C. E. Mollet; for Secretary, W. F. Rudd.

**W. J. TEETERS:** I move that the nominations be closed and that these gentlemen be elected by acclamation.

(The motion was duly seconded and carried.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The meeting stands adjourned until two o'clock this afternoon.

---

**JOINT SESSION OF THE SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION  
WITH THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL  
FACULTIES AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
BOARDS OF PHARMACY.**

The Joint Session of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the Section on Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association was called to order by President Rufus A. Lyman, of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, Friday, August 31, at 2.00 P.M.

The first order of business was the report of the current meeting of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, by Secretary W. J. Teeters, of Iowa. The report follows:

**ABSTRACT OF THE MINUTES OF AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES.**

The eighteenth annual meeting of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties was held in Indianapolis, at the Hotel Claypool, August 27 and 28, 1917.

The presidential address of Professor R. A. Lyman was so inclusive in scope and recommendations that all committee recommendations were, by request, to be considered in connection with it. The committee on the President's address consists of W. C. Anderson, of New York, C. E. Caspari, of Missouri, and C. A. Dye, of Ohio.

The following recommendations were approved by the Conference, or such action taken as indicated in this report.

*Recommendation No. 1.*—That the Conference appoint Dr. Edward Kremers, of the University of Wisconsin, a committee of one, to prepare a brief account of the lives and services of J. O. Schlotterbeck, W. C. Alpers, C. Lewis Diehl, and any others who may have died during the year, and that these accounts be printed in, and be considered a part of the records of the proceedings of the 18th meeting of the Conference, and that the Secretary of the Conference be instructed to notify the respective families of the action which has been taken. Adopted.

*Recommendation No. 2.*—That the Conference instruct the Secretary to take the proper steps before the next annual meeting in order that Article 1, of the Constitution, may be changed to read, "This body shall be known as the American Association of Schools of Pharmacy," and that the constitution and by-laws be modified in conformity with this change. Rejected.

*Recommendation No. 3.*—That the recommendation of the Executive Committee, with reference to committees, as indicated on pages 211 and 212, of the Seventeenth Proceedings, be considered not final, and that the following constitute the permanent standing committees of the Conference:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| No. 1. Committee on Higher Educational Standards.                  | No. 6. Committee on Relations of Pharmacy Schools and Other Professional Schools. |
| No. 2. Committee on Faculties (Classification and Teaching Staff). | No. 7. Committee on Relations of the Colleges with the Boards.                    |
| No. 3. Committee on Curriculum and Teaching Methods.               | No. 8. Committee on Joint Examination Questions.                                  |
| No. 4. Committee on Activities of Students and Alumni.             | No. 9. Committee on Research.   |
| No. 5. Committee on Uniform College Bulletin.                      |   |

*Recommendation No. 4.*—That a four-year high school requirement become binding upon schools of the Conference, September 1, 1920.

This was amended by striking out September 1920, and substituting September 1, 1923, and adopted as amended.

*Recommendation No. 5.*—That it be the sense of the Conference that Mr. Fairchild could render the greatest service to pharmacy by offering the scholarship to a graduate pharmacy student, in order that he might pursue some research problem for one full school year, in the school of his choice; and further, that this scholarship be awarded on the basis of the applicant's scholastic training, his standing as an undergraduate pharmaceutical student and upon his fitness to do research. Approved and referred to joint session.

*Recommendation No. 6.*—That the University of Santo Tomas de Manila be asked to designate someone in this country to act as her official representative at the Conference meetings, in order that we may feel the personal touch of that worthy institution, and that that institution in return may feel in a more direct way the inspiration which comes to an institution as a result of contact with the Conference.

*Recommendation No. 7.*—That the Secretary of the Conference be instructed to write a letter, in the kindest terms, but in a language which cannot be misunderstood, calling attention to what membership in the Conference means, pointing out where certain members have been negligent, and mail such letter to the Dean or Chief Executive Officer of each one of the departments, schools or colleges of pharmacy, and also to the President of each institution of which these pharmacy schools are a part.

*Recommendation No. 8.*—That the Executive Committee be instructed to invite some educator of prominence, who is in sympathy with pharmaceutical ideas, amenable, to meet with and address the Conference upon some problem relative to pharmaceutical education. This was referred to the Executive Committee, with instructions to secure some noted educator for an address each year when possible to do so.

*Recommendation No. 9.*—That the Executive Committee be instructed to study the matter of organization of colleges of pharmacy in the various Conference schools, and wherever it is thought desirable on the part of the school concerned, to offer any suggestions and help which the Conference has at its command.

*Recommendation No. 10.*—That the Executive Committee be instructed to investigate the organization of schools, to determine if there are cases where two schools are paying but one membership fee and the same men are representing two schools maintaining different requirements, and that the Executive Committee report at the next annual meeting.

*Recommendation No. 11.*—That the Executive Committee be instructed to notify a certain Conference school (the name of which the President will give in executive session) that the placing of traveling representatives upon the road is not in keeping with the spirit of the Conference, and that such action will not be tolerated and that an explanation of this college's action must be presented at the next annual meeting. The recommendation was referred to the Executive Committee, with instruction to formulate a rule covering this matter, for later submission to the Conference.

*Recommendation No. 12.*—That the Executive Committee be directed to present this matter to the Carnegie Foundation, and if this Foundation refuses to take it up, to discover some other method of investigating and classifying so as to accomplish a similar result and to report at the next annual meeting.

*Recommendation No. 13.*—That your Committee on Relations of Colleges with Boards be instructed to express the above view as the sentiment of the Conference, and that this Committee, in conjunction with the proper committee of the Boards, be requested to devise or discover a plan which can be developed, that will render justice to all, and that progress in the matter be reported as early as possible. This was disposed of by a motion that a committee of the Conference, in conjunction with the proper committee of the Boards be requested to devise a plan that will render justice to all concerned in the matter of apprenticeship.

*Recommendation No. 14.*—That the Committee on Activities of Students and Alumni be directed to devise a plan for establishing an honorary scholarship fraternity in pharmacy and report the same at the next annual meeting. Approved.

*Recommendation No. 15.*—That it be the sense of the Conference that for the study of pharmacy we should require one year of college work after September 1, 1925, and two years of college work after September 1, 1930, and that this declaration be given wide circulation through the pharmaceutical and lay press and that a special notice of such action be sent to the president of each American university holding membership in the Conference.

