

On motion of H. M. Whelpley, seconded by J. W. England, it was agreed that the Rules of Finance be so amended that the Committee on Finance shall audit all bills before payment is made.

J. A. Koch moved, seconded by F. J. Wulling, that the Acting General Secretary be requested to confer with the General Secretary elect, and arrange for the transfer of the property of the Association belonging to the secretarial office as soon as possible, and that the salary of the General Secretary elect be seven hundred and fifty dollars per annum and date as of September 1, 1914.

Adjourned.

J. W. ENGLAND, Secretary.

---

(FIRST SESSION OF THE COUNCIL FOR 1914-15.)

Immediately after the adjournment of the seventh session of the Council for 1913-1914, the first or organization meeting of the Council for 1914-15 was held on Saturday, August 29, 1914, at 10 a. m.

Chairman Eberle presided as Acting Chairman.

Present: Messrs. Whelpley, Wilbert, Eberle, Godding, Day, Shafer, Wulling, England, Hopp, Osseward and Mayo.

The following officials were elected:

Chairman—E. G. Eberle.

Vice Chairman—John G. Godding.

Secretary—J. W. England.

The Chairman and Secretary of the Council were named as the Committee on Nomination of Council Committees for 1914-15 to report to the Council later.

Adjourned.

J. W. ENGLAND, Secretary.

---

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.

Sixty-second Annual Meeting, Detroit, Michigan, August 24th to 28th, 1914.  
(First Session.)

The first session of the House of Delegates was called to order August 24th, at 8 o'clock p. m. in room "C" of the Convention Hall of the Hotel Pontchartrain.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Clyde M. Snow, of Chicago.

The Chairman stated that the first order of business was the calling of the roll of delegates whose credentials had been approved by the Council, but that unfortunately the Council up to that time had not presented the roll of delegates whose credentials had been approved.

Chairman Snow stated he had discussed in a general way with some of the members the measures it would be best to adopt in the House of Delegates, and it seemed to be the opinion of the delegates in the room, at least, that the meeting proceed with the order of business so far as it can. It had been suggested that the Committee on Resolutions will have but little time to consider proposed resolutions, and it seemed well that the meeting should at least appoint a Committee on Resolutions and receive as many of them as possible from the members present.

Chairman Snow stated that under the Constitution and By-laws of the House of Delegates the second order of business was the election and installation of officers, but at the meeting at Nashville, the order of business was amended to make the election and installation of officers sixth in order instead of second, and that inasmuch as the credentials have not been approved by Council, the next order of business will be No. Three, the appointment of the Committee on Resolutions.

The Chairman then appointed as a Committee on Resolutions, William Mansfield, New York, Henry M. Faser, University, Miss., Cornelius Osseward, Seattle, Wash., Fred W. R. Perry, Detroit, Mich., Wm. B. Day, Chicago.

The Chairman then called for the fourth order of business, the reading of communications from the Association Sections and the Council. The Secretary reported that none had been received.

The Chairman then called for the fifth order of business, Reports, Resolutions, and Communications from the delegates.

Mr. Wilhelm Bodemann, of Chicago, offered the following resolution:

That the House of Delegates endorse the aims and purposes of the Chicago Veteran Druggists' Association and recommend the formation of similar associations as Sections of the Local Branches of the A. Ph. A., provided that the members of such Association shall be also members of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

The Chairman stated if there was no objection the resolution would be referred directly to the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. George F. Payne, of Atlanta, Ga., inquired as to how old the applicants were required to be before they could be received into the membership of the Veteran Association. Mr. Bodemann replied that he had to be allied with pharmacy for a period of twenty-five years.

The Chairman then called for further resolutions from the delegates present.

Mr. Nitardy presented the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the A. Ph. A. make all possible efforts to have only graduates of reputable schools of pharmacy nominated as members of State Boards of Pharmacy by State Associations, and where possible, have such amendments made to state laws as will make such qualifications a pre-requisite."

Mr. W. C. Alpers, of Cleveland, Ohio, stated he did not wish to oppose the motion, but desired to call the attention of the members present to the fact that the resolution might be unconstitutional. Under the state laws, certain persons are eligible to hold a position on the Board of Pharmacy. A man who is a licensed druggist has the same standing as though he held a college diploma, and the question was determined by the laws of the several states. He was in full accord with the desirability of the law, but he thought the result would not be attained in the manner proposed. The advisable thing would be to secure the passage of the pre-requisite law in every state, so that, in time, only druggists who are graduates of colleges would be eligible to the Boards, but the present members could not be legislated out of their rights. Mr. Alpers said he only mentioned this to obtain an expression of opinion.

Mr. R. H. Walker, of Gonzales, Texas, said he thought the proposition was, as offered, a violation of state rights. You could not make New York or any other state adopt it if they did not want to. The legislation proposed was a state matter and if a date were named when it should take effect that most of the

states would encourage its passage. For instance, at the present time a proposed amendment was being considered by the Legislature in Texas which if passed would take full effect in 1920. It provides that no person could be a member of the Board of Pharmacy unless he were a graduate of a reputable college, and the amendment defines a reputable college. The State Association is favoring this amendment, but they realized that you have to bring about such a reform gradually; the first step will be made in 1916, a further step in 1918 and by 1920 a person will have to be a full fledged pharmacist, to be a member of the Board of Pharmacy in Texas. He hoped the measure would be passed and they were all working with that end in view.

Mr. Chas. M. Ford, of Denver, Col., stated it was well known that there were men on some state boards of pharmacy who are not pharmacists and that this whole subject had been covered by the President in his address and had been referred to the Committee on President's Address and therefore this question, in a very elaborate and fundamental way, was before that committee. He thought the matter had been so well covered by the President that it could be dropped.

Mr. P. A. Mandabach, of Chicago, suggested that there be interjected in the resolution that it was the sense of this body to recommend to the various state associations, that they select for future appointments graduates in pharmacy, stating he believed this would eliminate the chief contention.

Mr. C. Osseward, of Seattle, said that Washington did not have such a law, but the State Board has made a ruling that, under the pharmacy law of that state, the Board has the right to prescribe the preliminary education of students, and they had made the ruling that the preliminary education required is a three-year college course, and next month the first examination would be held under this ruling.

Mr. Nitardy explained to Mr. Osseward that his resolution did not have reference to the preliminary education of pharmacists, but simply had reference to the qualifications for membership on Boards of Pharmacy.

Mr. Chas. T. P. Fennel, of Cincinnati, said he thought the proposed resolution would be absolutely unconstitutional; that in the first place, every Governor of every state had a right to appoint whoever he saw fit as a member of the Board of Pharmacy, whether he was a pharmacist or not, although the State Association could recommend, the Governor could go outside the recommendation and did so occasionally. He did it in the State of Ohio and the matter was fought through the courts to the Supreme Court of the state and Governor Hoadley was upheld; the court deciding that the Governor had the right to go outside the recommendation; and he believed that Governor Dean, of Illinois, had done the same thing.

Mr. Gordon said he could not see that the recommendation was unconstitutional. It simply recommended that the American Pharmaceutical Association do all it can to bring this about and asked Mr. Nitardy if that were not correct. Mr. Nitardy replied that it was, and said there was nothing unconstitutional about it. The Governor's power of appointment under the proposed resolution was simply limited to the appointment of graduates of schools of pharmacy as members of the Boards of Pharmacy.

Prof. Albert Schneider, of San Francisco, said he had been very much inter-

ested in the discussion with regard to the powers of the Governor. He asked what could be done with the chief executive of a state who absolutely refused to make any appointments whatsoever. He said that the Governor of California had absolutely refused to appoint any member on any board, either old members or new members, and he believed Illinois had had some such experience.

Mr. Whelpley moved the reference of this resolution to the Committee on Resolutions; motion adopted.

Mr. Frederick T. Gordon then submitted the following resolution:

*“Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Association instruct its representatives in the National Drug Trade Conference to act immediately in connection with the representatives of other allied branches of the drug trade in the drug conference, and to draft at the earliest possible moment a bill to reform the present patent laws of the United States suitable to the best interests of the drug trade of the United States, and to urge its passage at the earliest possible opportunity, and that the support of the American Pharmaceutical Association is hereby pledged to such reform.”*

Referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. Hynson said he was very serious in what he was about to offer and he asked for the sincere and earnest thought of all the delegates. Mr. Hynson said he wanted to say by way of explanation that he had the greatest respect for the House of Delegates as a House of Delegates, representing so many pharmacists throughout the United States, and that he also had great respect for the organization of pharmacy from a national standpoint; that it had been his duty to study national organization and he had found that pharmacy as a whole is beautifully and wonderfully organized—unusually well organized; that every interest of pharmacy that he knew of, except possibly the errand boy and the scrub woman, was organized into a splendid national organization, and he thought it was time now, under the auspices of the American Pharmaceutical Association for those national associations to be correlated into a body to treat upon subjects of general import.

