

THE BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

VOL. XCVI.—THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1877.—NO. 23.

ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,

HELD AT CHICAGO, JUNE, 1877.

BY HENRY I. BOWDITCH, M. D.,
President of the Association.

GENTLEMEN: On looking back upon the addresses of my predecessors in this office, I find that the greater number have been devoted to topics tending to improve the practical working of this association. This seems a most fitting plan for me also to pursue. I ask, therefore, your attention to a few suggestions on The Past, the Present, and the Future of this Association.

THE PAST.

Previously to the birth of this association in 1847, the medical profession of these States as a united body did not exist. A few state and smaller local societies had been formed in some parts of the country, but the masses of the profession had not only no coherence, but were actually separated; for, owing often to political ideas at that time prevalent, and to the difficulties of communication either in person or by letter between distant points of our large country, we were, to a certain extent, rather alienated than drawn together. At our first meeting, it was a very curious psychological study to mark out the region of the country from which each speaker came, by his idiosyncrasies of manner and of action, which showed as distinctly the section of country in which he lived, as his individual habits and thoughts. Of course, such a body of heterogeneous natures, which had no distinct bond to unite them, was very hard to manage, as our earlier presidents soon found to their bitter cost.

But what is the fact at the present time? I doubt not many of you, who now hear me, have been equally fortunate with myself and can trace most valuable friendships to these annual reunions; friendships, which could have never arisen otherwise, because no such opportunities for meeting would have offered. My first point, then, in reference to the American Medical Association is that, whereas, before its inauguration, the profession was disintegrated, and members of it knew little of any others than those in their immediate home circle, now, while thinking of the profession, our thoughts embrace men from even the

most distant parts of our common country. This principle of union gains with each annual meeting. We are becoming more assimilated. Local idiosyncrasies are now less manifest; the meetings are much more quiet, and rarely otherwise than perfectly harmonious.

If I had no other reason, these facts would induce me heartily to sustain the association, for their effects on the whole country are excellent. We had proof of this when we saw how quickly and easily the Northern and Southern sections of this body coalesced immediately upon the closure of the civil war. The American Medical Association became, indeed, at that time, one of the strongest ties of these States, and for that very fact deserves from all of us unqualified respect.

ENTHUSIASM PREVALENT IN THE EARLIER MEETINGS.

Those who can look back upon the earlier meetings will recollect that, notwithstanding the disturbances that occasionally took place, there was a fine enthusiasm connected with them. The *élite* of the profession from all quarters of the Union attended and read papers, or took part in the debates. It will, moreover, be well remembered that wine flowed freely at the public and private gatherings, with at times unhappy results to a few. In spite of the disorder observable during our debates, and the improprieties following the abuse of wine, the clash of ideas during the week of the meeting was generally of a wholesome character. The association was borne onward for many years with the same earnestness which marked its birth, and, while it not only cemented our profession, it became, as I have hinted, by its ramifications everywhere through the land, one of the bulwarks of the state and a help towards civilization on this continent.

ITS PRESENT REPUTATION.

But what is its present reputation with the profession? Does that zeal which reigned at our earlier meetings prevail now? If not, what are the reasons for its apparent or actual loss of reputation with many of our best and oldest associates? I think we must admit that our meetings, with perhaps a few exceptions, rarely are carried out with the entire coöperation of the *whole* profession, as they were in the earlier years of our existence. I am sure that the meetings have lost reputation in the Eastern and Middle States. This I know by personal experience with some of our chief associates of Philadelphia, New York, and Boston; I infer that a similar feeling exists elsewhere, because I notice the absence of some of the prominent Western and Southern men. A portion of young physic, aided by some scoffing elders, would brush us away if it could do so, as a hindrance rather than a help to the progress of scientific medicine.

Why is this? I have already alluded to two chief causes of alienation. Men, naturally quiet and hoping to attend sedate scientific dis-

cussions, on important themes, have found themselves, at times among men furiously discussing points of order, or equally vain points on the ethics of professional etiquette. At our social meetings some lost their reason under the fumes of wine.

