

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

BY CARL G. A. HARRING.

Jan. 1, 1933, on hand.....	\$359.46	Jan. 15th, Printing minutes.....	\$ 10.66
Received dues from 30 members.....	150.00	Envelopes and stamps.....	3.96
	<hr/>	Mimeographing.....	3.00
	\$509.46	Mailing.....	1.65
Less expenditures.....	277.57	June 1st, Mimeographing.....	1.50
	<hr/>	Stamps.....	2.00
Cash on hand, Dec. 31, 1933.....	\$231.89	June 20th, Mimeographing.....	1.75
		Mailing.....	1.50
		July 5th, Mimeographing.....	4.50
		Stamps.....	1.50
		Aug. 16th, Mimeographing.....	3.00
		Aug. 24th, Mimeographing.....	4.75
		Sept. 15th, Mimeographing.....	2.25
		Stamps.....	2.00
		Donation to Century of Progress.....	50.00
		Donation to American Institute of	
		Pharmacy.....	100.00
		Honorarium to Secretary.....	50.00
		Oct. 15th, JOUR. A. PH. A.....	25.00
		Nov. 1st, Stamps.....	3.30
		Dec. 10th, Mimeographing.....	1.75
		Stamps.....	1.50
		Dec. 30th, Mimeographing and Mail-	
		ing.....	2.00
			<hr/>
			\$277.57

During 1934, 18 members have paid dues amounting to \$90 and about \$21 have been expended, which would leave on hand at this time \$300.

The address of President Robert C. Wilson was read. It follows:

ABSTRACT OF THE REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN.

BY R. C. WILSON.

Fellow Secretaries:

I do not propose to burden you with an extensive address but am using this opportunity simply for a few remarks on some matters in which we are vitally interested. I will not attempt a review of the various matters which have transpired during the year, but on the other hand while certain of these events are fresh in our minds I want to discuss one or two of them with you, which may have to do with our future welfare.

1. I believe that this Conference should be enlarged in so far as membership is concerned to include all other officers in addition to the secretaries; thus, by opening up the membership in this way would be very helpful by increasing the number attending this group and tend to bring together in a more general way the leaders in pharmacy throughout America, and would stimulate a much broader interest in the work of this Conference.

I, therefore, recommend for your consideration and action, if you deem advisable, that the name of this Conference be changed to read, "The Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Officers," and include elected or appointed officials of any or all of our State and Territorial associations.

2. American Pharmacy, as I see it, has been subject to many calls within the past and sensing that a crisis confronted us, or we thought it did, we have responded or attempted to respond to each of these calls, many of which were leading in diverse directions and getting us nowhere. Events of the recent past should impress upon us the importance of being able to present a united front, particularly in so far as our national objectives are concerned. We should be subject to one call, which should be promulgated by a properly constituted authority with the ability for real leadership.

I would not deny to the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the Drug Institute and the National Drug Trade Conference the right to existence so long as their primary objective is for the welfare of pharmacy in America. I do feel that if these organizations had given more attention to our State pharmaceutical associations, that their own work might have proven more worth while and our own State association's work would have been cemented one with another on a much firmer basis.

We are not only subject to calls from these national organizations but also from various minor groups as well as individuals who, independent of all other groups, are also seeking to establish themselves as leaders. This is not as it should be. Unless and until some sort of a plan for the unification and centralization of our efforts and objectives is found, American Pharmacy will continue to flounder as in the past; present conditions are the result.

We have seen our State associations ignored at times by our National associations; they come into our States for organization purposes, frequently without our knowledge or consent, seeking to build up their own organizations without due regard to or consideration for our State associations.

Lastly, we have seen the organization of District Drug Code Councils without any regard whatever for or relationship to the State associations. What comes next we cannot tell, but unless and until this matter of the invasion of the individual states by any and every organization which may come along, intent upon ignoring the existence of our State associations, is controlled in some way, then there will be no place for our state organizations.

I would, therefore, recommend that this Conference adopt some resolution covering the points I have just discussed with the idea of insuring some definite restraint against the possibility of future ignoring of our State pharmaceutical set-ups.

The address of the President was received and discussion deferred to the Second Session of the Conference; and a committee was appointed to present a report on the address at the Second Session.

