

(6) That Professor Flueckiger did not find professional life too rosy at Strassburg becomes apparent from other letters. The Kaiser-Wilhelms Universitaet was established in 1872 as a "Reichs Universitaet" not as a Prussian or other state university because Elsass-Lothringen were "Reichsland." Not only did Germany expect much from this "Staette deutscher Cultur" in the provinces that had been alienated more or less by long French rule, but every effort was made to attract students to the university. So far as pharmacy was concerned, these expectations were not fulfilled in spite of Professor Flueckiger's reputation, which was an international one. Whether it was the fact that his career had not been that of the regular German academician, whether it was due to his being Swiss, though "Deutsch-Schweizer," or whether it was due to the suspicion with which pharmacy was regarded at practically all German universities, it might be difficult to decide.

(7) This, the successor to Power as Flueckiger's assistant, was Dr. Arthur Meyer, later known as author of the "Wissenschaftliche Drogenkunde fuer Apotheker," published in 1891. Born March 17, 1850, in Langensalza, he studied in Leipzig and Strassburg, at which latter place, having received his doctorate in 1887, he accepted an assistantship at the Pharmaceutical Institute, which position he held until 1885. In that year he became docent at Goettingen and in 1886 Professor of Pharmaceutical Chemistry and Pharmacognosy at the Academy at Muenster. In 1891 he became Wiegand's successor at Marburg.

The writer recalls Professor Power's frequent references to Dr. Meyer in the course of our conversation. (8) For the papers which Dr. Meyer had to his credit at that time, also for further details and portrait, see B. Reber, "Gallerie hervorragender Therapeutiker und Pharmacognosten" (1897), page 47.

(9) These thoughts were, no doubt, suggested by Dr. Power's happy independent position at Wisconsin.

(10) As the date of the letter indicates, this outing was planned between the winter and summer semesters, when German professors enjoy a somewhat longer vacation than do their American colleagues. It had long been a practice of German university professors to spend part of the spring vacation in Italy or the French Riviera. (Comp., e. g., Strassburger's "Streifzuege an der Riviera," also Flueckiger's "Oesterferien im Sueden" in the *Arch. Pharm.*, 227, 1013; "An Easter Holiday in Liguria," 1877, translated from *Buchner's Report. f. Pharm.*, 25, page 440.)

(11) It was Thomas Hanbury, who, in 1894, came to Genoa to bid the Flueckiger party farewell as the latter was bound for the United States. It was to the Hanbury villa that the returning party went from Genoa before going farther to Bern. See Fr. Flueckiger's (Mrs. Oesterle's) *Diary, N. Y. Apt.-Ztg.*, 49, 57. (Abfahrt von Genua) and page 58 (Aufenthalt bei Th. Hanbury in La Mortola bei Ventimiglia).

(12) Daniel Hanbury, as is well known, was co-author with Flueckiger of "Pharmacographia," the first edition of which had appeared in 1874. At the age of forty-nine, Daniel Hanbury had died in 1875.

CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

ABSTRACT OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD IN BALTIMORE, MAY 8 AND 9, 1930.

The First Session of the second annual meeting of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Law Enforcement Officials was called to order by the Chairman Robert L. Swain, May 8th, at 10:00 A.M. Those present at the meetings were Messrs. Phelps, Arizona; Gilbert, Marsland, Connecticut; Dougherty, Delaware; Kemp, Sanders, District of Columbia; Monroe, Florida; Stead, Georgia; Christensen, Illinois; Funk, Kelly, Indiana; Gibson, Judisch, Slocum, Iowa; King, Kansas; Legendre, Louisiana; Bernhardt, Eberle, Kelly, Swain, Maryland; Heller, Peterson, Minnesota; Caspari, Missouri; Woehner, Montana; Dow, New Hampshire; Fischelis, New Jersey; Anderson, Dandreaux, Diner, Mather, Schaefer, New York; Ford, Freericks, King, Ohio; Roach, Oklahoma; Walton, Woodside, Pennsylvania; Adams, Texas; Kremers, Wisconsin; and others.

Chairman Swain delivered his address, and upon motion duly seconded, same was received for publication. (It is printed in July *JOURNAL A. PH. A.*, pages 788-790.)

Secretary Ford made a verbal report of the activities of the Conference, and upon motion duly seconded, same was received and adopted.