These facts had a most powerful influence for evil. But other and important causes of lukewarmness, or of opposition, on the part of many have arisen. Among these may be named, —

First. The consciousness, to which the members were very soon, and perhaps most rudely, brought, that their expectations as to what the association was to do for the profession were too high, and the destruction of these hopes seems to have taken away from not a few able men, all hope of future good from the association.

Surely nothing could be more unwise or illogical than this position, against which I would earnestly protest and put the following plea: —

How, I would ask, is it possible for an association which meets only once a year, which migrates from Maine to San Francisco, which annually changes its officers, which allows every one to be a contributor to its transactions, instead of itself seeking the noblest minds of the profession and winning them to labor for it, — how is it possible for such a society to have any real scientific work done at its meetings? It seems to me vain to hope that any such society can, of itself, carry on, to any great extent, fine scientific work. We need frequent, small reunions, or, still better, individual and hard, if need be midnight and solitary work, to enable science to make solid incursions into those unknown regions, where Nature stands always ready to open her beautiful laws to the quiet, patient, truth-loving investigator. I do not mean by these remarks to be understood that I deny to the association all power of *aiding* in scientific progress. Far from it; for I believe that indirectly and by small changes in our mode of proceeding, to which I shall presently allude, we may do much and give an immense impulse to science, while we may be forever unable, at our meetings, to add one iota to the stock of human knowledge.

Second. Another reason why the association has lost reputation, is the fact that its general meetings of the early days, and its sections of late years, have been often used for the presentation of papers or remarks from individuals, smitten with the *cacoethes scribendi aut loquendi*, and we have not always had the ability or the will to check them. Many of their victims have asked themselves the very pertinent question, Does it really pay me to travel perhaps a thousand miles to hear such papers or debates as these? You may be well assured that such persons have not often returned, after having been once or twice so victimized. They do not feel that the number of honorable and able men, who may not say or write a word, but whom they can meet and converse with, or perhaps form the closest friendships with, will amply repay them for many hours of *ennui*, inflicted by others.

Third. Still another reason for dislike to our association may be found in our Transactions. They have been too bulky. We are not led to look into them, with the certainty of adding to our stock of knowledge. Doubtless, many grave and admirable discourses may be found therein, but it seems to some of us that the amount of real knowledge, gained from them, is inversely as the cubes of their bulk.

Papers have been read in the sections, without protest, and some have been actually printed in our Transactions, which had been previously printed elsewhere.

Agassiz once said to me, "Most of the chief works, which have marked eras in the progress of European science, have been contained in pamphlets."

During the Middle Ages a huge folio carried with it immense intellectual power, and honest scholars of those days borrowed a volume on one Christmas Day and returned it the next, devoting a whole year to the study of its voluminous pages. But now, a huge volume repels by its very bulk, and I much fear that our Transactions, heavy as they are physically and often intellectually, and all unindexed as they are, have tended to depress more than to excite the enthusiasm of readers, and that depression has lowered the reputation of the association.

Fourth. Another very serious cause of complaint is that, led by violent partisans, the association has, at times, unwisely passed resolutions, thought to be quite insulting to large communities, or pledging the association to one opinion or another upon very mooted questions, on which the association was imperfectly informed, and by the passage of such votes we were all compromised.

Fifth. Among the objections urged recently, the last I shall name is the following, which seems to be a singular one for an American to offer, namely, that the association is too democratic.

The reason for this opinion is the vote we passed a few years since, taking from the colleges and hospitals their rights of special representation in this body. That vote only brought the rules of our association into proper relations with the fundamental ideas, underlying our nation, instead of any longer allowing them to foster class feeling, which was aroused by our giving to the colleges and hospital staffs an extra number of representatives. But I feel sure that no one intended, by that vote, to show disrespect to the professors or the hospital staffs.

There cannot be a doubt that, if they choose to take an interest in the meetings, these gentlemen would be as often sent representatives to this body, by the societies to which they belong, as they were by our previous rules designated by their respective faculties. I cannot think that this objection can have had much weight even with the few. But, however small or wide may be its influence, the surest way to overcome it is to prove, by our own works, that we are worthy the support of the most learned professors among us.