After further discussion William B. Day moved to extend invitations to State associations to be represented by all their officers, or as many as could attend. F. V. McCullough moved that the recommendations of President Wilson be considered following the Joint Session with the Section on Education and Legislation. It was so ordered.

J. J. Gill reported the illness of Secretary Haring and on motion a telegram was sent to him, expressing sympathy and the hope for his early recovery.

Walter D. Adams moved that a committee be appointed to draft resolutions and spread them on the minutes on the death of Edgar D. Oslin and that a copy of the resolutions be sent to his widow. It was so ordered.

President Wilson read a telegram of greetings from Secretary Elbert R. Weaver of Oklahoma Pharmaceutical Association.

Prescott R. Loveland moved that an honorarium of fifty dollars be paid Secretary Haring and that the Secretary-Treasurer be authorized to draw a check to that amount payable to himself—carried unanimously.

The list of topics for discussion were read. It follows:

(Instead of repeating the subjects they will be hereafter referred to by number.)

1. "Is it desirable, if so, is it possible to form a National Association from the various State Associations with every member of the State Association automatically a member of the National Association without payment of additional membership dues?"

Discussion opened by A. L. I. Winne, Secretary, Virginia Pharmaceutical Association.

2. "Is a State Drug Code desirable in addition to the National Code?"

Discussion opened by Prescott R. Loveland, Secretary, N. J. Pharmaceutical Association.

3. "Since the State Associations have been ignored in the National Drug Code set-up, what should be the attitude of the State Associations to Code matters?"

Discussion opened by J. Lester Hayman, Secretary, West Virginia Pharmaceutical Association.

4. "Can a plan be evolved whereby one membership fee can be made to cover State and National Association dues?"

Discussion opened by R. A. Turrel, Secretary, Michigan State Pharmaceutical Association.

5. "The organization of Congressional Districts or County Units."

Discussion opened by J. W. Slocum, Secretary, Iowa Pharmaceutical Association.

6. "Is the handling of liquor in drug stores under prohibition repeal on a satisfactory basis? What changes or improvements should be made?"

Discussion opened by F. V. McCullough, Secretary, Indiana Pharmaceutical Association.

7. "Is it desirable, if so, is it possible to have this Conference submit to each State association each year some suggestions as to the program with the idea of unifying our efforts toward some definitive objectives, National in scope?"

Discussion opened by W. D. Adams, Secretary, Texas Pharmaceutical Association.

8. "Is there a desirability and a possibility of holding joint meetings of the Pharmaceutical Associations with the State Medical and Dental Associations?"

Discussion opened by E. F. Kelly, Secretary, Maryland Pharmaceutical Association.

9. "What steps can be taken through Association channels to curb the practise of manufacturers packaging 10¢ sizes of proprietary medicines and cosmetics for distribution through department stores?"

Discussion opened by Roy C. Reese, Secretary, Kansas Pharmaceutical Association.

10. "To what extent can the professional phases of Pharmacy be made a part of our programs?"

Discussion opened by J. G. Beard, Secretary, North Carolina Pharmaceutical Association.

Editor Eberle extended greetings and offered to do whatever he could to help the cause of the Conference.

On motion duly seconded the reports of the Secretary and of the Treasurer were accepted with thanks of the Conference.

President Wilson stated that the topics for discussion would be taken up. A. L. I. Winne presented Topic No. 1.

Discussion was opened by A. L. I. Winne on the program item entitled, "Is it desirable, if so, is it possible to form a National Association from the various State Associations with every member of the State Association automatically a member of the National Association without payment of additional membership dues?" Mr. Winne reviewed the circumstances which prompted the inclusion of this item on the Conference program, referring to an editorial appearing in the January *Virginia Pharmacist*, and discussed the proposition briefly, presenting the seeming advantages that might accrue from a federation of State Association members and at the same time pointing out the disadvantages and the possible conflict with the several existing national organizations.