He offered the following amendment to the Constitution and By-Laws of the House of Delegates:

AMENDMENT TO BY-LAWS.

“Amend Chapter 2, Article 1, to provide that: the representation or the membership of the House of Delegates shall consist of three regularly elected or appointed delegates from each of the several pharmaceutical associations, all of whom shall be members of the American Pharmaceutical Association.”

In discussing his amendment Mr. Hynson said he had the greatest respect for every delegate present; that he had great respect for every representative present and for every Association that was represented in the House of Delegates, but that it was an unequal representation; that the National Associations, International Associations, medical societies, local societies, state societies, local branches and every other body that he knew of, were well represented except the State Associations. The local branches were now represented in the Council, and the national associations should be represented in that senate, meaning the Council. There were but few other scattering bodies and there might be some great associations who would send their delegates to the general session of the American Pharmaceutical Association. Mr. Hynson asked them to think over the matter and stated, in his opinion, it would be a fine thing if all the members of the House

of Delegates were equal members and there was an exact equality of members, each member representing his state association.

Mr. Hynson assured the members that he had no object in this other than to help the profession which he had worked and labored in, and to make it better for those who are to follow, and a more honorable profession in every way.

Mr. Hynson further said in support of his amendment that, while there might be delegates who felt that other associations should be represented in the House of Delegates, they would never have an effective, active, working body unless they had equal representation, a representation equally responsible and consisting of delegates of equal power.

Mr. Hynson also offered the following resolution:

*“Resolved, That the incoming President be, and he is hereby instructed to appoint a committee of three members, which committee shall confer with similar committees appointed for the same purpose by other organizations to consider the advisability of forming a congress of national drug pharmaceutical bodies under the auspices of the American Pharmaceutical Association; and*

*“Be It Further Resolved, That the results of the conference of these committees shall be reported to the several organizations represented, and to the American Pharmaceutical Association at their annual meetings in 1915,—most of which will be held in San Francisco, with such recommendations as may be agreed upon.”*

Mr. Hynson stated there was nothing radical or secret about this matter. It had simply been evolved in his mind and in the minds of a great many others, that these great associations which are so well organized and so well represent pharmacy in all its branches, should be correlated in some concrete body, and as he proposed, that body should consist of three representatives from each national association, and he believed a great deal of good would come out of it; that this was simply a matter to be passed on to the Committee on Resolutions, and the amendment to the By-laws should be taken up at a subsequent session.

The Chair then stated that he trusted the delegates all understood that Prof. Hynson had brought up two matters, one being an amendment to the Constitution and By-laws of the House of Delegates, which could be voted upon at the next meeting, and that the resolution which he had offered, unless there were objections, would be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. Whelpley took the floor and requested that every one register so they could get on the official record; also made an announcement as to the button of the Association.

The House of Delegates then adjourned to 7:30 p. m., Tuesday, August 25, 1914.

#### SECOND SESSION.

The second session of the House of Delegates was held August 25th, 1914, at 7:30 p. m. in Room C. of the Convention Hall of the Hotel Pontchartrain.

The first order of business was the calling of the roll of delegates, as follows:

*Bureau of Medicine*—Willard G. Steadman, Jr., U. S. Navy, Navy Recruiting Station, Detroit.

*Bureau of Chemistry*—Dr. George W. Hoover.

*Bureau of the Public Health Service*—M. I. Wilbert, Washington, D. C., Dr. G. A. Morris.

*Department of Commerce Bureau of Standards*—Dr. F. A. Wolff.

*American Medical Association*—Dr. R. Sollman, Dr. A. H. Hewlitt, Prof. W. A. Puckner.

*The American Association Pharmaceutical Chemists*—E. N. Webb, Columbus, O., Ralph R. Patch, Boston, Mass., J. Weinkauff, Chicago, Ill. *Alternates*—Dr. C. H. Searle, Dr. O. S. Burdick, F. A. Thompson.

*Cuban Pharmaceutical Association*—Gerardo Fernandez Abreu, F. Herrera.

*National Association Boards of Pharmacy*—T. A. Miller, Richmond, Va., J. W. Gayle, Frankfort, Ky., F. C. Dodds, Springfield, Ill.

*National Association of Drug Clerks*—P. A. Mandabach, Chicago, Chas. H. Bowersox, Columbus, Ohio, Milo Miller, Mansfield, Ohio.

*National Association, Manufacturers of Medicinal Products*—Chas. M. Woodruff, Detroit, Mich., Dr. A. R. L. Dohme, Baltimore, Md., B. L. Murray, New York City, N. Y.

*National Association Retail Druggists*—Chas. F. Mann, Chairman, Detroit, Wilhelm Bodemann, Chicago, Ill., William S. Flint, Boston, Mass.

*National Wholesale Druggists' Association*—James E. Davis, Detroit, F. E. Bogart, Detroit, Lee M. Hutchins, Grand Rapids.

*New Orleans C. P. Alumni Association*—Norman C. Richards, Ph. G., New Orleans, John B. Murphy, Ph. G., New Orleans.

*Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Alumni Association*—Frederick W. Archer, Dorchester, Jennie H. Summer, I. P. Gammon.

*Alumni Association College of Pharmacy City of New York*—Thomas F. Main, New York.

*Albany College of Pharmacy*—Alfred B. Husted, Wm. A. Larkin.

*Brooklyn College of Pharmacy*—Dr. Wm. C. Anderson, Dr. Henry W. Schimpf, Dr. Jacob H. Rehfuss.

*Buffalo College of Pharmacy*—Willis G. Gregory, Frank E. Lock, Albert P. Sy.

*Cincinnati College of Pharmacy*—Chas. T. P. Fennel, Fred S. Kotte, Chas. F. Harding.

*Colorado School of Pharmacy*—Homer C. Washburn, John B. Edeley, Francis Ramaley.

*Creighton College of Pharmacy*—Prof. I. Curtis Arledge, Herbert F. Gerald, M. D.

*Illinois School of Pharmacy*—C. M. Snow, Chairman, A. H. Clark, E. N. Gathercoal.

*Iowa College of Pharmacy*—Wilber J. Teeters, R. A. Kuever, Zada M. Cooper.

*Jersey City College of Pharmacy*—Otto Raubenheimer, Ph. D.

*Kansas School of Pharmacy*—L. D. Havenhill, G. N. Watson, L. E. Sayre.

*Louisville College of Pharmacy*—C. Lewis Diehl, Ph. M., John D. Lansing, Ph. G., Wm. Votteler.

*Maryland College of Pharmacy*—Henry P. Hynson, E. Frank Kelly, Chas. Caspari, Jr.

*Massachusetts College of Pharmacy*—Theo. J. Bradley, Elie H. LaPierre, John G. Godding.

*Michigan School of Pharmacy*—J. O. Schlotterbeck, A. B. Stevens, W. S. Hubbard.

*Minnesota College of Pharmacy*—Frederick J. Wulling, Edwin L. Newcomb, Gustav Bachman.

*Nebraska School of Pharmacy*—Rufus A. Lyman, Elsie Day.

*New York College of Pharmacy*—Geo. C. Diekman, Chairman, H. H. Rusby, M. D., Harry V. Army, Ph. D. *Alternates*—Ewen McIntyre, Ph. G., Chas. Holzhauser.

*Ohio Northern College of Pharmacy*—D. C. Mohler, Rudolph Raabe.

*Ohio College of Pharmacy*—Clair A. Dye, Edward Spease, Geo. B. Kauffman.

*Oklahoma School of Pharmacy*—Chas. H. Stocking.

*Philadelphia College of Pharmacy*—Joseph P. Remington, F. X. Moerk, Chas. LaWall. *Alternates*—E. F. Cook, E. P. Stroup.

*Pittsburgh College of Pharmacy*—J. A. Koch, J. H. Beal, J. C. Wallace.

*Purdue School of Pharmacy*—C. P. Jordan, A. H. Dewey, W. F. Gidley.

*St. Louis School of Pharmacy*—Prof. Chas. E. Caspari, H. M. Whelpley, M. D., Prof. Alfred W. Pauley.

*Texas Christian University, Medical Department*—R. H. Needham, Cassius C. Martin, Chas. L. Taylor.

*Valparaiso School of Pharmacy*—Geo. D. Timmons, Eber H. Wisner, Mason L. Weems.

*Vanderbilt University Department of Pharmacy*—E. A. Ruddiman, J. T. McGill, M. E. Hutton.

*Virginia School of Pharmacy*—Albert Bolenbaugh, Chairman, Wortley F. Rudd, Chas. O. Lee.

*George Washington University Department of Pharmacy*—Henry E. Kalusowski, Willard S. Richardson, Lewis Flemer.