Action on this subject was postponed until next year.

The officers elected for the coming year were as follows: *President*, Henry Kraemer, Ann Arbor; *Vice-President*, Charles E. Caspari, St. Louis; *Secretary and Treasurer*, T. J. Bradley, Boston; *Chairman Executive Committee*, J. A. Koch, Pittsburgh; *Members Executive Committee*, R. A. Lyman, Lincoln, and F. J. Wulling, Minneapolis; *Syllabus Committee*, A. Bolenbaugh, Richmond.

Respectfully submitted,

WILBER J. TERTERS, *Secretary*.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The report is open for discussion and corrections, if there are any to be made. I think the report is correct.

The next order of business was the report on the Fairchild Scholarship which follows:

TO THE SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION OF THE A. PH. A., THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES, AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY:

In the report of last year on the Fairchild Scholarship, the President of the American Pharmaceutical Association was named Chairman of that Committee and the other members are: the president of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, the president of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, and the editor of the JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, thus while the individual members of the Committee may change, it is really a permanent committee.

After the last annual meeting, President Frederick J. Wulling suggested to the Committee that the editor of the JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION be named Chairman; this suggestion was favorably acted upon by all the members, with the exception of the editor, who did not vote. The latter consented to accept, provided it met the approval of Mr. Fairchild. President Wulling wrote to Mr. Fairchild and his response was favorable.

The requirements of the candidates for the Fairchild Scholarship were named as follows: That the candidate shall be a graduate from a four-year high school course, that he have four years' drug store experience and pass an examination on questions to be prepared by a committee appointed by the Fairchild Scholarship Committee and that the examination be conducted under the supervision of the dean of a school of pharmacy belonging to the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, the president of the State Board of the State in which the examination was held or these officials might select representatives for the conduct of the examinations. The successful candidates shall have a right to choose the school in which he or she desires to matriculate.

The examination questions relate to elementary chemistry, elementary materia medica, practical pharmacy and prescription reading, and elementary business knowledge. The general scheme was outlined largely according to the rules of the British Fairchild Scholarship.

The Committee decided that the requirements for four-year drug store experience should be changed to two years of such experience and the Chairman was instructed to ask Mr. Fairchild whether he would be willing to have such change made. He answered as follows:

"Yes! it is quite agreeable to me to have the four years' drug store experience changed to two years; but with respect to any section of the plan of your committee please do not regard any wishes of mine as against the majority of the committee.

"I am very glad that it looks now as if the work might progress so that the Scholarship can be made available this year."

The letter is given in full so that Mr. Fairchild's coöperative spirit and interest may be shown evidencing that he desires to aid in every way possible and in accord with the interested bodies.

The Committee therefore proceeded with the preparation of examination questions through the appointment of a Special Committee consisting of Prof. Henry Kraemer, Prof. Wilber J. Teeters, Mr. H. C. Christensen and Mr. John Culley. The questions were prepared and the day set for the examination of candidates, namely, June 25, 1917. While a number of candidates promised to appear, only one actually came up for examination. It should be stated that the time was rather inopportune, the announcement was too late for most school catalogs and during vacation season. In order to make the Scholarship available, if possible, this year, and impossible to award the Scholarship without competition, an adjourned meeting for holding examinations has been called for September 26. It is to be hoped that the Conference and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy will make it possible to have a number of candidates at that time. We are certain that your interest and appreciation of Mr. Fairchild's gift will make the award possible.

As indicated, the plan of award was based on that of the British Fairchild Scholarship, but it is clearly evident if this does not seem practicable in this country, Mr. Fairchild will gladly consent to changes that may be deemed necessary.

The following suggestions have been made:

That the Scholarship be awarded to one who has finished one year in a school of pharmacy belonging to the Conference and successfully passed the prescribed examination.

That instead of proficiency in the subjects now required, the qualifying subjects should be English, arithmetic, physics, physiology, high school chemistry, and botany.

That the qualification be determined, not by the knowledge that the candidate has graduated from a high school course, but by actual test in the subjects regardless of the preliminary training and education.

That the Scholarship be awarded by competitive examination of senior students for post-graduate work.

That instead of the Scholarship being awarded by competition to a candidate regardless of locality in the United States, for the purpose of the award the United States be divided into four sections, the Northeast, the Southeast, the Northwest and the Southwest, and that the award be made the first year to a student of one section, next year to one of another section, until each section has had the opportunity for the Scholarship, and continue the award in this rotation.

It will, of course, be remembered that Mr. Fairchild offered the Scholarship *and we should as nearly as possible conform to his ideas when he first proposed his generous gift.* However, from the correspondence with Mr. Fairchild, it will readily be discerned that he desires to serve the best interests of pharmacy. Your consideration of the matter will therefore be appreciated by the Committee and your report awaited with interest. This year we hope that you will aid in making it possible to award the Scholarship under the rules formulated.

Sincerely,

E. G. EBERLE, *Chairman.*

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The Chair is not certain as to the method of procedure. The report of the Conference of the meeting is before us. One recommendation was made by the President with reference to the Fairchild Scholarship, and now we are discussing this recommendation with the report of Mr. Eberle, Chairman of the Committee on the Fairchild Scholarship.

**E. G. EBERLE:** Nearly all of the letters I have received are favorable to the plan that the Scholarship be awarded to a second-year student instead of one who has not attended a school of pharmacy.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** A motion is in order to receive and refer the report of the Secretary of the Conference for Publication.

**C. A. DYE:** I make such a motion.

(The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.)

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Now, we will take up this special item for consideration.

**ROBERT P. FISCHELIS:** I understood the recommendation of the Conference of the Faculties was to refer this matter to Mr. Eberle, and that he was to make a recommendation.

**E. G. EBERLE:** It should be understood that the Fairchild Scholarship Committee is really not a committee of any one of these bodies, but constituted of members belonging to these organizations. Whatever action is taken can only be recommendatory, if you feel so disposed, and I will be glad to confer with Mr. Fairchild.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The Conference approved the President's recommendation, which simply asks the Conference that this Scholarship should be awarded to a senior student of a college of pharmacy of the Conference; that it should be awarded upon the basis of the applicant's scholastic training in the course of work required while in college and his fitness to do research.

**R. P. Fischelis** moved the adoption of the President's recommendation.

**FREDERICK J. WULLING:** Does the recommendation state the second year, or the senior year?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The senior student.

