

The authors expressed thanks for the privilege of presenting this paper and regret that they could not be present for discussion of it, and their appreciation of the kindness of Dr. T. C. Daniels for his willingness to read it to the Clinical Congress of the American College of Surgeons.

THE CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

MINUTES OF THE CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.

Multnomah Hotel, Portland, Oregon.

August 8, 1935.

The Seventh Annual Meeting of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Law Enforcement Officials was convened by Chairman R. L. Swain, at 9:30 A.M. in the Club Room, with the following present:

A. L. I. Winne	Virginia	F. V. McCullough	Indiana
L. L. Walton	Pennsylvania	F. L. Christenson	Idaho
C. L. O'Connell	Pennsylvania	John Culley	California
Roy Cook	W. Virginia	W. M. Fulton	California
G. L. Hayman	W. Virginia	F. E. Mortensen	California
C. T. Gilbert	Connecticut	Edna E. Gleason	California
R. C. Schultz	Wyoming	W. B. Rutherford	California
E. F. Hart	Washington	Roy S. Warnack	California
P. H. Brady	Washington	Arthur Baker	Colorado
R. L. Parrish	Oregon	W. J. Bishop	Colorado
Alfred Wiehmark	Oregon	E. J. Prochaskz	Minnesota
A. F. Peterson	Montana	R. L. Swain	Maryland
Hugo Schaefer	New York	F. H. King	Ohio
Fred Schaefer	New York	M. N. Ford	Ohio
R. S. Lehman	New York		

Chairman Swain had no prepared address, however, he reviewed the work of the Conference in the past, in detail. Chairman Swain then called upon the Secretary and Treasurer, for his report.

REPORT OF SECRETARY AND TREASURER.

On June 26, 1934, we sent out 300 copies, by first class mail, of reprints of the 1933 meeting of the Conference.

Since the last annual meeting of the Conference, the Secretary, on September 7, 1934, distributed by first class mail, 315 copies of a compilation by Chairman Swain on the subject of "Temporary Absence."

On December 14, 1934, we also sent out 300 copies, as first class mail, of the reprints for the 1934 meeting of the Conference.

At the end of our last annual meeting, we had on hand \$280.67, with no outstanding bills. Following our last annual meeting, Chairman F. C. A. Schaefer and his finance committee, made another appeal for finances from state boards and individual members interested in the Conference. From that appeal he secured \$99.00, as follows:

John Seiden, Montana.....	\$2.00	V. C. Piakowski, Michigan.....	3.00
H. A. Stype, Ohio.....	1.00	C. H. Ganger, New York.....	2.00
Colorado Board.....	5.00	F. S. Houch, New York.....	3.00
H. R. Rudy, Maryland.....	1.00	J. Leon Lascoff, New York.....	2.00
Leon Marr, Maine.....	2.00	Geo. C. Dieckman, New York.....	2.00

Iowa.....	10.00	H. C. Christenson, Illinois.....	5.00
Alabama.....	5.00	New York Board.....	10.00
W. H. Roberts, New York.....	2.00	Kansas Board.....	10.00
E. E. Chilson, New York.....	2.00	Washington Board.....	10.00
Geo. W. Mather, New York.....	2.00	Minnesota Board.....	5.00
Wm. Mansfield, New York.....	2.00	Oscar Rennebohm, Wisconsin.....	1.00
Hugo H. Schaefer, New York.....	3.00	Berthold M. Kremer, Wisconsin.....	1.00
F. C. A. Schaefer, New York.....	3.00	Edith G. Schmitz, Wisconsin.....	1.00
Geo. Blackalls, Connecticut.....	1.00	H. G. Reunzel, Wisconsin.....	1.00
W. C. Anderson, New York.....	2.00		

For the present year, the Finance Committee sent out another appeal for a ten-dollar contribution from each state, or whatever amount could be paid, and from that appeal, Chairman Schaefer received \$111.00, as follows:

Ohio.....	\$10.00	Florida.....	5.00
Iowa.....	10.00	Maine.....	5.00
North Dakota.....	10.00	Pennsylvania.....	5.00
Kansas.....	10.00	Maryland.....	10.00
New Jersey.....	10.00	Minnesota.....	5.00
New York.....	11.00	Oregon.....	5.00
Alabama.....	5.00	Wisconsin.....	10.00