*Cleveland School of Pharmacy*—W. C. Alpers, W. T. Hankey, Lewis C. Hopp.

*Pharmacy Department Detroit Technical Institute*—B. D. Edwards, W. Ward, Ph. G., R. T. Lakey, B. Sc.

*Northwestern University School of Pharmacy*—John H. Long, Harry M. Gordin, Maurice A. Miner.

*Highland Park College of Pharmacy*—E. O. Kagy, R. L. Parker.

*Medico-Chirurgical College of Philadelphia*—J. W. Sturmer, C. E. Vanderkleed. *Alternates*—Dr. F. E. Stewart, Paul S. Pittenger.

#### STATE ASSOCIATIONS.

*Alabama Pharmaceutical Association*—L. C. Lewis, Tuskegee, Ala., Carl Whorton, Gadsden, Ala., S. L. Toomer, Auburn, Ala.

*Colorado Pharmaceutical Association*—F. W. Nitardy, Denver, Colo., C. M. Ford, Denver, Colo.

*Connecticut Pharmaceutical Association*—Chas. A. Rapelye, Hartford, Conn., P. T. Garvin, Bethel, Conn., Arthur E. Lathrop, Simsbury, Conn.

*Delaware Pharmaceutical Society*—Herbert J. Watson, Newark.

*Florida State Pharmaceutical Association*—Macon Thornton, Ormond; E. Berger, Tampa, W. J. Maloy, White Springs.

*Georgia Pharmaceutical Association*—Dr. Walter L. Meadows, Columbus, Ga., Dr. G. B. George, Gainesville, Ga., Dr. Ben S. Persons, Macon, Ga.

*Illinois Pharmaceutical Association*—C. H. Avery, Chicago, Ill., J. C. Wheatcroft, Greyville, Ill., W. B. Day, Chicago, Ill.

*Indiana Pharmaceutical Association*—Chas. A. Jordon, Lafayette, Ind., Frank H. Carter, Indianapolis, Ind., Geo. D. Timmons, Valparaiso, Ind.

*Kansas Pharmaceutical Association*—Mathias Noll, Atchison, Kan., W. E. Sherriff, Ellsworth, Kan., L. E. Sayre, Lawrence, Kan.

*Kentucky Pharmaceutical Association*—C. Lewis Diehl, Louisville, Ky., L. A. Brown.

*Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association*—Louis Emanuel, Pittsburg, Pa.

*South Carolina Pharmaceutical Association*—Sam Hodges, Greenwood, S. C., J. P. Glenn, Jr., Liberty, S. C., C. H. McMurray, Abbeville, S. C.

*South Dakota Pharmaceutical Association*—Edward C. Bent, Dell Rapids, S. D., Geo. F. Swartz, Red Field, S. D.

*Tennessee Pharmaceutical Association*—F. W. Ward, Memphis, Tenn., M. E. Hutton, Nashville, Tenn., J. L. Sonner, Knoxville, Tenn.

*Texas Pharmaceutical Association*—E. G. Eberle, Dallas, Texas.

*Utah Pharmaceutical Association*—John Culley, Ogden, Utah.

*Virginia Pharmaceutical Association*—T. A. Miller, Richmond, Va., Geo. T. Mankin, Falls Church, Va., E. S. Eley, Suffolk, Va.

*Washington Pharmaceutical Association*—Dr. C. W. Johnson, Seattle, C. Osseward, Seattle.

*Wisconsin Pharmaceutical Association*—Edward Kremers, Madison, Wis., Otto J. S. Boberg, Eau Claire, Wis., Geo. H. Kesten, Milwaukee, Wis.

*District of Columbia Retail Druggists' Association*—F. T. Stone, Washington, D. C., Lewis Flemer, Washington, D. C.

*California Pharmaceutical Association*—Mrs. Fletcher Howard, W. H. Guest, Dr. Albert Schneider.

*New York County Pharmaceutical Society*—J. Leon Lascoff, Otto Raubenheimer, Thomas Latham.

*New Yorker Deutscher Apotheke Verein*—Prof. Otto Raubenheimer, Geo. T. Riefflin, Prof. Harry V. Arny.

*Vermont State Pharmaceutical Association*—C. H. Skinner, E. G. McClallen.

*King's County Pharmaceutical Society*—Wm. C. Anderson.

*Kentucky Pharmaceutical Association*—C. Lewis Diehl, Louisville, Ky., L. A. Brown, Lexington, Ky., Robin H. White, Mt. Sterling, Ky.

*Maine Pharmaceutical Association*—Frank H. Tupper, Chairman, Martin L. Porter, Danforth, Me., Chas. H. Davis, Bangor, Me., W. J. Jackman, by proxy.

*Maryland Pharmaceutical Association*—Dr. Henry P. Hynson, Baltimore, Md., Dr. John F. Hancock, Baltimore, Md., Dr. D. R. Millard, Baltimore, Md.

*Massachusetts Pharmaceutical Association*—Arthur C. Morey, Brookline, Mass., Prof. C. F. Nixon, Leominster, Mass.

*Minnesota Pharmaceutical Association*—J. Eckstein, Clear Lake, Minn., Frederick J. Wulling, Minneapolis, Minn., W. A. Frost, St. Paul, Minn. *Alternates*—H. Martin Johnson, St. Paul, Edwin L. Newcomb, Minneapolis, Minn.

*North Dakota Pharmaceutical Association*—J. S. Miller.

*Missouri Pharmaceutical Association*—Chas. E. Zinn, Wm. Mittelbach.

*Nebraska Pharmaceutical Association*—N. P. Hansen, Lincoln, Neb., D. J. Fink, Holdrege, Neb., Autumn V. Pease, Fairbury, Neb.

*New Hampshire Pharmaceutical Association*—N. S. Whitman, Nashua, N. H., John I. Hoyt, Penacook, N. H., Dante Smith, Manchester, N. H.

*New Jersey Pharmaceutical Association*—Geo. M. Beringer, Camden, N. J., Chas. Holzhauser, Newark, N. J., Geo. M. Andrews, Woodstown, N. J. *Alternate*—Jeannot Hostman.

*New York Pharmaceutical Association*—Caswell A. Mayo, Brooklyn, N. Y., Albert B. Husted, Delmar, N. Y., Joseph Weinstein, New York, N. Y.

*North Carolina Pharmaceutical Association*—E. V. Howell, Chapel Hill, N. C., E. V. Zoëller, Tarboro, N. C., G. P. Greyer, Morgantown, N. C.

*Ohio Pharmaceutical Association*—Chas. L. McIntyre, St. Marys, Ohio, Edward Thiesing, Cincinnati, Ohio, Chas. S. Ashbrook, Mansfield, Ohio.

*Oklahoma Pharmaceutical Association*—Winfield Scott Samuels, Pawuska, Okla.

*Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association*—Louis Emanuel, Pittsburgh, Pa., Chas. H. LaWall, Philadelphia, Pa., Joseph L. Lemberger, Lebanon, (Chairman).

*Boston Association of Retail Druggists*—Elie H. LaPierre, C. Herbert Packard, John G. Godding.

*Syracuse Drug Association*—David Stolz.

#### BRANCHES.

*Chicago Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—Wilhelm Bodemann, William Gray, I. A. Becker.

*Cincinnati Branch*—Theo. D. Wetterstroem, F. H. Freericks, C. G. Merrell.

*Columbus Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—Edward Spease, M. N. Ford, Geo. T. Lehman.

*Denver Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—Prof. H. C. Washburn, Hugh SeCheverell.



*Nashville Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—Dr. E. A. Ruddiman, Dr. J. M. Rogoff, F. W. Ward.

*New England Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—Carlton B. Wheeler, Fred A. Hubbard, Wm. A. Glover.

*New York Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—Caswell A. Mayo, J. Leon Lascoff, Dr. Jeannot Hostmann.

*Northwestern Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—D. F. Jones, Watertown, S. Dak.

*St. Louis Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—Glenn A. Burkhart, Theodore C. Hagenow, A. W. Pauley.

*Washington City Branch American Pharmaceutical Association*—W. S. Richardson, L. F. Kebler, M. I. Wilbert.

*Northern Ohio Branch, American Pharmaceutical Association*—W. C. Alpers, W. T. Hankey, A. L. Flandermeyer.

#### WOMEN'S ASSOCIATIONS.

*Women's Pharmaceutical Association of the Pacific Coast*—Miss Clarissa M. Roehr, Dr. Josephine E. Barbat-Winslow, Mrs. K. K. Voluntine.

*Women's Organization National Association Retail Druggists*—Mrs. J. W. England, Mrs. E. H. LaPierre, Mrs. Chas. Mann.