The chairman then opened the topic for discussion and views were expressed by a number of those present. There was naturally a division of opinion and while a considerable number of the secretaries present thought that the plan might be successfully carried out others objected on the grounds of the difficulties to be encountered in the formation of another national organization, and of the possibility of a division of strength rather than the promotion of unity, and of the weakening effects which such an organization might have upon the already existing nation-wide associations. Those taking part in the discussion were Secretary Reese of Kansas, Secretary Adams of Texas, Secretary Wilson of Georgia, Secretary Clark of Wisconsin, Secretary McCullough of Indiana, Secretary Loveland of New Jersey, Secretary Pilchard of Pennsylvania, Secretary Slocum of Iowa, Secretary Plaxco of South Carolina, Secretary Day of Illinois, Secretary Mather of New York, Secretary Hayman of West Virginia and Mr. Riemenschneider of Chicago.

The discussion did not lead to any formal action but the incoming president was authorized to appoint a committee to give it further study and to empower this committee, under the direction of the President, to call a special meeting of the secretaries of the several state associations, at a place to be designated, to formulate plans and effect an organization, if deemed advisable.

This committee was also authorized to bring to the attention of each state association secretary the outline of the plan and to request that it be presented at the impending annual meeting of each state association for discussion, and for such action as the association desired to take with reference to the proposition. (Abstracted by A. L. I. Winne.)

Secretary E. F. Kelly expressed appreciation of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION for the work being done by the Conference and hoped that the relationship with State associations would be closer, for he believed firmly in the value of their coöperation. These bodies should meet several times a year and hold longer sessions and for this purpose the American

Institute of Pharmacy presents the opportunity and the ASSOCIATION hopes that these bodies will be one of the strong units of the Headquarters project. In Maryland there is a close coöperation of pharmacists with the medical and dental professions.

Prescott Loveland referred to the coöperation of the medical, dental and pharmaceutical professions and other related organizations in New Jersey.

Roy C. Reese referred to these bodies in Kansas with the Public Health Council.

President Wilson stated that in Georgia two pharmacists had been named on the State Board of Health.

Prescott Loveland introduced Topic No. 2. He said: In opening this discussion, I will state that the week before last, the pharmacists of New Jersey succeeded in getting a State Retail Drug Code. The primary reason for desiring a State Code was because the Code Authorities under the Federal set-up seemed unable to get action on code violations within a reasonable time.

Several months ago there was formed in the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association the Retail Drug Trade Alliance, a wheel within a wheel. Dr. Fischelis was the Chairman of the Alliance. This newly formed body in coöperation with local and county organizations, proceeded to prepare a State Retail Drug Code similar to the National Code, which, under a law passed and signed by Governor Moore in July of last year, made it possible for a majority of any industry applying for a code to obtain the approval of the Governor for one subject.

The services of a lawyer were obtained and Dr. Fischelis of the Retail Drug Trade Alliance and representatives from the other organizations, patterned a Code of Fair Competition for the Retail Drug Trade of the State of New Jersey. A public hearing was called in Newark on April 17th. A capacity crowd filled the largest room available in the Industrial Building. Deputy State Administrator Tepper was in charge of the meeting and called for statements from proponents and opponents of the code. Dr. Fischelis led off for the proponents, presenting the matter in a very comprehensive way. He was followed by several other speakers.

The opposition was represented by a woman attorney from New York. She stated that her clients bitterly opposed the 21% mark-up. In response to a question by the Deputy Administrator, she stated that no such mark-up was necessary. On being asked who her clients were, she refused to name them, but on Administrator Tepper's statement that he would expunge her remarks from the record, she stated that she would advise him privately who her clients were.

The representative of the owners of a chain of cosmetic shops also opposed the 21% mark-up. He stated that his firm was making money at the present time and did not need any such mark-up. A little cross-questioning by the Deputy Administrator showed the weakness of his argument.

One other opponent was heard, an officer of a department store, who said that his firm was not opposed to the code but was afraid that a 21% mark-up in Newark and Jersey City would drive a lot of business across the river to New York City where no such mark-up was in operation. Administrator Tepper's reply to this was "If New York business men want to do business at starvation prices, I don't see why New Jersey merchants should be compelled to do so."

