

A CHAMPIONSHIP OF PRESENT-DAY PHARMACEUTICAL PRACTICE
AND A CODE OF WORKABLE BUSINESS ETHICS.*

BY J. G. BEARD.

PART I.

Something more than a decade ago there gained in volume a plaintive cry first heard in the eighteen hundreds that pharmacy was losing its professional, scientific and ethical aspects, and was degenerating into a commercial enterprise engineered largely by men thinking more in terms of profit than in terms of unselfish service. The idea appalled older members of the retail trade who believed that they had been carrying on a strictly ethical undertaking, and who could not reconcile themselves to any departure from the customs they had inherited and had perpetuated. Analysts by the score rushed into print to explain the fading emphasis on professional practice, and pessimists by the hundreds voiced the certainty that pharmacy was headed straight for the rocks. The phrase, "What Is the Matter with Pharmacy?" became the prevailing note in papers read at conventions or printed in the drug press, seeming apparently to spring from a universal assumption that because retail pharmacy had altered greatly and was still altering, such change necessarily carried with it something ominous, something wrong. This highly vocal pessimism continued for several years—continues even yet in some quarters—but gradually the hysteria gave way to a stoical acceptance of the new order of things, until now nearly everybody is reconciled even if not satisfied with a pharmacy that is mostly mercantile in nature. My idea in this paper is not to lament but rather to champion the change referred to, and to say something in substantiation of the claim I here and now make that the drug business of this very minute is on a plane as high as any station which pharmacy has ever occupied.

Mankind is prone to throw glamorous halos around orders, events and men that have safely gone into the limbo of history. Time eliminates the errors and passing years bring into high relief the glories of things and persons antecedent to the particular generation engaged in passing judgment. Just so do druggists of to-day invest their calling in its earlier years with ideal qualities in which they take reflected pride and out of which they weave conclusions satisfying to themselves. Unquestionably the pharmacy of olden years had its virtues, and we do well to enshrine them in our memory, but equally without question it had some characteristics identical with those which in modern pharmacy we condemn. The pharmacist of a century ago set up shop to sell goods at a profit in order that he could secure sustenance for himself and dependents. There was nothing objectionable in such a purpose but was there anything particularly laudatory about it? If there was, credit the beginning proprietor of 1924 with precisely the same commendable even if elemental motive. The difference in the character of the goods sold in the far-back time and now is more quantitative than qualitative, however opposed this statement is to general thought. Just as drugs and prescriptions then constituted two items of business, so do they now, and just as side-lines were handled then, so are they now. If side-lines in drug stores of a hundred years ago were fewer in sort and bore a smaller ratio to volume of sale

* Read before North Carolina Pharmaceutical Association, June 25, 1924.

than custom now decrees, they were, nevertheless, as unrelated to disease and drugs as anything displayed in the shops of this age. Their paints, dyes, seeds, stationery, tobacco, perfumes, etc., were just as foreign to drugs as are our sodas, cutlery, magazines, photographic supplies, etc. If any odium attaches to the sale of sidelines, the blame should fall upon our revered predecessors because the original sin was committed some six generations back and we have but followed precedent and principle. The old-time druggist manufactured the majority of the medicines he sold, while his descendants purchase ready-made most of the remedies nowadays handled in drug stores. This fact is employed to bemean present practice when it should be cited in praise of progress, and as something typical of twentieth century thought. It is a truism to say that the present is an era of specialization, particularly in the case of Americans. Whether in the trades, in manufacturing, or in the professions, one type of worker chooses, or is chosen, to do one particular thing rather than a medley of things so that, by intensive rather than extensive application, he becomes perfected in his own comparatively narrow field of effort. Modern medicine has advanced far from its modest beginnings, and has become so complex in nature and so ramified in its branchings that specialists are required for each of the numerous subdivisions that have gradually evolved out of the one-time single form of practice. In a similar manner, pharmacy has gone far beyond the confines that formerly held it to a narrow scope. To keep pace with the progress of the healing art, it had to separate itself into parts and entrust each part with specially equipped masters. Thus there have developed distinct fields in pharmacy, some so far removed from the original apothecarial science as to get divorced in our thoughts from the pharmacy we have in mind when we say the word. Whereas, in former times but two groups were concerned in getting a drug from its native source to the sufferer for whom it was intended, we now find ten groups necessary for the responsibility. And right here we are apt to lose sight of a pertinent fact: each of the ten groups is engaged in a branch of pharmacy. It is not customary to call them all pharmacists since that title is reserved for the members of the last link in the chain of production, but all are, nevertheless, pharmacists in the broader meaning of the word. A plant is pulled in Asia by a collector, examined for merit by an inspector, sent to America by an exporter, received in New York by an importer, assayed for strength by an analyst, ground to powder by a miller, made into a galenical by a manufacturer, sold to a distributor by a traveling representative, sent to a drug store by a jobber, and finally made into a prescription formula and sold by a retail druggist. From the time that drug was taken from its native environment until it was delivered for use in disease, no other agencies were in play than those belonging to pharmacy. Thinking of the matter in this light, we see how necessary it is that present-day retail pharmacists confine the major portion of their energies to their own phase of drug distribution, and we also see that pharmacy has not degenerated in any manner but has responded gloriously to its obligations in the crusade against disease.