This makes a total of \$210.00 received since our last annual meeting. Balance on hand May 10, 1934, \$280.67, making a total of \$490.67. Bills paid since our last annual meeting are as follows:

May 22, 1934, E. G. Eberle, printing of proceedings.....	\$ 50.00
July 3, 1934, Dr. Hugo Schaefer, expense for finance com.....	26.80
Jan. 2, 1935, E. G. Eberle, reprints...	23.76
July 20, 1935, R. L. Swain, postage and stationery.....	8.70
<hr/>	
Total expenditure.....	\$109.26
Leaving a total balance to date of	\$381.41

Upon motion of Mr. Schaefer, seconded by Mr. Gilbert, the Report of the Secretary-Treasurer was approved.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

F. C. A. Schaefer, Chairman of the Finance Committee, reported that subsequent to the last annual meeting, the committee had decided to contact Pharmaceutical Law Enforcement Officials and also individuals who might be interested in the Conference, for additional finances. An appeal went out, from which the Secretary received \$99.00. From this appeal, most of the contributions received came from individuals as a personal donation for the reason it could not be paid out of departmental funds.

For the present year, an appeal was made to each state board and those having to do with law enforcement, for a sum of ten dollars and from this appeal, the committee received fourteen replies and have promises from others who said their contributions would follow.

Respectfully submitted,
F. C. A. SCHAEFER, *Chairman.*

Chairman Swain called for the next item on the program, which was an address from Harry C. Huse, Director of Licenses for the State of Washington. Mr. Huse being absent, his paper was presented by P. H. Brady of the State of Washington, which is as follows:

"You will notice from your program that this paper was to be handled by Harry C. Huse, Director of the Department of Licenses of the State of Washington. However, since your pro-

gram was prepared the state of Washington has a Board of Pharmacy entirely free from its Department of Licenses to enforce the pharmaceutical laws.

"It is very gratifying that at this first conference of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy here in the Pacific Northwest that we have a board of pharmacy to represent the State of Washington.

"This restoration of self government to the pharmacists of this state due to the untiring efforts of the officers and many of the members of the W. S. P. A. and the coöperation of Governor Martin and the legislature of 1935 is an exemplification of that outstanding principle that every industry can best regulate its own affairs and solve its own problems. And now that we have this measure of autonomy the responsibility for its success or failure rests entirely with the pharmacists of the state.

"The Pharmacy Board may be considered as a committee of three selected from the ranks of the registered pharmacists of Washington to supervise the pharmacy laws and regulations of the state.

"I would like to present two pictures to you. One is the sorry spectacle of this committee of three, with very limited resources, trying to enforce the pharmacy law against the will of the pharmacists of the state. The other is a picture of your District Councils adjusting every difficulty possible in a friendly coöperative manner and as a last resort presenting those cases which cannot be so handled to the Pharmacy Board for prosecution. As originally drawn up the measure instituting the District Councils provided for a Director of Law enforcement. This work may be handled through your director of Fair Trade Practice but if it proves too much of a burden together with other duties a Director of Law Enforcement should be elected to handle the matter.

"The pharmacy law is primarily a safeguard for the public. In the next place it is a measure of protection not only for law-abiding drug store owners, but also for Registered Pharmacist employees. The State of Washington, along with other states, now demands a four-year course of education and preparation for the students in pharmacy. There is an implied contract in this to the extent that the State should see to it that unqualified persons are not illegally performing the work of unemployed pharmacists.

"The guiding principle of your Board of Pharmacy will be that the practice of pharmacy is reserved for registered pharmacists just as much so as the practice of Medicine or Surgery or Dentistry is reserved for registered physicians, surgeons and dentists. A corporation or an individual may invest money in a drug store but this capital investment does not carry with it the privilege of performing those functions which are reserved by law to Registered Pharmacists.

"And so, in carrying out these principles, your committee of three would ask the District Councils for coöperation in the following matters: Pharmacy renewals. To check up shop-keepers who are offering for sale drug store merchandise and inspecting those shop-keepers who are advertising drug departments or use the word 'drug' in any form of advertising. We would also ask your assistance in the matter of checking up on vendors selling household remedies and suggest that you seek the coöperation of your local city and county authorities in this matter. While it does not come directly under the administration of the Pharmacy Law, your Board suggests that you obtain a list of unemployed registered pharmacists in your district and endeavor to work out a relief system to put men to work.