At the conclusion of this hearing, we were lead to believe that except for some minor changes the code would receive favorable consideration, so that several days later, Dr. Fischelis and the other members of the Committee were quite amazed on learning from the State Administrator that the code would be allowed to go through, but with the mark-up eliminated. At a meeting of the Board of Trustees of the New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association, the members of the Board were unanimously in favor of notifying the authorities that we did not desire a State Retail Drug Code unless it contained a mark-up, and after the matter was discussed, it was agreed that 15% would be the lowest mark-up that would be acceptable, and the State Administrator was so informed.

On April 27th, another mass meeting was called, this time in the Auditorium of the Elks Club, Newark, at which there were present about 1500 pharmacists. Governor Moore and the State Administrator, Colonel Eisner, and Deputy Administrator Tepper were present. In a brief speech, Governor Moore stated that he was glad to be able to assist the pharmacists of New Jersey in making a decent living. The next day, Friday, he signed the code with the 15% mark-up included, which was to take effect the following Monday, but as there was not sufficient time to start the machinery going, the code did not become effective for another week.

The Code Authority was originally intended to consist of 15 druggists and 4 members

representing perfume shops, department stores, etc., and one member, appointed by the Governor, who had no vote. At the organization meeting of the Authority, the Drug Clerks Association thought they should have representation, so the Authority was enlarged and now numbers 21. George L. Mederer, a retail druggist of Newark, was elected director of the State Retail Drug Code Authority. The proposed set-up is, in addition to the director, one assistant director or counsel, 5 regional directors, each with a regional inspector working under him. All information and material will be mailed from the Newark office of the Director. On Monday of this week, a copy of the code and a list of prices was to have been mailed from the Newark office to every retail drug dealer of record in the state.

As I understand it, violations are to be brought to the attention of the regional director who will endeavor to induce the erring brother to comply with the code regulations. If he fails to do so, the matter is to be referred to the Compliance Director.

Secretary Loveland stated that the foregoing was a brief statement regarding the formation of the New Jersey State Retail Drug Code, which was signed by Governor Moore on April 28th and which is just now being put into effect. (Abstracted by Prescott Loveland.)

In reply to F. V. McCullough and Ralph W. Clark, Mr. Loveland said that the wages named were \$35 per week of sixty hours. The Association of Drug Clerks desired seven 8-hour days. He stated further that the Code is on probation for sixty days. Ralph W. Clark referred to several complications of the State code in Wisconsin.

Mr. Riemenschneider inquired whether the legislation is part of the State Recovery Act; in reply, Mr. Loveland said, it is.

A. L. I. Winne said Virginia had a law which paralleled the Federal Act; violation can be punished under the State law.

Ralph W. Clark favored concentrating on the Federal code.

Prescott Loveland thought most druggists favored the State code.

J. W. Slocum stated that cost must be added in dozen price unless assumed by the manufacturer. He inquired whether the 15% mark-up was in addition to the defined cost. Mr. Loveland replied in the affirmative.

President Wilson called upon J. Lester Hayman, of West Virginia, to lead the discussion on the next topic—"Since the State Associations have been ignored in the National Drug Code set-up, what should be the attitude of the State Associations to code matters?" (No. 3.)

Mr. Hayman in the discussion took the attitude that it was the general opinion of most of the secretaries present that the State Associations had been ignored in Code matters with the exception of having been called upon to help in the organization of the Local Congressional District Code Authorities. He called attention to the fact that State Secretaries were called upon by members of the Local Trade Authorities for information and advice and under the present set-up such help could not be obtained either from the State Association or the National Code Authority, which resulted in unsatisfactory conditions in many of the districts.

He said that it was not the attitude of the State Association toward code matters that was particularly important, since all State Associations wanted to be of as much service as possible, the important question is—What may they do, under the circumstances, to be of service to their members?

President Wilson remarked that in answer to questions submitted to him, the National Code Authority replied that "We are busy corresponding with our districts and we haven't got time to talk with State Associations."

Mr. Hayman explained the difficulty experienced in calling the meetings for the election of the members of the Local Code Authorities, the delay and difficulties being due entirely to lack of information from the National Authority in regard to whether or not druggists from stores in towns of less than 2500 population were eligible to vote for the members of the Local Trade Authority. He thought the Local Trade Authorities, especially in the smaller districts, should be informed as to what they may or may not do under the code, and that at the present time due to lack of official information, are trying to follow rules and regulations of the larger cities, such as New York, Chicago, etc.