The following Delegates have credentials from two or more Organizations and according to By-Laws of the House of Delegates, should choose whom they will represent:

L. E. Sayre, C. L. Diehl, H. P. Hynson, F. J. Wulling, E. G. Newcomb, Ch. Holzhauser, Chas. LaWall, Geo. T. Timmons, L. Flemer, Wm. Bodemann, E. Spease, H. C. Washburn, E. A. Ruddiman, J. M. Rozoff, M. I. Wilbert, C. A. Mayr, J. Hostman, F. P. Stroup, A. W. Pauley, J. L. Lascoff, Otto Raubenhaimer, H. V. Army, W. C. Alpers, W. T. Hankey, L. C. Hopp, Dr. A. Schneider, J. G. Godding, E. H. LaPierre, Wm. C. Anderson.

Respectfully submitted,

Signed

(Signed) PHILIP ASHER.

F. E. STEWART.

F. W. NITARDY, Chairman.

Sixty-one answered as being present.

The Chair stated there still seemed to be some confusion about the recognition of delegates, and trusted that every member present would recognize the fact that the House of Delegates in itself, could not recognize a delegate unless his credentials had been approved by the Credentials Committee of the Council. Unless his credentials had been approved by the Council a delegate had no standing in the House of Delegates.

The Chair then, for the information of the Delegates who were not present at the first meeting, stated that he had named the following as the Committee on Resolutions:—William Mansfield, New York, Henry M. Faser, University, Miss., Cornelius Osseward, Seattle, Wash., Fred W. R. Perry, Detroit, Mich., Wm. B. Day, Chicago.

The Chair called for the reading of communications from the Association Sections and the Council. The Secretary informed him there were none.

The Chair then called for reports, resolutions and communications.

Mr. Jeannot Hostmann, of Hoboken, N. J., offered the following resolution:

*"Be It Resolved,* That it is the belief of the House of Delegates that the Year Book of the A. Ph. A. should contain abstracts of all papers submitted by members of the A. Ph. A. and published in the Journal."

He stated, as a reason for this resolution, that at the present time the papers submitted at the meetings are not abstracted and the only place to get them *in toto* was in the Journal.

Referred to Committee on Resolutions.

Professor W. S. Jackman, of Detroit, read a communication from the Maine Pharmaceutical Association, asking that the Association meet in Maine in 1917 and assist the Maine Association in celebrating their fiftieth anniversary.

Mr. Woodruff, of Detroit, stated that while he had no resolution to offer, with the unanimous consent of the delegates, he would like to give them a very important piece of information. He stated that in Arizona they are to vote next November upon a constitutional amendment which will absolutely prohibit the introduction of wines, spirits, liquors or alcohol in any form, denatured alcohol being excepted from the provisions of the amendment; that those who are campaigning in favor of this proposed constitutional amendment are claiming that denatured alcohol will answer all the requirements of pharmacy and that the Government has especially provided denatured alcohol for that purpose; that the inquiry came to him from Arizona as to whether that was true, and the last he knew about the law permitting the manufacture and use of denatured alcohol was that it absolutely prohibited it to be used for liquid medicinal preparations. He stated he did not know but what possibly some amendment had been made to the law that he had not heard of that would warrant the assertion of the campaigners in Arizona, and in order to find out, he called up the Revenue Office in Detroit and they advised him if there had been any such amendment they had not heard anything about it. Evidently the people in Arizona who are so anxious to amend their state law are either mistaken as to the Federal law or they are deliberately deceiving the people.

He stated further that if any delegates were present from Arizona this would undoubtedly be interesting information to them. In any event it is of academic interest to all the delegates because they ought to know that denatured alcohol cannot be used in liquid medicinal preparations.

Mr. Gordon then presented the following resolution:

*"Resolved,* That the President of the American Pharmaceutical Association at the opening session of each annual convention shall appoint an official censor whose duty it shall be to supervise the matter given to the representatives of the local press to insure that fair and accurate accounts of the proceedings and business of the Association during such meetings alone are printed."

Mr. Gordon stated he offered the resolution in view of the article that appeared in one of the Detroit papers that morning which would give the impression to the lay public that the President of the Association had recommended that the druggists have the mails thrown open to the free transmission of "dope" in medicines and drugs, the word "dope" being printed in big black type. That of course we understood perfectly well what the President's recommendation meant; that pharmacists should be allowed to receive packages, such things as heroin tablets from the wholesale druggists, but that the way the headlines were worded, it would seem that the American Pharmaceutical Association was trying to have

the mails thrown open to the free distribution and traffic in "dope," and therefore he thought an official censor should be appointed at each meeting to supervise as far as possible the matter given to the press and the way it is to be handled.

The Chair stated if there was no objection, the resolution would be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

Prof. Otto Raubenheimer, of Brooklyn, said he did not quite understand what a censor could do; that such things must be done before the articles are printed. It was the duty of the Publicity Committee to furnish proper news and proper publicity to the papers, which was done at the Nashville meeting.

Mr. Gordon replied it would be the censor's duty to see that a fair and accurate account is printed. He would have that for his special duty and nothing else, and if he could not manage to get out a fair account, then he could be "fired" and another censor appointed.

Mr. Woodruff said that the resolution was practical enough so far as the text of the matter supplied to the press was concerned, but wanted to know how the censor could control the headlines; that the censor could give the press any account he pleased, but the newspapers would put any scare head over it they wanted to.

Mr. Gordon explained that the idea would be for the representatives of the press to come to the censor, and that his experience had been that newspaper reporters are very decent fellows, and if they knew that there was an official appointed to furnish the press with whatever information the Association desired, it would act in the nature of a check on irresponsibility. He did not claim that the scheme would absolutely prevent such things as had occurred that morning, but it would be a step toward preventing it, would not do any harm and might do some good.

Mr. Hynson stated that there is a press committee of the American Pharmaceutical Association which has this matter in charge, but that in this instance, unfortunately, it had slipped through that committee, and that the Chairman had told him a half hour ago that it had worried him very much and he had sought a correction in that afternoon's paper, and the correction would be found in the same paper. Mr. Hynson said he thought the members ought to know there was a press committee which was active, and that Mr. Harry Mason happened to be chairman that year, and that this was simply an unfortunate slip.

The Resolution was referred to Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. William Gray, of Chicago, stated that he would like to call upon Prof. Remington to say something about the Pharmacopœia.

The Chair stated he was sure that every member present would be interested in anything that Prof. Remington had to tell them about the Pharmacopœia.

Prof. Remington then said that there was to be a meeting of the Section on Pharmacopœias and Formularies the following morning when the Pharmacopœia would be discussed; that he would say now briefly that the Pharmacopœia was now in press; that they had started to print the book and that there had been sent to the printer about 200 pages of the back part, covering volumetric solutions and the tables and the part of the Pharmacopœia which will be used in correcting the text of the book; that naturally, the standard tables were in the back

part of the book; that they must be corrected and amended and gotten exactly right. Each member of the committee would get a copy of these tables and they would be used when they started in with the text; and they would start in on the text immediately after this part of the work is through. He might say incidentally that the British Pharmacopœia was finished and that he fully expected to have a copy of it to show to the members at this meeting; but word come from the editor that the book would not be issued at all. As a result of the war they had held up the publication and the printing of the Pharmacopœia. Prof. Remington said he mentioned this as a matter of interest to the members because possibly some of them did not begin to realize what this war is going to mean to the future. He did not know the specific reasons for withdrawing the work or postponing publication. There were still a number of questions to be settled and the Committee on Revision was to have a meeting before the adjournment to go over the situation. Outside of a few things there seemed now to be nothing, after the tables are printed, in the way of going right ahead with the book. It would probably take four months to read the proof sheets, and it might take longer in case any questions came up, so he could not at that time set the date of the publication of the Pharmacopœia, but unless the United States became involved in war, the United States Pharmacopœia would appear before the British Pharmacopœia.

Mr. Hynson, under the question of unfinished business brought up the amendment he offered to the by-laws at the first session, stating that he was quite anxious for the House of Delegates to seriously consider this matter, as he believed the life of the House of Delegates was somewhat dependent upon a readjustment of the delegations, and if he was not mistaken, this idea of making it a body of equal delegates representing the splendid state associations would be a successful solution of the trouble. He thought it should appeal to the delegates as an opportunity for the organization and correlating of the state associations of this country under the auspices of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and it seemed to him so patent a thing as to hardly need any argument.

Mr. Hynson moved that this amendment be adopted by the Association. If the amendment were voted down, he would feel that his responsibility had been relieved and he had gotten the matter out of his system and the delegates had taken the responsibility and the House of Delegates into their hands.

Mr. Weinstein, of New York, wanted to be informed whether the proposed amendment would bar colleges from sending delegates to the American Pharmaceutical Association, as they had been doing in former years. In other words, whether Doctor Hynson means to separate the House of Delegates for executive work, for resolutions, etc., from the general sessions of the Association and whether the proposed amendment meant the delegates could not be received in the House of Delegates but on the floor of the general meeting.