**FREDERICK J. WULLING:** That would be the graduating year.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The motion was to the effect that this Joint Session go on record as favoring the award of the scholarship to senior students; the Joint Session goes on record as favorable to the report of the President of the Conference.

Motion seconded.

#### ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION.

**CASWELL A. MAYO:** This Scholarship was founded at my request, and after long consultation with Mr. Fairchild. When I conferred with him on the subject, we hit upon the expediency of having the Scholarship open to everyone. While he is perfectly willing to abide by any suggestions made, I always accentuated the fact that such Scholarship might attract a more desirable class of men to pharmacy than formerly. That was the idea in all our discussions. The idea is that there are a good many young men whose plans are indefinite, who might by the offer of a scholarship be induced to enter pharmacy. That is the thought I had at least, and one in which Mr. Fairchild decidedly agreed, of offering the Scholarship to a young man who was not already a student of a school of pharmacy.

There may be good and substantial and sufficient reasons to change. The difficulty we have had this year with the Scholarship indicates that there may be some reasons for changing the method of procedure.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** It seems to be evident from Mr. Fairchild's letter that he is amenable to suggestions, and it is just a matter of how we will gain the most for pharmacy in the awarding of this Scholarship.

**C. A. MAYO:** That has been his attitude from the beginning.

**F. E. STEWART:** I have not heard any reference made to the recommendations made by the Conference that this Scholarship should be awarded to one who has already graduated from our two-year course.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The motion is now before the house, that the Joint Body approve the recommendations of the President of the Conference. We are now talking to that motion.

**E. F. KELLY:** How would you make the examinations fit the curriculum of schools requiring more than two years for graduation?

**EDWARD KREMERS:** I believe that young men will be attracted to pharmacy, not so much from the fact that when they enter pharmacy they have no tuition fee to pay for the first year, as from the possibilities that develop in the future. If we can advance pharmacy, I am sure the better young men and women of this country will want to enter pharmacy.

Just a word with regard to the wording of the resolution. It seems to me it is a trifle unfortunate to say it is to be given to a senior student. That is a subject of dual interpretation.

It may be given to junior students, after completing the first-year course whereby they become seniors for the next year. If we want to stimulate graduate work, then we ought to have that specified. May I make an amendment that graduate be substituted?

R. P. FISCHER: I accept the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The maker of the motion accepts the amendment.

FREDERICK J. WULLING: I understood it was the desire of the donor of the Scholarship that it should go to a young man who has not yet entered school. If it is deemed admissible that the Scholarship be awarded to a graduate, that, I think, would be a very happy solution of our difficulty, provided it meets with the approval of Mr. Fairchild. I have thought right along that we should do what Mr. Fairchild wants us to do in this matter.

CHARLES E. CASPARI: In view of Mr. Fairchild's statement that he preferred to have the Committee settle this rather than consult his wishes in the matter, and in fact, there is only one scholarship, there seems to me no doubt it would do far more good to award it to a graduate in pharmacy rather than to a man not a student in undergraduate work. If we had one scholarship for each college, or more, I would say, let it go to one who has not entered a school, but since we have only one, I think the greater amount of good would be gained by granting the same to some desirable student deserving of it; if any student, a graduate student, rather than an undergraduate. As a member of the Committee on the President's address, it is the recommendation I would make.

CASWELL A. MAYO: I know Mr. Fairchild's view sufficiently to know that he only wishes the Scholarship to be administered in the very best way. I might relate an experience that I personally had, but I do not want it in any way to influence the members. Before entering a school of pharmacy I was a clerk in a drug store at a small salary and was questioning myself as to whether I would remain in pharmacy, when I was awarded the Peter Williamson Scholarship. With this deep feeling of indebtedness to that donor, I took the matter of a like scholarship up with Mr. Fairchild.

H. C. CHRISTENSEN: Inasmuch as the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy took action on this matter only in a recommendatory way, and as I have not made a report on our meeting, I would like to state that the Association went on record as recommending that the Scholarship be awarded on the basis of the second-year work. We did not hear anything of the graduation feature, and it seemed from our previous experience that the idea of awarding the Scholarship simply on high school graduation, that there was not anything to base the competitive examination on.

I agree with what has been said here entirely, that the basis should be graduation. Then there would be something on which to base competitive examination for scholarship, and I believe it would have a tendency to bring about competitive work, and make these applicants look forward to progress in pharmacy. I heartily agree with this proposition.

FREDERICK J. WULLING: Whatever action we take is also the action of the Board, as well as the Conference and this Section of the A. Ph. A., that the candidates for the Scholarship should be graduates of Conference colleges.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is so stated. The only change is that in connection with senior and graduate. I may say that the scholarship is awarded by the Fairchild Committee, and this action is simply recommendatory. This Committee and Mr. Fairchild are seeking light as to the best way of awarding this Scholarship to do the most for American pharmacy, so this is simply a discussion of the proposition by these three bodies, and then the matter will be considered by the Committee and Mr. Fairchild.

All those in favor of the motion will signify by saying "Aye." Contrary "No." It is carried, and is a unanimous vote.

The next matter on the program will be the report of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, by Mr. Christensen, of Chicago. This follows:

## REPORT OF THE FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY.

The Fourteenth Annual Convention of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was called to order in the Assembly Hall of the Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, Ind., by President Lawrence C. Lewis, at 10.15 A.M., Monday, August 27, 1917.

Roll-call showed twenty-seven states represented as follows: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin. Total number of delegates and associate delegates present, fifty-two. The address of welcome by Burton Cassaday, of the Indiana Board of Pharmacy, was responded to by John Culley, of the Utah board.

President Lewis invited D. W. Ramsaur, of Florida, to take the chair, and then proceeded with his presidential address. After calling attention to general conditions in pharmacy prevailing throughout the country on account of the war, he announced with much feeling the death of A. C. Wilson, of Iowa, late member of the Executive Committee; he also reported the death, during the past year, of C. Lewis Diehl, Wm. C. Alpers, Martin I. Wilbert and others, who had labored hard in the past to place pharmacy on a higher plane.

He then cited some of the activities of the Committee of the A. Ph. A. and the boards in the matter of the Fairchild Scholarship and said he hoped that during the next year a more practical plan would be adopted with regard to the awarding of this Scholarship. It was suggested later in the meeting that the Scholarship be awarded for the last year's work in a school of pharmacy instead of the first as this year. This it was thought would not only be the means of bringing more candidates to apply for the scholarship, but would also enable the Committee to adopt a more practical plan of award, basing examination on the first year's work in a school of pharmacy as well as high school and practical work.

