

SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION, AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.*

ABSTRACT OF MINUTES OF THE SESSIONS HELD IN CHICAGO, AUG. 14, 15, AND 16.

Chairman C. B. Jordan called the first session of the Section on Education and Legislation to order at 9.30 A.M., Wednesday, August 14, in Congress Hotel, Chicago.

C. A. Dye occupied the chair while the Chairman read his address.

Address of Chairman C. B. Jordan:

Fellow-Members of the American Pharmaceutical Association: This meeting of our Association takes place under most trying circumstances. Never in the history of the American Pharmaceutical Association has a meeting been held when our minds were so fraught with things foreign to Legislative and Educational Pharmacy. The thing that is uppermost in the minds of all of us is this World War. The thing that is most desired by all of us, and which is of the greatest import to all of us is the successful completion of the war. It matters little what we may say or do here, if that end be not attained. But I know that I express the firm conviction of all of you when I say that it will be attained.

Not a man, woman or child in the United States, but has been affected by its far-reaching results. It has been most forcibly brought home to all of us, and we have all been called upon "to do our bit."

American Pharmacy, has, I believe, nobly stood the test, and rendered well her part in this world crisis. The pharmacists of the United States have taken an active part in every Liberty Loan and Red Cross drive, in every Y. M. C. A. and K. C. campaign; in National, State and County Defense. Not only have we sent our young graduates and registered pharmacists to the front, but even young proprietors have entered the service. The drug stores of the country have sold Thrift and War Saving Stamps, have been repositories for French and Belgian Relief, and recruiting stations for Marines.

The colleges of pharmacy have done their part by preparing men for the service with regular and special war courses, by collecting and preparing drugs and medicines, and by even giving members of their instructional forces to the service.

Our young pharmacists have entered every branch of the service—Medical Corps, Engineering Corps, Infantry, Artillery, Navy, Gas Defense, Sanitary Corps, Aviation, and Ordnance Department, and are acquitting themselves well in all places. It was my good fortune to visit the Great Lakes Naval Training Station recently and to talk with the Assistant Surgeon of the Hospital Corps. He recounted with a great deal of pride the achievement of the Naval Hospital Corps, made up almost entirely of graduate and registered pharmacists.

The effects of the war are such that it is impossible to consider our legislative and educational problems apart from them. It has shown us our short-comings and has awakened us, as we never were awakened before, to the realization of our duties to the Nation and to ourselves. A number of years ago the N. A. R. D. attempted to secure recognition for the pharmacists in the Army, but they found that the pharmacists were asleep at the switch, were not interested, and luke-warm toward the movement. How well the war has awakened us. To-day we realize our mistake and are trying to remedy it, but we may have been aroused from our slumbers too late.

Three things, it seems to me, stand out and demand our attention: First, Securing legislation giving recognition to pharmacists in the Army. Second, Closer organization of American Pharmacy. Third, The attitude of the Government, of prominent pharmacists, and of the laity toward professional pharmacy, pharmaceutical education, and colleges of pharmacy. These questions are interdependent and cannot be considered apart from each other, therefore, I will not attempt to consider them separately but will endeavor to touch all of them in this discussion.

The profession of pharmacy and especially the colleges of pharmacy have suffered a cross-fire of criticism all year. Dr. J. H. Beal in "Facing the Facts," and Mr. H. B. Mason's editorials have criticized us for not recognizing that pharmacy has practically passed to commercialism, and our colleges are not, in their estimation, giving sufficient time to commercial subjects, but are

* Papers with discussions will be printed apart from minutes.

going to seed in professionalism which is not needed in present day practice. On the other hand the Government, through the office of the Surgeon General, criticizes us for devoting so much time to commercialism and so little to professionalism. They are painfully frank in their statements and say that colleges of pharmacy are educating mercantile clerks for the retail pharmacists of the country.

So we are criticized on the one hand for giving too much time to one phase of pharmacy, and not enough to the other, and criticized on the other hand for giving too much time to the other and not enough to the one. The colleges are placed somewhat in the position of the husband whose good wife scolded him if he did things and also scolded him if he didn't do them. He remarked, "Its mine coming or going, for I get Hell if I do and Hell if I don't." Ordinarily such criticisms are passed by as not having sufficient basis in facts to be worthy of serious consideration. However, coming from the sources that these come from, and with the acridity with which they are uttered, I believe they deserve our consideration.