I regret to feel compelled thus to allude to the short-comings of our association, but I know of no better way to make improvements than by looking fairly at our failures. Moreover, I have the fullest faith that we can easily, if we choose, remove all prominent objections, and, at the same time, put new vigor into the association. This may be done by carrying out some plans already adopted, but which have not, as yet, had time to bring out their best results, and by the adoption of suggestions, which circumstances may seem from time to time to lay before us. I propose to lay before you one or more such much-needed changes.

THE SECTIONS: WHAT THEY DO AND WHAT THEY CANNOT ACCOMPLISH.

The sections, if they would always do their duty, would prevent our transactions from being burdened by papers of small value.

But important as the sections have been, and as they will always be in other respects, I think that hereafter, as heretofore, want of time and often want of moral courage will prevent them from performing their duty as *critics*. They will therefore fail to keep up the highest standard of scientific statement on the part of our writers. No one likes to criticise a communication, even when it is patent to all, except perhaps to the writer, that the time of the meeting has been nearly, if not quite, wasted during the perusal of it, and that a recommendation for its publication would be a gross dereliction of duty on the part of every member of the section. Such publication may, occasionally, be prevented under the leadership of one or more men who, asking for no favor, and looking only to the conscientious performance of duty as critics, appointed in fact by this association partly for that express object, may dare frankly to express their opinions of any and all papers that may be read. But we cannot always have this. How can we hope for it, when we remember the number of papers presented, and the brief period of time we shall always have for careful and discriminating consideration of their contents?

In admitting this failure on the part of the sections, I do not admit that they have failed of doing very great services to this whole body. I cannot sufficiently express my estimate of their value in many other directions. A certain amount of critical acumen, of course, they will always have, but the question recurs, Will they each year and in every section *always* be able, even if willing, to decide upon the publication of communications, which are hastily and perhaps only in part read? My estimate of human nature, and my observation of the workings of the sections forbid me to believe that we can ever hope for this desirable result. To meet this difficulty, I would advise that we adopt the wise regulations established by the Smithsonian Institution, namely:—

First. To publish nothing but that which, after being read at the

sections and approved by them, shall have been also submitted to the critical eye of experts, whose names shall be unknown, and whose decision shall be final, in regard to the publication of any paper in our volume of transactions.

Second. We should declare, as our rule for the guidance of said experts, that no paper should be deemed worthy of publication in our transactions unless, —

(a.) It gives something new to medical science, or

(b.) Unless it present an analysis, or such a new or lucid arrangement, of facts, already wholly or in part known, that the profession will be greatly aided thereby.

I hope these suggestions will be referred to a special committee or to the judicial council for consideration, with directions to report before the close of this meeting.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL.

The most important measure ever adopted by the association was the establishment of the judicial council in 1873, of twenty-one members, each member to hold office for three years, and seven annually to retire. Chosen as representatives of the whole profession of the United States, to them are referred "at once, without discussion, all questions of a personal character, including complaints and protests, and all questions on credentials, after the report of the committee of arrangements or other presentation."

This council has been of incalculable value. If it had been thought of earlier it would have saved us from many of the turbulent scenes of former days, which, as we have seen, tended to alienate some of our ablest associates.

A STANDING COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATIONS PROPOSED.

To this judicial council I would urge you to refer the following proposition, namely : —

The propriety of having, as a standing committee, one on the procuring of scientific papers, for each annual meeting, from the ablest men who can be found in the various sections of the country. Such a committee has been of great value to the meetings of the Massachusetts Medical Society, as I well know from its operations during many years past, and therefore I urge your adoption of a similar plan. This committee would not, of course, prevent the presentation of voluntary papers, but I would establish the rule that the papers and writers, recommended by the committee, should generally have precedence. The committee should be small, say five, each holding office for five years, one leaving annually. They might be originally selected by the judicial council, and, each year, a new one selected, by the same body, to fill the place of the person who retires. Each one in turn should serve as

chairman, in his last year of service. I would have on this committee one or more of the older men of the profession, but the majority I should hope would be earnest, accomplished, scientific, middle-aged or young men.