"With the limited resources at our command for the next two years it is only through coöperation of this kind that the new pharmacy law can be effective. If the next legislature grants us a larger appropriation we will be able to carry on this work through inspectors but even then this can best be accomplished through the agency of the District Councils.

"In closing we would say that it is our ambition to place and maintain the profession of pharmacy in the State of Washington on as high a standard as in any state in the Union.

"Approximately \$26,000.00 a year into the State Treasury. All money must go to the State Treasury. Then the State Legislature appropriates the money. We have only \$10,000.00 for two years. We might ask for a deficiency appropriation—we are going to ask for more money at the next legislature. We have our new pharmacy law and one of the points in it is that all shop-keepers who use words to make the public think of drug stores must have a registered pharmacist to supervise the work. . . . It was simply a matter of collecting taxes without any great effort to enforce the Pharmacy law. Physicians of Spokane County would handle the matter very thoroughly themselves and that is what I am trying to get the pharmacists to do."

The paper was discussed by Messrs. Cook, Swain, Rutherford and Fulton.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. Cook: "What constitutes a shop-keeper?"

Mr. Brady: "A grocery store that handles Castoria, Mentholatum, etc. If they use the word 'drugs' in any way, then they must have a registered pharmacist in attendance."

Mr. Cook: "In the state of Washington, what is the attitude of the Board of Pharmacy and what can they do about such a situation?"

Mr. Brady: "When they have a sign up saying 'Leave prescriptions here.' That can only be done by a registered pharmacist at all times, even if he does not fill them—our interpretation is receiving, is dispensing. There are members of the legislature who are shop-keepers and that is why the fee was reduced from \$6.00 to \$2.00."

Mr. Swain: "Does the Board have any full-time employees to take care of this work?"

Mr. Brady: "Mrs. Adams has been turned over to us on a part-time basis. All our records are at Olympia and she looks after it all. The Department of Licenses pays the major part of her salary and we pay the rest."

Mr. Swain: "Is there any member of your Board who is a full-time member?"

Mr. Brady: "No. We are putting a paid inspector to work on September 16th to inspect and report and if the thing is to be taken care of at once, he takes it up to the prosecuting attorney."

Mr. Swain: "What license do the itinerant vendors pay?"

Mr. Brady: "Two dollars per year."

Mr. Swain: "How many?"

Mr. Brady: "They are working on that now and it's very difficult to find out. In the past, these companies have been very willing to cooperate. The first step is to write to them and get the names of their individual agents. Twenty such fees have been paid."

Question: "What do these vendors sell?"

Mr. Brady: "Household liniments and veterinary remedies."

Mr. Swain: "Do you enforce the law that department stores cannot use the words 'patent medicines?'"

Mr. Brady: "They could not without using a registered pharmacist. They usually employ registered pharmacists—girls."

Mr. Rutherford: "Does your Board register Asiatics?"

Mr. Brady: "They have to be citizens of the United States—foreign born is all right as long as they are naturalized citizens."

Mr. Fulton: "It might be of interest to know that we have pharmacists, assistant pharmacists, general dealers, itinerant vendors. We have general dealer licenses if they are 3 miles from a drug store—they can sell any medicine that is trade-marked and registered. We give them a list of what they can sell. Our itinerant vendor license is \$100.00 a year. Nobody can run a prescription drug store unless he has a pharmacist in charge from the time he turns the key until he shuts the door. No exceptions of any kind. No one can use the word 'drugs' unless he is a registered pharmacist. They have no agents any more, or dealers. Ford did have Ford dealers. Now he has agents. They buy the stuff and then they have no further responsibility. We have seven inspectors and four of them will work wholly on itinerant vendors and general dealers. Last week we had one fellow get five itinerant vendors and about twenty general dealers. We catch more druggists violating the poison law than others. We have a lot of first-class druggists in California and some that don't want to live up to the law. We gave one of these, in San Francisco, seven prescriptions and on five of them he substituted. They are hurting the business and not helping anybody else."

At this time, Chairman Swain appointed a nominating committee consisting of C. T. Gilbert, *Chairman*; Fred Schaefer and F. V. McCullough, with instructions to bring in nominations for a Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer and Delegate to the House of Delegates.