He explained the reasons for not having a written report; the substance of his remarks is given in the following:

"Two very important meetings were held in South Dakota, last year, at which time enforcement methods were discussed. During the year, under the direction of Chairman Swain, he had sent out letters to all states—to those who are interested in the enforcement of pharmacy laws. Replies were received from all of them and numerous requests were made for information on law enforcement, and these requests, as far as possible, were complied with. He expressed the opinion that great progress had been made. There had been laxity in law enforcement; in Ohio progress had been made in restricting the sales of such items as carbolic acid.

It is hoped to obtain opinions regarding law enforcement from all State Boards of Pharmacy, from the State Attorneys and other enforcement agencies. Files have been started in the Secretary's office for convenient reference to information on laws and law enforcement, opinions rendered, etc. The states having had success in law enforcement will be able to aid states that have not been as successful. The Secretary's office can supply copies of many decisions. Coöperation in supplying information, should be given by members and secretaries of boards and associations. He referred to an experience when information was important; instead of securing copy

of the decision the correspondent replied "that copies of the decision could be obtained by addressing the Court;" delay would have been avoided, if the correspondent had secured the information. All changes in laws, decisions, etc., should be communicated to the Secretary's office, and reports made at the annual meetings."

At this time Chairman Swain called for the paper on enforcement procedure in New York by George W. Mather. Mr. Mather presented a very instructive paper on the requirements for registration of stores and the enforcement procedure. Many questions were asked from the floor and discussion entered into by many. Mr. Mather will furnish the Secretary sets of forms in use for those who may want them.

Chairman Swain next called for the paper on "The Relation of the U. S. P. and N. F. to Pharmacy Law Enforcement," by Robert P. Fischelis of New Jersey. In presenting his subject, Mr. Fischelis requested that all persons presenting papers be permitted to pass upon same before they were released for publication. With this assurance, Mr. Fischelis talked at length on his subject and proposed resolutions to be presented by this Conference to the U. S. P. convention on the subject of not admitting proprietary medicines to the U. S. P. and that synonyms shall be listed in the monographs and index of the U. S. P. The paper follows:

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE U. S. P. AND N. F. TO PHARMACY LAW ENFORCEMENT.

BY ROBERT P. FISCHELIS.

Revision of the Pharmacopœia and National Formulary is imminent and it may therefore be timely to inquire whether certain improvements might not be made in the methods of stating standards and describing preparations which will assist pharmacy law enforcement. Of course, I have in mind particularly the enforcement of the pharmacy law in New Jersey, but what will be helpful in our state will also be of value in other states. I might say, briefly, that our law provides that drugs, medicines and poisons shall be sold only by registered pharmacists, assistant pharmacists or persons working under the immediate supervision of a registered pharmacist. Non-poisonous patent and proprietary medicines and simple non-poisonous domestic remedies sold by retail dealers in rural districts are exempted from this provision. Retail dealers are not defined. Rural districts are not defined and simple domestic remedies are not defined in the New Jersey law. Our law contains no schedule of drugs or medicines that may be sold by persons not registered pharmacists. Our Board of Pharmacy is empowered to make rules and regulations for enforcement of the law. Under this regulating power we have defined a rural district as an unincorporated place of less than 1000 inhabitants, situated at least two miles from a pharmacy supervised by a registered pharmacist. That definition has never been challenged in a court of law. We have defined simple domestic remedies without naming the remedies. Anyone engaged in this kind of work knows how difficult it is to prepare a list which will satisfy not only the retail dealers in rural districts who are selling medicines as an accommodation, but also the manufacturers who want to sell to dealers in rural districts and to any other kind of retail dealer anywhere. We have, therefore, refrained from making such a list public.

The procedure we follow is this: When a rural district store writes in and asks what sort of domestic remedy may be sold, we inform the dealer that the intent of the pharmacy law in this respect is to give people in the rural districts such emergency service as they might need, and not to make a pharmacy out of a general store. If the dealer will send us a list of the remedies for which he has a demand, we will check that list and advise him which items may be sold without the supervision of a registered pharmacist, and which may not. That has worked out pretty well with us and it has, to our mind, given people in the rural districts the service they need, and has saved the publication of a list which greedy manufacturers would take to the various stores and show the dealer as "a list of the products the Board of Pharmacy permits general merchants to sell."

Some general merchants, when called to account by our Board for selling drugs and medicines, have secured the backing of manufacturers in taking the matter to the courts. We have been consistently upheld in our work by the Supreme Court of the State. So far, the decisions have involved Tincture of Iodine, Camphorated Oil and Essence of Peppermint.

The Iodine case was easy because iodine is a poison. The question arose whether Camphorated Oil is a medicine or whether it is a domestic remedy, or whether it is a proprietary