There is one serious criticism of pharmaceutical education and of colleges of pharmacy that we all can agree upon, and that is that pharmaceutical education is not built upon a good, strong foundation and that our colleges are not demanding sufficient preliminary training of the entering students. It matters not whether the education of the pharmacist should be along commercial or along professional lines, this criticism still holds, for no true education can be built upon a poor foundation. The student who wishes to secure a college education along any other line finds that he must at least have a high school education before entering college. Medicine, Dentistry, Veterinary Science, Law, Commerce, Liberal Arts, Engineering, and even Agriculture, demand a high school education for entrance. Pharmacy stands alone in not demanding such high requirements. Can it be that Pharmacy is right and all the others are wrong? If it is necessary for the successful practice of Medicine, Commerce, Law, Engineering, etc. that the beginners have a broad general education, it is also necessary for the pursuit of Pharmacy. If the man who manages a farm finds that this preliminary education is necessary, how much more necessary is it for the man who follows a scientific profession or meets the fierce competition of the commercial world?

Some may argue that this particular education does not teach the student how to accumulate dollars and cents or how to create a desire for a commodity that he has to sell. This training develops the mind of the young student and teaches him correct habits of thought. In fact, many of our young people are unable to direct their thinking, while many others are prone to avoid mental exercises. This training, although it may not bear directly upon the work in hand, is of great value in mental development, and no one needs this mental development more than the pharmacist. He comes in contact with people in all walks of life, and ought to be able to meet these people upon an equal footing and discourse intelligently upon the topics of the day. In particular he ought to be able to speak intelligently concerning medicines and public health questions. If he does not have a good fundamental training, he will find himself handicapped in meeting this important obligation.

There is something necessary for the full development of the American citizen other than the ability to accumulate this world's goods. We are learning to-day, as we never did before, that a full rounded life gives as well as receives and, to be truly successful, we must render service to our neighbors as well as secure a competence for ourselves. If the war has taught us one thing it is this, that he who renders service to his fellow man and to the nation is more worthy of respect and honor than he who accumulates wealth. Not a little part of this service in a commonwealth like ours consists in activity in public welfare work, whereby the respect of the community is secured. Have the pharmacists of the country done their full measure along this line? Do they command the respect that an educated professional class should command? Do they take as active a part in public life as is expected of college men? To answer these questions I have but to state that we have endeavored for a year now to secure recognition in the Army, and have failed. What if somebody has the lid down and is sitting upon it! If we had sufficient public sentiment back of us, the lid would soon be lifted. The chemists of the country had no particular difficulty in securing recognition. The Sanitary Corps was organized especially to give recognition to bacteriologists, food chemists, sanitary and public health workers. Even nurses have received recognition, but we have failed. We failed because we lacked the necessary public sentiment to force recognition, and, I believe, that one of the

chief reasons why we lacked it, is because our profession ranks very low in educational attainment. When a man, whose only qualifications are that he has sold cigars, or "jerked" sodas for four years, can cram for a pharmacist's examination and pass it, and thus become a bona fide member of our profession, we cannot expect to command much respect, and we are not getting it.

Not until the retail pharmacists of the United States awake to the importance of higher entrance requirements for their profession and demand them, will we be able to place pharmaceutical education on a plane that will command the respect of our sister professions and of the public. As long as the retail pharmacists demand cheap registered men and lend their support to diploma factories that turn them out, just so long will pharmaceutical education be at a low ebb. The colleges themselves are unable to remedy the difficulty, because there are bound to be "black sheep" in the fold if there is financial gain in being black.

Turning now to the criticisms of which I have spoken. Doctor Beal, in "Facing the Facts," very ably presents the problems that confront us to-day. He discusses the whole question and shows us the reasons for the rise of "commercial pharmacy" and the decline of professional pharmacy. He asks, "Shall we like other small industrial proprietors, accept the transformation from producers to store-keepers and distributors, or shall we linger in a fool's paradise of hoping for some special dispensation of Providence to save us from the operation of economic laws that are universal in application?" He then proceeds to show us that "commercial pharmacy" is just as ethical as professional pharmacy, or at least can be made so.

Mr. H. B. Mason, commenting editorially upon the speech of Dr. Beal, says that this address should have been given before a group of pharmaceutical teachers and writers instead of before a group of retail pharmacists, as they have been "facing the facts." Continuing he says, "Too many of the college professors and too many of the writers and lecturers on pharmacy are still seeking, like Mrs. Partington, to sweep the ocean back with a broom. The college curriculum becomes more and more scientific. Little or no attention is paid to commercial subjects. The student is told that he must go out into the highways and byways and play the part of a pharmaceutical Moses and rescue the calling from the disgrace into which it has fallen."

In the July issue of the *Bulletin*, Mr. Mason says, "Only a half-hearted recognition of 'commercial pharmacy' has been made. Perhaps the most unfortunate feature of the solution lies in the fact that the colleges are not so blind as to what is going on as they are stubborn. They see the truth, but they refuse to recognize it."