The committee should hold its sessions, each year, during the week of the annual meeting of this association, and, if possible, should select the best men at one meeting, and engage them to prepare papers for the ensuing one.

If it did its duty thoroughly, it would select the wisest and best representatives of the science and practice of medicine and surgery in America. Communications from men thus chosen would undoubtedly render our reunions much more interesting to all, and would raise the standard of medical learning. Months before each meeting of the association, due notice in the medical journals should be widely given of the names of the writers, and of the nature of the papers to be presented. Thus every member of the association would know of them long before their presentation, and could prepare himself for abler discussion of the topics involved. This information would also induce a fuller gathering, and livelier discussions.

All these papers should be afterwards referred to experts, as stated above. If any author, feeling aggrieved by an adverse decision from the experts, should publish elsewhere his communication, he might, in his preface, point his wit at our expense. It would not injure us, if, in our endeavors to winnow out the chaff, we should sometimes throw away a few perfect grains of wheat.

OUR SOCIAL MEETINGS.

Among the most agreeable memories I have of our meeting at Louisville, in 1875, is the fact that all our public entertainments were conducted on temperance principles.

This was peculiarly significant to dwellers outside the limits of Kentucky. To have had such a noble example, set in the land whence comes the famous "Bourbon" whisky, was indeed a triumph for true temperance. Hereafter, we cannot do better than follow the lead of Louisville in two respects, namely:—

First. In its abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, and

Second. In the invitation it extended to woman to meet with us in social intercourse.

But I would go a step farther, and would recommend that the association should itself now take the highest ground against the use of intoxicating drinks at its meetings hereafter.

It seems to me that every one of us, even if he disagree to the proposition of total abstinence, and regards a prohibitory law as simply impossible, would be willing, at these meetings, to forego the use of any stimulant, for the sake of not leading some weaker brethren into mis-

chief, and because such a position, taken by this great association, would have a most important, though indirect, effect on the noble cause of temperance throughout the land. I would submit, therefore, whether we, as a body of physicians, believing in a true temperance, although varying in our views of what that may mean, should not declare that hereafter we will respectfully but decidedly decline any public or private entertainment, for our whole body, where intoxicating drinks are to be offered.

I sincerely hope that you will request the judicial council to consider, at this meeting, this subject, and if it be deemed wise, that a manifesto upon it should be prepared by the council, which shall hereafter be our guide upon this important matter.

There are two other suggestions which I will make in this connection, and which, it seems to me, if carried out would be of benefit to the association : —

First, I wish every honorable, well-educated physician in the United States to feel an interest in, and to be a member of, this association by the very fact of his having become, by proper education and examination, such a physician. In some state medical societies the county societies, by their censors' examinations, have the right to admit members to the local society. That diploma makes the receiver of it a member of the state society. In like manner I wish that every member of a state society should become, what is now called a permanent member of this association, and he should have the same rights that permanent members have now. This alteration of our constitution would immediately place this association in relations, with the young physicians of the country, much more satisfactory than those existing under our present rule.

Second. I wish we could still further vary from our present plan, and make the representation at our annual meetings smaller ; for example, if each society could send a representative for every twenty, or perhaps every thirty of its members, when the society is a large one, instead of every ten as now allowed. If we had this smaller representation, the honor of being a delegate would be higher, and doubtless the plan would tend to induce the best men of the profession to be willing to accept the office of delegate, which is certainly not the fact, at present, in many places.

UNION OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION WITH THE CANADA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION.

At the meeting in Louisville, in 1875, in accordance with a suggestion from the Canada Medical Association, "that, in consideration of the true interests of medical science, it is desirable that a medical conference should take place between the American Medical Association

and the Canada Medical Association," it was voted by the American Medical Association "that a committee of thirteen be appointed, whose duty it shall be to confer with a like committee of the Canada Medical Association at such time and place, as may be agreed upon by the joint committee of the associations."

