

The Sixty-First Annual Convention

Held at Nashville, Tennessee, August 18-23, 1913

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

FIRST SESSION—MONDAY EVENING, AUGUST 18, 1913.

The first session of the House of Delegates was called to order in the auditorium of the Masonic Grand Lodge, on Capitol Boulevard, at 8:15 p. m., by W. C. Anderson, of Brooklyn, who had presided at the organization of the House of Delegates at Denver last year.

The acting chairman said he would like to explain that, in order to organize the House of Delegates, the first thing necessary would be the reception of the credentials of the different delegates approved by the Council. It seemed that there had been some misunderstanding as to how this matter was to be handled, and many delegates had never handed in their credentials to the Secretary, to be referred to the Council for action. For this reason, he expressed the opinion that it would be impossible to properly organize the House at this time, and he suggested an adjournment to Tuesday evening at 7:30 o'clock. This was to give opportunity to have announcement made at the next general session of the Association that all delegates should hand in their credentials at once, so that the Council could pass on them, and a full list be presented at the organization of the House of Delegates at Tuesday evening's session.

Thereupon, upon motion of H. M. Faser, of Mississippi, seconded by C. F. Nixon, of Massachusetts, an adjournment was taken to Tuesday evening, at 7:30 o'clock.

SECOND SESSION—TUESDAY EVENING, AUGUST 19, 1913.

The second session of the House of Delegates was called to order in Room "A" of the Masonic Grand Lodge, by Acting Chairman W. C. Anderson, at 7:55 p. m.

The Chair announced that the first order of business was the calling of the roll of delegates whose credentials had been approved by the Council. He said that, as the roll was called, if there were any substitutions to be made, they should be made at this time, so that the roll might be as complete as possible. Any delegate present whose name was not called, and who had been authorized to take the place of one whose name was called, should indicate the fact as the roll-call proceeded.

As Miss Clarissa M. Roehr, the Acting Secretary of the House, proved scarcely equal to this task, on account of the unusual amount of noise in the room, the Chair appointed Hugh Craig, of New York, as Assistant Secretary, who proceeded to call the roll of delegates. (See *October Journal*, p. 1230).

The Chair stated that the courtesy of the floor would be extended to any delegate present whose credentials had not been passed upon by the Council.

The Chair declared the election and installation of officers for the ensuing year to be the next order of business.

C. M. Snow, of Chicago, said that, in order to bring the selection of officers of the House of Delegates in accord with the manner of selection of officers of the Association, he would move the suspension of the by-laws, and that the officers now presiding should continue in that capacity during the present session of the House of Delegates. This motion was seconded by Otto Raubenhimer, of Brooklyn, and unanimously carried.

The Chair appointed the following as a Committee on Resolutions: Messrs Hugh Craig, of New York; Otto F. Claus, of St. Louis; Ernest C. Marshall, of Boston; L. C. Lewis, of Alabama, and L. A. Brown, of Kentucky. The Chair explained that all resolutions presented to this body would, after discussion, if the House saw fit, be referred to this Committee on Resolutions, who would consider them in the light of the discussions had thereon, and at a subsequent House session of the House of Delegates would make report, and recommend the adoption or rejection of the resolutions proposed.

The Chair stated that the House would now listen to the reading of any communications from associations, sections, or from the Council that might have come to the Secretary's desk, but Miss Roehr reported that none had been received.

The Chair stated that the next order of business would be the calling of the roll of delegates for reports, resolutions and communications, all of which should be in writing. He suggested that the best method of procedure was to call the roll of the associations and institutions that had been accorded a status in this body, and have the delegates present respond with a few words of greeting, if they would, or by the presentation of such resolutions as their associations had sent to this body, with such comment as they chose to make upon them.

Thereupon, Assistant Secretary Craig began reading the list of State Associations and Colleges of Pharmacy entitled to membership in the House of Delegates.

When the New York Pharmaceutical Association was reached, the following resolution from the New York Association was presented:

WHEREAS, Under the present plan of having the revision of the Pharmacopœia of the United States every ten years, and whereas, this plan is inadequate to meet the demands of the times, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York State Pharmaceutical Association appoint a committee to confer with the American Pharmaceutical Association in the effort to devise a method whereby the periodical revisions of the United States Pharmacopœia will more correctly represent the progress of pharmacy.

On motion duly seconded, the resolution just read was ordered received and referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. Caswell A. Mayo, on behalf of the State of New York, offered a resolution requesting the Association to assist in procuring legislation to provide a separate license for the sale of alcohol for medical and mechanical purposes.

John C. Wallace, of Pennsylvania, moved the adoption of the resolution, but Chairman Anderson, suggested that it be referred to the Committee on Resolu-

tions, with favorable recommendation from this body. Mr. Wallace indicated his acceptance of the amendment, and the amended motion was put to a vote and carried.

Assistant Secretary Craig continued his reading of the list.

When the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association was reached, Mr. Wallace stated that he thought there was a series of resolutions relating to the same subject-matter as that upon which Mr. Mayo, of New York, had just offered a resolution, emanating from the Pennsylvania Association, and he thought these had been turned in to the General Secretary.*

Assistant Secretary Craig continued his reading of the list.

When the New York Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association was called, the following resolutions were submitted, and on motion made and seconded were received and referred to the committee on Resolutions:

Resolved, That inasmuch as the American Pharmaceutical Association has invited Colleges of Pharmacy to offer as a prize to students a year's membership in the Association, the Association provide an appropriate certificate to be given to the students meriting the prize membership.

Resolved, That the New York Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association petition the parent Association to go on record in favor of a legal requirement with reference to methyl alcohol that will differentiate it from ethyl alcohol.

Resolved, That the New York Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association is in favor of and will assist in the establishment of a home for the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the New York Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association that there is a crying need for reform in legislation exempting drugs dispensed by physicians from the requirements of the food and drugs act.

Resolved, That the members of the New York Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association hear with much regret that the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association has receded from the action taken at the Boston meeting to continue the publication of the Report on the Progress of Pharmacy in the form of a separate bound volume.

Prof. Remington, of Philadelphia, suggested that the passage of this resolution was unnecessary, as the Council had decided to publish a Year Book, and the Association had approved that decision.

The Chair stated that the Committee on Resolutions would no doubt be glad to have this knowledge, but it would do no harm to let the resolution take the usual course and go to the Committee, and it was so ordered.

The last resolution coming from the New York Branch the Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the New York Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association that to assign women members to a separate section and to admit non-members to membership in a section of the Association is inadvisable, and that any organization for women should be in nature and name an auxiliary, designed chiefly for those who are not members of the Association.

The resolution was ordered to take the usual course, and be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The Assistant Secretary concluded the reading of the list of institutions entitled to membership in the House of Delegates, and the Chair stated if there were any other delegates present who had any resolutions to offer, they might be presented at this time.

*No such resolutions were received from the Pennsylvania Association.—*General Secretary.*

Prof. Albert Schneider, of San Francisco, said he had not been instructed by the California Association as to what resolutions to submit or report, and he begged to submit the following on his own responsibility, assuming that it would receive the sanction of the California Pharmaceutical Association:

Resolved, That the House of Delegates of the American Pharmaceutical Association recommend that the American Pharmaceutical Association go on record as approving the college graduation prerequisite to State Board examination.

