

Voegtlin, Carl, and Johnson, J. M.

Preparation of sulfarsphenamine

J. Am. Chem. Soc., 44 (Nov. 1922), 2573

Wastenson, Hugo

Testing of ether

Svensk Farm. Tidskr., 26 (Oct. 1922), 474

Wieland, Heinrich and Bettag, Ludwig

The Friedel-Craft reaction

Ber. deutsch. chem. Ges., 55 (Sept. 1922), 2246

Willstätter, R., and Kalb, L.

Reduction of lignin and carbohydrates by hydriodic acid and phosphorus

Ber. deutsch. chem. Ges., 55 (Sept. 1922), 2637

CLINICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC METHODS.

Arreguine, V., and Garcia, E. D.

Color reaction of urea

Ann. Assoc. Quim. Argentina, 9 (1921), 183;

through *J. pharm. Belg.*, 4 (Oct. 1922), 754

Tramasure, M.

Cryogenine in urine

J. pharm. Belg., 4 (Oct. 1922), 767

Van Eck, P. N.

Detection of blood

Pharm. Weekbl., 59 (Nov. 1922), 1098

COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. PH. A. COUNCIL LETTER NO. 3.

(Continued from p. 973, November Journal.)

16. *Election of active members:* No. 17, Raymond H. Duke, Mason City, Nebraska; No. 18, Joe Cording, Litchfield, Nebraska; No. 19, William Daniel Barnett, Gaithersburg, Md.; No. 20, T. Leith Gill, 5626 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C.; No. 21, Charles W. Wagner, 1101 5th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.; No. 22, K. E. Thompson, Colome, S. Dak.; No. 23, T. F. Nagee, Whitefish, Mont.; No. 24, Dr. K. Wientjes, Toendjoengan 35, Soerabaja, Ned. Oost Indie; No. 25, F. V. Cassaday, c/o The Cassaday Drug Co., 444 East Main St., Alliance, Ohio; No. 26, George L. Burroughs, Univ. School of Pharmacy, University, Miss.; No. 27, W. H. Ya Deau, 116 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.; No. 28, William Ferdinand Trukenbrod, 120 Jefferson St., Monroe, Wis.; No. 29, Otto L. Uhlig, Spearfish, S. Dak.; No. 30, Miss Alice Lucile Ritchie, 2139 Auburn Ave., Christ Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio; No. 31, Neil E. Gordon, 2320 Reistertown Rd., Baltimore, Md.; No. 32, Sister Lucian Woodlock, St. Joseph's Hospital, Linwood & Prospect Sts., Kansas City, Mo.; No. 33, Edward F. Wagener, 1502 Shelby St., Indianapolis, Ind.; No. 34, Sister Mary Dominic, St. John's Hospital, St. Louis, Mo.; No. 35, Sister Mary Alfreda, E. Morgan St., Boonville, Mo.; No. 36, Susana F. Blechle, St. Mary's Hospital, East St. Louis, Ill.; No. 37, Sister M. Delphine Wendel, St. Mary's Hospital, Jefferson City, Mo.; No. 38, Sister M. Leonilla Hahn, St. Mary's Infirmary, 1536 Papin St., St. Louis, Missouri; No. 39, Sister Mary Theophila, Grand & Chippewa Sts., St. Louis, Mo.; No. 40, Edward S. Rose, 2056 4th Ave., Cedar Rapids, Iowa. A. G. DUMÉZ, *Secretary*.

A. PH. A. COUNCIL LETTER NO. 4.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 30, 1922.

To the Members of the Council

17. (*Motion No. 5.*) *Motion to table the resolutions of the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association (see Item 14).* Under date of October 20, 1922, Secretary Day writes from Chicago as follows:

"Concerning the resolution submitted to the Council by the Council of the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association, I am of the opinion that the Council of the A. Ph. A. should proceed cautiously. I realize that the situation in the state of Ohio on account of the state law enactment is such that pharmacists may be embarrassed if the deletion of wines and sherry wine from the new National Formulary is carried out but, at the same time, I believe that the Council of the A. Ph. A. would set a bad precedent if it overrules the action of the National Formulary Committee.

"The National Formulary Committee has no doubt considered carefully the deletion of these preparations and presumably possesses information that the A. Ph. A. Council does not have.