Over and against such criticism we have that of the office of the Surgeon General of the Army in replying to the Attorney for the N. A. R. D. when he requested that students in pharmacy be furloughed to complete their college courses. This Office made it very clear that it considered a great majority of the colleges of pharmacy as colleges in name only, since their most important function was preparing mercantile clerks for retail pharmacies. There are only about eight real colleges of pharmacy in the United States, according to their expressed opinion, and the Surgeon General hesitates to recognize them because of the difficulty involved in denying recognition to the other so-called colleges.

At the recent meetings of the American Medical Association the Council refused to endorse the recognition of the pharmacists in the Army. When the members of the Council were asked why they refused to do this, they said that they could not afford to recognize as equals a class of men with as little professional education as the pharmacists have.

Again, the fact that we have not been able to convince the House Committee on Military Affairs of the necessity of recognition of pharmacists in the Army is good evidence that they consider our professional training insufficient.

Thus our colleges are attacked by one set of critics for not devoting more time to commercial and less to professional subjects, and by another set of critics for giving so much attention to commercial and so little attention to professional subjects.

I maintain that the colleges of pharmacy are giving the retail pharmacists what they demand. There are a goodly number of retail pharmacists that are demanding better and better professionally prepared graduates and our better colleges of pharmacy are meeting this demand. On the other hand, there are many retail pharmacists that demand a commercially trained man with a sufficient smattering of professionalism to get him by the State Board of Pharmacy, and we have a number of colleges that are supplying this demand.

Mr. Mason is wrong when he says that the colleges are stubborn. Those colleges that, in his opinion, are going to seed in professionalism, have a deep realization of the obligation, often a matter of life or death, that devolves upon pharmacists and they are willing to sacrifice numbers in order to protect the public from incompetence. When the dispensing of prescriptions is separated from commercialism and done entirely by men who love their work sufficiently to take pride in it and do it well, then we will have a reorganization of our colleges that will meet the needs of both sets of critics.

The trouble lies in the attempt of the retail pharmacists of the country to do two entirely different things well at the same time. This is impossible. Either they should devote themselves to commercialism or to professionalism. I have heard retail pharmacists say that they were not dispensing pharmacists and catered entirely to commercial trade. Yet the same men retain the sign "Prescription Pharmacists," and resent any imputation that they are not fully qualified for professional work. They refuse to remove their prescription laboratories, and turn over to their neighbors any professional work. The prescription sign and laboratory add a respectability to their business and they intend to retain it regardless of the fact that they are not devoting any time or interest to professional work.

A certain retail druggist has a card advertisement in every street car in his city, setting forth the care and precision used in compounding prescriptions in his place of business. I visited his store and expected to see a modern prescription laboratory. In this I was disappointed, for it was not what you would expect from the advertisement. When I remarked that he must do a good prescription business, I was surprised to have the proprietor tell me—with a sweep of his hand toward his well filled shelves—that he made his money out of paints, wall paper, patent medicines, drug sundries, etc., and that his prescription work amounted to nothing. Yet it was his prescription work that he was advertising. He was using it as a cat's paw to get people into his store so that he might sell them paints, wall paper, drug sundries, etc.

The cases that I have set forth are not unique and can be multiplied many times throughout the United States. Until the retail pharmacists stop using their professionalism only as a means to further their commercialism, we cannot expect to advance.

Many retail pharmacists demand cheap help and say that they are not able to pay the college prepared man, and are therefore in favor of keeping the requirements low that they may secure cheap help. One of the chief arguments against "prerequisite" legislation is that it will increase clerk hire. If these men are not able to pay competent help, why, under the sun, do they not give up their prescription work that is bringing them no profit and devote their entire attention to commercialism?

It is absolutely impossible to develop commercial and professional pharmacy together. We have tried to do it ever since American pharmacy began and have failed, as is evidenced by the criticism I have just set forth. Either one or the other will suffer if we continue to do it. They are incompatible, and we may as well "face the facts" and recognize the incompatibility and with true pharmaceutical skill remove it. As long as we continue to attempt to develop them together we will fail, because it is based upon the wrong assumption, that we can become proficient in two quite different things at the same time. The man who tried to kill two birds with one stone missed them both, and we have also missed both the full development of "professional pharmacy" and of "commercial pharmacy." European countries have recognized the absurdity of such an attempt and have solved the problem. Why not follow their example?

Let us then get back to a true premise and separate them and develop each without the encumbrance of the other—have colleges to train "commercial pharmacists," and also colleges to train "professional pharmacists." One class of education is just as ethical as the other. The old idea that to educate for merchandising is unethical is antiquated and out of date. We have changed our ideas a great deal regarding what is ethical and what is unethical, and the man who retains the old notion that "commercial pharmacy" is unethical should wake up and realize that we are living in an age that is wise enough to consider any useful occupation as ethical.