That joint committee met in Philadelphia, the first week in September, 1876, at the hall of the Jefferson Medical College, about one third of the committee being present. On motion of Dr. Gross, Dr. Grant, of Canada, was chosen chairman, and Dr. W. B. Atkinson, of Philadelphia, secretary. Some time was spent in informal discussion as to the wishes of the members of the two associations, as to the possible joint meetings of the two at certain places and times, and a desire was expressed by some of the committee for a permanent union of the two bodies. Finally it was unanimously voted that "a union of the two associations into one is desirable, and that the presidents of each be requested to bring the subject before his own association, and present his own views upon the matter, in order that the question may be fully discussed, and action taken thereupon by the members, at their next annual meeting." In accordance with this request, I propose the following as some of the arguments against and in favor of the proposed union: —

First. The already large dimensions of the American Medical Association, and the difficulty of making so unwieldy a body a real working society, seem to contraindicate the proposition of union. If the American Medical Association be already too large, as it certainly is in the estimate of many persons, why make it a quarter or a third more bulky by the addition of new members, and from a different country, having somewhat different tastes and habits?

Second. However desirable it would be to unite with the intelligent men of the Canada Association, it may be asked, by others, whether the fact of two languages being used throughout Canada will not tend to make joint meetings objectionable.

Third. The difficulty of arranging the expenses of the united body, of course, would be somewhat greater than it is at present.

Fourth. Objections might be made to the fact that the places for holding the annual meetings may be, one year so far distant from that of the preceding, that the members of one or the other association would, practically speaking, have, at times, no annual conference.

These are all the objections I have heard urged against the proposed union. Some of them seem to me grave, and as such should be gravely weighed.

In favor of the plan I find the following reasons: —

First. We should associate ourselves with a body of physicians, all of whom have been educated under English influences, and many of

whom have pursued their studies in England, and have received diplomas from the schools of that country. We all know the high standard of qualifications, required by the British schools.

Second. Why may we not look upon such a connection as quite similar to that, which has frequently taken place and which will occur hereafter, when a new State in this Union is formed?

In that case, if a state medical society be organized, it has a right to send delegates to this association. The only difference, in the two cases, would be that Canada embraces a very much larger constituency than any of our new States would have.

Third. I am inclined to look with favor upon the proposed union from the stand-point of civilization itself. There can be no doubt, as already stated, that this American Association has been a great means for promoting good-will between the different sections of the United States. The proposed union with Canada will tend much towards the reuniting of two of the freest nations on the globe, and certainly civilization can get only good from such coöperation. All means that we can bring to unite mankind I hail with delight.

Fourth. I will allude to what would give me and, I doubt not, many more, great pleasure. I wish the united professions to meet in the old cities of Montreal and Quebec, and pass up and down the noble Saint Lawrence, magnificent as it is in the length, depth, and breadth of its waters, and still more fascinating from its early associations with European civilization. I would like that we should all stand on the scarred battlements of Quebec, and I think perhaps we, of this country, might learn a divine lesson of magnanimity after war, if we could together look at the obelisk, erected by the graceful action of the British government, to the joint memories of Wolfe and Montcalm, two brave soldiers, antagonists in battle, but, in death, joint heirs in the memories of mankind.

These are some of the reasons for and against an organic union of the two associations. It will be seen that none of them militate against occasional joint meetings, at selected sites, convenient to both parties. I am not prepared to advise any course, but suggest that the whole subject be referred to the judicial council, with directions to report during this meeting, upon the feasibility of the union or, instead thereof; of biennial or quinquennial congresses of the two bodies; and, if the council approve of either of these measures, it be further directed to nominate a committee to meet a similar one, to be chosen by the Canadian association. This joint committee should be requested to draft some plan for meetings, either annually, or at longer intervals, said plan to be submitted to the two associations for acceptance, emendation, or rejection, at some subsequent annual meeting of the two bodies.

THE AMERICAN PHARMACOPŒIA, AND THE RELATIONS OF THIS ASSOCIATION TO IT.

Last year, after a speech from Dr. E. R. Squibb, of Brooklyn, N. Y., certain resolutions were offered by him, embodying the following questions : —

First. Whether the decennial plan of publication of the United States Pharmacopœia be practically sufficient for the present time, and whether any plan better than the present could be devised ?