"I think that our immediate step should be to refer this resolution to the National Formulary Committee so as to give the Committee an opportunity to reconsider the matter if they wish to do so or to make a statement to the Council of the reasons which have led to their decision to delete wines and sherry wine from the next revision of the National Formulary. Meanwhile, I understand that the question of the admission of whisky and brandy to the Pharmacopoeia has been revived and it occurs to me that there is a possibility that not only

whisky and brandy but possibly wine as well will be restored to the Pharmacopoeia, in which case the aim sought by the Council of the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association would be accomplished without action by the National Formulary Committee."

Under date of October 21, 1922, Wilbur L. Scoville, chairman of the National Formulary Committee, writes from Detroit as follows:

"To the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

"Gentleman:

"The resolution of the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association presented in Letter No. 3, page 7, to the Council calls for an explanation of the facts.

"First it may be remarked that the resolutions presented are in error: 1, in the statement of the composition of the N. F. Committee; 2, in the vote by which wines were deleted; and 3, in presuming to dictate how reports of committees shall not be made in the American Pharmaceutical Association.

"But disregarding these errors, I invite your attention to some facts:

"The question of deleting wines was first considered by the N. F. Committee in July 1920 when a *unanimous* vote to delete tentatively was passed. Then, in accordance with the publicity policy of the Committee, this intention was published in all (about 45) of the pharmaceutical journals in the following fall, each Branch of the A. Ph. A. was asked to consider the subject of deletions, with full list given, and more than 4000 letters were sent to individual pharmacists in different sections of the country, all requesting the attitude of pharmacists on the subject. As a result of this publicity it appeared that the great majority of pharmacists throughout the states were either indifferent to or in favor of the deletion of the medicated wines. A few protests directed to about five of the individual wines were considered by the Committee, and these were changed to tinctures with the synonym of wine to be retained. Thus all of the medicated wines which are in active demand can continue to be supplied on prescriptions or otherwise.

"The attitude of the pharmacists was further strengthened by the fact that 18 of our states cannot supply wine (not medicated) even on prescriptions, being prevented by state laws; by the fact that large manufacturing pharmacists are eliminating wine

from their products and are discouraging its use as a vehicle or menstruum; and by the fact that government officers are making it increasingly difficult for pharmacists or manufacturers to obtain wine for medicinal or manufacturing use. All of which shows that it will be increasingly difficult for pharmacists to secure medicated wines in most states, and the official substitution of a 20% alcohol menstruum will make it unnecessary.

"But all of this was ignored by the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association until the N. F. Committee again considered the subject in July 1921 in the light of the publicity results, and again voted *unanimously* to delete the wines.

"This action was again published in the pharmaceutical journals and brought forth a protest from the Ohio S. P. A. stating its reasons. This letter was published in full in the N. F. Committee Bulletins, a motion to reconsider was made, and the subject was discussed during a period of three months, when the motion to reconsider was lost by a mail vote of 9 to 2.

"The next incident was the appearance of the secretary of the O. S. P. A. at the Cleveland meeting of the A. Ph. A. protesting that this report of the N. F. Committee had been read and accepted in his absence, though the time and place of the report was stated plainly in the official program and was followed to the letter. At this time requests to reopen the subject in the A. Ph. A. meetings were refused.

"Step No. 3 was the issuing of a letter early in September addressed to the members of the O. S. P. A. in which the members were urged to send letters of protest to the chairman of the National Formulary Committee. Up to this date I have received four such letters—one from a manufacturer, who states that he has eliminated wine from most of his listed products and is discouraging its use; one from a wholesale druggist; one from a teacher in a pharmacy school; and one from a retail druggist.

"Step No. 4 is the presentation of resolutions, similar to these now presented to the Council, to the N. A. R. D. at its meeting in Detroit in the latter part of September. The writer was present at the meeting when these were discussed, was accorded the privilege of the floor and made an explanation of the facts which was courteously

received by the N. A. R. D. members. I have been informed, however, that the resolutions were adopted by the N. A. R. D. though I have not yet been officially informed of the fact.

"Step No. 5 is the presentation of the resolutions to the Council of the A. Ph. A. in Council Letter No. 3, and to which this letter is a reply.