Frank L. Christenson, President of the Idaho Board of Pharmacy, explains the Idaho laws, as follows:

"It might be said that I have been interested in this work for several years. I have studied the laws of every state, even the Dominion of Canada, very seriously with the help of some good

legal authorities. I have obtained practically every decision rendered for the past 15 years. I want to make a statement that we have a very unsatisfactory set-up in Idaho. I am attempting to operate a 'bluffer' act. So long as I am on friendly terms with the state police and the government I am getting by very nicely. We have no money to enforce, just as Mr. Brady said, 'all of our funds at the present time have to go into the State treasury and it takes an appropriation to get them back out.' For your information: I am one of those trying to raise about two million dollars in this state for relief, and I think one of the best ways would be to put a tax upon peddlers and agents of about \$500.00 or more. As Mr. Mortensen said, 'when they start to tear your bill apart, place another before them and get them to fight and you will generally get a compromise.' Until 1937 we will be operating under what is commonly termed the 'bluffers' act."

Mr. A. L. I. Winne, of Virginia, talks on the subject of the difference between patent and proprietary medicines, as follows:

"Relative to the difference between patent and proprietary medicines.

"The committee has done nothing since the time it rendered a report. At that time we did get the information from all over the United States and found it deplorably deficient; as a matter of fact. I believe my own state is the only one that has a definition and it is a very poor definition. Some of the states have what might be constituted as a casual definition but nowhere in the United States could I find a clean-cut definition. We talk about patent medicines. We talk about proprietary medicines. In the eyes of the law, a patent medicine is a proprietary medicine. It says the nature of the remedy must be on the label, address must be on the label, directions for its use must be on the label. I have found that useful sometimes when you go in and find some remedy that does not have a label which states for what it is intended to be used. We just tell them to throw it out. That is the 'bluffer' law. This subject has got to be studied further and I think good legal talent will have to be employed to get a definition that will hold water. I think that in most states patent medicines are going to be sold in general stores. Most states have legislatures very much like that in Idaho. I think that is the most difficult thing we have to face—how to put a good definition over and still not encounter the opposition of the people who are sympathetic with the dealers in the stores out in the country. There is no drug store there—people need the medicine. They have to find somebody to sell the medicine." Mr. Cook made a motion seconded by Mr. Gilbert that Mr. Winne's committee on definition of "Patent and Proprietary Medicines" be continued.—Motion carried.

DISCUSSION.

Fred Schaefer: "In New York we have never had any difficulty with that. We have handled them as a class."

Mr. Christenson, Idaho: "We are not attempting to differentiate between those two terms but we are attempting to segregate advertised package remedies and pharmaceutical preparations. Those who own a process patent and have a copyrighted label have the exclusive right to the finished product and still it's proprietary."

Mr. Schaefer: "Why can't the law simply read patent or proprietary medicine and include both?"

Mr. Christenson, Idaho: "There are two types of patent and proprietary medicines. We handle those all as one."

Mr. Winne: "You can't draw a distinction between patent and proprietary medicine. What we call patent medicines are not patent medicines at all. We have to draw a line of demarcation between those that are intended for self-medication and those intended for use of physicians. Just as soon as we attempt to draw up a definition which will segregate those things, they will throw them out into the other class. We have to draw up a definition and draw it up good and tight so it will not matter how they change their labels."

The subject was further discussed by Messrs. Culley, Hugo Schaefer, Christenson, Swain, Fulton, Rutherford, Winne and Cook. Upon motion by Mr. Cook, seconded by Mr. Gilbert, the Winne committee on the definition of patent and proprietary medicines was ordered continued.

Mrs. Edna Gleason of California discussed legislation effecting the control of pharmacies, pharmacists and the manufacture and distribution of drugs and medicines, as follows:

"I am naturally very interested to know what the other Boards of Pharmacy were doing

but I think that maybe California (I don't want to say takes the lead) but I think that we are just a jump ahead of other states. I want to say perhaps it is because we have seven members on our Board of Pharmacy and maybe we have sold the idea to the people of California as well as to the legislature that we are looking out for the public health and safety of the people.

"The Board of Pharmacy has the right to make rulings not inconsistent with the laws of California. Di-nitro-phenol can be sold by no one except by a registered pharmacist and that is on a prescription and only can be refilled by a doctor's orders. Many of you have been reading the journals recently of the results of thyroid. We feel that making a move like that is the first step toward real coöperation in bringing back a closer relationship of the doctor and the druggist—when we will refrain from selling anything of which we don't know the contents.