Second. Whether the association be the proper custodian of the interests involved in the National Pharmacopœia, and proper source of the National Codex, and whom can it invite to coöperate with it in the work ?

Third. If it be the work of this association, in what way can its details be wisely undertaken with any prospect of material improvement upon the present plan ?

Fourth. In order for mature deliberation, the matter be laid over for one year and the president be recommended to consider it in his annual address.

In accordance with this last vote I propose to address you a few words. Previously to 1808, no recognized American Pharmacopœia existed. In that year, the Massachusetts Medical Society published one, grounded on the Edinburgh Pharmacopœia. The Massachusetts publication never attained a national reputation, and was not continued. In 1820, the plan, at present pursued in the publication of the American Pharmacopœia, was adopted. The first work published at Philadelphia did not meet with a hearty recognition by the country, and in 1830, when the second issue was made, it was met by one from New York, and for the time being there were two pharmacopœias, each seeking for a national reputation.

Fortunately for that published at Philadelphia, which was the manuscript offered by Drs. Wood and Bache, those gentlemen published a larger work, grounded upon the Philadelphia Pharmacopœia, and not only explaining that, but giving a great number of articles and preparations, unknown to the Pharmacopœia, though thought valuable by many of the profession.

It is believed that this work, which every physician in the country needs and uses perhaps daily, saved its companion, the Pharmacopœia. The New York Pharmacopœia has never been continued. The American Pharmacopœia has existed to the present time, and professes to be the national standard, everywhere admitted. The method pursued in regard to this publication seems not only eminently fair, but *a priori* one would think that it would be very likely to succeed. It is as follows : Every ten years since 1820, a convention has been held in Washington ; and, in the month of May of the last year of each decade, the

president of the previous convention, or in case of his death, other officers having the same rights, issues a call requesting all the incorporated medical colleges, incorporated colleges of physicians and surgeons, incorporated colleges of pharmacy, throughout the United States to choose delegates, not exceeding three, to attend a general convention to be held in Washington, in May of the following year. This convention has usually decided on all points, connected with the Pharmacopœia, and has published it. The next call will be made in May, 1879, and the convention will be held in May, 1880.

Five conventions have been already held.

Two of them have passed since this association was instituted in 1847. This association has never taken any action relative to them, —

First. Because it has never been invited to do so, and

Second. Because, according to the very terms of the call of the convention, we really have no right to attend; for it will be remembered that delegates from *incorporated* societies alone are invited.

This association has never been incorporated. It will have no right to send delegates to the next convention, even if it wish to do so, except under one or more of these three contingencies: —

First. That we procure an act of incorporation from Congress before May, 1879.

Second. We may choose delegates and at the meeting of the convention in 1880, they may ask to be admitted. I think that body would not refuse to receive delegates we may select.

Third. We may follow a plan suggested by Dr. Squibb, namely, appoint a pharmaceutical council of this association, consisting of five members to be chosen as follows: The president should be chosen by this association. The army and navy of the United States should select two more. The American Pharmaceutical Association, which in this case is considered only a branch of the medical profession, should select the other two.

If this were done, it is surmised by the friends of the measure that the convention would either not be summoned in 1880, or that it would resign its powers to this new council. Whether this association should accept either of these propositions I am not prepared to say, until I have further information. I wish to know the views of the officers of the convention which is to be held in 1880. I do not see how the last president of that body can, conscientiously, refuse to issue his call for that meeting. I think, moreover, that there should be some conference with the publishers of the *Dispensatory*. Before we have had some such conference with the principals, who have for forty years carried on that work, I do not see how this association can, with much hope of success, take action in the premises. It may be asked why we are called on to interfere at all in the matter of issuing a new pharma-

copœia. What complaints are there to justify our undertaking to do so? I have consulted eminent druggists and have perused the long and able discussions in the American Pharmaceutical Association, and find the following are some of the chief points of complaint against the Pharmacopœia as at present published:—

First. It is not cosmopolitan enough. It fails to give many excellent preparations, for example, that might be taken from other countries.