Other recommendations of the president were as follows:

That the secretary and the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Association be appointed as a Committee on Necrology to draft suitable resolutions, and that the "In Memoriam" page in the Annual Proceedings be continued.

That the dues and reciprocal blank fees remain the same as in the past year, so that the chairman of the Advisory Examination Committee may be enabled to visit as many states during examination periods as possible and furnish such suggestions and information as may lead to continued progress toward higher and more uniform standards for state board examinations.

The Committee on the President's Address not only approved of this, but suggested further that the members of the state boards should visit their neighboring states while holding examinations and thus by personal interview acquaint themselves and study the methods and practices in use.

That a committee of three, consisting of the president, secretary and chairman of the Executive Committee, confer with the Committee on Time and Place of the A. Ph. A. with a view of having our annual convention a week earlier in August. The reason for this was given that it would insure a larger attendance of board of pharmacy members. Most board members are actively engaged in business and many handle school text-books so that it is imperative that they be at their places of business several days before the first of September, so as to have this part of their business in shape for the opening of schools.

That state board members be as liberal as possible in construing the "one year resident" clause in cases of applicants for reciprocity where the applicant complies fully with other requirements of the N. A. B. P. for reciprocity.

That the Association go on record as endorsing the Edmonds Bill, known as H. R. 5531, introduced by Honorable G. W. Edmonds, Philadelphia, and drafted by the National Pharmaceutical Service Association.

That state boards adopt more uniform fees for reciprocal registration in the various states. It was pointed out that fees varied from five to twenty-five dollars. A uniform fee of fifteen dollars was recommended, unless this would conflict with state laws.

In accordance with action previously taken by the Executive Committee, it was recommended that the Secretary be instructed to make application for membership of the N. A. B. P. in the National Drug Trade Conference, and on adoption of the report of the Committee on the President's Address it was so ordered.

From reports made by committees of the Association, it is very evident that the past year has brought forth more good than any previous year since the Association was organized. The report of the chairman of the Advisory Examination Committee showed that as secretary and chairman of this Committee he visited fourteen states during the past year and that in all of these satisfactory progress was being made in examination work; also, four states, Colorado, Nevada, Pennsylvania and South Carolina, were added to the active membership list of the Association during the past year.

The following officers were elected: *President*, W. P. Porterfield, Fargo, N. D.; *First Vice-President*, J. A. Weeks, Ballinger, Texas; *Second Vice-President*, W. R. Jarrett, Oklahoma City; *Third Vice-President*, D. E. Haddon, Alta, Ia; *Secretary*, H. C. Christensen, Chicago; *Treasurer*, Charles H. Skinner, Windsor, Vt.; *Members of the Executive Committee*, John Culley, Odgen, Utah, and H. E. Purdy, Derby, Conn.

H. C. CHRISTENSEN, *Secretary*.

C. E. Mollett moved that the report be received and being seconded was on vote adopted:

CHAIRMAN R. A. LYMAN: President Stone was on the program for an address but he is absent so this finishes the business in which we are concerned as a joint body. I will now call upon Mr. Kuever, who will act as Chairman and finish the program.

CHAIRMAN R. A. KUEVER: We have two papers from the first session on Wednesday, and we will hear those first. They are: "The School of Pharmacy and the Profession," by C. F. Nelson, and "Graduate Instruction in Pharmacy in the United States," by Edward Kremers.

These were read, discussed and referred for publication. (See this issue.)

The next paper was by C. H. LaWall on "A Bad Spell, or Who Mixed the Letters." (See p. 1063, December issue.)

The following papers, owing to the absence of the authors, were read by title and referred for publication:

"Privately Owned Schools and Colleges of Pharmacy," by Edward Spease.

"Are Colleges of Pharmacy Devoting Sufficient Time to Prescription Laboratory Practice?" by A. W. Linton.

"The State Legislature," by W. H. Cousins.

The next order of business was the presentation of the report of the Committee on Drafting of a Model Pharmacy Law by Chairman F. H. Freericks.

(This report with abstract of discussions will be printed in a later issue.)

A motion was made by H. C. Christensen and seconded by C. E. Mollett that a rising vote of thanks be extended to this committee for its faithful work, and this was afterward amended, requesting the incoming President to reappoint the same committee and that it be empowered to continue the work. It was unanimously carried.

Chairman Freericks expressed the hope that the final report would be made at the next annual meeting of the Association.

The meeting of the Section on Education and Legislation was then adjourned.



REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PROPRIETARY MEDICINES OF  
THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,

1916-1917.\*

TO THE COUNCIL AND MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION:

The Commission on Proprietary Medicines submits for your consideration the following report of its activities for the year 1916-1917:

Since its last report the Commission has suffered the loss by death of two of its most valued and useful members, Mr. Martin I. Wilbert, of Washington, D. C., and Mr. Thos. F. Main, of New York City.

## MARTIN I. WILBERT—THOMAS F. MAIN.

Mr. Wilbert was one of the best-known pharmacists in the United States, and one of the most conscientious members and ablest workers of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

He became a member of the Commission at the time of its creation, and during his remaining life gave close attention to the problems incident to the manufacture, advertising, sale and use of package medicines of a proprietary character; and worked faithfully with his fellow-members of the Commission to formulate and secure the adoption of principles designed to safeguard the public interest and to place the proprietary medicine industry upon a proper and acceptable basis.

He was an honest, earnest and continuous student of the reciprocal relations between pharmacy, medicine and the public, and devoted the utmost energies of his too short life to work for the common good.

Mr. Main was also one of the original members of the Commission and until the day of his death was constant in his efforts to contribute to the success of its work.

Mr. Main's many years of experience as manufacturer, wholesaler and retailer fitted him peculiarly for service on the Commission and to render unbiased judgments upon questions affecting the several divisions of the drug trade.

To all who knew him he was the embodiment of honor and integrity, and one whose broad-mindedness and gentleness of manner endeared him to those with whom he was brought in contact.

The surviving members of the Commission desire here to place on record their sense of loss and profound sorrow occasioned by the death of their two departed colleagues, whose virtues and eminent services they will ever hold in faithful remembrance.