Let us have good colleges with high requirements that will give our boys a good broad education together with expert training in "commercial pharmacy," and also good colleges that will do the same for "professional pharmacy." When we do this, then and then only will we

reach a solution to our difficulties. "Professional pharmacy" has been a millstone around the neck of "commercial pharmacy" and vice versa long enough. Let us cut them free and permit them to develop, each to its full measure.

You may ask how this is to be done. I answer, "I do not know." I only know that it is necessary for the full development of each. The operation may be a little severe, but the patients will soon recover from it and once they get upon their feet they will produce marvelous developments.

May I suggest a plan by which this may eventually be accomplished without disturbing business conditions. All registered pharmacists of to-day will retain their registration and enjoy their full privileges, therefore we must begin with those who are entering. If all entering the calling be divided into two classes, say pharmacists and druggists, with different requirements and privileges for each of them, then the first step toward this end would be made, and eventually our aim would be accomplished. This could be done without disturbing business, or causing hardship to any one.

Require of druggists a pharmaceutical competence similar to that required of assistant pharmacists to-day or eventhatrequired of registered pharmacists, and in addition a thorough training in all commercial branches. Grant them the privilege of conducting a modern commercial drug store, but not the privilege of compounding prescriptions or handling the more dangerous poisons and narcotics.

Require of pharmacists at least a training equivalent to that required for a baccalaureate degree, including the usual cultural subjects of English, mathematics, modern languages, physics, history, economics, etc., and a thorough training in chemistry, pharmacy, materia medica, bacteriology, physiology, chemistry, and food and drug analysis.

Men with such a training would be competent to dispense medicines, handle narcotics, and other poisons, and do analytical work for the physician and public health boards. There is to-day a demand for men qualified for making urine, gastric, bile and feces analyses; bacteriological and physiological analysis; and the demand for such experts is growing instead of decreasing. A pharmacist prepared as suggested would be qualified to do all of this work. In addition the demand for laboratory analyses for the protection of public health is growing, and in some states they are advocating a public analyst for each county. Here is another opportunity for our pharmacists. Before very long the prescription business done by our present pharmacists would be turned over to them and this—together with the sale of sick-room supplies, surgical instruments, etc.—would make a very good competence for the pharmacists. They would be conducting a purely ethical pharmacy, in the present-day acceptance of the meaning of this term, and in addition a bacteriological, analytical, and physiological laboratory.

I think I hear you say that there would not be a sufficient amount of work to support even a limited number of such pharmacists. My own city alone, a city of 20,000, could support three or four such pharmacists if all prescription work were turned over to them. At present a man is employed all of his time in making urine, gastric, bile, bacteriological and physiological analyses, with an increasing demand for this kind of work. It may be that smaller communities could not support such an establishment at present, but time will adjust this difficulty and meanwhile the present registered pharmacists could handle the prescription business.

The colleges of pharmacy could easily adjust themselves to such a plan. Our present two-year courses, if extended and modified to suit the needs, could easily educate druggists, and our four-year courses the pharmacists. The graduates of our four-year courses are not entering the drug stores to-day, because clerk hire is so low, and other activities offer better opportunities. This is unfortunate, because pharmacy is losing its best prepared men. This would be changed with the newer opportunities that would present themselves in "professional pharmacy."

When we require of pharmacists a training similar to that which I have outlined, then the matter of recognition will take care of itself. In fact, their services would be demanded, conscripted if need be, and proper recognition in the form of commissions would be given to them.

American pharmacy is so unorganized that it is almost impossible to secure united action on any matters pertaining to the professional side of the calling, albeit we have preached organization for the last fifty years. Such is not true of other lines of work. We have excellent evidence of the power of organization in the strength wielded by the American Medical Asso-

ciation. In my own state about ten percent of the registered pharmacists are members of their state organization, while ninety percent of the ice men are members of their organization. It has been impossible to well organize the pharmacists of any of the states except those in which membership in the state organization is required by law. The mere handful of retail pharmacists that belong to the American Pharmaceutical Association is conclusive proof that the organization of pharmacists along professional lines is next to impossible.

Along the commercial lines the endeavor meets with much better success, and the N. A. R. D. has a very well perfected organization, that is producing results. One reason for this is because many retail pharmacists do not do a sufficient "professional" business to become interested in the scientific phase of their calling. The scientific sections of our State Associations receive scanty attention. I have seen retail pharmacists sit with a bored expression on their faces throughout an interesting paper on some phase of "professional pharmacy." They were not interested because they could not apply the ideas to their business.

Now if the separation that I have referred to were made, we would throw together men interested in the same things, the merchant pharmacists and the prescription and analytical pharmacists. As a result of common interest and common purpose these men would form a closer and more effective organization and another one of our problems would be solved.