The Chairman said that this certainly would not prevent the sending of delegates.

Mr. Hynson in reply to Mr. Weinstein, said if an association were of sufficient importance to claim representation, they should be received. Delegates by courtesy are sent to this association from, for instance, the American Medical Association and the American Chemical Association, and that those national asso-

ciations were of sufficient importance to be received in open session at the opening meeting, as had been heretofore done, but it was not to be supposed after the passage of this resolution, if it was passed, and the House of Delegates reorganized along this line,—that they would ask for and receive delegates from local associations or from colleges or from other organizations as had been the practice. The reason that those delegates came in the past was because they had no national representation in a regular national association, but that this was no longer true and they had such representation so that there was no need for a college of pharmacy for illustration, sending a delegation to the House of Delegates as they had representation in their own national organization which was affiliated with the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Mr. Weinstein said that it was not clear to his mind yet; what he wanted to know was whether delegations from the bodies he mentioned could be sent to the American Pharmaceutical Association and not to the House of Delegates. If the intention was to make the House of Delegates a true representative institution of the states, and each state send three delegates for the purpose of passing upon resolutions and doing executive work, he heartily supported the amendment; if it meant that it would bar delegates from the retail drug associations, the colleges of pharmacy or an organized association of any other order, who now have the right to come here as delegates to the main body of the Association and who are granted the privilege of the floor and accepted as delegates, then he opposed the amendment.

Mr. Hynson replied that he could not see how the proposed by-law could prevent these people from coming to the Association as delegates, but he hoped it would bar delegates from any association other than a national body, and there was no reason why the American Pharmaceutical Association should at this time receive delegates from every college and every local association; and he believed that the affairs of the Association would get along very much better if the small local associations would send representatives to the American Pharmaceutical Association through their national association in which they are already represented.

Mr. Raubenheimer said the idea of Professor Hynson, in his mind, was an excellent one, and he would certainly be in favor of it.

To inform Mr. Weinstein, Mr. Raubenheimer stated that the delegates from the smaller associations do not bring greetings as the National Associations do to the A. Ph. A. He referred to the delegate from the American Medical Association, and to Mr. Bodemann of the National Association of Retail Druggists who brought the greetings of these associations to the A. Ph. A. The adoption of this amendment would disbar small associations of retail druggists from sending delegates to the A. Ph. A. or the House of Delegates. He said if the smaller associations had any question they wished to bring before the A. Ph. A., they could appeal to the state association and ask the state association to bring such matters before the A. Ph. A.

Mr. Frank H. Freericks, of Cincinnati, Ohio, stated that he did not wish to appear as opposing anything that his friend Doctor Hynson proposed, but it occurred to him that the real sense of the amendment was that the House of Delegates as constituted at the present time is really not representative. In

other words, that it is not big enough because it is made up of the various representatives of the various smaller organizations. It seemed to him they were getting just a little away from the original purpose which caused the founding of the House of Delegates. If he remembered correctly, the primary purpose in founding the House of Delegates was to give the men who represented the smaller associations, and who were unacquainted, an opportunity to get in somewhere, and to know that they represented something and that the others who were there were there because they represented something. The House of Delegates originally, if he understood correctly, was organized primarily as a sort of clearing-house and to do away with a great many things that interfered with the general work of the association and give everybody an opportunity to be heard more or less. He agreed that up to this time the original plan had not worked out properly and that there was something missing. There was not the proper spirit about it. There might be a reason for it which they might be able to remedy, but he was not prepared to say that Professor Hynson's proposition of limiting the representation exclusively to delegates from State Associations was not a good one. He recalled in the early days when he attended the A. Ph. A. convention when he didn't know anybody, and when he came as a representative from a small local association, it would have made him feel much better if he had known that he had a place in the Association somewhere, and it was that very thought that caused the formation of the House of Delegates.

He did not want to appear as opposing the proposition as submitted by Dr. Hynson, for everyone would agree that there was something lacking in the matter of the conduct of the House of Delegates and of preparing its work. If it was to have any work to do, it should be work that would be of service. He recalled that the House was rather hurriedly organized and brought into life at Denver; that there were some who were instrumental in its organization who had given it much thought, but possibly not developed thought, and who may not have been called upon to add to what they originally proposed and to further work it out. It occurred to him that a better purpose might be served if a committee were appointed to thoroughly study the activities of the House of Delegates and the work that might be turned over to it, rather than to undo the original idea, and doing away altogether with representatives from the smaller associations in the body. It seemed to him it would be worth while to give it study, and in that connection he did not think the proper effort had been made in the way of giving notice to the various local associations to prepare resolutions and present them. He did not think that anything along that line had been done particularly, or if it had been done, it had been done after the various associations had held their meetings so they could not prepare resolutions. He thought those were the things that should be worked out so that instead of having a purposeless meeting of the House of Delegates, something might be done that would be really worth while and done without changing the manner in which the House of Delegates is at present made up.

Mr. Hynson asked Mr. Freericks what he would think if the House of Representatives at Washington were composed of members from the state, or the congressional districts, and also from the counties.

Mr. Freericks replied that he fully agreed with Mr. Hynson's argument if the

House of Delegates were really to be the all-important body of the Association, but he was not willing to grant that it was to be the all-important body of the Association; he believed that the general sessions of the Association should continue to be the all-important sessions of the meetings.

While he heartily agreed with the contention that it seemed idle to bring delegates together from the larger associations, the national associations and state associations and the smaller associations, still it was not originally the intent of forming the House of Delegates to constitute or be constituted of representatives simply from the important organizations. The purpose of creating the House of Delegates was to make it a sort of clearing-house for things that could not be otherwise handled. He realized that it was not serving a good purpose at the present time because it was doing no work, but he did believe that if a committee were appointed to study out proper functions for the House of Delegates, it could do good work and it would really serve the purpose for which it was originally intended.

Mr. Gordon said that the by-laws creating the House of Delegates provide places for the delegates from the small colleges and small associations who come in and find they have no other place in the workings of the association. The House of Delegates was originally thought out by Professor Beal to provide a place for all of these delegates in the association and to give them some work to do, with the hope that when a college or state association had some matter that it wanted to bring before the parent association, it could be brought up by their delegate and discussed in the House of Delegates and prepared as a resolution, and the resolution either approved or disapproved by the House of Delegates and the final recommendation presented to the Council.

He said the idea was to provide the House of Delegates for those who came to the meetings alone and unacquainted, and give them a human interest in the work of the Association. He agreed with the other speakers that the House of Delegates had not done well, but it was not the fault of anybody but the House of Delegates itself, and he would second the motion, if he were a delegate, that a committee be appointed to outline a comprehensive plan to make the House of Delegates an active working body of the American Pharmaceutical Association to work as a clearing house for all the colleges of pharmacy and state associations. So long as they were interested enough in the American Pharmaceutical Association to send delegates to its meetings, it was no more than fair that the Association should return the courtesy by giving them something to do in the meeting.

Mr. Freericks said that if a committee were appointed along the line suggested, it could work out something that would serve a splendid purpose, and they could still continue the House of Delegates as a sort of a clearing-house, which would give an opportunity for the smaller organizations to take part in the activities of the Association. He was thoroughly convinced the House of Delegates could be used for the purpose of giving new men, gradually, an opportunity of working-in, and of feeling free to stand up on the floor and speak their minds. He was certain if the various bodies who were now represented had known they could offer resolutions, that they would have prepared and presented them. If they had that opportunity many of them would accept it, and it would add to the Association spirit.

Mr. Edw. N. Webb, of Columbus, O., stated that he had never before attended a meeting of the Association, but he had been a member for nine years of the A. Ph. A., and a member of the American Chemical Society for ten years, and that if he were permitted to take a moment of their time he would point out something that had occurred to him. It seemed to Mr. Webb that the question before the House of Delegates properly resolved itself to this: Is the American Pharmaceutical Association to be a name, or is it to embrace the business and profession of pharmacy in this country?

Mr. Webb thought that few of the firms such as his,—The Columbus Pharmacal Co.,—would trouble to attend a meeting of the state association to present a petition or resolution to be brought before the American Pharmaceutical Association; that they did not have to; their business was established and growing, and growing without the necessity of presenting resolutions; that if the Association wished to keep them interested there was only one way, and that was through the House of Delegates, because the general sessions of the A. Ph. A. would not bring them to the convention.

He said the objection which had been made to the drug clerks being represented in the House of Delegates did not appeal to him. While he did not represent the drug clerks, he ventured the assertion that as most of the proprietors came from the ranks of the drug clerks, if the Association was going to keep the clerks out they would keep out the proprietors of the future, and thus limit the representation of the profession as a whole.

