

An example of how quickly orders are filled may be given from a recent experience, when at five o'clock in the afternoon a rush order was telephoned to make up six camionette units of emergency supplies for relief work on the returning ex-prisoners who were in desperate need of medical attention. This entire order, making approximately half a ton of assorted supplies to each load, was assembled, packed, each unit numbered, and a list of the contents made of each case, ready and awaiting the camionettes at half past six o'clock.

One of the great aids in filling emergency orders has been the so-called "Burlingame Unit," which was made up by the Pharmacy force. It consisted of all the surgical instruments, sutures, antiseptics and drugs necessary for a surgeon's use in treating five hundred cases. This unit has been carried on hand at the Pharmacy, ready packed for immediate delivery.

Instances such as the above could have been enumerated many times, as the Section of Hospital Supplies has at all times given of its best efforts to coöperate with the Medical and Surgical Section in making the American Red Cross Service all that the American people demanded.

Despite the arduous duties of their own section, when in March the call came for assistance in caring for refugees, the men of this Section volunteered for night work in this relief and several of them served at the railroad station until midnight during that week. Again in July, when wounded men were arriving in Paris in large numbers, our personnel assisted in the receiving and undressing of these patients at the hospital.

To work in the Section of Hospital Supplies has been a privilege greatly appreciated and an honor highly prized by all the personnel, in whom there is established a feeling of pride amply justified by the record of their achievement in maintaining the honor and reputation of the American Red Cross in its greatest humanitarian work—saving the lives of sick and wounded.

The Section is still one of the most active in the organization and daily the loaded camions leave its office with the medical supplies for all parts of Europe.

---

### EBERT-HALLBERG-OLDBERG.\*

BY HENRY M. WHELPLEY.

The Ebert-Hallberg-Oldberg pharmacy period of Chicago, Illinois, the Middle West and in a way of the entire country, stands out with increasing prominence as time passes and we gain the advantage of perspective.

Each one of these three men was sufficiently strong in character, active in work and efficient in accomplishments to place a city even of the size of Chicago on the pharmaceutical map and keep it there during decades of subsequent history. The co-existence of the three is a remarkable circumstance. It was not, however, mutual affinity that brought them together. It is with some hesitation that I hyphenate the three names for this sketch. They are euphonius enough as I say, "Ebert-Hallberg-Oldberg," and I hope the echo will not disturb their peaceful and well-earned "rest beyond."

---

\* An address, illustrated with lantern slides, before the Section on Historical Interests, A. Ph. A., Chicago meeting, 1918.

In spite of their friction and lost motion, each one devoted his life to the common cause of better pharmacy. The Chicago period, marked by the subjects of this sketch, began in the early forties, when Albert Ethelbert Ebert, a child of one year, came with his parents to the new town, Chicago. At the age of thirteen years, in October, 1853, he apprenticed to the drug firm, F. Scammon & Co., of 140 Lake St.



O. W. Steinmeyer, Carlinville, Ill., to the left; Albert E. Ebert to the right. The picture shows the usual pose of the latter.

Carl Svante Nicanor Hallberg was within a few months of legal age when he arrived in Chicago, in the spring of 1877, and engaged as drug clerk for C. F. Hartwig.

Oscar Oldberg came to the city and became a member of the faculty of the Chicago College of Pharmacy in 1883, at the age of thirty-seven years. He was the last to arrive, but soon established himself as qualified for a full third of the work necessary to keep local pharmaceutical affairs in a state of constant ebullition.

These three men came to their common home at widely distant dates: Ebert, in 1841; Hallberg, in 1877; and Oldberg, in 1883. Their deaths occurred in the same sequence and during a single decade, Ebert's in 1906, Hallberg's in 1910, and Oldberg's in 1913. Thus only seven years elapsed from the first to the last demise. It is not my purpose on this occasion to repeat extended biographical in-

formation already on record, so I refer those interested to some of the published sketches, as follows:

Ebert: Bulletin of the A. Ph. A., December, 1906, Memorial Issue.

Hallberg: Bulletin of the A. Ph. A., October, 1910, p. 531.

Oldberg: Journal of the A. Ph. A., March, 1913, p. 413.