The idea of the separation of "professional" and "commercial" pharmacy is not a new one, by any means, but one that has been thought about and discussed many times. Papers on this subject have been presented to this Section before. In "Facing the Facts" Dr. Beal says, "The results (that is a frank acceptance of commercial pharmacy), will be an acceleration of the present trend towards a division of the drug trade into prescription pharmacists and merchant pharmacists, each class rendering useful service and each having scope for development along the lines of their respective preferences."

I firmly believe that this separation is the only satisfactory solution of the problem and that the time is ripe for both parties to take the case to court and sue for a divorce. No organization is better fitted to judge the case than the American Pharmaceutical Association, therefore, in conclusion, I would suggest that this Section recommend to the Council that a Committee be appointed to study this question for a year and present to us at our next annual meeting a plan of separation that will cause the least amount of harm and the greatest amount of good to both of the unhappy parties.

C. B. JORDAN,

Chairman.

F. J. Wulling moved and F. E. Stewart seconded the motion, that the address be printed in an early issue of the JOURNAL and the recommendation of the address be referred to the Council. Carried.

Report of Secretary W. F. Rudd:

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION:

Before attempting to write this report your Secretary read again the one submitted in 1917 to this Section, by your present Chairman.

Those of you who were present on that occasion will recall that his report brought together in a most comprehensive way what the Colleges, State Legislatures and State Boards of Pharmacy were doing. I concluded that the report of this year should bring to the Section all changes in State Pharmacy Laws that have been made since the last annual meeting so as to keep the record up to date. In addition to this it seemed wise to collect and tabulate certain facts relative to State Board statistics. Accordingly, a questionnaire was sent to each State Board Secretary as follows:

"1—What changes have been made in the Pharmacy law of your State since January 1, 1917?

2—What percent of applicants for examination in your State since January 1, 1917, have been graduates of Colleges of Pharmacy?

3—Number of applicants for examination for each of the following years:

April 1, 1914, to April 1, 1915

April 1, 1915, to April 1, 1916

April 1, 1916, to April 1, 1917

April 1, 1917, to April 1, 1918

4—Number of applicants granted registration for each of the following years:

- April 1, 1914, to April 1, 1915
- April 1, 1915, to April 1, 1916
- April 1, 1916, to April 1, 1917
- April 1, 1917, to April 1, 1918."

Question No. 2 relative to the percentage of applicants who were college graduates was suggested by Chairman Jordan. Questions 3 and 4 relative to number of applicants for examination and the number successful were suggested by the writer's own observation of results in Virginia. It has always seemed incongruous that often not more than one-third of those admitted as eligible for any formal examination, should be able to pass the same successfully.

The results for these States as tabulated below are striking. The writer cannot but feel that they furnish the basis for a strong indictment against the present system of admitting candidates to State Board examinations.

Replies have come in from thirty-one States and Question 2, as to percentage of applicants who are college graduates, has been answered as follows:

Alabama.....	20%	Florida.....	50% (about)
Arkansas.....	(Reports none)	Conn.....	No figures available
	(evidently an error)		
Illinois.....	39%	Indiana.....	47%
Iowa.....	20%	Kansas.....	40%
Kentucky.....	78%	Massachusetts.....	No statistics
Maine.....	15% (about)	Maryland.....	87%
Michigan.....	10%	Minn.....	12½% (about)
Missouri.....	10.7%	Nebraska.....	86%
New Hampshire.....	(No record)	New Jersey.....	(No record)
New Mexico.....	(No record)	New York.....	100%
North Dakota.....	100%	North Carolina.....	19%
Ohio.....	28%	Pennsylvania.....	100%
Rhode Island.....	80%	Tennessee.....	50% (guess)
South Carolina.....	68%	Texas.....	49%
Vermont.....	40%	West Virginia.....	75%
Virginia.....	35%		

The States with "prerequisite" law already in force report, of course, 100 percent. The States showing lowest percentage of graduates are: Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, and Missouri, all being below 20 percent. The State not having a "prerequisite" law, showing the highest percentage of graduates, is Maryland, with 87 percent. The general average for this report is 50 percent of graduates. That is to say, with States having "prerequisite" legislation only 50 percent of all men making application for examination in the States are graduates in pharmacy.

The thirty-one States returning questionnaire report on questions 3 and 4 are as follows:

April 1914 to April 1918.