"Now in view of the fact that the N. F. Committee has during the last two years made an energetic effort to secure the opinions of pharmacists on this question (and it should be stated that special credit is due to Dr. E. L. Newcomb and Dr. H. Engelhardt for sending out personal letters in their districts on the subject), and that as a result of this publicity the *evidence* which the N. F. Committee has received is strongly in favor of this action taken—even in Ohio if a majority of the officers of the O. S. P. A. acting together be excepted—I move that the resolutions of the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association be laid on the table."

Prof. Clyde M. Snow under date of October 23, 1922, writes from Chicago as follows:

"In Re Deletion of Wines and Sherry Wine from the National Formulary:

"It is not the function nor within the scope of the National Formulary to delegate or to deprive any individual or group of individuals of the privilege of trafficking in medicinal preparations or alcoholic liquors, medicinal or otherwise, and any attempt to so divert its function is an attempt to prostitute its authority.

"The pharmacist is not authorized by law, by education or by training to set up his judgment as a criterion for the therapeutic value of any drug or preparation. This is exclusively the province of the physician. Up to this time there has been no considerable evidence that physicians generally are satisfied that sherry wine has any medicinal value. Those who do look upon it with favor agree that any therapeutic activity is due to the alcohol content.

"Alcohol is now official in the Pharmacopoeia, so the practice of medicine does not suffer any deprivation in the deletion of sherry wine from the National Formulary.

"The action of the National Formulary Committee in voting to delete the medicated wines was given wide publicity by being published in all the pharmaceutical journals. Comment on the action was invited by the chairman of the Committee.

"To subordinate the National Formulary which is a national standard to the statutes of any one of the states is of course untenable."

A. G. DuMEZ, *Secretary*.

A. PH. A. COUNCIL LETTER NO. 5.

(Abstract.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 6, 1922.

To the Members of the Council:

18. *Election of member of the Committee on Research (see Items 7 and 11).*

19. (*Motion No. 6.*) *Motion to fix the date for the next annual meeting (see Item 15).* It is moved by H. M. Whelpley, seconded by Wm. B. Day, that the week of September 3, 1923, be selected for the date of our next annual meeting. Prof. Day writes that this date is satisfactory to the N. A. B. P. A vote is being called for.

20. *Applicants Nos. 17-40 elected to active membership.*

21. *Request that a committee be appointed to represent pharmaceutical interests in the Division of Biology and Agriculture of the National Research Council.* Under date of October 17, 1922, Prof. H. V. Army writes to Chairman Hilton as follows:

"Not knowing which of you should be addressed on the important topic I have to present, I am sending this letter to you jointly as well as copies to Secretary Day and Secretary DuMez, with the hope that the subject-matter be presented to the A. Ph. A. Council as quickly as possible in order that the results of the Council vote reach Dr. Lillie before the time he suggests in his letter.

"In 1920, Mr. Beringer, Dean LaWall and myself called on Dr. McClung, then Chairman of the Division of Biology and Agriculture, National Research Council, requesting his kindly offices in securing pharmaceutical representation upon the National Research Council. We found Dr. McClung, himself a graduate in pharmacy, very sympathetic and he offered to appoint a sub-committee on pharmaceutical research within his own Division.

"The following year our own Dr. Francis, the only member of the National Research Council actively engaged in pharmaceutical matters, was empowered by the Division of Chemistry to organize within that Division a sub-committee on pharmaceutical research. This sub-committee has been appointed and is now engaged in preliminary work and in

this work was immediately confronted by the difficulty that a sub-committee consisting of pharmacists, pharmaceutical chemists and pharmaceutical botanists scarcely fitted in the Division of Chemistry. Accordingly this (chemical) sub-committee as now constituted consists of one or two practicing pharmacists, a number of pharmaceutical chemists and no botanists. With Dr. Francis' approval, I took up with Dr. Heber W. Youngken the question of representation of pharmaceutical botanists and pharmacognosists in the Division of Biology and Agriculture, taking up the work with Dr. McClung where we had left off in 1920. Dr. McClung in the meanwhile had retired as chairman of the Division but we found in Dr. Lillie, his successor, a sympathetic listener and as the result of the negotiations conducted mainly by Dr. Youngken we have the following invitation from Dr. Lillie.