"We have \$94,000.00 and we can't begin to do the things that we feel should be done to carry on our work successfully and be a credit to the state. We are trying to do it but we can't do it without finances. We started this year to put over a bill in the legislature. We find that what is good for one should be good for them all. We find that the little druggist who wants the other fellow to behave, doesn't want to behave himself. We are going to help police the industry and then our enforcement is going to be a very minor affair. The little fellow knows what's good for the other fellow, but he doesn't want to take the same medicine himself.

"You can get anything that you believe in. They said we couldn't do anything against chain stores. All the money in the world can't combat man-power. We proved it. You can have whatever legislation you want if you go there with a firm purpose. If your policy is right and you are looking out for your community or the people, at large, you will be heard—if you are willing to abide by the law and say 'this is going to pinch me a little bit but it's good for the other fellows.' If you believe in what you are doing and you know you're right, you have to convince the other fellows. We criticise the man that makes more laws. Why do we want more laws when we have laws now that are never obeyed?

Edna Gleason: "Our college requirements are 3200 hours, only one examination to be given to a student immediately upon his graduation and he is given a certificate and as soon as he has proven his year's experience he can come back and is then given his diploma. He does not have to take two examinations as he has in the past. He must have that examination during his college. He has his experience year after he takes the examination to get his certificate and if he doesn't make 75 he cannot get his certificate."

Question: "What about your reciprocity?"

Edna Gleason: "In order to protect our men we have had to refrain from any reciprocity. We have had an overflow of as high as 3000 or 4000 unemployed druggists. We had to protect our men and keep the other fellows from coming in. People are willing to work for \$18.00 and \$20.00 a week because there has been that influx of people coming into the state."

Dr. Hugo Schaefer, of New York, took the place on the program of Mr. Geo. Mather and explained provisions of the Dunkel Bill in their state, as follows:

"I will restrict my talk to the Dunkel Bill. Several years ago when we were working under our old law, the Board of Pharmacy was in control of all medicines with exception of proprietary or patent medicines, this left a large loop-hole. Two years ago we passed the Dunkel Bill, this placed under the control of the Board of Pharmacy, the sale of all proprietary medicines which were harmful or habit-forming. During last winter the Board of Pharmacy drew up the regulations for the sale of these preparations which were put under their control—regulation which governs the sale—that these preparations, patent or proprietary, which are habit-forming or deleterious can only be sold by registered pharmacists—to have a measure of safety in a drug store which we would not have in a grocery store. If a man is working one day in a grocery store and he sells a preparation illegally and if he is working for a druggist it is legal—does not seem quite right. Therefore, the sale must be made by a registered pharmacist. The grocer couldn't very well say whether the patent medicine contains a harmful or habit-forming substance and they therefore last year passed a labeling law which requires that every patent medicine or proprietary medicine, if it contains any of these ingredients that it must have that ingredient on the label, put on by the manufacturer, with the quantity thereof. The manufacturer's name and address must be on the label and the preparation must be manufactured under the supervision of a pharmacist or chemist. Our law defines anything as a poison which may cause death to the

human adult life in a 60-grain dose—that preparation can in future only be sold in registered pharmacies by registered pharmacists.”

Mr. Gilbert: “Does the New York law define what a chemist is?”

Dr. Schaefer: “We left the law that way because we were afraid to make it simply a pharmacist—there are certain lines where a chemist would be just as much in order. We put in the word ‘chemist’ even though we have no definition for a chemist at the present time. The Board took it up at its last meeting. Don’t know whether it was finally accepted or not.”

Dr. Schaefer’s remarks were discussed by Messrs. Culley, Swain, Gilbert, Walton and Winne.

Mr. R. C. Schultz, of Wyoming, makes a report of conditions in his state, as follows:

“There was no legislature enacted at the last session of the Wyoming legislature. However the Board of Pharmacy on April 8th of this year had a conference with the Attorney-General of the State of Wyoming for the purpose of examining the laws that we had to see if something in the nature of enforcement could be had simply by interpretations. A two-day conference was held with the Attorney-General. There was much interest in the discussion on patent and proprietary medicines, because we find that the Rocky Mountain states have about the same law on patent and proprietary medicines. The Board of Pharmacy of Wyoming will endeavor to enforce them and of course there are differences in the law in different states and the only thing the Board of Pharmacy can do is to apply them to their own particular state. Wyoming does not have a license fee for drug stores.