States.	No. Applied.	No. Successful.	Per cent. Successful.	States.	No. Applied.	No. Successful.	Per cent. Successful.
Ala.....	446	359	80.5	N. J.....	2315	688	29.8
Ark.....	487	216	44.3	N. Mex.....	34	24	70.6
Conn.....	330	110	33.3	N. Y.....	2592	1885	72.7
Ill.....	2355	758	32.2	N. D.....	125	71	56.8
Ind.....	1029	513	49.7	N. C.....	518	227	43.8
Ia.....	1065	514	48.2	O.....	2105	1029	48.8
Mass.....	2042	630	30.8	Pa.....	2437	1667	68.0
Kan.....	601	442	73.0	R. I.....	137	98	80.0
Ky.....	355	134	37.7	S. Car.....	263	153	58.0
Me.....	410	136	33.2	Tenn.....	337	142	42.1
Md.....	382	218	56.7	Tex.....	629	385	61.2
Mich.....	1340	672	50.2	Vt.....	128	45	36.0
Minn.....	1432	559	39.0	Va.....	672	307	45.0
Mo.....	529	310	58.5	W. Va.....	268	158	59.0
Neb.....	609	300	49.2				
N. H.....	218	82	37.6		26190	12832	48.9

Tabulating the preceding by years we get the following results:

	Total No. Applied.	Total No. Passed.	Per cent. Passed.
April 1914 to April 1915.....	7088	3501	49.3
April 1915 to April 1916.....	7328	3493	47.9
April 1916 to April 1917.....	6961	3297	47.3
April 1917 to April 1918.....	5855	3267	55.8

These figures tell in unmistakable terms what most of us know from experience. In the past four years the number applying for examination has decreased from 7088 to 5855, or a difference of 1233. The number successful, however, was only 234 below the number registered four years ago. This seems to mean one of two things: either the material is better or the boards are more lenient. Maybe both conditions contributed to this end.

Repeating what was said in the first part of this report, it would seem that the percent of those successful in any set of examinations where proper precautions are taken in admitting candidates, should always be much above the average shown in the figures above. Why should candidates manifestly unfit be allowed to come up repeatedly without any additional preparation? Perhaps nothing has done as much to bring pharmacy examinations into disrepute as the fact that the same men continue to take these examinations year after year. This condition needs to be changed. This Section can at least go on record in favor of some method by which a limit may be set to the number of times a man may come up for examination.

Very few changes have been reported in the pharmacy laws of the thirty-one States returning questionnaires. Massachusetts has a new narcotic law; New Jersey a "prerequisite" law to take effect September 1920; Rhode Island reports changes in narcotic provisions; Virginia passed a "prerequisite" law which will go into effect in 1922.

And so the good work goes on. Each year adds one or two States to the list requiring graduation before registration. At the present time nine States are enrolled in this progressive list. May the time not be far distant when not one shall be left out.

Respectfully submitted,

WORTLEY F. RUDD,

Secretary.

W. H. Ziegler moved and Bernard Fantus seconded the motion to refer the report for publication. Carried.

The report of the Committee on Patents and Trade Marks was presented by Chairman F. E. Stewart. Motion of L. E. Sayre to receive the report was carried by vote of the Section.

A paper "What is the meaning of a degree in pharmacy" was read by the author, L. E. Sayre. (See August JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 700.)

The next paper, entitled "The District of Columbia Advertising Law," was presented by L. F. Kebler.

After considerable discussion the following resolution was proposed by M. E. Dorsey:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Legislation, A. Ph. A., be instructed to take up with the War Board at Washington, D. C., the control of advertising pertaining to venereal diseases, and by coöperation with the Advertising Clubs of America, a national organization, endeavor to eliminate all advertising pertaining to venereal diseases from the daily and weekly press."

After some discussion a motion to adopt was carried.

The following papers were read and, after discussion, referred for publication:

"Publication of Potent Drug Content in All Ready-made Medicines," by Oscar Dowling.

"Pronunciation of Pharmaceutical Latin," by A. B. Stevens.

The report of the Committee on Regulation of the Transportation of Drugs by Mail was read and accepted.

A paper "What Shall We Teach" was presented by H. H. Rusby and after discussion referred for publication.

The first session of the Section on Education and Legislation was then adjourned.

SECOND SESSION.

The second session of the Section on Education and Legislation was convened at 9.30 A.M., Thursday, August 15, by Chairman C. B. Jordan.

The Committee on Nominations for officers for the ensuing year reported the names of nominees.

The following papers were read, discussed and referred for publication:

"Chemical Theory—A Practical Method of Teaching," by Freeman P. Stroup. (See October JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 864.)

"Plan of Civil Administrative Code of Illinois in Its Relation to the Pharmacy Act," by F. W. Shepardson.

"The Teaching of Plant Chemistry," by Dr. Nellie Wakeman.

"Is Research Work Along Lines Suggested by the Last Revision U. S. P. Possible and Practicable in Schools of Pharmacy?" by C. S. Chase.

"Entrance Requirements to the Practice of Pharmacy," by W. G. Gregory. (See October JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 870.)