Prof. Philip Asher, of New Orleans, said that while he was heartily in accord with the spirit of this resolution, he thought it was out of order, for the reason that, as he understood, no resolution could be presented unless it emanated directly from a State Association or College of Pharmacy.

The chair ruled that, as Prof. Schneider was a regularly accredited delegate to this body, he was empowered to present resolutions, whether sent directly by his Association or not.

On motion of Mr. Wallace, duly seconded, the resolution just read was then referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. F. T. Gordon, of Philadelphia, presented the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Increased membership and influence can be secured by this Association by a wider propaganda as to its scope and work, and such propaganda is best performed by individual effort, and whereas, at present there is no suitable badge indicating membership in the Association, be it

Resolved, That the Council be authorized to approve the production of a convenient button or pin style of the official badge of the Association that may be worn conveniently at all times by members, and that this form of the official badge be distributed to dues-paid members by the Treasurer.

Mr. Gordon explained that his idea was that, by adopting a little button that could be worn on the lapel of the coat, large enough to be visible and yet not conspicuous, the attention of druggists, clerks and apprentices would be attracted thereto, thus giving the wearer opportunity to explain what the American Pharmaceutical Association stood for. The doctors would also be interested, he thought, and it would especially appeal to them to know that the wearer of the badge was a member of the American Pharmaceutical Association. By this means each member could become a "recruiting officer" for new members.

Mr. Wallace suggested that the author of the resolution wanted to "authorize" the Council to do this, when this body could not authorize the Council to do anything. He suggested that the word be changed to "request."

Mr. Gordon responded that this was simply a skeleton resolution, written hurriedly, with the idea that it would be referred to the Committee on Resolutions, which Committee would put it in proper shape, and he said he would be glad if it would.

On motion of Mr. Hynson, of Baltimore, duly seconded, the resolution was then referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. Nitardy, of Denver, offered the following resolution:

WHEREAS, There can still be found druggists professing to practice pharmacy who do not possess a copy of the U. S. P. or N. F., be it

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association further the enactment of State legislation, or rulings by boards of pharmacy, that will require each pharmacy and drug store to possess a copy of the text of the latest edition of the United States Pharmacopœia and the National Formulary.

Mr. Freericks, of Cincinnati, said that this was one of the provisions of the

Pennsylvania pharmacy law, and he believed it one of its best provisions. He heartily favored the sense of the resolution, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Resolutions. This motion was duly seconded and adopted.

The Chair stated that if there were no other resolutions to be offered from the delegates present, the House would now listen to the reading of the resolutions that had been referred to this body through the Council of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Assistant Secretary Craig stated that these had been offered in the name of Prof. Beal, and read the following, each of which, on motion made and seconded, was ordered received and referred to the Committee on Resolutions:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association hereby voices its approval of the movement in favor of one cent letter postage.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association favors the so-called zone system of Parcel Post, whereunder charge for the transportation of parcels by mail is in proportion to the distance, and that it favors such a modification of the present Parcel Post Law as will prevent transportation by mail of prison-made articles of manufacture.

Resolved, That it is the sense of the American Pharmaceutical Association that in order to minimize the danger of the internal use of poisonous tablets intended for external use only, tablets containing toxic substances in sufficient amount to be dangerous to life if taken internally, should comply with the following requirements: (1) The form, size, markings and color of tablets intended for external use should be distinctive, and the color should preferably be of some water soluble dye, calculated to call attention to the dangerous nature of the tablet when dissolved. (2) Dangerously toxic tablets should be marketed and sold at retail in glass containers only. (3) The labels on such containers should be printed in red on white paper; should bear the word "poison" in large type, the death's head symbol, a caution against internal use and against placing the package in the vicinity of medicines to be used internally, and directions for the emergency treatment of accidental poisoning from the use of such tablets.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association recommend to the Committees of Revision of the United States Pharmacopœia and the National Formulary that they consider carefully the advisability of including in these national standards recommendations for appropriate methods of indicating the dangerous character of poisonous tablets.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association go on record in favor of such a revision of the United States patent and trade-mark laws as will tend to prevent the extortion of exorbitant prices for medicinal and chemical products patented or trade-marked in the United States, but that it is opposed to the provisions of the present measure, known as the Oldfield Bill, as unfair to inventors and manufacturers alike, and as tending to promote monopoly by compelling inventors and manufacturers for self-protection to keep secret the methods and processes for the preparation of newly-discovered medicinal substances.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association request of Congress that it revise the existing internal revenue laws so as to provide for a special nominal tax upon the sale of alcohol for medicinal, scientific, mechanical or pharmaceutical purposes, and the sale of alcohol-containing liquids upon prescriptions, the tax-paid stamp issued for such purpose to be different in design from that issued to the retail dealer in alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association continue its affiliation with the National Drug Trades Conference.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association go on record in favor of the supplementing of federal anti-narcotic legislation by the enactment of effective anti-narcotic laws uniform in all the states.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association hereby record its appreciation of the valuable services of Honorable Francis Burton Harrison, Dr. Hamilton Wright and the members of the National Drug Trades Conference in the preparation of a bill for the federal supervision of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association endorse and approve the measure known as the Harrison Bill H. R. 6282, now pending in the United States Senate, providing for the registration of dealers in narcotic drugs, as a reasonable and effective measure to provide means of tracing the principal habit-forming narcotic drugs from the time of their introduction into the United States until they reached the hands of the physician and the retail druggist, and that the Association hereby pledge its influence in favor of the enactment of the aforementioned bill.

Mr. Freericks stated that, if he understood correctly, this resolution referred

to the Harrison Bill now pending in the Senate of the United States. He did not feel that he would be justified in taking up the time of the House of Delegates at this juncture to discuss the provisions of the Harrison Bill, and would only say now that, in his judgment, these provisions were entirely wrong—at least so far as the interests of the retail pharmacists were concerned. He hoped to have the opportunity tomorrow of addressing himself more particularly to the subject, and his only object now was to let the Committee on Resolutions know that there was at least one delegate present who did not approve of this particular resolution.

On motion duly seconded, the resolution was then referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The Assistant Secretary read the following resolutions offered by W. L. B. Brittain, delegate from the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association:

Resolved, That the delegates of the American Pharmaceutical Association to the National Drug Trades Conference be instructed to give consideration to the feasibility of amending Section 7 of Regulation 7 under the Federal Food and Drugs Act so as to allow the sale of no products deviating from official standards.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association recommend to the Committee on Revision of the United States Pharmacopœia the reincorporation of the terms "castile soap" and "white castile soap" as synonyms for "sapo" in the forthcoming revision of the Pharmacopœia.

Prof. Charles Caspari, Jr., said he thought all the pharmacopœias stated that this was an olive-oil soap. He doubted whether the Pharmacopœia had any right to introduce the name "Castile Soap," or "White Castile Soap," as a synonym for the official soap.

The resolution was then ordered to take the usual course.

The Assistant Secretary read the following resolution from the Washington State Pharmaceutical Association:

Resolved, That we earnestly request our senators and representatives in congress and instruct our legislative committee and our delegates to the National Drug Trades Conference, to urge as strongly as possible the passage of the Bacon-Hughes bill, which will procure better treatment for the hospital corps of the United States army.

The resolution was ordered to take the usual course.

The Chair asked if there were any other resolutions to be presented at this time, but none were offered.