I made the acquaintance of the three during the year 1884. It was Oldberg whom I first met. I became pharmaceutical editor of the *St. Louis Druggist* in February, 1884. The Oldberg-Wall Laboratory was then in full operation in St. Louis. I had been graduated by the St. Louis College of Pharmacy the year previous, and counted Professor Otto A. Wall, of the faculty, as a personal friend. I accepted his invitation to become his assistant in the school and soon met his partner in business, Oscar Oldberg. They were both at work on the *Companion to the U. S. P.*, by Oldberg and Wall. I can recall Oldberg as I saw him for the first time. It was in the dining room of his St. Louis home. He was at work with books, proofs and manuscripts spread over the long dining table from which the dishes and cloth had been removed. I was awed in the presence of such a real author who was fifteen years my senior. I do not recall seeing him again

until eight or more of us went from St. Louis to Milwaukee, a few months later, for the A. Ph. A. convention. By the way, the since deceased of our party are: M. W. Alexander, H. F. Hassebrock, C. F. G. Meyer, Enno Sander and F. W. Sennewald. I was neither a member of the A. Ph. A. nor a delegate to that body, so my name does not appear in the roster, but I was an observant attendant at the A. Ph. A. sessions. Here I met Ebert, saw Oldberg and heard Hallberg. The proceedings were new and strange to me. They were quite unlike the meetings of the Sons of Temperance to which I then belonged. I had held office in a Cobden, Ill., lodge and in another one at Otsego, Mich. As I recall the Milwaukee A. Ph. A. convention, Ebert-Hallberg-Oldberg made a more lasting impression on me than all of the other participants together. I found Ebert ever alert and rather suspicious. He was a watch-dog of the treasury and a guardian of American pharmacy, as exemplified in the A. Ph. A. Oldberg evidenced a cool and calm determination. He seemed to be of the same opinion still, even after submitting to a preponderance of expression and nominally accepting arguments as being convincing. To him, financial questions were an annoyance. Hallberg did not often agree with either of two sides in a debate but proposed a procedure of his own. Either or both of the other views might be good, but his was the correct method to follow. This is the general impression that Ebert-Hallberg-Oldberg made on me during that A. Ph. A. meeting of thirty-four years ago. I recall one extended and animated discussion which will illustrate their relative characters. It is also timely and reminds us of the A. Ph. A. Research Fund debates, the echoes of which have not entirely died away.

A proposition was before the Milwaukee meeting, to set aside the sum of five hundred dollars each year for research work. Ebert sprang to the floor and moved to postpone action for one year. He said something about money going like the dew of the night before the sun of the day. He said research was a good word but in this case meant experimentation and that was all it would amount to. He wanted a year for the A. Ph. A. to think it over and formulate a rigid plan for handling the money and conducting the work. Oldberg urged the importance of immediate action and laid stress on the fact that the Association had the money on hand. Hallberg waited until the two views had been expressed and then said the right thing to do would be to give the money or as much of it as could be spared to the colleges of pharmacy for real pharmaceutical research. He then mentioned



Oscar Oldberg to the left; William M. Searby to the right. In profile, these two pharmacists resembled each other.

some of the unsolved problems in pharmacy and most of them are still in the experimental stage.

So much for Ebert-Hallberg-Oldberg. Now a few comments on each in a personal relation to myself for, after all, it is the personal touch that has the most to do with the sum of daily life. I do not anticipate what I have said and particularly what is now to follow will meet with universal approval. These men were too strong and pronounced during years of active life to receive a unanimity of expression from associates. I shall not, however, anticipate a single dissenting voice when I say that never in life would these three men link themselves in intimate association as I have done in the caption, "Ebert-Hallberg-Oldberg." When Oldberg came to Chicago in 1883, the three men had a common interest and work in the Chicago College of Pharmacy, but divergent views regarding needs and methods prevented them from doing real team work. Some years later, a rumor became common that Chicago had three "bergs," Oldberg, Hallberg, and between them an iceberg. Ebert might well be termed the iceberg in effect, even though his nerve tension gave him a constant high temperature. Hallberg laughed at the rumor of the three-berg story. Oldberg disdained to take notice of it. Ebert told me that if both of the "bergs" would listen to him, there would not be an iceberg between them.

OSCAR OLDBERG, PHARM.D.

He was proud of that title and, early in his work as a teacher, advocated the general adoption of the degree.

Of the three men, Oldberg was the first that I met and he was the last to pass away, but I never knew him well. Some say that no one did. I was unfortunate in my first meeting, the one in his St. Louis home in 1884. It is true I went to Oldberg on an errand, but I was his partner's assistant at the College. I was a graduate of the school, I was an editor and I was ambitious to know people who were making good in the world of pharmacy. Oldberg was intent on his proof-reading and scarcely noticed me. Somehow, that first impression was a lasting one. I never detected the least bit of magnetism in Oldberg's make-up. I was a member of an American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties Committee, of which he was chairman. He sent me a report to "sign." This I declined to do, and he wired me a command to sign without further delay and a long, long letter from him followed. It was written in the imperative mood and among other things told me what I must do as dean of the St. Louis College of Pharmacy. The document, which I believe I still have, was an attempt at both politics and diplomacy, but fruitless in effect on me. I believe Oldberg was a good judge of human nature but a poor hand at managing people.