Mr. Woodruff stated his understanding of the purpose of the House of Delegates was that it was simply to be a sort of an advisory body where a concensus of opinion of the various branches of pharmacy might be obtained upon questions which were of interest to all the branches of pharmacy in common, and therefore be a sort of clearing-house, as the term had been frequently used, for resolutions originally introduced into the meetings of the associations of general, rather than of special interest, for illustration, matters of legislation in which not only colleges of pharmacy are interested academically, but the retail and wholesale druggists were interested practically, and in which the manufacturers were also interested. Resolutions that related to matters of that kind were to be referred, as he understood it, to the House of Delegates, in order to give all interested an opportunity to be heard, after which the House of Delegates would simply make its recommendations to the Council, and Council could do as it saw fit. He understood that the House of Delegates would simply be a sort of advisory board, rather than a body that could control the affairs of the Association.

Mr. C. G. Merrell, of Cincinnati, said that there was undoubtedly a great deal of truth in what Doctor Hynson had said in presenting his resolution. The representation in the House of Delegates was rather unusual in an organization of this kind. It was heterogeneous, and it did not represent the membership of the American Pharmaceutical Association, as the membership in other bodies was represented. However, Dr. Hynson's remedy did not seem to him to be a good one in view of the fact that the state associations are not constituent bodies of the American Pharmaceutical Association, but were independent bodies and a large portion of their members were not members of the A. Ph. A. It was a question in connection with the general questions brought up in the President's address



and the Secretary's report, which ought to be considered together. It was a question that could not, possibly, be considered at the present meeting, and he believed the suggestion of Mr. Freericks that a committee be appointed was the only solution of the matter, and if it was in order for the body to do so, he would like to second the motion of Mr. Freericks that a committee be appointed to make a study of the matter and to report at the next meeting. It seemed to him it was worth while to take this step, and something good might come out of it. It was evident something was needed, but it was also evident that they had not yet hit upon the proper remedy.

Mr. Joseph L. Lemberger, of Lebanon, Pa., stated that he had been listening to all that had taken place at the meeting. It was the first time he had been in the House of Delegates as he had not attended the last two meetings. He did not believe there was a single body that had sent delegates which was not perfectly justified in sending them. He looked upon the body as a representative body of all the branches allied with the American Pharmaceutical Association. He did not believe there was any delegate there who had not a full understanding of his privilege as a delegate to the body. He came principally to represent the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association, and he believed that all these associations, such as the National Wholesale Druggists' Association, the National Association of Retail Druggists, had active members in the American Pharmaceutical Association, and he believed they made it a point to send delegates to the A. Ph. A. to represent them. He would like to see the House of Delegates get right down to business. They were in a sort of a formative period and he did not believe in smashing the egg they were hatching, until they knew it was not sound, but to give it a chance. He said that if there were any weaknesses he felt sure they would develop, and with the aid of the parent association, the difficulties would be corrected. He had an idea what led up to the formation of the House of Delegates, and he believed the matter was wisely considered. The plan seemed to be working well in the American Medical Association, which he believed was the pattern after which this body had been organized, and he did not believe that it had had the opportunity of showing what it could do because it was, so to speak, in its formative period, and he would like to see the original plan of the House of Delegates carried out. He wanted to impress one fact upon the delegates and that was that any delegates who had been sent there, and whose credentials had been approved, should have the courtesy of the floor for suggestions, and it was up to the House of Delegates itself to consider the suggestions presented. He advised proceeding with caution. He had heard intimations that the House of Delegates did not amount to anything, but he did not believe it. He thought it did and that the best thing to do was to get in good working-shape.

Dr. W. C. Anderson, of Brooklyn, N. Y., stated he hoped that Mr. Freericks' motion with reference to the appointing of a committee to make a study of the matter and determine what the work of the House of Delegates is, should be carried. He felt that the condition present was due to a misunderstanding. The House of Delegates, in reality, was intended to be a Committee on Resolutions; in other words, the resolutions brought before the meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association should be referred to the House of Delegates and considered by that body. A sub-committee, if you please, should formulate the action

of the body into a definite list of resolutions, so that at the last general session of the American Pharmaceutical Association there would be presented to that body a complete list of resolutions outlining the policies of the organization that could be acted upon at that meeting. The plan suggested had been carried out in some organizations with a great deal of success and in order to make it absolutely successful in this organization, practically all the recommendations and resolutions that are offered at the sessions should be referred to this body, and this body act as a committee on resolutions, allowing free discussion, and then its action recorded, and its approval or disapproval sent to the parent body for its final action. He believed the idea of having these resolutions after they passed go into the Council for its approval or disapproval and then come back into the general session, makes the procedure cumbersome and wastes a lot of valuable time, which he thought was unnecessary. If the original plan were carried out, reports of officers, for instance, would be referred to the House of Delegates, together with the recommendations or reports that come up in the different sessions. It would act as a clearing house for these things. The idea of admitting other than members of the organization to seats in the body, was with the idea that members of the A. Ph. A. would constitute the body principally, and the representatives of organizations that had not membership in the A. Ph. A., would have an opportunity to say something on propositions which they themselves might bring into the organization and would have the privilege of offering resolutions, because they would have no other way of bringing resolutions or the opinions of their organization on certain subjects to the American Pharmaceutical Association. He believed if the House of Delegates were constituted in that way and the officers and sections of the American Pharmaceutical Association understood what this body was to do, it would facilitate the work of the organization very much.

Dr. Anderson said, in this connection, he might refer to the National Association of Retail Druggists which works on this plan. In that body all resolutions are referred to the Committee on Resolutions. This committee holds meetings at which a free discussion of the resolutions takes place and that then a report upon the resolutions was made to the Association for discussion and action. This procedure facilitated the work of that Association in a large degree. In fact he might say that it would be impossible to conduct that organization along proper lines and get through with the work, if that method was not followed. He trusted that there would be no movement that night without deliberate consideration, to radically change the body, and was very much surprised that any member of the A. Ph. A. having its interest at heart should come into a new organization and introduce anything that would tend to disrupt it. If any members of the Association could not understand just what the body could do, they at least should give sufficient time for a study of it. They ought to study it because there were members who saw things very quickly and it took others a longer time to understand them, particularly anything that they originally have been opposed to, and therefore, he believed that they should give deliberate consideration to this matter and have this committee report at a later session, possibly, of this meeting, just what, in their opinion, the province of this body is and see if a way could not be provided for the representatives of these other organizations to meet with the A. Ph. A. and join in the discussions and help in the work of the Association.

Mr. Bodemann stated that the reason the Resolutions Committee referred to, worked so successfully and so skillfully, is, that there are not three, or four, or five cog wheels in it. All the resolutions are referred to the Resolutions Committee and that committee has no sub-committee in its own body. The House of Delegates has to report to the Council and they can either disapprove matters sent to it by this House or report them to the Association. In the N. A. R. D., resolutions are referred to the committee and the committee has an open session, and they report their action back to the general session, and it is settled right then and there. But in this association it goes through three or four cog-wheels and the members do not know whether it is acted upon or not, and sometimes they never hear of the resolutions again.

The Chair stated that there was no special motion before the meeting; that Prof. Hynson had offered an amendment in writing but it had not received a second.

Mr. Hynson replied that he thought it had been seconded and he understood the amendment had been referred to the Committee on Resolutions at the first meeting.

The Chair stated that it had not been, and for the information of the delegates present called their attention to Chapter 7, Article 2, amendments, providing that every proposal to amend the by-laws shall be submitted in writing at one session of the House and may be voted upon at the next session and only upon receiving the affirmative vote of three-fourths of the members present it shall become a part of the by-laws, and asked if the members were ready for the ballot.

Mr. Frank Ryan, of Detroit, stated he was not a delegate but in observing the proceedings it seemed to him he had discovered the reason that there is no business before the body, and if they would permit him, he would like to say that it is apparent that the associations sending these delegates have really placed nothing in their hands to bring before the House of Delegates. If they wanted to keep that body alive they would have to take steps to have the various associations understand that their delegates are the proper people to bring resolutions before the body, and anything the various associations wanted to bring before the American Pharmaceutical Association should come through their delegates to this delegate body. Unless they told these associations of the purpose of the House of Delegates they would never get any resolutions, and it seemed to him the trouble was, the fact that the delegates have not any resolutions to bring; that in order to keep the House of Delegates alive they had to do something in the way of informing these associations what the House of Delegates was for.

Chairman Snow replied that for his information and that of the delegates present, he had written the president of every state association between the first of January and the first of March, informing him of the meeting of the Association and asking to have each state association represented by three delegates, and especially asking them that they send with the delegates resolutions in which the state associations were interested.