Thereupon the Chair called for miscellaneous business as next in order, and stated that, under this head, he would suggest the offering of a motion to the effect that any resolutions coming from the different Sections which might have sessions after the House of Delegates adjourned, be referred, by common consent, to the Committee on Resolutions. He thought this was the only practical way to handle this proposition, as most of the reports handed in from the different Sections would have recommendations attached to them; and as the House of Delegates would not meet again until Friday night, when it would consider the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. Freericks said he would so move, but with the proviso that the Committee on Resolutions would give to those who might be interested in the particular resolutions introduced at the different Sections an opportunity to be heard. This motion was seconded by Mr. Nitardy and carried.

At this point, Mr. Mayo, of New York,—harking back to the subject of soap, presented the following:

“Fair are your daughters, Castile;
Brave are your sons in the field,
Pure all the products you yield.
Did I say ‘all?’—all but *soap!*”

The Chairman stated that this “resolution” would be referred to the Committee on Resolutions, for its information and delectation.

Mr. Marshall, of Boston, said he did not quite understand Mr. Freericks’ motion, and would like to inquire if the Committee on Resolutions was to hear discussions by those who opposed or favored resolutions.

Mr. Freericks said he had not intended to put his suggestion in the form of a motion; but he thought it would be understood, and granted as a courtesy to anyone who had introduced a resolution at a Section session, that that person should be given an opportunity to be heard. He thought it should be understood that the Committee on Resolutions would grant this.

Mr. Wallace objected to taking up the time of the Committee with discussions, and expressed the hope that no addition or amendment would be tacked onto the motions already passed.

Mr. Marshall said he could see good reasons why it might be well for the Committee to obtain information from those who favored or opposed any resolution, even at the cost of considerable time, as the Committee might not be correctly informed as to such matters, while others might be thoroughly informed. He thought there was force, therefore, in the suggestion of Mr. Freericks.

Mr. Freericks said he had thought that this privilege would be granted as a matter of courtesy, but since there seemed to be some objection to it, he would move that any resolution adopted by any Section and referred to the Committee on Resolutions of the House of Delegates, should be subject to the right of the introducer of the resolution to appear before the Committee.

Mr. Marshall seconded this motion.

Mr. Wallace moved as an addition to the motion of Mr. Freericks that notice of the time of meeting of the Committee be posted where it would be seen by the parties interested, and Mr. Freericks indicated his acceptance of this suggestion.

Mr. Wallace went on to say that he had no objection to anyone appearing before the Committee in advocacy of a resolution, provided those who were not in favor of it should also have equal opportunity to appear and present their views. The Chair said he did not believe that any committee that might be appointed,—and he was sure this applied to the one he had just appointed,—would deny the right of anybody who had anything to say on the subject of a resolution to appear before them.

Mr. Freericks’ motion as amended was then put to a vote and carried.

An adjournment was then taken to meet Friday evening, at 8 o’clock.

THIRD SESSION—FRIDAY EVENING, AUGUST 22, 1913.

The House was called to order by Acting Chairman W. C. Anderson, at 8:30 o'clock p. m.

The Chairman announced that the first order of business was the presentation of an additional list of delegates entitled to seats in the House. He called on Acting Secretary Craig to read the names of these additional delegates, which he did, as follows:

American Association of Food and Drug Officials—

Prof. Charles Caspari, Jr., of Maryland.

Brooklyn College of Pharmacy—

Dr. William C. Anderson.

New York County Pharmaceutical Society—

J. L. Lascoff, Otto Raubenhemer.

Vermont State Pharmaceutical Association—

A. B. Anderson and Mason G. Beebe.

Oregon State Pharmaceutical Association—

D. O. Woodruff and Miss Kittie W. Harbord.

Connecticut Pharmaceutical Association—

P. J. Garvin, Charles S. Rapelye, A. E. Lathrop.

The Chair stated that, without objection, these names would be added to the regular list of delegates entitled to seats in the House.

Mr. Craig here asked permission to interrupt the regular order by presenting the following resolution, action upon which, under the by-laws, would have to be delayed until another session:

Amend Chapter VIII, of the by-laws by changing the order of business so the election and installation of officers shall be the last order of business prior to adjournment.

The Chair stated that the resolution would take the usual course, and would have to lie over to another session.

Report of the Committee on Resolutions was called for as the next order of business, and the Chair suggested that, as it was quite a long report, time should not be taken to read it through completely, and then go back and consider the resolutions *seriatim*, but that each resolution as read should be acted upon at the time, thus obviating the necessity of reading the report twice. There was no objection to this, and it was so ordered.

Mr. Wallace suggested that each resolution as read should stand approved, unless there was objection to it, and the Chair said this rule would be followed.

Thereupon Acting Secretary Craig proceeded to read the report of the Committee, and there was no objection until the fifth resolution was reached and read:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association is unreservedly in favor of the professional education of the pharmacists of this country, and that whenever the time seems ripe for such requirement, it most certainly should be enacted into law.

H. B. Mason, of Michigan, objected to the last resolution read as meaningless, and moved to strike it out. This motion was seconded by Mr. Wallace.

Mr. Beal thought the resolution could be made to mean something by a slight amendment, and moved to strike out everything after the word "pharmacists,"

and insert in lieu thereof the words, "as represented by a college education in pharmacy, of the grade recognized as standard by the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties."

Mr. Mason thereupon withdrew his motion, and seconded a motion made by Mr. Wallace that the resolution as amended by Mr. Beal be adopted, and this was done.

Assistant Secretary Craig then proceeded with his reading of the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association go on record in favor of legally requiring Methyl Alcohol to be sold under a name that will differentiate it from Ethyl Alcohol or spirits generally, and under a poison label.

Resolved, That the establishment of a home for the American Pharmaceutical Association is desirable, and commendable, and that the Council appoint a committee to consider and formulate a plan for the establishment of such a home and to report at the next annual meeting.

Resolved, That we earnestly request our senators and representatives in Congress and instruct our delegates to the National Drug Trade Conference, to urge as strongly as possible the passage of the Bacon-Hughes bill, which will procure better treatment for the hospital corps of the United States army.

No objection was recorded against these resolutions, and they were considered adopted as read.

The Assistant Secretary then read the following resolution:

Resolved, That to assign women members of the American Pharmaceutical Association to a separate section and to admit non-members to membership in a section of the Association, is inadvisable, and opposed to the best interest of the association, and that any allied organization for women should be in nature and name an auxiliary, designed chiefly for those who are not members of the Association.

The reading of this resolution at once brought forth an indignant protest from Mr. Beal, who moved that the resolution be stricken from the record. This motion had a second in Mr. Mason.