*Action of Associated Advertising Clubs with Respect to Medical Advertising.*—By invitation, the Chairman of the Commission on Proprietary Medicines attended the mid-year conference of the National Vigilance Committee of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World, held at Indianapolis, Ind., March 5, 1917, and presented a paper dealing with the general subject of medical advertising and with the work of this Commission.

Following a general discussion of the paper and of the general subject of medical advertising, the Vigilance Committee appointed a sub-committee to formulate standards for proprietary package medicines advertised to the general public, and invited the members of the Commission to meet with and take part in the deliberations of such sub-committee.

The Sub-Committee thus created met at the LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, March 27th, at which meeting the Commission on Proprietary Medicines was represented by the Chairman, who was the only member able to be present.

After a discussion covering almost an entire day, the Sub-Committee formulated a list of principles to be regarded as standards for proprietary package

---

\* Presented at the Indianapolis meeting, 1917.

medicines advertised to the general public, and adopted a code of rules and regulations for the investigation of such medicines.

The report of this Sub-Committee was at a later date presented to the National Vigilance Committee of the Associated Advertising Clubs at its annual convention held in the city of St. Louis, June 4, 5 and 6, 1917, when the principles and regulations were completed and approved, and now constitute the code by which the National Vigilance Committee will judge the character of package medicines advertised in so far as it shall be called upon to pass judgment upon the same.

The standards and regulations as promulgated by the National Vigilance Committee are as follows:

#### STANDARDS FOR MEDICAL ADVERTISING.

There is a legitimate field for the advertising of ready-made package remedies intended for the domestic treatment of common ailments, providing the following requirements are met:

(1) *Appropriate Use.*—The advertised medicine must be appropriate for use in the particular affections for which it is recommended and must not unfavorably affect the course of the disease for which it is recommended.

(2) *Prescription Fakes, Concealment of Proprietary Character.*—The preparation must not be named or advertised in such a way as to conceal its proprietary character and lead the purchaser to believe that it is a simple chemical or vegetable drug ordinarily purchasable in small quantities instead of a proprietary mixture or substance.

(3) *Methods of Marketing.*—Ordinarily the preparation should be one which is regularly offered to the public through the usual trade channels, *i. e.*, through regular wholesale and retail dealers in ready-made medicines, and thus subject to inspection by the authorities charged with the enforcement of state food and drug laws.

(4) *Alcohol Content.*—If the preparation contains alcohol, it must be sufficiently medicated to prevent its use as an intoxicating beverage, and in addition to this requirement, the proportion of alcohol present must not be greater than is properly necessary to hold in solution in permanently active condition the essential constituents of the preparation, and to protect the preparation against freezing, fermentation, or other deleterious change.

(5) *Content of Habit-Forming Narcotic Drugs.*—If the preparation is one which is capable of being used internally, whether recommended for internal use or not, it must not contain cocaine, nor shall it contain opium or any of its alkaloids or their derivatives in greater proportion than those specified in Section Six of the Federal Law, commonly known as the Harrison Act, and it shall also contain other active drugs in such proportion that the use of the preparation will not be likely to create a drug habit, nor satisfy such a habit when previously existing.

(6) *Remedies for Children's Use.*—If intended for administration to infants or children, the preparation must not contain cocaine, or opium or its alkaloids, or their derivatives in any proportion whatever.

(7) *Activity of the Preparation, Cautions against Misuse.*—The preparation must be of such character that it will not be liable to endanger life or health when used in accordance with the accompanying instructions, and if the preparation is one which is liable to occasion injury when improperly used or when used to excess, the accompanying label and literature must bear instructions tending to guard against such improper or excessive use.

(8) *Immoral or Illegal Purposes.*—The preparation must not be intended for use as an abortifacient nor for use for any other immoral or illegal purpose, nor must it be advertised or recommended either directly or indirectly as an abortifacient or for any immoral or illegal purposes.

(9) *Incurable and Contagious Diseases.*—The preparation must not be advertised or recommended, directly or by inference, as a cure for diseases or conditions which are generally recognized as incurable by the simple administration of drugs, or for the cure of contagious diseases or those sufficiently acute to require treatment by a qualified medical attendant.

(10) *Conformity to the Federal Food and Drugs Act.*—Neither the label on the package nor any of the accompanying literature shall bear or contain any statement in conflict with the misbranding provisions of the Federal Food and Drugs Act.

(11) *Advertising Not Accompanying the Package.*—Advertising not accompanying the package shall conform substantially to the statements on the label, carton, or in the accompanying circulars as to the origin, composition or character of the preparation, or concerning its curative or remedial value.

#### OUTLINE OF A PLAN FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF PACKAGE MEDICINE ADVERTISING.

The National Vigilance Committee approves the following plan for the investigation of the advertising of proprietary package medicines to the public:

(1) The requirements for proprietary package remedies intended for direct sale to the general public approved by the Commission on Proprietary Medicines of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as modified by the Vigilance Committee, are hereby adopted as the requirements of this committee in so far as they may be applicable to the work of the committee, and in so far as they are consistent with the regulations herein contained or which may hereafter be adopted by the Vigilance Committee.

(2) In considering the claims of curative or medicinal value made for a proprietary medicine, the Vigilance Committee will not undertake to decide between the views of rival schools of medicine, or between groups of physicians which maintain antagonistic opinions as to the medicinal value of the important constituents of any such proprietary medicine.

(3) In view of the difficulty of demonstrating the curative value of drugs by absolute proof and of the wide difference of opinion maintained by the various schools of medicine respecting the curative or medicinal value of numerous drugs, the Vigilance Committee will confine itself in the main, to a consideration of the honesty and good faith of the claims which are made in the advertisements to be considered.

(4) Evidence offered to justify claims of remedial value must be of substantial character, or of such a character as would ordinarily appeal to men of good judgment and not personally interested in the results of the decision.

(5) Evidence as to the medicinal value of a preparation or of the drugs used therein shall be of the same kind and quality as would ordinarily be considered sufficient to justify the good faith of a physician in using the same drugs in the same affections as those for which the preparation is advertised.