Charles J. Clayton said that he was under the impression that later on the operations of the code would be turned over to the various trade organizations, and that in their state the association

was drafting amendments to their constitution and by-laws so as to put their organization in a position to take care of the change if such was made.

Roy C. Reese and A. L. I. Winne contributed to the discussion by questions and the relating of similar experiences.

President Wilson appointed the Nominating Committee composed of the following: Mr. Hayman, Mr. Winne and Mr. Clark.

Mr. Slocum called attention to the lateness of the hour and the fact that there were several important topics to be discussed. Several secretaries expressed themselves as feeling that the Secretaries Conference was not given sufficient time. Mr. Hayman moved that the session be continued immediately following the Joint Session on Thursday evening. The motion was carried.

Mr. Reese moved for adjournment, and the motion carried.

The Extra Session of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries was convened May 10, 1934, at 11:15 P.M., by President R. C. Wilson.

F. V. McCullough said one thing to be considered was the recommendation of the President that this organization ought not to be confined to secretaries but that all officers of State Associations should belong.

Roy C. Reese stated that if the membership is limited to not over three officers of any association he would support the recommendation.

J. Lester Hayman said that he believed it would be better to merely invite the other officers to the meeting next year and that if the response was favorable a change could be made.

Prescott Loveland asked if it was the intention to invite all elected officers of a state association and President Wilson replied that he had in mind bringing to the attention of as many people as possible the work of this Conference. He said some associations would continue to send only one or two, but some might send three, four or ten and that it would be helpful in distributing the information brought out in the Conference meetings.

Roy C. Reese believed it would be better to hold the membership down and that more could be accomplished by limiting it to the President, Secretary and one other member. He expressed the opinion that the Conference would get farther and much more would be accomplished. He explained that a large group would consume hours and hours of argument and discussion.

J. J. Gill moved that the membership be limited to the President and Secretary; the motion was seconded by Mr. Reese.

A. L. I. Winne hoped that this motion would not be defeated. He made mention of the fact that he was largely responsible for the organization of the group in St. Louis and that at that time he had in mind the getting together of the secretaries who were the most active officers of the State associations. He said, however, that he wished that he had suggested a Conference of State Association Officials instead of State Association Secretaries. He had no objection to having all the officials of the State associations present nor any reason why they should be excluded from the discussions. He suggested that the name be changed to a "Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Officials" and limit a vote to each State as represented in that body.

J. J. Gill thought the membership should be limited to the President and Secretary.

J. Lester Hayman did not believe it would be a good move to enlarge the membership at this time. He pointed out that Secretary Haring was absent on account of illness and that a copy of the by-laws was not procurable. This being the case it was not definitely known whether change in membership could be made in the by-laws at this meeting. He pointed out that the same purpose could be obtained by merely inviting the presidents or other officers for next year and if the response was favorable, then the membership could be enlarged; he could see no point in doing so without knowing whether or not it was constitutional, or without knowing whether or not the other officers would take an active part in the Conferences.

After further discussion—in which Messrs. Pilchard, McCullough, Gill, Winne, Hayman, Reese, Loveland and Wilson participated—the motion of Mr. Gill did not prevail.

F. V. McCullough said that President Wilson had the good of the Conference in mind when he made the recommendation and, at first, he thought well of it, but that after the discussion he didn't think so well of it. He stated that the Conference was interested in organization work, how to make out programs and how to collect dues, how to run the association. He thought that the Conference was primarily for secretaries and ought to be kept that way. He moved that

the Conference disregard the recommendation of the President; seconded by A. L. I. Winne. The motion was carried.

J. Lester Hayman moved that the Secretary of the Conference be instructed to send a cordial invitation to the presidents of the State Associations to meet with the Conference next year and take part in the deliberations.

Rowland Jones seconded the motion and moved to amend it to have the letter suggest to the President the importance of the Secretary attending these conventions, stating some state associations are not sold on the idea of having the Secretary attend. The mover accepted the amendment and stated that last year in his address he had suggested that it be a duty of the President of the Conference each year, to so address the President of each State Association. The motion was carried.