Mr. Beal said the resolution first constructed a man of straw, and then proceeded to knock him down. Instead of coming out courageously and saying that the existence of the present Women's Section was not approved of, the resolution sought by innuendo to convey the impression that this Section was something which it was not, and something which might possibly be discreditable to the Association. The Women's Section did not do what was intimated here—separate the women from the other Sections. So far as the papers contributed by members of the Women's Section came properly within the sphere of the other Sections, they would be referred to and read in the other Sections. If they had papers on education and legislation, they would be presented to the Section on Education and Legislation; and so as to papers properly applying to the Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing and the other Sections. This was well understood in the Women's Section, and had been repeated time and again. The women believed that there was a certain line of papers concerning woman's special work in pharmacy, such as their relation to hospital employment and other public employments of that kind, which could be more properly considered in a separate section of their own. They also felt that they would be more at ease to have a section of this kind for the consideration of such papers, as some of them were timid about appearing before the other Sections and engaging in the discussions on these topics. The matter of the creation of a Women's Section had been fully considered at the Denver meeting,

and it had been deemed advisable to grant the petition of the women who had asked for its establishment. Personally, he could see no good reason for denying to the women this opportunity for usefulness. Their Section as established and conducted was a credit to the American Pharmaceutical Association, and no Section during this meeting had presented an order of exercises more creditable or better adapted to the purposes for which it was created than the Women's Section. Moreover, this Section had brought thirty new members of the very best quality to the Association this year, and this had been the direct result of the stimulus given to their efforts by this separate representation. The meetings of the Women's Section did not interfere with those of the other Sections, and the hours assigned for the sessions of that Section were those which had hitherto been employed in shopping expeditions and automobile tours—for the entertainment of the ladies attending the meetings, who did not care to attend the regular Section sessions. Some of the women had said to him and to others: "We don't come here to be amused; we are really willing to do some work, and we should like to have an opportunity for showing, by some real constructive effort on our part, that we are interested in the work of the American Pharmaceutical Association." In conclusion, Mr. Beal said the women had made a splendid start with their new Section, and he thought it would be a shame to present to the Council of the Association a resolution like this.

Mr. Craig, after stating that he did not like to be accused of "stabbing in the back," but admitting that when a man came forward as the spokesman of somebody else who had a pet scheme he must expect "to get thumped," proceeded to take sharp issue with Mr. Beal as to the desirability of the new Women's Section. The resolution just read, he said, came from the New York Branch, to which it had been referred by the New York Women's Association—because the women pharmacists of New York did not want such a Section; nor had he found one woman pharmacist present at this meeting who favored the proposition, though he had spoken to all he knew upon the subject. He believed that any member of the New York Branch present would bear him out in the statement that the women pharmacists of New York City had said to them: "You look upon women in pharmacy as a joke. You are going to put us off in a fool's corner, with a high-cap, to play dunce, because you don't want us with you." Mr. Craig went on to say that he had no personal reason for opposing this Women's Section, except as stated in the proposed resolution, that it admitted non-members of the Association to its membership. He was unalterably opposed to that idea, and held to the proposition that a Section of the American Pharmaceutical Association should be composed only of members of the Association. He was not opposed to a Women's Auxiliary, nor to a Section for Hospital Pharmacists, if they wanted that to discuss hospital work, as this was a branch of pharmacy distinct from all other departments, except practical pharmacy, and might justify a Section. There were really good reasons for a Women's Auxiliary, as their advice and assistance through such an organization would be desirable and valuable. There they might discuss questions in which they were interested—questions of the druggist's home life, and other questions that could be better discussed by women. Recurring to his main point of objection, Mr. Craig said that if there was to be a Women's Section, to which

non-members of the Association were to be admitted, with equal consistency a Section for the Sons of Members could be established, for they had as much interest in the business of their fathers as the daughters. "Then," said Mr. Craig, "why couldn't his father, his brothers, his uncles and nephews come in for their Section, as well as the mother, the grandmother, the aunt and the sisters?" If there was any real reason for having a Section for non-members, he thought it should be called a Section for Non-Members, and a distinction should be made between members and non-members of the Association. He concluded by saying that there was nothing to his mind more discriminatory, or that reflected more upon the qualifications of women pharmacists, than to thus set them aside and apart from the regular membership and work of the Association—not as he thought, nor as the ones interested in this resolution thought, but as the women pharmacists themselves thought.

H. P. Hynson, of Baltimore, supported the position of Mr. Craig. After deploring the fact that such an unfortunate question should have arisen, as not in keeping with the dignity and high ideals of the American Pharmaceutical Association, he spoke for the right of those women who were qualified to become members of the Association to come in and take equal measure and effort in whatever was done, and said he wished them to have all the honor they deserved; but expressed himself as opposed to the establishment of a Section that would cast the women off to themselves, and separate them from the regular work of the Association. He knew their ability, and wished to see them have their proper place, and disclaimed any intention to reflect upon the women who had worked their way in pharmaceutical life; but if something in the nature of a Section was considered desirable, he thought it should be a Woman's Auxiliary, or a sort of Social Section, which should be "light and airy, and free from any care—light society, so to speak."

Prof. T. J. Bradley, of Boston, was an earnest advocate of the new Women's Section, and said it had been established only after proper consideration. Its officers had worked hard to establish it, and the disagreement here was more as to the name than the substance, and it mattered little whether it was called a Section or an Auxiliary. He thought it was only fair that the women should be given an opportunity to show whether they had a right to exist as a Section, and if they failed to show it the thing would fall of its own weight. He thought it would be an act of injustice to forestall them and abolish their own Section at this time.

After a short colloquy between Messrs. Beal and Hynson, following a question by the former as to whether this request to create the Section should have been refused to the women who believed they could do work in a Section of their own which they could not otherwise do, and a counter-inquiry by the latter as to what would happen if the American Medical Association were to establish a Women's Section, Mr. Beal went on to say that the ladies did think they could do valuable work, and had done it. They had brought into the Association this year more real, active, live members, of good material, than any other single instrumentality, except the General Membership Committee. It was not intended, he said, that all the ladies should be compelled to attend the sessions of this Section, any more than it was intended that all the members of the As-

sociation should attend the sessions of the Commercial Section, or any other Section. It was simply intended for those women who felt that there was work that they could do, and who wanted to do it. They had been given the opportunity, and they had made good. The Section's work, so far as he knew, had been thoroughly creditable to the Association, and he thought it would be a grave mistake to adopt the resolution offered.

In answer to a question by Doctor Ruddiman as to eligibility to membership in the Women's Section, Mr. Beal stated that there was no recognized membership list, but any woman who was a member of the family of a member in good standing in the Association might attend these sessions and take part in them—just as they might, and frequently did attend the general sessions of the Association and its other Sections.

Doctor Geo. F. Payne, of Georgia, while frankly confessing that he was not thoroughly advised on this subject, said he was in favor of giving the women any privilege they might ask for within reason. He even believed in female suffrage, despite the fact that he was from the South.

Doctor H. M. Whelpley, of Missouri, spoke at some length in advocacy of the new Women's Section. He said he had not attended the annual meetings of the American Pharmaceutical Association since 1884 without realizing that the membership might not always agree with the views that he held on questions, or that he should be even in perfect accord with the minority on other questions; but he was constrained to say that when, at the Denver meeting last year this proposition to establish a Women's Section was brought up, it struck him favorably. His only misgiving was as to the extent to which the women themselves would take hold of it. When he attended the first session of the Women's Section this year, he was very agreeably surprised to find the large attendance; the enthusiasm of the members, and the nature of the program, and he at once made up his mind that the venture launched at Denver was an assured success. The objection now made to it was a surprise to him. It went without saying, of course, that all were anxious to do anything and everything to advance the welfare of the Association. He did not know how the opposition to this movement started, or where it got its momentum, or just what it meant; but it certainly was not started, nor would it be continued, with any idea of hurting the Association; and, personally, he could see nothing dangerous to the Association in this effort the women were making. Therefore, he favored giving them a chance, and if it was not a good thing, it would die of itself. If there was anything in their form of organization or their constitution that was not in proper keeping with the ideals of the Association, that could be taken care of at the proper time and place, probably through the Council. These were details that would have to be worked out. He was reminded that when he was President of the Association, in its semi-centennial year of 1902, in order to familiarize himself with the history of the Association, he had gone back to volume I of its proceedings, beginning with the initial meeting in 1851, and even at that early date he had found that there was opposition to, and even indignation over, the proposition of some of the members to take their families with them to the annual meetings. It was regarded by some as an unjustifiable innovation, and the argument was made that the American Pharmaceutical Association

meetings were for the pharmacists, and for pharmacy and its progress, and nothing savoring of an attempt to introduce social features to detract from the real work of the Association should be tolerated. One Nestor of pharmacy even went so far as to say that if such a course was followed, he would stay at home. He expressed the hope that history of this character would not repeat itself. He favored trying out this experiment, and was sure the Association could live through it.