“DEAR DR. YOUNGKEN:

“I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 19th enclosing a letter from Dr. Army and to say that I am very happy that the American Pharmaceutical Association has decided to appoint a Committee to represent pharmaceutical interests in the Division of Biology and Agriculture. I assume that you will now proceed to secure the appointment of such a committee. It is our experience that a small committee, not exceeding five members, is more effective, and we find it difficult to arrange for meetings of committees with large membership. We shall, therefore, await your nominations for the membership of this committee and will then have them presented for approval to our Executive Committee to be passed through the usual channels of confirmation. If the proposed committee were named a committee on coöperation of the American Pharmaceutical Association, our Executive Committee would constitute it as its committee on pharmaceutical botany and pharmacognosy. This would require the action of our Executive Committee which, I think, would be assured if you desire this form of classification.

“I am writing to Dr. Army enclosing a copy of this letter. We hope that we may have your nominations in time for action at a meeting of the Executive Committee of this Division which we contemplate holding near the end of the year.’

“You will note that Dr. Lillie as the result of the Youngken-Army negotiations takes it for granted the A. Ph. A. ‘has decided to appoint a Committee to represent pharmaceutical interests in the Division of Biology and Agriculture.’ I do hope that the A. Ph. A. Council will confirm this impression by voting that the committee of five suggested by Dr. Lillie be appointed by President Koch or whoever is the parliamentary appointing power in such cases and that this committee of five be chosen before December fifteenth.

“In closing may I point out that some of our council members have already expressed the opinion that Pharmacy should have more in the National Research Council than mere sub-committees within Divisions already established. With this contention I agree in principle but I always believe in the trite saying ‘half a loaf is better than no bread.’ Moreover sub-committees within the Division of Chemistry and the Division of Biology are fine starts, and I am confident that if the newly organized National Conference on Pharmaceutical Research properly performs its functions it will by logical evolution become a Division of Pharmacy in the National Research Conference. In conclusion, may I point out that both Dr. Francis and Dr. Lillie believe that there is every likelihood that the National Research Conference will be willing to send delegates to the National Conference on Pharmaceutical Research.

“Pardon the length of this letter, but I cannot present this important matter with sufficient clarity in more condensed form.”

22. (*Motion No. 7.*) *Motion to present a set of A. Ph. A. Year Books to the Library of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain.* The following is an extract from a letter of H. C. Kassner (Plaut Fellow of the New York College of Pharmacy at the University of London) to Prof. H. V. Army:

“The subject upon which I am now going to write will, I know, interest and concern you as much as it has me. The Library of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, which is the circulating and the pharmaceutical library for the United Kingdom, has never received, for some unknown reason or oversight, the Year Books of the American Pharmaceutical Association. It might interest you to know that this library *has* the following publications of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

"1. A treatise on the 'Convention of the Pharmacists and Druggists held in the City of New York (N. Y. C. P.) in 1851.' (Before the A. Ph. A. was organized.)

"2. The publication on the 'National Pharmaceutical Convention in Philadelphia in 1852.'

"3. And ALL the 'Proceedings' of the American Pharmaceutical Association up to and including Vol. 59 of 1911, at which time I believe the A. Ph. A. Year Book was substituted for it.

"As the A. Ph. A. has already donated the Year Books of the A. Ph. A. to the University of Berne, etc., as recorded in the literature of the A. Ph. A., there is no reason why it should not be done in this instance

"According to the encyclopedia, the Library of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain is the largest Pharmaceutical Library in the world. In the main room of this library the splendidly and costly bound Journals of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the 'Proceedings' occupy really about the most prominent space in the room. The library takes all the leading American pharmaceutical journals, such as the JOURNAL OF THE A. PH. A., the *Druggists' Circular*, the *American Journal of Pharmacy*, the *Pharmaceutical Era*, etc., etc.

"I have spoken with the Librarian and the Heads of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain and I found that they would greatly welcome the acquirement of the Year Books of the A. Ph. A."

It is moved by Wm. B. Day, seconded by H. V. Army, that this request be granted. A vote is being called for.

A. G. DuMEZ,
Secretary.

A. PH. A. COUNCIL LETTER NO. 6.

(Abstract.)

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 14, 1922.

To the Members of the Council:

23. Motion to table the resolutions of the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association on wines in the N. F.—Result of vote.—Carried.

Prof. L. E. Sayre votes "yes" with the understanding that this can be raised from the table if future developments on the part of the N. F. or other committees make it wise to do so. He also states that the medicinal value of 15 or 20 percent alcohol is not the same as that of wine.