(6) As admissible evidence within the meaning of Regulations 4 and 5, the Vigilance Committee will consider any or all of the following:

a. Either oral or sworn written statements as to the use by legally qualified practicing physicians of the drugs contained in such preparation in the treatment of the affections for which the preparation is advertised.

b. Either oral or sworn written statements of the maker or advertiser as to the truthfulness and good faith of the claims made for an advertised preparation, or of the names and addresses of persons who have used such preparation with satisfactory results.

c. Affidavits of persons who have used the advertised preparation for the purpose for which it is advertised; but every such affidavit shall be signed by at least one disinterested witness in addition to the officer before whom the affidavit is made, which witness shall also certify that the contents of the affidavit were read in the hearing of the affiant and that the latter assented.

d. The statements of medical journals having general circulation among medical practitioners representing any school of medicine as to the medical properties and uses of any preparation or of any drug or medicinal substance used as an ingredient of such preparation.

e. The statements of text-books or manuals of materia medica, therapeutics or practice of medicine, or other works of reference in common use by legally qualified physicians of any so-called school of medicine, as to the medicinal uses or value of the drugs contained in a preparation.

f. Any other testimony which the Vigilance Committee may deem competent evidence as to the medicinal value of the preparation, or as to the truthfulness and good faith of the advertised claims made therefor.

Any information as to the composition of a proprietary medicine which may be communicated to the Committee will be preserved in confidence by the Committee, if so requested by the party making the communication, provided such request is made before the information is submitted.

(7) In all matters of dispute between the advertiser and Vigilance Committee, the burden of proof shall be upon the advertiser to establish the truth of his contention to the satisfaction of the Committee.

(8) Within the discretion of the Vigilance Committee a written answer to any objection which may be made to any advertisement may be accepted, or the advertiser may be requested to appear in person or by representative for the presentation of evidence or argument.

(9) Copies of the requirements for advertised proprietary medicines adopted by the Vigilance Committee and of these regulations shall be furnished on request to any advertiser or proprietor of an advertised package remedy, and to any newspaper advertising association or other agency of publicity.

The importance of this action of the National Vigilance Committee can hardly be over-estimated. The Associated Advertising Clubs is probably the strongest existing influence connected with the advertising business, and its ability to investigate and expose fraudulent advertising schemes is constantly increasing.

The members of the National Vigilance Committee are practical men, with judgments matured by many years of experience and who are thoroughly imbued with the doctrine that truth in advertising is essential both to those who have wares to sell and to those who deal in advertising.

We may expect with confidence that the efforts of the Vigilance Committee will result in the gradual elimination of the advertisement of fraudulent or valueless package medicines from the columns of the public press and that they will also promote the more truthful advertisement of those which, though possessed of merit, are frequently extravagantly extolled.

*Effect of the Harrison Act on the Sale of Package Remedies Containing Habit-Forming Narcotic Drugs.*—As a part of its work during the past year the Commission has made an investigation of the effect of the Federal Anti-Narcotic Act, commonly known as the Harrison Law, upon the sale of habit-forming narcotic drugs and of package medicines containing them. Letters were addressed to members of the wholesale drug trade, distributed generally over the United States, asking for information as follows:

1. The extent of any observed increase or decrease in the sale of drugs covered by the Harrison Law, since its enactment.
2. The extent of any observed increase or decrease in the sale of non-proprietary preparations, such as paregoric, Godfrey's cordial, and Bateman's drops, exempted by Section Six of the Harrison Law.
3. The extent of any observed increase or decrease in the sale of proprietary package remedies containing the drugs covered by the Harrison law and exempted by Section Six of that law.

Replies were received from 102 wholesale drug firms, located in 37 states, from which the following data have been compiled:

The replies to Query No. 1 indicate conclusively that since the enactment of the Harrison law there has been a large decrease in the sale of habit-forming narcotic drugs covered by that act for the sale of which an official order blank or physician's prescription is required, the average of all the decreases reported in figures amounting to no less than 66.3 percent.

The answers to Query No. 2 indicate that there has been a very considerable increase in the sale of *non-proprietary* articles containing opium, such as paregoric and Bateman's drops, amounting to an average of 118 percent for the firms which give definite figures for their increased

sales. These increased sales, however, fall far short of replacing the decreased sales reported for the drugs included in Query No. 1.\*

The answers to the query respecting increased or decreased sales of *proprietary medicines* containing narcotic drugs were agreeably surprising to the members of the Proprietary Commission. It had been assumed as a matter of course that the inability of drug addicts to procure their accustomed supplies of opium or its alkaloids would prompt them to purchase package remedies containing these drugs among their constituents. Such, however, does not seem to have been the case, as indicated by the reports of wholesale druggists.

Fifty wholesale druggists report that they have noted little or no change in the volume of sales of proprietary preparations containing narcotics, notwithstanding the very general increase in the volume of business in other drug lines.

Twenty-six firms report *decreases* in the sale of such preparations, which they estimate at figures ranging from 10 to 80 percent.

Thirteen firms, without naming any percentage of reduction, report that their sales of such proprietary articles have decreased or largely decreased.

Three report that the sale of such articles in the districts in which they mainly do business is practically non-existent.

Several firms report that they do not handle such preparations, and several other firms do not make any answer to the query.

Eight firms report some *increase* in the sale of proprietaries of this class, generally stated to be slight, or very slight, but in two cases estimated at 25 percent. These reported increases appear to have been in connection with only two preparations, which are said to include other narcotic drugs, such as alcohol or ether in addition to their opium content. These particular preparations will be again referred to in a later section of this report.

The firms reporting decreases in the sale of proprietary articles containing habit-forming drugs offer one or more of the following reasons in explanation:

1. That the general notoriety given to the subject of habit-forming drugs by the enactment of the Harrison Law has tended to make purchasers wary of preparations containing such drugs, and has also prompted retail pharmacists to advise their customers against the purchase of such preparations.

2. That several of the more objectionable preparations of this class, *i. e.*, those which contain narcotics in sufficient proportion to make their use desirable by addicts, have been entirely withdrawn from the market by their manufacturers.

3. That the quantities of habit-forming drugs contained in certain other proprietaries have been reduced to such an extent that their narcotic effect is negligible in comparison to the effects of the associated drugs, so that habitués not being able to obtain the desired effect from the combinations do not purchase them.

From the above it would appear that the sale of proprietary medicines containing habit-forming drugs does not at the present time constitute any serious menace to the continued efficiency of the Harrison Law, and that if any further federal legislation is needed with respect to habit-forming narcotic drugs it should rather be made to apply to the official preparations of the Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary, than to the usual non-official preparations of the market.