In answer to a question by Mr. Hynson as to whether he had any means of estimating how many members the American Pharmaceutical Association would have had in the absence of its social features at its annual meetings, Doctor Whelpley responded that of course this was merely a matter of opinion. Perhaps, he said, that old Nestor was right after all, and that the Association would have been better off in numbers if none of the families of members had been brought to the annual meetings except the sons.

Mr. Craig, in closing this discussion, and replying to some of the criticisms made, insisted that the men of New York were just as courteous as their Southern brethren, and that they were not being discourteous to the women of New York, because they did not want this Section. To the statement made that the new Women's Section had been the means of bringing in thirty new members, he replied that he knew it had kept out twenty women pharmacists of New York City who would not join because of it. They had succeeded there in getting one woman out of thirty, and could have gotten at least twenty, without question, if it had not been for this blow, as they considered it, aimed at them. They were not hitting at the new Section for what it was doing, but objecting because it made a sexual distinction, and admitted members into the Association without the payment of dues. They did not think this was fair, and in taking this position they were speaking for the women of New York City, not for themselves. All they asked was that the women be treated fairly.

Thereupon a vote by division was called for and taken upon the resolution under discussion, with the result that the motion to strike out was carried by a vote of 20 for to 5 against.

Acting Secretary Craig then read the following Resolutions, to which no objections were made, and which therefore, under the rule, stood adopted as read:

Resolved, That the Council be authorized to approve the production of a convenient button or pin style of the official badge of the Association, that may be worn conveniently at all times by members, and that this form of the official badge be distributed to members by the General Secretary upon the payment of a sum which will be commensurate with the cost.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association hereby voice its approval of the movement in favor of one cent letter postage.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association favor the so-called zone system of parcel post, whereunder charge for the transportation of parcels by mail is in proportion to the distance, and that it favors such a modification of the present parcel post law as will prevent transportation by mail of prison-made articles of manufacture.

Resolved, That it is the sense of the American Pharmaceutical Association that in order to minimize the danger of the internal use of poisonous tablets intended for external use only, tablets containing toxic substances in sufficient amount to be dangerous to life if taken internally, should comply with the following requirements: (1) The form, size, markings and color of tablets intended for external use should be distinctive, and the color should preferably be of some water soluble dye, calculated to call attention to the dangerous nature of the tablet when dissolved. (2) Dangerously toxic tablets should be marketed and sold at retail in glass containers only. (3) The labels on such containers should be printed in red on white paper; should bear the word "poison" in large type, the death's head symbol, a

caution against internal use and against placing the package in the vicinity of medicines to be used internally, and directions for the emergency treatment of accidental poisoning from the use of such tablets.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association recommend to the committees of Revision of the United States Pharmacopœia and the National Formulary that they consider carefully the advisability of including in these books of national standards recommendations for appropriate methods of indicating the dangerous character of poisonous tablets.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association go on record in favor of such a revision of the United States patent and trade-mark laws as will tend to prevent the extortion of exorbitant prices for medicinal and chemical products patented or trade-marked in the United States, but that it is opposed to the provisions of the present measure, known as the Oldfield Bill, as unfair to inventors and manufacturers alike, and as tending to promote monopoly by compelling inventors and manufacturers for self-protection to keep secret the methods and processes for the preparation of newly discovered medicinal substances.

Acting Secretary Craig next read the following Resolution:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association request of Congress that it revise the existing internal revenue laws so as to provide for a special nominal tax upon the sale of alcohol for medicinal, scientific, mechanical or pharmaceutical purposes, and the sale of alcohol containing liquids upon prescriptions, the tax-paid stamp issued for such purposes to be different in design from that issued to the retail dealer in alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes.

Mr. Mayo, in commenting upon this resolution, said that he thought it might be well to make it more specific as to the designation "retail liquor dealers." The wording, "the tax-paid stamp issued for such purposes to be different in design from that issued to the retail dealer in alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes," might mean simply in the wording as referring to the design. He moved to amend by adding thereto, "and be specifically termed a druggist's license." The idea was, to make it perfectly clear that it was not in design only, but in title, that the stamp should be different.

Mr. Craig stated that this thought had occurred to the Committee, but they desired to include the sale of alcohol for medicinal, scientific, mechanical or pharmaceutical purposes, and they could not say that only druggists should have this license, for anybody who sold under that license must have it.

Mr. Beringer suggested that there were already two forms of certificate, one for the wholesaler and the other for the retail liquor dealer, the stamp-tax for the latter being lettered, "R. L. D."

Mr. Mayo said he had drawn up the resolution, presented from New York and that it was a matter he had been agitating for some years past. What the druggists wanted was some legislation or regulation providing for a new form of tax, and he had suggested a retail druggist's separate license. He thought he would press this point and ask that the tax-paid stamp issued for such purpose be different in design and designation from that issued for retail dealers in alcoholic liquors. He moved, therefore, to insert the words "and designation" after the word "design." The Government now required that the druggists should take out a retail liquor license; and in Mississippi, for example, if a man held this license it was *prima facie* evidence that he was selling whiskey. He had consulted several lawyers relative to changing the name of this license, and had been told by all of them that there was no chance to have it done; that it would be class legislation, and on that ground such a measure would not pass. He expressed the belief that there was a chance by simply showing the designation.

The Chair stated that the Committee on Resolutions was willing to accept this change, and if there were no objections, the resolution as read, with the words "and designation" inserted after the word "design," would be adopted.

The Acting Secretary read the following resolution, to which there was no objection, and it stood adopted:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association continue its affiliation with the National Drug Trades Conference.

The Acting Secretary read the following resolution:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association recommend to the Committees of Revision of the United States Pharmacopœia and the National Formulary that they include in the next revised issues of those volumes a minimum list of apparatus and utensils required for the proper manufacturing and testing of the products for which working processes are given.

Geo. M. Beringer said he did not think this idea was at all practicable; it might be sufficient today, and next month it might be insufficient. It was foreign to the idea of any of the Pharmacopœias to include a list of apparatus and utensils. For this reason, he moved to non-concur in this resolution.

Doctor Payne stated that, in his own experience, he had found a cut-and-dried list of apparatus not to be useful. One of the first things a pharmacist had to learn was to be able to utilize different kinds of apparatus for different purposes. He had found that students in drug stores always wanted to use the apparatus included in the text-books. It did serve a good purpose for the schools to put in a certain amount of apparatus, but he thought it would do the pharmacists no good to rely on a list like this, because, if made out properly, it should show how much range should be given in carrying out certain processes. It was very necessary for a man to learn to utilize the apparatus he had.