Chas. C. Neal votes "yes" with the following reservation: "cannot accept the logic of the N. F. Committee's action in giving 'wine' as a synonym for tinctures."

Under date of November 7, 1922, George M. Beringer writes as follows:

"In reading letter No. 4, I am impressed with the fact that some of the members of the Council do not appear to appreciate the importance of the subject presented in the resolutions submitted to the Council by the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association.

"To the practical pharmacists in Ohio, the action of the National Formulary Committee in deleting all wines will cause a serious predicament, and it may be that a similar situation either exists or may exist in time in other states. I fear the members of the revision committee have been too greatly influenced by fanatical and radical temperance arguments that have no bearing at all upon the status of alcoholic liquors in medicine and the need of standards therefor.

"I have consistently and persistently refused to vote in favor of the deletion of distilled spirits and wines from the official lists because I realize the importance of these and of medicated wines in the practice of medicine and pharmacy as now carried on in this country.

"I am heartily in accord with the suggestion made by Secretary Day that the resolutions submitted by the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association should be properly referred to the Committee on National Formulary for careful consideration. To table these resolutions, in accordance with motion No. 5, would show but scant courtesy to a state association that has called the attention of the American Pharmaceutical Association to a very important problem affecting practical pharmacy."

24. Motion to fix the date of the next annual meeting for week of September 3, 1923. Carried.

25. Appointment of a committee to draft resolutions on the death of Mrs. Lewis C. Hopp. Chairman S. L. Hilton of the Council announces the appointment of the following to serve as a committee to draft suitable resolutions on the death of Mrs. Lewis C. Hopp: Prof. H. V. Army, *chairman*, Dr. James H. Beal, Prof. C. H. LaWall, Mr. Eugene R. Selzer and Mr. Frederick J. Cermak.

Members of the Council who are to serve on this committee will please take notice.

26. *N. A. R. D. approves of the meeting together of the executive committees of the N. A. R. D. and A. Ph. A.* Under date of November 1, 1922, Secretary Samuel C. Henry of the N. A. R. D. writes to Secretary Day as follows:

"It is, I assure you, with very great pleasure and a considerable degree of satisfaction that I convey to you the information that the National Association of Retail Druggists at its recent meeting in Detroit unanimously adopted a resolution, authorizing our executive committee to meet with the executive committee of the A. Ph. A., such meeting to be held in alternate years in connection with the annual meeting of the A. Ph. A. and the N. A. R. D.

"As most of the members of our committee met with the representatives of your body at Cleveland, it is our understanding that your committee will meet with us at the time of our next annual convention. I will, therefore, inform you promptly upon the selection of the time and place of our next meeting.

"Trusting the coming together of the representatives of the two organizations in this may be productive of much good in binding the associations more closely together, I am."

Secretary Day, in forwarding this communication writes as follows:

"I enclose a letter from Secretary Henry of the National Association of Retail Druggists, which I believe should be included in your next Council Letter so that the members of the Council may clearly understand the situation concerning the attendance of our Executive Committee at the next convention of the N. A. R. D.

"This may also influence our Executive Committee in deciding whether to have a meeting before our next convention, for if our Executive committee is to go to the N. A. R. D. convention, and presumably have their expenses paid by the A. Ph. A., they may not care to put the Association to the expense of holding two Executive Committee meetings in one calendar year."

It would appear that some action should be taken by the Council at this time definitely authorizing its Executive Committee to meet with the Executive Committee of the N. A. R. D. at the next meeting of the N. A. R. D., and to provide the necessary funds to cover the expenses of the members of the Committee who attend.

27. *Motion to present a set of A. Ph. A. Year Books to the Library of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain.* Carried.

28. *Petition for permission to organize a local branch of the A. Ph. A. to be known as the "University of North Carolina Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association."* The following petition for permission to organize a local branch of the A. Ph. A. at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, has been received:

"To the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association:

"We, the undersigned, having fulfilled the requirements for members of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and being members of this Association, or having properly made application for membership in same, do hereby petition the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association for a local branch of this Association, to be known as the 'University of North Carolina Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association.'