QUOTE: RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE WYOMING COMMISSION OF PHARMACY, adopted April 8, 1935. Page 14 of the Pharmacy Laws of the State of Wyoming, together with the Rules and Regulations of the Commission of Pharmacy.

Wyoming is called the state of the great wide-open spaces. We only have 122 drug stores in the entire state and inspection is made once a year. Naturally the funds of the state are not very extensive, possibly as low as any state in the Union, although we were able a few years ago to get the Board of Pharmacy on a self-sustaining basis. Money does not go into a general fund at all—in the hands of the State Treasurer—but paid out only on the order of the Board of Pharmacy.”

Mr. A. F. Peterson, of Montana, reports as follows:

“At the last session of the legislature in Montana they spent most of their efforts killing the legislation that would be hard on the drug business. A contraceptive act was passed which limits the sale of all contraceptives to a drug store. Merely possession of a stock by anyone outside of a drug store is a violation. An inspector discovering it, confiscates it. The legislature passed a poison register law, which requires druggists to make out an affidavit each time a poison is sold and gives the Board of Pharmacy the power to designate what is a poison. In Montana we have just inaugurated our first law-enforcing campaign. The state is so large and the expense so great, it is impossible to raise the money. When drugs are sold in a drug store they are regulated by the State Board of Pharmacy but if they are sold any place else they are not regulated, so the inspector had a very fertile field to work in. After being on the road for two months, only a small part of the state was covered. He has not lost a single case—every violator that he has cited in court, with one exception was cited for selling aspirin. I do not think there is any chance of losing that case. Our enforcing campaign has only been operating for two months—we have noticed a lot of improvement. The principal violators are the grocery stores, some of the wholesale grocers have put in lines of drugs.”

Mr. John Culley, makes a report for the State of Nevada, as follows:

“Nevada is instituting a campaign for bringing everybody up to registration requirements. There are only 48 drug stores and five of those are owned by two people, so there are really only 44 proprietors in the state of Nevada. There is only one registered assistant in Nevada and he is going to take the examination next Fall.”

Roy Cook, of West Virginia, gives the following report for his State:

"It seems to me that if some way could be set up by which we could sit down and exchange our copies of laws, forms, blanks of all kinds, from one state to the other, it would be very helpful. I have been interested in our young friend in the house of delegates in Idaho. He has my sympathy. I would suggest that if he could enable us to control Senator Borah that that would be helpful. In West Virginia last year we have had some changes in connection with the alcohol and liquor situation. Out of 425 stores, 212 carry beverage sale permits. Those that traffic from one state to another always have something that cannot be tolerated—they attempted to compel the pharmacist to buy alcohol from or through but mostly from these various beverage control commissions. It had to be purchased from the commission and a charge of \$10.00 was made regardless of whether liquor was sold or not. The state added to that a profit. Ten dollars was paid for a permit, \$7.25 for a can of alcohol and 50 cents for having it delivered. Then it was announced that a pharmacist could buy alcohol from the liquor stores and would not have to pay the \$10.00 license fee. Some did this and were hailed up on the grounds that it made them manufacturers.

"Just before I left the city of Charleston, by inviting the Attorney-General out to two or three dinners, he decided that he could find a loop-hole in this. One of the very best things we have done in West Virginia is to borrow from Virginia a few changes and get a new permit law. It creates confidence."

Upon motion, duly seconded, the Conference adjourned at 12:45 P.M. to meet in joint session at 8:00 P.M.

The Conference convened at 9:00 P.M., August 8th, in the Junior Ball Room of Hotel Multnomah, in joint session with the Section on Education and Legislation and the Conference of Pharmaceutical Secretaries.