Mr. W. S. Richardson here seconded the motion of Mr. Beringer.

Mr. Beal said the resolution was simply a recommendation that it would be advisable for the Committees of Revision to include somewhere, perhaps in an appendix to the U. S. P. and N. F., a suggestive list—not necessarily a complete or perfect list—of utensils which a druggist contemplating a given manufacturing process would be expected to have. It struck him that it would have a good effect if such a list were included in the Pharmacopœia and National Formulary, in which event probably thousands of drug stores now unprovided with such utensils would soon become equipped with them. He thought this would be a good thing for the pharmacists of the country, for he thought the Association could do some good in this way, and expressed the hope that the resolution would not be voted down without due consideration.

Mr. Wallace heartily agreed with the views of Mr. Beal. He believed that if such a list of apparatus should be included somewhere in the Pharmacopœia, whether by way of appendix or otherwise, it would be a valuable addition thereto; and, even though it might be necessary to change it within a year or two, it would nevertheless be a valuable thing for the profession to have.

Mr. Mayo said he thought Mr. Beringer was mistaken in saying that such a list was entirely foreign to the Pharmacopœias of the world. He knew there was one in the French Codex, and Mr. Craig had informed him that there was one in the German Pharmacopœia.

Mr. Murray said his recollection was that the German pharmacists were obliged to have a specified list of apparatus on hand.

Continuing, Mr. Mayo said that what was proposed was, that the Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary should require a minimum outfit of some kind, and this could be made very simple, as it would contain very few things. He thought it would be a very desirable addition to the Pharmacopoeia, but doubted whether the Committee of Revision would take favorably to the idea, as he knew that several suggestions had been made to the Committee which they had not regarded with favor.

Mr. Beringer said he wished to make himself plain upon this subject: In Germany every pharmacist was licensed by the Government, and he was required to have certain articles and certain medicines in his store before he could secure a license to do business. Such conditions did not exist in this country. A Pharmacopoeia was, primarily, in this country today a legal standard for formulas and medicines. "We have never attempted to dictate to a man," said Mr. Beringer. "We don't attempt to dictate how many pieces of apparatus he shall have, and I don't believe, personally, it is feasible to prepare such a list of apparatus. I don't believe any two men on the Committee of Revision would agree as to the number of burettes or pipettes that should be required to make up such a list of utensils." He agreed with Doctor Payne that pharmacists should learn to make use of the apparatus they had, and get good results. He failed to see how the mere putting of such a list in the Pharmacopoeia could be construed as a legal authority, under our present laws, to have these utensils in stock. He did not consider that it was at all practicable to introduce such matter, and expressed himself as anxious that the Association should not place itself on record before the Committee on Revision in a useless or senseless way.

Mr. Mason said that two thoughts had occurred to him as he had listened to this discussion. First, it seemed clear to him that such contemplated list would be foreign to the nature of a book of standards, and would more appropriately appear, he thought, in a text-book on pharmacy. In the second place, he regarded it as surplusage, because he could not believe that any pharmacists who were qualified to carry out the assay processes of the Pharmacopoeia would not know what apparatus they ought to use. On the other hand, the exceptional man—if he might be so called—who did not carry out such assay processes, would not need such a list.

Doctor Payne said that all who had had experience knew that a man could take a half-ounce or ounce bottle, scratch a mark on it, and do just as accurate specific-gravity work as he could with a flask made by a pharmaceutical manufacturer. In a legal case which came up in Georgia, the prosecution made the point that the defendant had not taken the specific gravity correctly, because he did not use a pycnometer; and when they came to inquire what a pycnometer was, they found it was nothing but a specific-gravity bottle. At last, it all depended on accurate weighing and measuring. He suggested that by drawing the line too tightly in regard to apparatus, some legal liability might be incurred by failure to have the particular kind of apparatus called for by the Pharmacopoeia.

Thereupon, the motion of Mr. Beringer to strike out the resolution under consideration was put to a vote and carried.

Acting Secretary Craig read the following resolutions, to which no objections were offered, and which, therefore, under the rule, stood adopted as read:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association go on record in favor of the supplementing of federal anti-narcotic legislation by the enactment of effective anti-narcotic laws uniform in all the states in order that the illicit traffic in habit-forming drugs may be better suppressed.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association hereby record its appreciation of the valuable services of Honorable Francis Burton Harrison, Dr. Hamilton Wright and the members of the National Drug Trades Conference in the preparation of a bill for the federal supervision of the traffic in habit-forming narcotic drugs.

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association endorse and approve the federal measure known as the Harrison Bill H. R. 6282, providing for the registration of dealers in narcotic drugs as a reasonable and effective measure to provide means of tracing the principal habit-forming narcotic drugs from the time of their introduction into the United States until they reached the hands of the physician and the retail druggist, and that although we believe that the provisions of the measure would be improved by substituting in paragraph b, of Section 2, the words "a regularly licensed physician, dentist or veterinary surgeon" for the words "a physician, dentist or veterinary surgeon registered under this act," and that its purpose would be more completely fulfilled if it provided the same restrictions upon the dispensing physician as it does upon the retail pharmacist, the Association hereby pledges its influence in favor of the enactment of the aforementioned bill.

Resolved, That in the opinion of the American Pharmaceutical Association there is a great need for reform in the matter of the exemption of dispensing physicians and the drugs they dispense from the provisions of the state laws relating to the practice of pharmacy, and the Association go on record in favor of the enactment of state legislation tending to bring about this reform.

Mr. Craig, as Chairman of the sub-Committee on Resolutions, reported that the Committee had a resolution from the New York Branch, regarding the form in which the report on Progress of Pharmacy should be published, but which the Committee did not act upon, as they were informed by the Council that the action called for had already been taken. He also stated that there was a resolution in regard to castile soap, presented by one not a member of the House of Delegates, and this resolution had failed of action for that reason.

Mr. Beal said that if the resolution was rejected, for the reason that he was not a member of the House of Delegates, it was a mistake. If, on the other hand, it was rejected because the Committee did not favor the resolution, that was a matter within their province. He thought there could be no doubt that any member of this Association had the right to hand in resolutions to the House of Delegates, and the same could not be refused consideration for the reason only that he was not a member of the House of Delegates.

The Chair said that he would rule that the sub-Committee on Resolutions should present at this time, for action by the House, any resolutions or motions offered by any member of the American Pharmaceutical Association, or any Section thereof, or any delegate having a seat in this body, where such resolutions or motions had been set aside because of the decision of the sub-Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. Craig explained that this resolution was presented as coming from the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association, which had no delegates seated, and for this reason he had brought the matter up. The Committee did not know what to do with it, under the circumstances. They thought they had no right to act upon it, believing that all resolutions must come from Sections or delegates. They did not believe a member could come into the House of Delegates

and offer a resolution. They had no information on the subject from which to form a conclusion as to whether this resolution did, or did not, come from the Ohio State Association.

Mr. Wallace endorsed the action by the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions as absolutely correct. He did not believe that an organization having no accredited delegates to this body had a right to present resolutions.