"So-called Commercial Pharmacy Should not be Taught in Colleges of Pharmacy," by Frederick J. Wulling. (See October JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 872.)

"The Future Pharmacists now in the Army and Navy," by H. F. Freericks. (The recommendations of this paper are printed in the minutes of the Sixth Session of the Council, November JOURNAL A. PH. A., pp. 1004 and 1005.)

A ballot was taken on the nominees for officers for the ensuing year; the result of the election to be announced at the Joint Session of this Section, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

The second session of the Section on Education and Legislation was then adjourned.

JOINT SESSION OF SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION, A. PH. A., AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY.

The joint session, as indicated above, was called to order by Chairman C. B. Jordan at 9.30 A.M., Friday, August 16.

The first order of business was the report of Secretary Theodore J. Bradley of the proceedings of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties. (See September JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 799.) After some discussion the report was accepted.

Chairman F. E. Stewart read the report of the Committee on Patents and Trade Marks and also a paper entitled "Is the Exclusive Ownership and Use of Coined Names for Chemicals, Drugs and Their Preparations Objectionable and Should it be Subject to Limitation and Restriction?"

It was moved to accept the paper and report and refer them to the Publication Committee. Carried.

The result of the election of officers for the ensuing year was announced by Julius A. Koch, as follows:

Chairman—W. F. Rudd, of Virginia.

Secretary—C. A. Dye, of Ohio.

Associates—William Mansfield, of New York; E. L. Newcomb, of Minnesota; W. H. Ziegler, of South Carolina.

The report of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was read by Secretary H. C. Christensen. (See September JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 801.) After brief discussion the report was accepted.

Chairman Frank H. Freericks presented the report of the Committee on Model for Modern Laws Pertaining to Pharmacy. It was voted to continue the Committee and the report was referred for publication.

Chairman C. A. Dye presented the report of the Committee on Relations of Colleges with Boards of Pharmacy. It was referred to the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

Chairman E. G. Eberle presented the report of the Fairchild Scholarship Committee.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF FAIRCHILD SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE.

PHILADELPHIA, August 1, 1918.

As Chairman of the Fairchild Scholarship Committee my report has been made to the members of the Committee and also to Mr. Samuel W. Fairchild, so a report on last year's work simply requires me to speak of the results. Mr. Daniel Kollen, of New York, was the successful candidate, and his election met the approval of all members of the Committee and Mr. Fairchild as well. The next highest ranking candidate fell only 2.5 points behind, while the others were considerably lower.

The first American Fairchild scholar is of Russian birth, having been born in the city of Kishinef, State of Bessarabia, Russia, August 27, 1898. The father was a maker of wooden models for shoes; he died when Daniel was about eight years of age. The young man attended a Russian grammar school for about three and a half years and until April 1, 1910, when the family emigrated to the United States, arriving in New York City April 19. Two weeks after arrival Kollen entered Manhattan Public School No. 64, where June 29, 1913, the young man received his diploma. The spare hours and vacations were spent in the employ of his uncle at S. H. Ager's Pharmacy, 145 Avenue C, New York City, where he has ever since, up to the present, given his time between studies. September 9, 1913, Daniel entered DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, from which he graduated June 30, 1917. His recommendations from the teachers and preceptor are excellent in every way.

All the papers concerned with the examinations are in my hands and I also have copies of all correspondence bearing on the subject. On February 15th I notified Mr. Fairchild of the election of Daniel Kollen, and at the same time advised him of the action of the Joint Conference as I understood it at the time, and enclosed the pages from the JOURNAL of January, 1918, 60-64. My letter follows:

"February 15, 1918.

MR. SAMUEL W. FAIRCHILD,
WASHINGTON & LAIGHT STS.,
NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR MR. FAIRCHILD:—

I wrote you January 31 and was awaiting the return of the vote of the Fairchild Scholarship Committee and they have unanimously declared that Daniel Kollen, 600 E. 169th St., New York City, has won the Fairchild Scholarship which you so kindly donated. I do not

presume that any further action on our part is necessary and that you will take up the matter with the nominee. Of course, if you deem it necessary, I shall be glad to attend to the matter.

I take this opportunity also of bringing the matter of award for the next scholarship to your attention, and, if you decide to act in accord with the expression of the Section on Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, it will be necessary for us to provide a different standard for the candidates and thereafter a different kind of examination. It would take up too much space in this letter and the action on my report will be found on the enclosed pages.

One argument for awarding the scholarship to a graduate is that there is more likelihood of giving it, not only to a deserving student, but, at the same time, to one who will apply himself for the benefit of pharmacy. The question came up of whether in awarding one scholarship it was not better to give it to one who had shown his aptness rather than one who had all the college years before him. I would be glad if you would advise me of your decision as early as you can.