Oldberg believed in condensing the A. Ph. A. meetings by having work all day and much of the night. He had no use for any part of the entertainment. Somehow, I induced him to go to the Missouri Botanical Garden with us in 1901. This was one of our entertainment trips during the St. Louis meeting. Oldberg told me, as local secretary, that it was the first time he had ever taken part in an A. Ph. A. entertainment and he admitted that he had enjoyed it. He added that he did not expect to ever again go on such an occasion, for it encouraged a feature of the meetings of which he did not approve.

I must here testify to my full appreciation of much good and timely work accomplished by Oldberg. I have in mind particularly the way in which he contended that it was the province of the school to train and of the Board to license the pharmacist.

I think the real surprise of Oldberg's life came when he learned that Hallberg had nominated him for president of the A. Ph. A. The news gave him a distinct shock and he seemed to regret that the nomination came from the fellow on the other side of the iceberg. Those who were on the Nominating Committee when Hallberg took the floor will recall with what earnestness and fervor the nomination was made.

CARL SVANTE NICANOR HALLBERG.

Hallberg never used his title, "Ph.G.," except in an academic way, but he did not object to the use of his full series of given names. In fact, he learned the given names of a large proportion of people about which he knew something. Hallberg told me that it was just as easy for him to remember "Henry Milton Whelpley, 2342 Albion Place, St. Louis, Mo.," as it was to recall "Whelpley, of St. Louis." He did admit, however, that he could not always think of his own telephone number, which fact made me feel that he was just human, after all.

Hallberg came into my life at the Milwaukee meeting of the A. Ph. A. in 1884 and remained there until we laid him to rest in Graceland Cemetery, Chicago, in 1910. We met at the A. Ph. A., Illinois, and other state pharmaceutical conventions, and were thus together a few times a year. In early days, I bunked with him in Chicago and after his marriage always visited his interesting home whenever I was in the city. Do not infer from this that we always agreed. He did not expect that much from any one. He enjoyed oral contention and never side-stepped an offhand dispute. I did not take his criticisms as abuse and he spoke and acted when we were together with a freedom which I believe was true to his innermost nature. I know he always made a confidant of Fred W. Meissner. Yes, Hallberg often consulted friends, but could not always convince himself that it was best to follow their advice. No one ever accused him of mental inertia and he was liable to get a new idea of his own and act on it with enthusiasm. To me, he was a bundle of information, ideas and enthusiasm. Conscious touches of satire and invective often got him into trouble. He was weak in diplomacy and knew it so well that he was more apt to "take his medicine" than to try to



C. S. N. Hallberg to the left; Dr. Morton, Ft. Smith, Ark., to the right. This photograph was taken a few months before Dr. Hallberg's death.

fix things up. But Hallberg was tender-hearted and I have heard him make abject apology when he had been misunderstood and hurt some one's feelings.



C. S. N. Hallberg, Mrs. Hallberg and their son Carl, photographed in their Chicago home by H. M. Whelpley.

My life with Hallberg was so full of interesting incidents that I desist from starting on the list.

The manner in which he so freely gave his time as one of the executors of the Ebert estate and how he helped arrange for the funeral and then edited the Ebert Memorial Volume are all matters of record. He arose above all personalities of days gone by and performed a task which perhaps no one else could have done so well.

Then, let us recall how, after Hallberg's death, his friends in the A. Ph. A. over-subscribed to clear the title to the home for his widow and son. This was the only time that such an action was ever authorized by the A. Ph. A. It was a fitting testimonial to the fact that pharmacists of America understood and appreciated Hallberg as I knew and loved him.

#### ALBERT ETHELBERT EBERT.

I earned and saved sufficient money to take me through the St. Louis College of Pharmacy before I entered the institution, but my bank account was small when I finished. I was attending the Milwaukee meeting of the A. Ph. A. to represent the *St. Louis Druggist*. I did not feel able to join the association and explained the matter to Ebert. Just why I told him about it I do not know. I well remember, however, that he patted me on the shoulder and said, "My dear boy, that is all right. You stay right here, and if any one objects, just let me know." I was twenty-three and he was forty-three years old. Somehow, I never outgrew the feeling that he had a fatherly interest in me. I know I was only one of many boys he coached at pharmaceutical meetings. He also encouraged and helped many young men in writing papers. Ebert was called erratic by some. He, too, was rather weak in diplomacy but often gave good horse-sense advice. We were both members of the Committee on Transportation for the 1889 meeting of the A. Ph. A., at San Francisco. I had joined the A. Ph. A. in 1887. During the Mo. Ph. A. meeting at Excelsior Springs, that year, Wm. J. M. Gordon, George Leis and C. M. Ford, also members of the committee, met Ebert and myself and a few railroad men for a conference. It proved to be a long drawn out and strenuous discussion. The details do not now concern us. It was my first acquaintance with George Leis, but Ebert knew him well. — Mr. Leis discussed me with

Ebert and said in my presence, "Why not make the young man president of the A. Ph. A. this year?" I do not think he meant it for more than a complimentary remark. I know I did not take it seriously, but what Mr. Leis said worried Ebert. At the first opportunity, Ebert mentioned the matter to me privately and said, "Look here, young man, don't you get the presidential bee in your bonnet! No, not now; perhaps some time, but not for years." What a wonderful example of good judgment, personal interest in a young man and a care for the welfare of the A. Ph. A. But that was just like Ebert. Twelve years later, when I became president of the A. Ph. A., I reminded Ebert of the 1889 incident. His only comment was, "Did I do that?"