Mr. Beal, by way of amplifications of his remarks just made, stated that the credentials of the Ohio representatives had been received and approved, and were in the hands of the House of Delegates; but at the last moment the gentleman who was delegated to bring them, one of the representatives, was unavoidably detained, and another member was kept from attending by the sudden death of his son. The resolution had been sent to him as General Secretary of the Association, and he had made a statement of the facts to the Council, that such resolutions had been offered, and that, with the approval of the Council he had transmitted them to the House of Delegates.

Mr. Craig said that, as Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, he was glad to be enlightened on this point, although the Committee had not taken action on the resolutions for the reason stated.

The Chair here ruled that, after being presented to the House of Delegates and referred to the Committee on Resolutions, the Committee had no authority to say they were not legal, or in due form for action.

Mr. Craig acknowledged that the Committee stood corrected on this point.

Thereupon, Acting Secretary Craig read the following Resolution:

Resolved, That the delegates of the American Pharmaceutical Association to the National Drug Trades Conference be instructed to give consideration to the feasibility of amending Section 7, Regulation 7, under the Federal Food and Drugs Act so as to allow the sale of no products that deviate from official standards.

Mr. C. M. Woodruff said he did not wish to object to this resolution, or to provoke discussion, but the resolution involved a question about which there was destined to be a decided conflict between those who had proposed it and those who did not believe that all the work of years of investigation and thousands upon thousands of dollars invested in products not conforming to the U. S. Pharmacopoeia, but equally as good, in the opinion of thousands using them, if this proposition was not modified so as to protect them. The manufacturers of these products would fight, and fight hard, for what they believed to be their industrial rights. He thought some such organization as the National Drug Trade Conference should get together upon some modification of the law that would at once correct the evil complained of and protect their rights. The wording of the Richardson Bill—which was not such as had been approved by any association that he knew of—would have made it impossible to market any article found in the Pharmacopoeia under a name other than that given in the Pharmacopoeia. It would have put the homeopaths and eclectics out of business, practically, and would have deprived thousands of physicians of the use of preparations they believed they had the right to use.

Mr. Woodruff reiterated his suggestion that the National Drug Trade Conference, where the representatives of the manufacturers, and of the American Pharmaceutical Association, the National Wholesale Druggists Association and

the N. A. R. D., could get together and canvass this subject, and come to some agreement. He went on to tell of an instance in the State of New Jersey, where, under the old law of that State, a drug which did not conform in strength to the U. S. P. was adulterated, three druggists had been fined \$50 apiece for having a tincture of nux vomica that did not contain the U. S. P. amount of extractive matter, though it had sufficient of the active principle and was a superior article. It was about that time that a Pure Drug Bill was introduced into Congress, which incorporated the New Jersey provision. The question was, how to prevent the repetition of such injustice. The variation clause was the answer. It was true that, with the variation clause, had come many abuses; but the thing to do was to try to correct them, and at the same time preserve the rights of the manufacturer and the rights of the wholesaler, and also to establish the rights of thousands upon thousands of physicians who prescribed preparations not conforming to the U. S. P., and of the druggists who dispensed them, but with the difference stated on the label so that the physician or druggist could understand it. It was no argument to say that the public could not tell the difference, because the manufacturers were not putting up these articles to be sold to the public. They were putting them up to be placed on the shelves of the druggists, and every druggist knew what the U. S. P. prescribed. Mr. Woodruff closed by saying that he believed that when all the interests got together and thought the matter thoroughly over, all objections could be met by modifying these provisions.

Mr. Beringer said that he thought the principle of this resolution, to stop adulteration in every way possible in reason, was one that all were in accord with. Of course there were certain practical difficulties and dangers which were bound to come up from the adoption of such an amendment to the Pure Food and Drugs Act, which would permit no deviation whatever from the standards laid down in the U. S. Pharmacopoeia or National Formulary. As a member of the U. S. P. Revision Committee, he said it had come to his lot to do considerable experimenting, and to make critical examination of these formulas. If the Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary were infallible, there would be no need for corrections, and the standards laid down in the law could be accepted without hesitation. This was not always the case, however. Only recently he had had to point out an error in solution of iron iodide, which had to be corrected. If there were no deviation clause, no provision for variation in the Pure Food and Drugs Act, a National or State law, the druggists would often times be committing a crime. Moreover, it was not desirable to prevent improvements in formula. He instanced the formula for elixir of phosphate of iron, quinine and strychnine, U. S. P. There had been a change of manipulation, by which better and more permanent preparations had been produced—a decided improvement had been made.

Continuing, Mr. Beringer said that when the New Jersey Pure Food and Drugs Law was passed, the druggists very soon realized that they were in an extremely dangerous position. For instance, he said, they had prescriptions for such an article as emulsion of cod liver oil, 40 percent or probably 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ percent, that would not comply with the Pharmacopoeial standard, and the druggists would have been liable under the law for prosecution. The same was true as

to certain plasters; the manufacturers made for both home and export trade an article that was not the official belladonna plaster. After considerable agitation they had succeeded in getting written into the State law a clause providing for articles not complying with the standard, except as to preparations of opium, camphor and peppermint; where there should be no deviation from the official standard, because these were common articles sold in domestic trade and frequently adulterated. Mr. Beringer concluded with the statement that if, under present conditions such a clause as was contemplated by the resolution was embodied in the Food and Drugs Act, it would be exposing the druggists of the country to great danger. He expressed himself as favoring some modification of the proposed requirement which, while closing every avenue of adulteration, would at the same time protect the trade in their legitimate sphere of manufacturing and dealing. He thought that the suggestion of the gentleman who had just spoken, that this matter should be submitted to the Committee of this Association on Drug Conference was a wise one, and he moved that the resolution be referred to that Conference.

Mr. Mason seconded the motion made by Mr. Woodruff, and it was unanimously carried.

The Acting Secretary then read the following resolution, to which no objection was made, and it stood adopted:

Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association recommend to the Committees of Revision of the United States Pharmacopœia and the National Formulary, the incorporation in the books of official standards such synonyms as will compel uniformity of product and eliminate the opportunity for unfair competition.

In this connection Mr. Beringer explained that the Committee on Pharmacopœia had already considered the subject of synonyms, and had taken action thereon. He had no doubt that the next revision would carry a great many synonyms that would be entirely appropriate and very nearly in conformity with this resolution.

The Acting Secretary then read the following resolution, heretofore referred to as coming from the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association:

WHEREAS, The market is flooded with various mongrel preparations, masquerading under the fair name of Castile Soap, we recommend the reincorporation of the terms "Castile Soap" and "White Castile Soap" as synonyms for "Sapo" in the forthcoming edition of the Pharmacopœia.

Mr. Beal stated that this resolution referred to a subject which was doubtless quite important, and in order that the subject might have proper consideration, he moved that the resolution be returned to the Council, with the request that it be referred to the Committee on U. S. Pharmacopœia of this Association.

Doctor Payne seconded this motion.

Mr. Beringer said he thought the object aimed at in this resolution would be fully met if the reincorporation of the words "Castile Soap" and "White Castile Soap" as synonyms for "Sapo" should be recommended in the forthcoming Pharmacopœia. This would fix the legal standard of these terms, and meet the question raised here, without putting the Association in the peculiar situation of adopting the word "mongrel."

Mr. Beal said that he would withdraw his motion, in view of Mr. Beringer's suggestion.

Thereupon, Mr. Beringer moved that the resolution just read be adopted, and this motion was seconded by Mr. Payne and carried.