Mr. Ryan replied that that was very commendable but it was necessary to do more than that, that the Chairman would have to pound it in with a hammer.

Mr. Merrell inquired if he had confined his notices to the state associations, and the Chair replied that he had, because of a lack of time.

Mr. Merrell said that was just the point he tried to make, that the members of the state associations are not all members of the A. Ph. A. and that perhaps they were not directly interested in the work of the House of Delegates as perhaps some of the colleges or branches or other organizations of that kind.

Mr. Hynson said he recognized the difficulty of reaching a decision that evening. The question was one requiring much study and thought. At the meeting at Hot Springs in 1908 he had proposed the formation of a House of Delegates, to consist of representatives from State Associations and the idea was ridiculed. Since that time he had given the matter deliberate consideration and he was still of the opinion that the logical way of organizing the House of Delegates was in that manner. He believed that the House of Delegates was a splendid thing for the Association, but that its faults of organization should be corrected. The American Medical Association has a House of Delegates composed of delegates from state-bodies and from nothing else, and that was what he was trying to accomplish for this body. By such an organization of this House the State Associations would be brought into close and intimate touch with the Association and more interest would be taken in its work and a greater dignity given to its deliberations. He believed that the proposed plan was so based upon order, precedent and good example and also was so founded upon common sense that it must be adopted in time. He therefore moved to table his amendment and to move that a Committee of five be appointed to consider the organization of the House of Delegates and its interests in connection with the parent association and that the amendment which he had proposed should be referred to this committee when appointed.

Mr. Freericks seconded the motion and said that the committee should have a year's time to consider the matter and to give it thoro study. It was true beyond question that the organization was not working well,—as we would like to see it work and he believed that the proposed committee would be able to devise some plan by which it could be made most useful to the Association.

On motion of Mr. Bodemann the House adjourned to meet on Friday evening.

#### THIRD SESSION.

The Third Session of the House of Delegates was called to order, August 28th, at 8:00 p. m., in room "C" of the Convention Hall, of the Hotel Pontchartrain.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Snow, to listen to the report of the Committee on Resolutions, and the election of officers. The Chairman announced, that if there was no objection, the body would take action on the resolutions *seriatim*, as read by the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

The Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, Mr. Mansfield, then read the first resolution, as follows:

*"Resolution No. 1.* It was moved by W. Bodemann, seconded by Mr. H. M. Whelpley, that the House of Delegates endorse the aims and purposes of the Chicago Veteran Druggists Association,' etc.

Mr. Mansfield said that the above resolution had been approved by the Resolutions Committee, and the Committee recommended that the Resolution be adopted by the House of Delegates.

Chairman Snow explained to Mr. Mansfield that the House of Delegates existed by virtue of the action of the Council, and it had to report to the Council, that if the Committee on Resolutions saw fit not to concur in some of the resolutions that were submitted to them, that action could be disapproved by the Council.

Secretary Kuever said he was under the impression that any resolution the Committee would approve would not go to the Council at all, and was advised by Chairman Snow that they reported to the Council with their approval or disapproval, and if the Council did not see fit to accept the action of the Committee on Resolutions, they did not do so.

Mr. Mansfield then proceeded to read Resolution No. 2, as follows :

2. *Resolved*, That the American Pharmaceutical Association instruct its representatives in the National Drug Conference to act immediately in connection with the representatives of the allied branches of the drug trade in the Drug Conference to draft at the earliest possible moment a bill to reform the present patent law, registration of names of drugs and the granting of sole right to sell certain drugs to the people of the United States suitable to the best interests of the drug trade in the United States, and to urge its passage at the earliest possible opportunity, and the support of the A. Ph. A. is hereby pledged to such reform.

Mr. Frederick T. Gordon, of Philadelphia, stated that the whole system of patent laws needed reformation, as everybody would concede, and that now was the time to get it, because the Congressmen themselves felt the need of it at this time, and there never had been a better time to push the matter; that the N. A. R. D. has passed a similar resolution, and the other associations represented in the Drug Trade Conference would probably pass it, and he thought if the representatives of the different associations in the Drug Trade were properly instructed, something would be done.

Chairman Snow stated that if there was no objection the House of Delegates adopted the report of the Committee, on this resolution. There being no objection, the report was adopted.

Mr. Mansfield then proceeded to read the third resolution as follows :

3. That the A. Ph. A. make all possible effort to have only graduates of recognized schools of pharmacy nominated as members of the State Boards of Pharmacy by the State Associations and where possible have such amendments made to state laws as will make such qualifications a pre-requisite.

Mr. Mansfield in explanation of the action of the Committee on the third resolution stated that the Committee had thought that the resolution would do no harm, but that they did not think it would do very much good because they did not know how it could be enforced.

Chairman Snow stated that it put the Association on record as favoring such a proposition. Mr. Mansfield said that was the idea the Committee had in mind, and that was the reason they recommended its adoption.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. Mansfield next proceeded to read Resolution No. 4 as follows :

4. *Resolved*, That the incoming President be and is hereby instructed to appoint a committee of three members, which committee shall confer with similar committees, appointed for the same purpose by other organizations, upon the advisability of forming a congress of national drug and pharmaceutical bodies

under the auspices of the American Pharmaceutical Association. And be it further

*Resolved*, That the results of the conference of these committees shall be reported to the several organizations represented and to the American Pharmaceutical Association at their annual meetings in nineteen hundred and fifteen, with such recommendations as may be agreed upon.

Mr. Mansfield explained in regard to the above resolution that here again the Committee felt that it was a move in the right direction; that the proposed congress would be a congress of the national pharmaceutical bodies of the country which would be able to do a great deal of good.

There being no objection the House of Delegates adopted the report of the Committee on Resolution No. 4.

Mr. Mansfield then read Resolution No. 5, as follows:

5. WHEREAS, The usefulness of the House of Delegates during its two years' existence, not having been such as was expected at the time of its installation, it is important that something be done to increase this usefulness; therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this House of Delegates that increased efficiency can be secured by making this body a permanent one instead of making its existence dependent upon the actions of the Council.

The Committee recommended its adoption.

Chairman Snow stated that the resolution above seemed to be in accord with the sense of the delegates and if there was no objection the report of the Committee would be adopted.

Mr. Hostmann said that his idea in bringing this up was because he had heard that the Council had appointed a committee to consider the question of the usefulness of the House of Delegates, and he knew that there had been a committee appointed by the House of Delegates, but he thought it would not do any harm to impress upon the Council that some of the delegates thought there was some usefulness in the House of Delegates.

Mr. Gordon said that the House of Delegates was not dependent upon the Council for its existence; that it had been created by a vote of the Association, at Denver, and it would take a vote of the Association to abolish it.

Chairman Snow replied that he thought Mr Gordon was correct.

Mr. Gordon continued there had been considerable debate upon the House of Delegates proposition at the first session of the Denver convention, and it was such a serious innovation that he made the motion himself that the whole thing be printed and distributed to the members so that the matter could be gone over in private, and discussed among the members, and have the matter taken up at a later session; that the proposed constitution and by-laws were, in accordance with that motion, printed and distributed among the members, and the matter was discussed during the week and at the last session the matter was taken up and adopted, and the vote was almost unanimous to establish the House of Delegates, and the Council had nothing to do with it.

Chairman Snow stated that he did not know but what Mr. Gordon was correct, but that he had a personal letter from Dr. Beal, in which he made the statement that the House of Delegates existed by action of the Council, and he felt that action should be taken to make it a permanent section.

Mr. Hostmann said that he believed Mr. Gordon was right, but he thought the

resolution referred to would not do any harm, and would call attention to the fact that there was a lot of misunderstanding about it.

Mr. Gordon said he thought the suggestion was all right, and he only wanted to bring out his point.

There being no objection the report of the Committee on the above resolution was adopted.

Chairman Mansfield then read Resolution No. 6, as follows:

6. That it is the belief of the House of Delegates that the Year Book should contain abstracts of papers submitted by the members of the American Pharmaceutical Association and published in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

Mr. Mansfield said in regard to the above resolution that many of the most valuable papers that are published during the year are papers that are read before the different sections of the Association, which are never abstracted and never appear in any of the proceedings, and he thought every one felt that a presented paper certainly ought to be abstracted and placed in the Year Book, and for that reason recommended the adoption of the resolution.

The report of the Committee was adopted.

Chairman Mansfield then read resolution No. 7, as follows:

7. That the President of the American Pharmaceutical Association, at the opening session of each annual convention, shall appoint an official censor whose duty it shall be to supervise matter given to representatives of the local press, and to insure that fair and accurate accounts of the proceedings and business of the Association during such meetings shall be fairly and accurately printed.

In regard to the above resolution, Mr. Mansfield said that the Committee felt that it was a resolution which they would favor because it would not do any harm, although they did not feel it would do much good.