J. J. Gill thought that the meetings of the Conference should be held a little earlier during the convention; in his opinion they were about as important as anything transacted during the convention. As now held, in widely separated sessions, it was almost impossible to bring before the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION matters of importance before adjournment.

The matter of special business for this session, which was held over at the request of Mr. Adams was postponed due to his absence.

A motion to adjourn was carried.

President Wilson appointed J. Lester Hayman and A. L. I. Winne members of the Committee on Nominations. (The foregoing report was abstracted by J. Lester Hayman of West Virginia.)

SECOND SESSION.

The Second Session of the Conference, of Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries was convened by President Robert C. Wilson, May 11th, at 2:00 P.M. President Wilson called on Walter D. Adams to discuss phases of the President's address. The first question was disposed of following the presentation of A. L. I. Winne.

The second question related to the activities of national associations in securing membership in states, without conferring with state associations. The question was freely discussed by Messrs. Adams, Wilson, Clayton, Slocum and others. The following motion by President Wilson was adopted:

"It is the conviction and the belief of this body that the interests of Pharmacy in America be best served if all national groups will conduct their activities by coöperating with the various State pharmaceutical associations."

Lester J. Hayman presented the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the State pharmaceutical associations have been ignored in the set-up and administration of the National Retail Drug Trade Code Authority, and

WHEREAS, many of the local trade authorities set-up under said code for the enforcement of the provisions seem not to properly understand their authority in many questions concerning the enforcement of the provisions and are not permitted to make interpretations of its provisions, and

WHEREAS, the local Trade authorities turn to State pharmaceutical association secretaries for counsel and advice in many questions concerning the interpretations of the code, as well as to their duties and authority under such code, and

WHEREAS, it has been impossible to obtain the proper advice counsel and interpretations from the National Retail Drug Trade Code Authority, and

WHEREAS, such advice counsel and interpretations have extreme importance in the successful administration and enforcement of the code, therefore be it

Resolved, that the National Retail Drug Trade Code Authority be requested to take immediate steps to properly and promptly interpret the code when called upon to do so by either the local authority or the State pharmaceutical association secretaries.

On motion of J. Lester Hayman, seconded by Walter D. Adams and a vote the resolution was adopted.

Walter D. Adams requested that he be permitted to prepare the resolution on the death of Edgar D. Oslin, after returning to his home. Permission was granted to Mr. Adams; copy of the resolution is to be sent to Mrs. Oslin.

F. V. McCullough suggested that steps be taken to have weekly bulletins issued from Washington, during the sessions of Congress, advising State associations of legislative matters, brief

résués of bills introduced. That State associations address the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION and the National Association of Retail Druggists to take up this matter.

A motion to that end was made and carried.

Topic 4, owing to the absence of R. A. Turrell, was not discussed at this time.

Discussion on Topic 5 was opened by J. W. Slocum.

He referred to a tri-county organization in Iowa, seven or eight years ago; this body has been functioning ever since and has been enlarged. He attended as State Secretary, various district meetings but there was no great interest until the depression came when County groups were organized and then the druggists began to realize the possibilities. The entire ninety-nine counties have been organized.

Much good work has been done by Virgil C. Smith in securing information which made the druggists conscious of the need of group organization. At the monthly meetings items of importance are discussed and Mr. Smith has brought much information to them exemplified by charts; for example, the relation of ten cent items sold in department and ten cent stores, proportionately containing more than regular sizes. Druggists from adjoining states came to hear Mr. Smith.

Much enthusiasm was shown at the meeting of the State association. Manufacturers were ready to confer and those that supplied filling stations and ten cent stores were told and made to understand the situation—they were shown by examples.

Mr. Slocum stated that Iowa druggists had discovered, for the first time, the power of the retail druggists by getting together in groups; the dealing must be fair and reasonable and then a fight made for the right. This work cannot be done by a State association, but better by smaller groups. These groups have their own organizations and study their own problems. Secretary Slocum is preparing monthly bulletins to be sent out to the various groups in which questions which are of interest and importance are presented. This conforms with the thought of A. L. I. Winne.