Acting Secretary Craig read the following resolution, from the Section on Historical Interests which he stated had not reached the Committee until to-night:

Resolved, That this Section be represented by a paper on Historical Pharmacy at the Eleventh International Congress of Pharmacy at The Hague in September next; that the history of the American Pharmaceutical Association by W. C. Alpers, be selected.

There was no objection to this resolution, and it stood adopted as read.

Mr. Mayo here stated that he was not clear as to the scope of duty of the House of Delegates, and desired to submit a question for information. He said he had a report of the Committee on International Pharmaceutical Nomenclature, and this report recommended that delegates to the International Pharmaceutical Congress be instructed to move for the appointment by the International Congress of a Committee on Unification of Pharmaceutical Nomenclature throughout the world. It was simply a matter of policy, and the recommendation was for the appointment of this Committee and its instruction. The report had not yet been submitted to the Association, as it had been crowded out for lack of time at the last general session; and he asked for a ruling from the Chairman as to whether or not this matter should be brought up before the House of Delegates.

The Chair said that his idea of the function of the House of Delegates was, that all resolutions should pass through the House, both those presented by delegates from different Associations and those presented from the different Sections; that, instead of being referred directly, as formerly, they were now referred to the House of Delegates, action taken on same by the House, and its recommendation passed on to the Council for general action by the Association.

Mr. Mayo said this ruling made it competent for him to introduce the desired resolution in his personal capacity, and he would therefore move

That the House of Delegates recommend that the delegates from the American Pharmaceutical Association to the Eleventh International Pharmaceutical Conference be instructed to move for the appointment of an International Committee on the Unification of Pharmaceutical Nomenclature, both as to pharmacopœial and non-pharmacopœial remedies and drugs.

This motion was seconded by Mr. Beringer and carried.

This concluded the series of resolutions to be considered by the House.

Mr. Beal said it seemed to him that the House of Delegates owed the Committee on Resolutions a very hearty vote of thanks for this most excellent series of recommendations. There were a few points, however, where he thought some slight additions or changes might be of benefit. For example in the resolution holding that the establishment of a "home" for the American Pharmaceutical Association was desirable. He thought there was danger that the word "home" might be misunderstood, as pointed out by President Day in his presidential address. It seemed to him, therefore, that this resolution would be improved by inserting after the word "home" the words: "or permanent official headquarters."

Mr. Beringer and Doctor Payne both thought the word "home" might be dropped to advantage, if the words "or permanent official headquarters" were

inserted, and the Chair stated that, without objection, this change would be made, since it was a mere change in wording, and did not change the sense of the resolution. It was so ordered.

Mr. Beal also moved to strike out from the resolution endorsing the Harrison Bill (H. R. 6282), providing for the registration of dealers in narcotic drugs, the language, "and that although we believe that the provisions of the measure would be improved by substituting in paragraph b. of section 2, the words, 'a regularly licensed physician, dentist or veterinary surgeon,' for the words, 'a physician, dentist or veterinary surgeon registered under this act.'"

The Chair stated that, by common consent, the action of the House on this resolution might be reconsidered; whereupon Mr. Beringer seconded Mr. Beal's motion to amend, and it was unanimously carried.

Mr. Mayo suggested a change in the resolution, "That the American Pharmaceutical Association go on record as in favor of the supplementing of Federal anti-narcotic legislation by the enactment of effective anti-narcotic laws uniform in all the states, in order that illicit traffic in habit-forming drugs may be better suppressed." He thought the word "illicit" was rather tautological in the connection used, and moved to strike it out and insert the words "for illegitimate purposes," after the words "habit-forming drugs," so that the latter clause would read "in order that the traffic in habit-forming drugs for illegitimate purposes may be better suppressed."

The Chair stated that, without objection, the resolution would be amended as suggested, and it was so ordered.

Thereupon, upon motion of Mr. Beal, duly seconded, the recommendations as a whole were adopted, and ordered to be transmitted to the Council, in accordance with the By-Laws.

The Chair called for miscellaneous business as the next order, but nothing was offered.

The Chair then stated that the election of officers for the ensuing year was the final order of business, and called for nominations for Chairman.

Prof. Clyde M. Snow, of Chicago, was nominated by Mr. Craig for Chairman, and the nomination seconded by Mr. Wallace. On motion, nominations for Chairman were closed, and the Secretary was directed to cast the affirmative ballot of the House of Delegates for Mr. Snow for Chairman for the ensuing year. The Secretary announced that he had cast the ballot as directed, and the Chair declared Mr. Snow duly elected.

Nominations for Vice-Chairman were called for, and W. S. Richardson, of Washington, was nominated by Mr. Snow, and the nomination was seconded by Mr. Day. The Chair stated that, without objection, nominations would be closed, and the Secretary instructed to cast the affirmative ballot of the House for Mr. Richardson for Vice-Chairman, and it was so ordered.

Nominations for Second Vice-Chairman were called for, and Linwood A. Brown, of Kentucky, was nominated by Mr. Claus. Nominations were closed, and the Secretary was directed to cast the affirmative ballot of the House for Mr. Brown.

Nominations for Secretary were called for, and R. A. Kuever, of Iowa, was

nominated by Mr. Wallace. Nominations were closed and the Secretary directed to cast the affirmative ballot of the House for Mr. Kuever.

At this point, on motion of Mr. Craig, seconded by Mr. Mason, an adjournment was taken for five minutes.

Upon resumption, Mr. Craig brought up the amendment to the By-Laws previously presented and moved it be adopted, and this motion was seconded by Mr. Richardson and carried.

Acting Chairman Anderson announced that this concluded the business of the House of Delegates, and he would call on Dr. Otto Claus, of St. Louis, to escort the newly-elected officers to the rostrum, for installation. Dr. Claus duly performed this very pleasant duty, and introduced, successively, Mr. Snow, as Chairman, Mr. Richardson, as Vice Chairman, Mr. Brown, as Second Vice-Chairman and Mr. Kuever, as Secretary.

Mr. Snow took the chair, and stated that a motion to adjourn was now in order, and he would entertain a motion to that effect.

Mr. Mayo stated that, before this motion was put, he wished to move a vote of thanks to the retiring and very efficient officers of the House of Delegates serving during the past year, including the very efficient Secretary—not forgetting the Assistant Secretary. This motion was seconded by Mr. Beal, and carried by a unanimous rising vote.

Upon motion duly seconded, the House of Delegates then stood adjourned *sine die*.

THE NECESSITY OF SOUND PREPARATION.

Any one who hopes to achieve success, even the average, must know more, or at least as much, about some one thing as any other one, and not only know, but know how to do—and how to utilize his experience and knowledge for the benefit of others. Broad success depends on singleness of purpose, clear perception of what is to be desired and to be accomplished, and capacity to recognize true values of men and things and properly place them. Thorough preparation in elementary knowledge, wherever and however it may be acquired, development and training of the powers of concentration and application, is the best, in fact the only, foundation upon which to build this special or technical training. After this the willingness to persevere in the effort to accomplish something for the purpose of accomplishment, the ambition to do whatever is to be done and whatever is undertaken, and do it right—making personal ambition secondary to everything else—will bring about great success, provided the God-given, or inherent, capacity to do great things exists; but in any case success up to the full measure of capacity.

Without this preparation and training, failure is absolutely certain.—*T. A. Vail.*