Ebert did not like to "tie up" with people, for he knew sooner or later, and usually sooner, he would disagree with them and he wanted to be free to speak his mind. But I do know that Dr. George W. Sloan and Leo Eliel were held in high personal esteem by Ebert.

Ebert shunned office, for he could be more independent as a high private. But you never found him in the rear ranks. He occupied a seat in the front row and his presence helped make it the firing line. The only office I ever knew Ebert to really want was a place on the Board of Trustees of the U. S. P. C. Such a position he was given by the convention of 1900, and he served until his death, six years later. I was associated with him on the Board and must testify to his wonderful usefulness in the cause of American pharmacy. It was the beginning of the first decade for the Board and Ebert helped in establishing sound business precedents for time to come.

The Ebert Prize Fund of about twelve hundred dollars and the Ebert Legacy Fund of about five thousand dollars which he gave the A. Ph. A. indicate his regard for the value of that organization. Ebert was quite as much a man of deeds as he was of words.

The Chicago Veteran Druggists' Association, I believe, literally prolonged the life of Ebert. At the same time, his historical work for the C. V. D. A. proved to him that history makes some amends for the shortness of human life.

I have spoken of Ebert as I knew him, but he had a personal touch with hundreds of other pharmacists. His death received more extended attention in the drug world than that of any other retail druggist. The funeral ceremonies were attended and conducted by delegates from nineteen pharmaceutical organizations.

In closing, I cannot help but think of these three men as they would likely be if with us during the most supreme phase of our country since the Civil War. The ever-calm Oldberg would turn aside from routine work to help in the duties coming to those who must remain at home in civil life. Ebert, the sturdy warrior in times of peace, would enlarge his field of action during the world war and every



Photo taken at Lake Minnetonka A. Ph. A. meeting. Left to right: Local Secretary Edward Shumpik; Treasurer S. A. D. Sheppard; C. M. Ford; Caswell A. Mayo; Albert E. Ebert; H. M. Whelpley.



Dedication of the Albert E. Ebert monument in Graceland Cemetery, Chicago.

act ring true to the cause of the World Democracy. Then comes Hallberg, who never was a pacifist in principle, word or action. He would go over the top on the slightest pretext. Hallberg was always a student of the nation's heart pulse. So, in brief, the contribution of pharmacy to the work of the Allies in the World War would have been even greater than it is now if Ebert-Hallberg-Oldberg were still with us.

#### A FRENCH PHARMACEUTICAL DILEMMA.

The French law prohibits the sale of "secret remedies" and includes under this definition all preparations not in the Codex, or the formula of which has not been published by the Government, hence excludes the sale of valuable recent additions to the materia medica, of utmost therapeutic value as well as the most evil mixture engendered by quackery. We are quoting an editorial of the *Chemist and Druggist* of February 22, 1919, in which a case of 1906 is cited in which the French higher court decided that a pharmacist who had supplied urotropine on a medical man's prescription was guilty of a punishable offense—urotropine not being included in the Codex it was a "secret remedy," hence might not be supplied. It is not now in the Codex. The General Association of Pharmaceutical Societies has drawn the Government's attention to the situation, and has asked for a ruling that a paragraph of the law of May 3, 1850, be construed that new remedies recognized as useful by the National Academy of Medicine, and the formulas of which are approved by the Minister of Agriculture and are published by consent of the owners and

inventors, shall no longer be considered "secret remedies." These then may be freely sold pending their inclusion in the Codex.

This has raised the question of pharmaceutical specialties "the nature and composition of which rests solely on the arbitrary choice of their manufacture." Professor Bourquelot gave the following definition at the Academy: "An honest specialty requires a legal existence as it complies with the sole condition of publishing its composition. The originality of the product resides in the perfection of its manufacture, and the use of operations and procedures which are not disclosed; but *no substance whatever may be administered to the patient unknown to the doctor.* That is the minimum of protection necessary for the health of the public, and which the Academy has the right of demanding." The Academy itself formulates the following addition to the law of 1850, *viz.*, "that every simple or compound remedy, the quantitative as well as qualitative composition of which is not known, shall be regarded as a secret remedy and proceeded against as such."