President Wilson stated that Topic No. 9 was in line with the subject discussed by Secretary Slocum and called on Roy C. Reese, who gave examples of ten cent sizes and the great variety of the products. He referred to a meeting for which he had purchased a variety to illustrate his argument. Mr. Reese gave the relationship of some of these products in ten cent and regular sizes.

The presentation made at the Kansas meeting was repeated at the Missouri convention.

Mr. Reese said that there will now be improvements in many of these matters. He referred to an experience in New York City a number of years ago when he made an effort to call on the wholesalers; he found that many self-styled wholesalers were only designated as such, or at least mainly so, for receiving wholesaler's discount.

A. L. I. Winne offered a motion that the Secretary of the Conference prepare a communication for transmission to the secretaries of the State pharmaceutical associations and bring the subjects to the attention of their respective organizations. The wording was stated as follows, "that the Conference of Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries condemns the practice of any manufacturer who supplies medicines in a 10 cent-size package to outlets other than drug stores and refuses at the same time to supply such packages to the drug trade at a price the same as that charged to other outlets, provided such manufacturers are selling to the drug trade packages of the same product of a larger size." The resolution was adopted.

Mr. Winne stated that he would like to have the suggestion go out to the secretaries which will explain to them that if they wish to get up some discussion at their annual meetings they should have a collection of some of these 10 cent samples. In his opinion, not all pharmacists are aware of the extent to which 10 cent packages are on the market nor do they know of the relation of the regular sizes to the sizes handled in 10 cent and department stores.

Mr. Reese said that he simply displayed the samples so that all could see for themselves.

The next item in the list of topics was No. 6. The discussion was opened by F. V. McCullough who explained the legislation in Indiana and how it applied to the drug stores. Mr. McCullough was of the opinion that if alcoholic beverages were handled with the same conscientious care as other medicines they could be handled satisfactorily. A number of questions were asked relative to the stamps which must be affixed to package goods and whether a physician could write a prescription for blended whisky.

He thought that if the prescription simply called for whisky then the official article had to be dispensed, but if a physician wrote for a blended whisky this could be dispensed as such.

President Wilson stated that owing to the absence of Secretary Beard Question No. 10 would not be discussed, unless some one desired to do so.

A. L. I. Winne and Walter D. Adams presented the following:

Resolved, that the Conference of the Pharmaceutical Secretaries go on record as opposed to the policy of any manufacturer of distributing any of the medicinal products to filling stations, meat markets, pool rooms, etc., in any town or county where there is located a retail drug store." The resolution was adopted.

President Wilson referred back to Topic No. 1 which was discussed at considerable length by A. L. I. Winne and others. Mr. Winne referred to the address of President Swain of the A. Ph. A to the House of Delegates, in which he spoke of his efforts to secure membership for the ASSOCIATION and that the results were disappointing and discouraging. In Mr. Winne's opinion the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION would have to render a dual service if the object was to largely increase the membership, which might be affected by establishing a publication similar to that published by a number of State associations. He referred to the work that the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION is constantly doing for retail druggists and very often the value is not fully understood. He hoped that the Conference would seriously consider taking up this matter with the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. There is not in existence to-day any national association of druggists that can lay claim to represent pharmacy in the United States. He was of the opinion that the only way to accomplish this was by the coöperation of all states working in an organized way to bring into one group all the members of the various State associations. He thought that State associations could increase their membership if they were in position to offer the benefits of both a local and a national tie-up.

J. B. Pilchard was of the opinion that a monthly bulletin concerning national matters and sent to every State secretary each month might solve the question.

A. L. I. Winne thought such a bulletin should carry the information relative to the work going on in Washington in a legislative way and other matters in which the druggists all over the country are interested.

J. B. Pilchard thought that instead of a separate journal which would incorporate the information, the state publications could be built up by carrying such items to the members.

A. L. I. Winne stated that it was necessary for pharmacy to have the support of a sufficiently large number to speak as representative.

President Wilson inquired whether a committee could be appointed from the Conference to confer with the Council of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION on this matter.

F. V. McCullough suggested the following resolution:

Be it resolved, that it is the opinion of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries that federation of State pharmaceutical associations should be formed at an early date and *further resolved* that the matter of such an organization be presented to the Council of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION and to its Executive Committee." The motion was carried.