Second. Another complaint is that the publication of the Pharmacopœia only twice in a generation is too infrequent, and the demand is made that, every year, at least a pamphlet should be issued containing new formulas, from which selections should be subsequently made and embodied in the decennial Pharmacopœia. This is the plan followed by the Pharmacopœia Germanica, the authorized codex of the German Empire.

It is similar to the plan proposed in the American Pharmaceutical Association, but, in this latter case, every six months is the time at which it is suggested new issues might be made. It seems that the last convention voted that this should be done, and it was ordered, and the complaint is made that the publication committee failed to carry out the vote of the convention. Some persons complain that the present weights and measures, used in the Pharmacopœia, cannot be easily adapted to the decimal system, and that a better method would be to use that of the German Pharmacopœia, namely, of parts and fractions of parts.

Third. It is objected to the present arrangements that, although apparently a convention is called and rules and orders adopted, these orders are not attended to, and the result is we have no real national Pharmacopœia and no national codex of authority, — that each druggist makes the official preparations according to his own formulas, stronger or weaker than is authorized. I think there is some truth in this assertion, and it is lamentable that such should be the fact.

Finally. It is said that while the Dispensatory and the Pharmacopœia purport to be mutually supporting, and that the former illustrates the latter, such is not really the fact, of late, and the Dispensatory of 1870 fails to meet the edition of the Pharmacopœia of that year (Dr. E. R. Squibb's letter of November 26, 1876). To meet these and perhaps other objections, Dr. Squibb's plan is brought forward.

Another plan is proposed by the Chicago College of Pharmacy, which, by request of the college I lay before you, namely: that the convention which will meet in 1880 should choose two committees, one of physicians, the other of druggists. The physicians should say what remedies should be used, and give the form in which they should be prepared. The duty of the pharmacists should be to make "the formulas and direct the processes for all preparations, named by the committee of physicians." A publishing committee, consisting of a part

of the other two should secure the early publication of the Pharmacopœia, and that committee should have full powers to make any revision required, if either of the other committees failed to do its proper work. The object of these suggestions is obviously to give to physicians the right to say what the remedies shall be, which the pharmacist will prepare. One objection to this plan is this, that most of our modern preparations are made by druggists alone, and subsequently used by physicians. It would not therefore, as I think, be well to try to limit the druggists in the preparation of their remedies under the direction of any single committee of physicians. If we did it, even if we could do so, I fear we should lose many new and valuable preparations now frequently sent forth by druggists, which can never be objected to, provided the physician knows, while prescribing, the quantity and quality of each medicine, given in any particular formula.

But these objections and suggestions refer, of course, merely to the Pharmacopœia. To the Dispensatory, they cannot be applied. That is a private and very remunerative work, most valuable to the profession, more valuable than any Pharmacopœia, unless we very materially modify the present form and character of the latter work. I can readily conceive of the two books being combined, and indeed that would seem to some a very desirable object. But the question is whether that can be done, at present, in this country. The Dispensatory, even if it do not always correspond with the Pharmacopœia, is exceedingly valuable to those who publish it under a copyright. The editors are already preparing to bring it up to the highest standard, under the direction of two of our ablest physicians. That copyright runs, I believe, several years longer. I hardly fancy that, at present, any one could ask the venerable proprietor to forego the advantages, which have accrued and will accrue to him, for many years, from the great sale annually made of that work, and upon which he has expended so much intellectual labor, during so many years, and greatly to the profit of the whole profession. The question comes up now before us, What, if anything, shall this association do in the premises?

In replying to this I beg leave to lay before this association the protests of the Philadelphia County Medical Society, of the Philadelphia College of Physicians, and of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy against any action by this body in the premises.

These should be respectfully received, and duly weighed in any decision we may arrive at.