The Fairchild Scholarship Committee for this year is composed of the following members: Dr. A. R. L. Dohme, Pratt & Howard Sts., Baltimore, of the American Pharmaceutical Association; Prof. Henry Kraemer, Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties; W. P. Porterfield, 61 Broadway, Fargo, N. D., of the National Association Boards of Pharmacy, and the Editor of the JOURNAL.

I have notified Mr. Daniel Kollen of his election.

With expression of sincere regard,

Respectfully,

(Sgd.) E. G. EBERLE."

In reply, Mr. Fairchild answered:

"NEW YORK, February 18, 1918.

MR. E. G. EBERLE, CHAIRMAN,
FAIRCHILD SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

DEAR MR. EBERLE:—

I notice with pleasure the article in the JOURNAL, page 60, recommendation No. 5, 'It is the sense of the Conference that Mr. Fairchild could render the greatest service to pharmacy by offering the scholarship to a graduate pharmacy student.' Now, Mr. Eberle, I shall be delighted to do so, and think perhaps it is the best thing we could do with the Scholarship, so you may change it around and do anything that you please.

When does Mr. Daniel Kollen begin his studies? Then we will know when to send him a cheque.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) SAM'L W. FAIRCHILD."

and my answer was as follows:—

"February 19, 1918.

MR. SAMUEL W. FAIRCHILD,
WASHINGTON & LAIGHT STS.,
NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR MR. FAIRCHILD:—

I have your splendid letter of February 18 and under the circumstances the Fairchild Scholarship Committee will undoubtedly be very much pleased to have your consent to offer your scholarship to a graduate pharmacy student. I am to-day sending out letters to that effect.

Relative to Mr. Daniel Kollen, he began his studies in Brooklyn College of Pharmacy last fall and is now a junior student there.

We are endeavoring to make haste with the next scholarship so that it can be offered for a graduate student for this year. This will then right the matter and there will be no further trouble in awarding the scholarship each year.

With expression of sincere regard,

Respectfully,

(Sgd.) E. G. EBERLE,
Chairman, Fairchild Scholarship Committee."

On February 19 I sent out the first letter, as a result of which the following were named as the Examination Committee: J. W. Sturmer, H. C. Christensen, Geo. C. Diekman, R. A. Lyman. A date, June 25, was named for Examination Day, but as it was impossible to reach a decision, notice of postponement was made and all pharmaceutical journals kindly printed the notice. There has been considerable correspondence and the decision was reached that final action would be taken during the meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association in Chicago.

Respectfully,

E. G. EBERLE, *Chairman.*

Further report of the Committee on Award of the Fairchild Scholarship is printed in September JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 824. Since then Chairman H. C. Christensen has advised that the name of no candidate has been presented this year for the Fairchild Scholarship.

Chairman R. A. Lyman presented the report of the Committee on Higher Educational Standards. After some discussion it was voted to refer the report to the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

The paper presented at the close of the Second Session of the Section on Education and Legislation by Frank H. Freericks was discussed and, after approving of the recommendations therein, referred to the Council.

(As heretofore stated, the recommendations are printed in November JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 1004. The Council has taken action and the Committee is now at work.)

The Joint Session of the Section of Education and Legislation, American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was then adjourned.

WHAT SHALL WE TEACH?*

BY H. H. RUSBY.

The teacher who is thoroughly interested in the subject matter of the Syllabus cannot fail to be impressed by the objections that are advanced against the inclusion of matter that does not pertain to the particular department of instruction in which the objector is interested. It is a regular occurrence for such teachers to depreciate the value of and disparage attention to the subjects taught by others. Within the last few months the writer has been favored with the following views, partly verbal and partly written, from teachers whose schools are represented in the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

1. "You make the subject of pharmacy entirely too prominent in the Syllabus. Pharmacists no longer manufacture their own preparations and they are getting farther away from it all the time. The pharmacist is becoming more and more a tradesman. What we want in the Syllabus is more attention to the commercial side of the business."

2. "Only the fundamental principles and procedures of business should be taught in the pharmacy school. The way to learn business methods is by business experience, and the place for it is the store, the same as in any other department of commerce."

3. "The pharmacy course is no place for so much botanical instruction as is contained in the Syllabus." "Boards of pharmacy do not ask questions upon it and should not do so." "Botany is a delightful study and I find great recreation in pursuing it in my spare time, but the pharmacist has no use for it and it should be deleted from the pharmacy course."

4. "An extreme amount of attention is given to pharmacognosy in your Syllabus. The retail pharmacist no longer sees crude drugs to any extent and is seeing less and less of them in any condition. Only a very few drugs should be studied and those only in a superficial way."

* Read before Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Chicago meeting, 1918.