A. L. I. Winne did not want to make a motion but he hoped that when a committee is appointed the president of the Conference be included as a member of it.

President Wilson thanked the members for their coöperation and interest.

A. L. I. Winne stated that President Wilson had requested him to present a report regarding conflicting dates of Association Meetings in adjoining states. He said that consideration had been given, but it is a very difficult matter to arrange for these meetings without conflicting at times.

J. Lester Hayman reported for the Committee on Nominations as follows: For *President*, F. V. McCullough of Indiana; *First Vice-President*, J. W. Slocum of Iowa; *Second Vice-President*, Roy C. Reese, Kansas; *Secretary-Treasurer*, Carl G. A. Harring of Massachusetts; *Delegate to the House of Delegates*, Charles J. Clayton, Colorado; *Executive Committee*, Robert C. Wilson, J. J. Gill and W. E. Bingham.

On motion duly seconded and a vote, W. E. Bingham was delegated to cast the unanimous vote of the Conference for the nominees. At his request, he being one of the nominees, J. B. Pilchard was instructed to cast the vote.

The officers elected were then duly installed.

President McCullough said that it was his purpose to serve the Conference to the best of his ability and hoped for the support of all the members. He stated that soon after his return home he would prepare a bulletin from the notes he had made and send mimeographed copies to the members.

A. L. I. Winne asked the President to appoint the committee to confer with the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. The following committee was named: F. V. McCullough, J. Lester Hayman, A. L. I. Winne and R. C. Wilson.

The motion was made and duly seconded, giving a vote of thanks and appreciation to the retiring officers. The meeting of the Conference was then adjourned.

(Report of the Joint Meeting with the Section on Education and Legislation and Conference of Law Enforcement Officials, will be printed in the same issue with the Minutes of the Law Enforcement Officials.)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRESCRIPTION TOLERANCES.*

BY HUGO H. SCHAEFER, CHAIRMAN.

The Committee on Prescription Tolerances has now been functioning for two years. During the first year no actual data were collected but a general study of the problems involved was made, meetings were held with Dr. Campbell, Chief of the Bureau of Food and Drug Administration, a news bulletin was prepared and sent out and the entire subject given as much publicity as possible. This was done with a view of obtaining sufficient publicity and to arouse enough interest to enable the Committee to obtain a large number of compounded prescriptions of which a study could be made. The chairman wishes to thank not only the members of his Committee but also Dr. R. L. Swain, of Baltimore, and Mr. John M. Woodside, of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, for furnishing material and data.

The chief factors to be studied in connection with prescription tolerances are as follows:

- (a) Moisture and allowable impurities in chemicals.
- (b) Decomposition and deterioration.
- (c) Unavoidable errors in the weight of the individual powders, pills or capsules.
- (d) Unavoidable losses due to a portion of the prescription ingredients remaining in the mortar or adhering to utensils.
- (e) Unavoidable errors in weighing and measuring.

It was realized that not all of these points could be properly considered at one time and the work of the past year was chiefly in connection with making a study of the unavoidable and normal variations in the weights of individual powders and capsules.

With this in view a prescription not subject to decomposition or moisture content changes was selected. It represented a mixture of powdered charcoal and magnesium oxide. Since the work of the Committee members consisted essentially of weighing the contents of the individual powders it was deemed necessary to first determine what losses this weighing operation involved. For this purpose 15-grain powders consisting of 10 grains of charcoal and 5 grains of heavy magnesium oxide were prepared by weighing the ingredients directly on a counterbalanced powder paper. The latter were then folded and placed in a prescription box. This operation was repeated with 10 grains as well as 5 grains of the mixture per powder. One set was prepared with ordinary powder papers and another with wax impregnated papers. The papers were then unfolded and the contents carefully transferred to a watch glass and weighed. The findings were as follows:

AVERAGE LOSS PER POWDER.

	Plain Paper.	Waxed Paper.
15-grain powders	0.05 grain	0.16 grain
10-grain powders	0.04 grain	0.14 grain
5-grain powders	0.035 grain	0.13 grain

* Presented before Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing, A. P. H. A., Washington meeting, 1934.