Obviously, it is for the best interests of the association to have an American Pharmacopœia of the highest character. Is the association prepared to publish one of its own? I certainly cannot advise this course. Nor am I prepared, at present, to urge upon you the adoption of either the pharmaceutical council proposed by Dr. Squibb, or the plan

suggested by the Chicago College of Pharmacy, or by any other society or individual. We want more light upon the subject before entering upon so important an undertaking, which, if not carried forward with extraordinary success, would, I fear, prove a most disastrous failure. I doubt if any publication of our own, even if supported by army and navy and colleges of pharmacy, however learned and complete, would be able effectually to cope with the *bonus* of the good name, gathered by the present Pharmacopœia, sustained as it has been by the Dispensatory during the past fifty years. Certainly, we have not seen any such rapid sale of our publications hitherto, that we could come before the community with great hope of success in any new undertaking. Moreover, in such a contest we must remember the powerful private vested rights, which would necessarily be brought to bear on any new and apparently rival publication. But it may be again asked, Shall this association do nothing in the premises? I think it may do much. As the only representative body of the medical profession of this country we are bound to do everything in our power in the premises, and to demand that our National Codex shall be as perfect as it can be made. But do we not all, as I have already intimated, want more information upon this subject before taking definite action?

I would advise that a committee be appointed at this meeting to consider every matter connected with the Pharmacopœia. Said committee should communicate with the officers of the convention, that is to be held in 1880, with the publishers of the Dispensatory and Pharmacopœia, with the American Pharmaceutical Association, and with any others interested in the subject, and report the result of such inquiry to this association, at its next annual meeting, with resolutions for any action on our part, which may be deemed appropriate.

Before closing, allow me to allude, most briefly, to three objects which I trust will be deemed important for the association, either as a body, or by means of its individual members, to act upon:—

First. I refer to the committees appointed by this association to urge upon the different States the importance of the establishment of state boards of health. I am happy to learn that very efficient work is doing for this object, in several States, by these committees. It should be continued, without abatement, until every State has its board of health.

Second. I want to propose to every member of this association, whether present at this meeting or otherwise, the importance of his conversing with, or writing to his representative in Congress in relation to the museum and library, now collecting under the charge of the surgeon-general of the army.

You all know the high honor conferred upon this country by the museum. It should be well sustained and augmented. That cannot be, without constant aid from the national exchequer.

The library is perhaps less known, but it is the largest in the United States. It is most valuable for every practitioner in the United States, for, by the liberality of the officers in charge, every honorable physician has access to it, and can there find ample means for studying, in any department of medical learning. Let your senators and representatives know annually, if need be, that any cutting off of pecuniary supplies from either of these great establishments is just so much of a retrograde course in human progress, for I deem it a self-evident proposition, that, unless the medical profession advances, in a manner commensurate with its high mission to mankind, civilization itself suffers an incalculable loss.

Third. Upon the question of the proper disposal of the interest from the funds, which may be collected to keep alive the memory of our great, first ovariologist, Caldwell, and which may arise at this session, I have received an excellent but anonymous communication. The writer very justly objects to the narrow ground, on which it was originally proposed that premiums should be given: namely, only to "writers upon the uterus and its appendages." He suggests that they should be given, from time to time, to any persons "who have confessedly promoted the welfare of mankind by original conceptions, essays, or contributions whatever" to medical science.

While I deem this proposition a good and a liberal one, I would ask whether the subject of gynæcology, in its broadest sense, would not satisfy the desires of both parties, inasmuch as, under it are included not only uterine, but much of general human pathology.

Gentlemen, I have thus briefly reviewed the past and present condition of this association. I have but little to say of its future. That depends entirely upon the way in which physicians, especially the young scientific physicians of the present hour, do their duty towards it. If our best men will not come up to its meetings, and work for the common good of all; if they stand aloof, uttering vain complaints of the inferiority of our work, or actually scoffing or sneering at us, we shall accomplish less perhaps, hereafter, than we could wish. But if we, who, year after year, attend these gatherings are determined that, so far as in us lies, nothing but what is excellent shall be allowed, and that our publications shall be sifted, by trained experts, of every iota of dross, then we shall be sure of doing a really noble work, and shall be able eventually to claim and to get the respect of the whole profession. I feel assured that all gloomy forebodings are out of place.

The association is gradually and healthfully growing stronger. Each year, it will have new young life instilled into it. Thus it will have combined in it, perpetual youth, a stalwart manhood, and, as I sincerely trust, a genial old age.