*The Origin and Introduction of Package Remedies.*—Acting on a suggestion of our lamented colleague, Mr. M. I. Wilbert, the Commission has this year made a preliminary study of the origin and introduction of the package remedies commonly known as “patent medicines.”

It was Mr. Wilbert's belief that, contrary to general opinion, the drug trade has had but a minor part in the introduction of patent medicines to the public

---

\* The answers to these two queries are dealt with more in detail in a separate paper presented by the Chairman to the National Drug Trade Conference at its last meeting in Washington, held in May of the present year.

attention, and that the major responsibility for the introduction of such remedies rests with the medical profession, which opinion seems to be in some measure borne out by the result of our investigations.

In accordance with Mr. Wilbert's suggestions, letters were addressed to about 250 makers of proprietary medicines scattered quite generally over the United States, presenting a series of questions concerning the points upon which information was desired. Each letter was accompanied by a stamped return envelope, and the persons to whom the questions were addressed were advised that information furnished would be used in a statistical way only, and that if given as "confidential" it would be so preserved. About 100 manufacturers responded with more or less completeness to our questions, and upon these responses, supplemented by personal correspondence when the information first given was not satisfactory or sufficiently definite, the following study has been based.

On a study of the letters it was found that many of the answers related to toilet articles or preparations which could not properly be regarded as remedial in character, and these, together with other answers which seemed to be evasive or indefinite in their terms, were rejected, after first attempting to secure more satisfactory information by further correspondence.

After these various eliminations were made there remained answers from 79 makers of proprietary remedies giving information respecting 317 package preparations, which seemed to be of such definiteness as to entitle them to serious consideration, and from a tabulation of these answers the following data have been compiled:

Of the 317 preparations reported upon, 187, or 58.99 percent, are reported as originating in the form of physicians' prescriptions, the information being accompanied by the names and addresses of the physicians whose prescriptions were used as the foundation of the medicines named.

Of the 187 remedies reported as originating as physicians' prescriptions, 97, or 30.59 percent of the whole number of preparations studied, were introduced and first sold in package form by the physicians who claimed to be their originators.

The remainder of the 317 remedies are reported to have originated in the following ways:

The formulas of 28 package remedies are admitted to have been adopted or "adapted" from standard medical or pharmaceutical literature, such as the Pharmacopoeia of the United States, the French Codex, the British Pharmaceutical Codex or the National Formulary.

The formulas of 73 preparations are claimed to have been devised by chemists or pharmaceutical chemists, some of whom admit their indebtedness to physicians' prescriptions or to medical or pharmaceutical literature, while others claim entire credit for the creation of the formulas reported upon.

The formulas of the remaining 29 preparations are reported as having come to the manufacturers in the form of recipes which have been long in the possession of certain persons or families, and highly prized because of their real or supposed efficacy in the treatment of certain ailments. In such cases all traces of the real origin of the formulas have usually been lost or forgotten. Some preparations of this class have been continuously on the market for periods ranging from fifty to eighty years or more.

Of the preceding it will be observed that there are three classes of cases in which the formulas are not attributed directly to physicians' prescriptions, namely, those adopted or adapted from medical or pharmaceutical literature, those claimed to have been devised by pharmacists or pharmaceutical chemists, and those the origin of which is unknown, or which came into the hands of their present

proprietors in the form of what are commonly known to the trade as "family recipes."

Persons familiar with the manner in which formulas are introduced into medical and pharmaceutical literature, and with the manner in which so-called family recipes originate, will recognize that they are but a very short distance removed from physicians' prescriptions, and also that those claimed to be devised by pharmaceutical chemists are very largely based upon physicians' prescriptions, either directly or upon printed formulas appearing in medical literature.

In studying the answers one is struck by the considerable number of names eminent in American Medicine as authors of text-books on *materia medica* or practice who have been responsible either openly or under cover, for the introduction of remedies of this class. One expedient sometimes resorted to in naming such medicines has been to call them by the first name of the originating physician. For example, if the physician's name was Dr. X. Y., the preparations were put on the market as Dr. X.'s remedies.

In some instances the physician's prescription has apparently been used without any knowledge or connivance on the part of the physician himself, but in numerous other cases the physician has given permission for the manufacture and sale of the preparation as a package remedy in return for a cash bonus or for a royalty on the medicine sold. In many cases where royalties were at first paid they have later been extinguished by the payment of a lump sum in cash or by the acceptance of a certain amount of stock in the manufacturing concern.

Another interesting fact brought out from the study of the letters is that of late years, and especially since the passage of the Food and Drugs Act of 1906, it has become increasingly common for manufacturers of package remedies to submit their formulas and literature to one or more physicians or pharmaceutical chemists for study and revision, and to make changes in the formula or the literature in accordance with the recommendations received.

An illustration of the adage that "Doctors will differ" is presented in one case where a manufacturer, desirous of availing himself of the best of authority, submitted the formula of his preparation and the accompanying literature to a committee of three physicians representing three different medical colleges. The formula was approved by all three of the physician experts who, however, recommended some changes in the claims made in the literature. These suggestions were adopted and incorporated on the label and in the literature and, about a year later, to his surprise, the proprietor was cited under the Food and Drugs Act for issuing a misbranded preparation, *i. e.*, for making claims in the literature which, in the opinion of the authorities at Washington, were false and misleading. The puzzled manufacturer inquires, "How in — can a man know what to do when he gets the opinion of the best medical experts on his labels and is then arrested for selling a fraudulent medicine?"

One can understand the puzzlement of this manufacturer when he reads the general medical literature pertaining to the various articles of the *materia medica*. There are very few items of the *materia medica* that have not been extolled by therapeutists in medical journals or in the text-books which they have written for their students in far more laudatory terms than the average maker of a package remedy would dare claim for his preparation.

A question which suggests itself in this connection is, to what extent is the manufacturer of a proprietary medicine justified in relying upon the statements found in books generally regarded as standard authorities on materia medica and therapeutics when he composes his claims for his preparation? Should he be permitted to recommend his preparations with the same liberal terms of praise that the professor in a medical college is permitted to bestow upon the drugs used as ingredients of such preparations in his lectures to his students, or the writer in a medical journal or the author of a text-book addressed to his colleagues in the profession; or is he to be held to a higher and stricter accountability for his claims of therapeutic value?