(Signed)

A. L. Hogan,	H. R. Laidlaw,
G. W. C. Rush,	W. F. Craig,
Almond P. Westbrook,	J. Reeves,
L. M. Lamm,	E. L. Reeves,
J. L. Alderman,	E. V. Howell,
Sam Sowell,	J. G. Beard,
Homer E. Whitmire,	Frederick O. Bowman,
R. H. Curtis,	E. V. Kyser,
D. J. Womble,	H. R. Totten"

Prof. E. V. Howell, in presenting this petition, writes as follows:

"I am enclosing a petition for application to membership as a branch of the A. Ph. A. This branch will be maintained for students at the University and it may be possible to recruit from the surrounding cities. We have not approached the junior students as we wish to perfect our branch before going forward with our program. Please favor us with confirmation of our branch as soon as possible."

At the present time, only three signers (E. V. Howell, J. G. Beard and E. V. Kyser) of this petition are members of the Association, but a sufficient number of the remainder have made application for membership to bring the number above 15.

29. *Nominations for honorary membership in the Association.* The following nominations for honorary membership in the Association are made by Secretary Day, seconded by DuMez:

Dr. Hermann Thoms, Director of the Pharmaceutical Institute of the University of Berlin.

Dr. J. Gadamer, Director of the Pharmaceutical-Chemical Institute of the University of Marburg.

Dr. L. Van Itallie, Chairman of the Pharmacopoeial Revision Committee of the Netherlands.

Prof. Emile Perrot, Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Pharmacy of the University of Paris.

These nominations are made in view of the recommendations passed by the Scientific Section at Cleveland and of the following correspondence:

"CHICAGO, ILL., October 24, 1922.

"Dear Dr. DuMez:

"I enclose a letter from Professor Zörnig of the University of Basel which is self-explanatory. You will note that Professor Zörnig calls attention to the recent death of our only two honorary members residing in Germany, and suggests the nomination of Professor Gadamer of Marburg.

"Immediately upon receipt of this letter, I wrote to Dr. Kremers asking for his opinion concerning the nomination of Professor Gadamer, and I attach his reply.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) WM. B. DAY,
General Secretary."

"BASEL, October 2, 1922.

"Prof. Wm. B. Day, General Secretary,
American Pharmaceutical Association,
Chicago, Ill.

"My dear (esteemed) Colleague:

"To-day I received the sad news of the death of Dr. Herman Schelenz in Cassel, Honorary Member of the American Pharmaceutical Association. Dr. Schelenz died on the 28th of September at the age of 75. This was the death of the last of the three German Honorary Members of your Association. Prof. Arthur Meyer, Marburg, whom I had the pleasure of visiting about the middle of July, passed away the end of August following a second attack of apoplexy.

"There are, which as a German I sincerely regret, none to-day among the German pharmaceutical teachers and research workers who are Honorary Members of the highly esteemed (to us) American Pharmaceutical Association.

"A humble question. If the Association sees fit to award Honorary Membership to one of the aforementioned German scholars, might I make a suggestion (nomination—literally)? I am thinking of Prof. Dr. J. Gadamer, Professor of Pharmaceutical Chemistry and Director of the Pharmaceutical-Chemical Institute of the University of Marburg.

"Prof. Gadamer is undoubtedly, to-day, our best German pharmaceutical chemist, he is (was) a student of Ernst Schmidt at Marburg, for several years an Honorary Member of your Association, graduated under Schmidt, was Privatdozent at Marburg and from there became Resident Professor at Breslau. While yet alive, Schmidt saw to it that his best student should become his successor. Gadamer will also publish the next edition of the well-known 'Textbook of Pharmaceutical Chemistry,' by Schmidt. This may seem a rather bold suggestion, but I could not name a better German from the whole list (or circle) of aforementioned pharmaceutical research workers.

"It gave me great pleasure that the last award of the Flückiger Medal went to an American, Prof. Dr. Frederick Power of Washington. I know Prof. Power personally, having visited him in 1914 in London. The Medal this year went to the Swiss Pharmaceutical Society. I had the pleasure of giving a paper (address) at this meeting, and had the honor of being the only Swiss Professor to win it. It was to me a great joy.

"With the expression of sincerest regards,
(Signed) F. H. ZÖRNIG."

"MADISON, WIS., October 23, 1922.

"Prof. Wm. B. Day, Secy.,
American Pharmaceutical Association.