Report of the Committee on the above resolution adopted.

Chairman Snow stated that he had a resolution from the Section on Education and Legislation, which seemed to have been taken up by that section Thursday, and which had been referred to the House of Delegates, and if there was no objection, the House of Delegates would take action upon it. He read the following Resolution:

8. That the principle in the two measures—the Metz Bill and the Stevens Bill, i. e., price standardization, be approved by this Association.

Mr. W. S. Richardson, of Washington, D. C., moved that the Resolution be approved. Motion seconded by Mr. Mansfield and carried.

Chairman Snow stated that he believed the consideration of resolutions was completed, and that a motion had been made and carried that the Chairman appoint a committee to investigate the House of Delegates, and see if its usefulness could not be improved. Chairman Snow appointed the following, as members of the Committee:

H. P. Hynson, of Baltimore, Md., F. H. Freericks, of Cincinnati, O., Joseph Lemberger, of Lebanon, Pa., W. C. Anderson, of Brooklyn, N. Y., F. M. Apple, of Philadelphia, Pa.

Chairman Snow stated that the motion which had been passed contained the suggestion that the above Committee make their report at the next year's meeting.

The next order of business before the House of Delegates was the election of officers.

Mr. Hostmann inquired whether they should proceed with this matter, in view of the fact that they might elect somebody as an officer who would not be a delegate to the next annual meeting. Chairman Snow replied that they should, and stated that the procedure had been changed at the Nashville meeting for the reason that when they elect officers at the beginning of the meeting for that meeting, they might find it necessary to elect some delegates as officers who had no idea of their duties, or of the business to be done by the House of Delegates.

Mr. Gordon inquired as the House of Delegates is not a self-perpetuating body, how they could elect officers for the next meeting; how it could be known that the officers would be delegates to the next meeting.

Chairman Snow replied that they were delegates at present and were delegates until a successor was chosen, and the idea was, as he had just explained to Mr. Hostmann, to avoid electing a delegate an officer who would have no chance to look over the situation and inform himself on what duties he should perform.

Mr. Gordon said that if a delegate wanted to come back to the next meeting, he would have no trouble in being appointed a delegate.

Chairman Snow stated the next order of business would be the election of officers for the House of Delegates for the ensuing year, and explained that the constitution and by-laws provided for the election of a chairman, two vice-presidents and a secretary, and that nominations were in order for the office of Chairman for the House of Delegates.

Chairman Snow further stated there was a provision in the constitution and by-laws for as many sessions as were required to transact the business of the House of Delegates, but that under ordinary conditions the session at which the Resolutions Committee reported was the final session. After making this explanation, Chairman Snow stated that nominations for Chairman for the ensuing year were in order.

Mr. Mansfield said it seemed to him in view of the several resolutions which had been adopted by the House about the effectiveness of the organization, and in view of the fact that its reorganization required special knowledge of the workings of the society, that the present president of the House of Delegates should be re-elected to the position in order that he could go on with the work and bring about the results he thought best.

Mr. Mansfield stated that was the way it appealed to him and for that reason took great pleasure in placing the name of Mr. Snow in re-nomination for president.

Seconded by Mr. Hostmann.

Chairman Snow stated with all due regard to Dr. Mansfield it did not seem possible that he would be able to go to California and he thought he had already received sufficient honor in having served one year, and for this reason would have to decline. He stated he appreciated very much Dr. Mansfield's action but he could not consider serving another year.

Prof. Remington asked the Chair for a little information. He stated some one had told him,—he could not remember who,— that the House of Delegates had not elected any officers, and if it was true, he only wanted to say he thought it



was a very grave mistake to omit such an important matter ; that he did not think the election of officers should be omitted as the Council and the Committee had not yet voted to give up the House of Delegates and he had great hopes that this "child" would acquire a lusty growth in the future, and until the action of the Association should be taken there was nothing else to do but for the House of Delegates to elect its officers just as though it were going to continue, and pay no attention whatever to these uncertain plans until the Association otherwise directed.

Mr. Faser nominated for Chairman Mr. W. S. Richardson, of Washington, D. C. This motion was seconded by Dr. Mansfield.

Mr. Remington then moved that the nominations be closed and the Secretary instructed to cast the ballot of the house for W. S. Richardson for Chairman ; motion seconded and unanimously carried.

Mr. Frank H. Carter, of Indianapolis, Ind., nominated Mr. C. B. Jordan, of Lafayette, Ind., as First Vice Chairman ; motion seconded.

It was then moved by Mr. Hostmann, seconded and unanimously carried that the nominations be closed and the Secretary instructed to cast the ballot of the house for C. B. Jordan for First Vice-Chairman.

Prof. Remington nominated Mr. H. M. Faser, of University, Miss., for Second Vice-Chairman ; motion seconded.

It was then moved, duly seconded and unanimously carried that the nominations be closed and the Secretary instructed to cast the ballot of the House for H. M. Faser, of University, Miss., for Second Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Faser then moved that the present efficient secretary, Mr. Rudolph A. Kuever, of Iowa City, Ia., be re-elected.

Mr. Kuever thanked the House very much but said it would be impossible for him to serve because he had been elected to another position which would take a great deal of his time.

Prof. Remington nominated Mr. Joseph Weinstein as Secretary ; motion seconded by Dr. Mansfield, who said that he was very glad to be able to second this nomination as he believed Dr. Weinstein would make a very efficient secretary for the organization.

On motion duly made, nominations for the office of secretary were closed and the Secretary directed to cast the ballot of the organization for Mr. Weinstein.

Chairman Snow then appointed Mr. Joseph Lemberger a committee of one to conduct the officers to the platform for installation.

Mr. Lemberger then conducted Mr. Richardson to the rostrum and presented Mr. Richardson as the newly elected president of the House of Delegates, stating he felt sure there had been no mistake made in electing Mr. Richardson, and that he would make good.

Chairman Snow then advised Mr. Richardson that he had been duly elected Chairman of the House of Delegates and he was now installed in his office.

Upon calls being made for a speech, Chairman Richardson stated that the House of Delegates would have to excuse him from making a speech, although he wanted to thank them for the high honor conferred upon him and he prophesied that the House of Delegates was going to be a very important body of the Association.

(Applause.)

Mr. Lemberger then introduced to the Chairman and the body, Mr. C. B. Jordan, the newly elected first vice-chairman, and said he felt sure that in this case they had made no mistake. Mr. Jordan, upon being declared the duly elected first vice-chairman, said he thanked the delegates very much for the honor and that he would try to perform the duties that might devolve upon him to the best of his ability.

Mr. Lemberger then escorted Mr. Faser to the front and introduced him to the new chairman, stating that Mr. Faser had been elected second vice-chairman and he believed the House had made no mistake in the selection of Mr. Faser, and that the time might come when the duties of the office of chairman would rest on his shoulders, although he was second vice-chairman; that those things had happened before, and that if it happened during Mr. Faser's administration he felt sure Mr. Faser would be able to handle the body.

Chairman Richardson declared Mr. Faser the duly elected and installed second vice-chairman of the House of Delegates.

Mr. Faser stated he had been looking for a long time for an office with no work attached and he believed he had found it, in view of the fact that there were two men ahead of him. (Laughter.)

Mr. Lemberger then introduced to the Chairman the newly-elected Secretary, Mr. Weinstein, and stated he felt Mr. Weinstein would discharge the duties of his office with fidelity; that the office was a responsible one and the organization had confidence in the new secretary.

Chairman Richardson declared Mr. Weinstein the official secretary of the House of Delegates. Mr. Weinstein said his election had been a great surprise to him and he appreciated very highly the honor conferred upon him. There was one consolation, namely, he did not know what functions the Secretary would have to perform and if he did not perform them properly it would be because of his ignorance of what he was supposed to do.

Mr. Snow said he would soon find out what his duties were.

Mr. Hostmann thereupon moved that the House of Delegates adjourn.

Motion adopted.

---

#### ESTIMATION OF CREATIN IN URINE.

A quantity of the urine containing between 7 and 10 Mgm. of total creatinin is placed in a small flask or beaker, and 10 to 20 mils of normal hydrochloric acid added together with a pinch or two of powdered or granulated lead. The mixture is boiled over a free flame until nearly down to dryness, and then evaporation is continued on a water-bath, until most of the excess of hydrochloric acid gas has been expelled. The residue is dissolved in about 10 mils of hot water, and the solution passed through a plug of cottonwool into a 500-mil volumetric flask. Twenty to 25 mils of saturated picric acid solution is added, and about 7 to 8 mils of 10 percent sodium hydroxide solution, which contains 5 percent of Rochelle salt. The flask is filled up to the mark at the end of five minutes, and read in the usual way. —S. R. Benedict (Journ. Biol. Chem., Baltimore, July, 1914.)