*Cases of Drug Addiction or Alcohol Habit, or of Injuries Resulting from the Use of Patent Medicines.*—The resolutions providing for the creation of the Commission on Proprietary Medicines make it a part of the duty of the Commission to inquire whether and to what extent package medicines contain alcohol or habit-forming narcotic drugs in sufficient proportions to render them likely to create an alcohol or drug habit, or render them liable to cause injury in the hands of the laity.

As an introduction to this particular feature of its work, the Commission early in the year requested the editors of journals addressed to the drug trade within the United States to print the following announcement:

"TO MEMBERS OF THE DRUG TRADE."

"The Commission on Proprietary Medicines of the American Pharmaceutical Association is desirous of obtaining reliable information respecting injuries alleged to have been caused by the use of proprietary medicines, or respecting the alleged improper use of such preparations.

"The assistance of members of the drug trade toward the securing of definite information of the kinds indicated below will be greatly appreciated by the Commission:

"Accounts of specific cases of harmful results following the use of proprietary medicines.

"Accounts of specific cases of narcotic drug habit resulting from the use of proprietary medicines, or of the use of proprietary medicines for the satisfaction of a habit previously existing.

"Accounts of specific cases of the habitual use of proprietary medicines as substitutes for the usual alcoholic beverages.

"Information bearing upon the above should state facts and circumstances that are capable of verification."

The announcement was printed in practically every drug journal in the United States, many of whose editors were also kind enough to comment liberally upon the subject and to urge their readers to comply with the Commission's request.

The replies to our request for information have been few in number, indicating either that injuries from the use of package medicines are rare or that druggists are not willing to cooperate with the Commission by supplying such information as they may possess. To such as have responded with information the Commission hereby expresses its thanks.

One prominent Indiana pharmacist reports his personal knowledge of three opium addicts who have made use of a certain proprietary cholera and diarrhoea medicine as a substitute for morphine. This preparation, while the opium content is within the exemption of the Harrison Act, is stated to contain alcohol and ether in addition thereto, the combined narcotic effect being apparently sufficient to give the opium addict some measure of relief when he cannot obtain the stronger



drug. This same preparation has also been reported upon unfavorably by several of those answering inquiries relative to the effect of the Harrison Act, which are set forth in another section of this report. The Commission is at present in correspondence with the manufacturers of this proprietary, and will report the result of such correspondence at some future date.

The Commission has also received a printed pamphlet issued by a noted authority on the treatment of drug addiction, in which the statement is made that the author has knowledge of cases of drug addiction resulting from the use of proprietary medicines. The Chairman of the Commission addressed the author personally, requesting specific information as to the cases of drug addiction referred to for utilization in this report. The Chairman was disappointed to receive a reply from the author to the effect that this information was of a strictly confidential and professional nature and could not be imparted to the Commission.

Some partial information bearing on the subject has also been received through the courtesy of the City Chemist of one of our larger cities in which the health authorities are conducting a special campaign against valueless or dangerous proprietary remedies, based on information obtained by a canvass of physicians of the city as to the use of such medicines by their patients, or otherwise coming within their observation.

Unfortunately the information which the City Chemist could supply was of such a nature, or was of such an indefinite character, that it has a very limited usefulness for the purposes of this report.

One of the preparations complained of was a hair stain alleged to have occasioned dermatitis in the users, while two other preparations which were named are supplied directly to their patients by advertising physicians and are not obtainable through the regular drug trade, and therefore do not properly come within the scope of the work assigned to this Commission.

Of the complaints pertaining to preparations which can properly be regarded as coming within the category of patent medicines, the following are important:

Fourteen cases were cited by physicians where certain proprietary medicines were taken without benefit, or where the patient grew worse after taking the medicine.

Two cases were cited by physicians of the use of a proprietary medicine for one ailment when the patient was in fact suffering from a different ailment, and grew worse because of failure to receive early treatment for the affection from which he was suffering.

Two cases were cited of the death of infants resulting from the use of a proprietary medicine containing a narcotic drug.

One case was cited of the creation of a morphine habit by the taking of a proprietary dyspeptic remedy.

The names of the preparations complained of were given, but not the names of the persons who used them with such unfavorable results nor the names of the reporting physicians.

As the nature of the cases cited seemed to be right in line with the work of the Commission, an effort was made to obtain such definite information of the cases cited as would justify naming the remedies complained of in this report. Our correspondent, the City Chemist, was personally willing to comply with our request for more definite information, but found that the names of the patients who had received injury through the use of the preparations named, or who had

failed to receive benefit from their use, were held as official secrets and could not be imparted to the Commission.

Other leads which at first appeared promising on further investigation proved to be equally disappointing; that is, the persons claiming to possess such knowledge either revised their statements when asked to make them more definite, or claimed to possess their information in a confidential way, and were therefore unable to give the Commission any specific data by which independent investigation could be made.

As the Commission has not been able to verify any of the alleged cases of injury resulting from the use of proprietary remedies, it does not feel justified at present in reporting the names of the preparations concerning which complaints have been made.

The Commission intends to continue this particular part of its investigation during the coming year, and hopes to be successful in obtaining some accurate information upon the subject in time for its next report.

Other studies of special features of the matters assigned to the Commission for investigation have been initiated during the past year, or have been continued from former years, but are not sufficiently advanced to report upon at the present time. Some delays have been unavoidable owing to the much-regretted deaths of two of our most active and valuable workers, Messrs. Wilbert and Main, to whom the duty of making several special studies was entrusted. It is hoped that by the time of our next annual convention these subjects will be in better form for presentation to the Association.

Respectfully submitted,

J. H. BEAL, Chairman,

CHAS. CASPARI, JR.,

JOHN C. WALLACE,

W. H. COUSINS,

SAMUEL C. HENRY.

---

## GRADUATE INSTRUCTION IN PHARMACY IN THE UNITED STATES.\*

BY EDWARD KREMERS.

When in 1821 the "School" of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy offered its first course of evening lectures to the apprentices of Philadelphia, the first step toward the realization of systematic instruction in pharmacy had been taken. No doubt, this early experiment in continuation work reflected a need that had been felt by those who had given the subject any thought whatever. In part, however, it must be looked upon as a counter movement to the proposed step toward pharmaceutical education contemplated by the Medical Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. As an assertion of professional independence it was highly to be commended. Viewed from the point of view of Peter K. Lehman,

---

\* Presented before joint session of Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, Indianapolis meeting, 1917.