The Joint Session was called to order by Chairman McCullough of the Secretaries, and the record of this meeting will be printed elsewhere.¹

The Second Section of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Law Enforcement Officials was called to order by Chairman Swain at 9:50 A.M. in the Junior Ball Room, August 9, 1935. The following were present:

P. H. Brody	Washington	S. L. Hilton	Dist. of Columbia
Roy Cook	W. Virginia	C. T. Gilbert	Connecticut
G. L. Hayman	W. Virginia	F. L. Christenson	Idaho
R. P. Fischelis	New Jersey	R. A. Lyman	Nebraska
L. L. Walton	Pennsylvania	Zada Cooper	Iowa
E. F. Cook	Pennsylvania	W. J. Teeters	Iowa
W. B. Day	Illinois	C. E. Mollet	Montana
Edna Gleason	California	R. L. Swain	Maryland
Fred Schaefer	New York	F. H. King	Ohio
Hugo Schaefer	New York	M. N. Ford	Ohio

Chairman Swain referred to the program and asked that the first number under item seven, be discussed. This subject was discussed by the Chairman, also Fred Schaefer, Hugo Schaefer, Mrs. Gleason, Mr. Brody, Mr. Cook and Mr. Day.

At this point the Chairman stopped the discussion and proceeded to the next question "Should Boards of Pharmacy be empowered to regulate the number of drug stores, and, if so, what shall be the basis of such regulation?" Discussion was general and many good points were brought out.

The question, "What can be done to further restrict to pharmacists the distribution of potent drugs and medicines and medicines in general" came up. This subject was continued at this time without discussion.

The next question "Have the barbituric acid laws worked out satisfactorily" was discussed. The general impression was that longer experience was needed to answer this question.

The next question to be discussed was "Should Law Enforcement Officials attempt some program looking to supervised experience?" This subject was ordered continued for the next year.

¹ February JOURNAL.

The subject to come up next for discussion was "What enforcement difficulties have been met with under the Uniform State Narcotic Act?" This subject was held over.

At this time the Chairman referred to the Finance Committee and upon motion by Mr. Gilbert, seconded by Mr. King, the Finance Committee was ordered continued.

The Chairman next referred to the advisability of sending out reprints of this meeting. Upon motion by Mr. Fred Schaefer, seconded by Mr. Gilbert, reprints of the meeting were ordered distributed to members and others interested.

Upon motion by Mr. Hugo Schaefer, duly seconded, the remainder of the program was ordered postponed.

At this time the Chairman asked for the report of the Nominating Committee. Chairman Gilbert of the Nominating Committee made the following report:

For *Chairman*, R. L. Swain, Maryland

For *Secretary-Treasurer*, M. N. Ford, Ohio

For *Delegate to House of Delegates*, Fred Schaefer, New York.

Your committee recommends the same officers be continued for the ensuing year.

Upon motion by Mr. Cook, seconded by Mr. King, the report of the Nominating Committee was received and the same officers continued for the ensuing year.

Chairman Swain then referred to the difficulty in getting attendance for the meetings and asked the advisability of holding the first meeting next year on a Sunday Evening or Sunday Night, previous to the opening of the Convention.

Upon motion duly seconded, the Chairman was empowered to arrange the program for next year as he may deem advisable.

Upon motion duly seconded, the Conference adjourned at 12:15 P.M.

M. N. FORD, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

NOTE: It was necessary to defer the Abstracts of the Minutes of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries to the February JOURNAL.

THE TEXAS CENTENNIAL.

The Texas Centennial will be different; while the central celebration will be in Dallas, where the gigantic construction program is now bringing into being the buildings that will house the Texas Centennial Exposition, many other cities and all sections of the State will prepare for special celebrations. San Antonio will be the scene of a beautiful commemoration at the Alamo; Houston will hold an impressive San Jacinto exposition; Tyler will have its Rose Festival on a more beautiful and larger scale and Corpus Christi a water pageant—these are only a few of the many other colorful celebrations which will dot the State throughout the Centennial Year.

THE CITY OF MEXICO.

The interesting city of Mexico was founded by the Aztecs about 1325. Aztec writing, recently, was brought to the attention of pharmacists by the rediscovery of the Badianus Manuscript.¹ The City is situated about 7400 feet above sea-level; Popocatepetl is about 40 miles to the southeast, its peak is 17,550 feet; and its crater about 2000 feet wide.

SALT LAKE CITY MAY ESTABLISH A CLERK SCHOOL.

Salt Lake City druggists contemplate the organization of a local association and they are considering the suggestion of the American Vocational Association to establish a training school for clerks. D. R. Gardeman has been giving lectures on the subject.

¹ See September JOURNAL, page 771.