"My dear Professor Day:

"It gives me pleasure indeed to endorse the nomination of Prof. Gadamer to honorary membership in the A. Ph. A. But, as taking precedent, I should like to suggest the name of Professor H. Thoms, Director of the Pharmaceutical Institute of the University of Berlin at Dahlem, for honorary membership in our association. I supposed that he was an honorary member and was surprised to learn, after reading your letter, that his name is not on our list.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) EDWARD KREMERS."

“CHICAGO, ILL., November 1, 1922.

“Dear Dr. DuMez:

“In regard to the election of honorary members, I learn from Eberle that the Scientific Section voted a recommendation which should have gone to the Council but apparently the Chairman of the Section did not convey it to the Council.

“This recommendation proposed the election to honorary membership of Dr. L. Van Itallie, Chairman of the Pharmacopoeia Revision of the Netherlands, and Dr. Hermann Thoms, Director of the Pharmaceutical Institute of Berlin and a member of the German Pharmacopoeia Revision Committee.

“I suggest that we include these two men in our list of honorary members proposed for election at this time along with Professor Gadamer of Marburg, and that we also include Professor Emile Perrot, Professor of *Materia Medica* and Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Pharmacy of the University of Paris, who has recently been awarded the Hanbury Medal by the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) WM. B. DAY,

General Secretary.”

30. Election of Active Members. No. 41, Clarence W. Hart, 13825 Beaumont Ave., Cleveland, Ohio; No. 42, Mervin Hoyt Sidener, Beach, N. Dakota; No. 43, Harold E. Schlichting, Dept. of Agriculture, Lansing, Mich; No. 44, Jesse G. Matteson, Creston, Ohio; No. 45, Carl H. Kienker, c/o Wm S Merrell Co.,

5th & Pike Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio; No. 46, Richard Monroe Olmlee, Bedford, Pa.; No. 47, Clyde N. Phelps, P. O. Box No. 25, Stamford, Texas; No. 48, Walton Lester Sanderson, 2209 15th St., Troy, New York; No. 49, E. K. Porter, Carbondale, Illinois; No. 50, Joe Elmer Rex Taylor, Severance Union Medical College, Seoul, Korea; No. 51, Theodore Edwin Thress, 8809 Beckman Ave., 7102 Central Ave., Cleveland, Ohio; No. 52, Harry F. Simons, Jr., 1936 N. 6th St., Philadelphia, Pa.; No. 53, Ramlal Balaram Bajpai, 477 Keap Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; No. 54, Ralph J. Walker, Box 35, Norton, Va.; No. 55, Sam Sowell, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 56, John Everett Tilley, P. O. Box 2007, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 57, Rufus Harrison Curtis, P. O. Box 187, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 58, Almond Percy Westbrook, P. O. Box 485, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 59, William Franklin Craig, P. O. Box 63, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 60, Alexander Lacy Hogan, Box No. 870, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 61, George Washington Carr Rush, P. O. Box No. 870, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 62, Frederick Oscar Bowman, P. O. Box No. 697, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 63, Homer Edward Whitmire, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 64, Jacob Leroy Alderman, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 65, Herbert R. Laidlaw, P. O. Box 410, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 66, Lewis Marion Lamm, P. O. Box 1113, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 67, Jefferson Reeves, P. O. Box 410, Chapel Hill, N. C.; No. 68, Henry Roland Totten, Chapel Hill, N. C.

A. G. DUMEZ, *Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE GENERAL SECRETARY.

In membership the Association is at least holding its own which is better than some other professional and scientific societies have done during the past year. The membership August 4, 1922, was 3548.

The income of the National Formulary for 1921 was but slightly less than for the preceding year, and for the first six months of 1922 shows an increase over the corresponding period a year ago. The total sales of N. F. IV to June 1, 1922, were 38,370 copies, amounting to \$66,049.67. The Association has already expended on the revision of N. F. IV, \$2,457.72 (to July 1).

Volume 8 of the YEAR BOOK was distributed last December. Nearly 3300 copies were sent to members. About 200 copies were retained as stock. The sales of Proceedings and YEAR BOOKS in 1921 amounted to only \$64.35. The YEAR BOOK (Volume 9) is ready for distribution and will be mailed soon to all dues-paid members.

The sales of gold bars have fallen off greatly and to avoid further accumulation of unsalable bars, the General Secretary will take orders for these and supply only those who place orders with him at the meeting.