It may be objected just here that only retail drug stores were in mind when charges were made that pharmacy no longer receives or merits the high esteem it formerly enjoyed in the minds of the public and in the hearts of its own practitioners. Now what specifically is in the bill of indictment brought against retail pharmacy? First, that it is no longer a profession; second, that it no longer

is ethical; third, that it has lost its dignity as a calling and has descended to the level of a mere trade; and fourth, that the aims actuating its followers are altogether without idealism, are in fact purely mercenary. Suppose we examine each of these charges and determine whether or not the premises upon which they are based are sound and whether or not the conclusions drawn therefrom are justified. We will take them in the above order.

(1) Is retail pharmacy a profession? The answer is no, if you are speaking of the learned professions, since only theology, law and medicine belong in this classification; the answer is yes, if you are using the term "profession" in its broader sense as when speaking of engineering, for example. Unless the word profession is prefaced by the qualifying adjective "learned," one should define it as meaning *a calling in which one professes to have acquired some special knowledge used by way either of instructing, guiding or advising others or of serving them in some art.* Retail pharmacy can certainly qualify under the provisions of the above definition which was taken from the latest unabridged edition of Webster's Dictionary. Personally, however, it is a matter of indifference whether retail pharmacy is called a profession or not. It has in it elements of a trade, but so has the exchange of service for money as carried on by lawyers and physicians for that matter. Suppose we compromise the question and call retail pharmacy a business? Using the conception of this word that shall later on in this paper be brought out, we could be contented with the dignity and honor that the term "business" implies and withdraw all claim to the more debatable word "profession."

(2) Has retail pharmacy lost its right to be called ethical? A substitute question must be interjected here before the above query can be answered. The substitute is this: Has retail pharmacy ever been ethical? Ethics, it must be understood, is a matter of morals; it is a principle of practice and a practice of principle. The ratio of drug or prescription sales to total volume of business has nothing whatsoever to do with ethics. When druggists give honest service and genuine values; when they avoid substitution and unfair practices; when they hold inviolate the confidence of customers and protect the interests of physicians; and when they approximate an observance of the golden rule in their competitive relationships with each other; then they have conformed to every ethical requirement.

A century ago pharmacists in the main were impelled by an inner spirit or a moral consciousness along a course which was ethical by any standard of judgment. Right now, too, druggists in the main are honorable in their dealings, scrupulous in their transactions, and aboveboard in their relationships with each other. Merely because competition between druggists is keen nowadays when formerly it was comparatively non-existent, and because there has resulted in consequence a different, a more intensive type of rivalry, one is not to suppose that drug ethics died with the fading out of the old order. On the contrary, it is more conspicuously outstanding to-day than ever in the history of the drug business. Challenge this declaration if you like, but before doing so read carefully the literature of earlier times, search carefully for evidence of ethics, and point out a single event, or record, or individual action, that will disprove the claim here made. Every man then was a law unto himself; there was no code of professional conduct, no effort to associate ideas, no collective attempt to promote the public health, and

no evidence or record or proof was put into print that would lead one to believe any system of ethics prevailed. We may assume on the part of these pharmacists a rigid resolve to act circumspectly, and towards each other in a moral manner, as well as to give to the job in hand the best they had to give, but further than this a claimant cannot go. Compare such a condition with the order of to-day, freeing your mind of prejudice against contemporary developments, and your conclusions will coincide with mine. We, too, give of our best to the job we have in hand, and that best is incomparably superior to the superlative of earlier days. Medicines now, in quality, reliability, appearance and taste approximate the perfect; organizations by the score, local, state and national, have been set up so that by multiplied, unified effort the science of retailing and hence drug service to patrons may be improved; regulatory laws, initiated by ourselves, have been enacted to make certain an increasingly higher order of pharmaceutical excellence, and to guarantee proper protection to users of drugs; codes of moral conduct have not only been framed to guide us in our relationships with each other but these codes are by the majority being observed in spirit and in letter. These things were not forced out of nor upon us, but they issued, instead, from an inherent ethical impulse that is more vitally alive to-day than ever in the history of pharmacy. Has retail pharmacy sacrificed its claims to ethical practice? Emphatically no!

(3) The third charge is that retail pharmacy has lost its dignity as a calling and has become, instead, a mere bartering institution—a trade and nothing else. Here is a subject possessing potentialities of unlimited argument and one over which so many words have already been spilled that I hesitate to add to the flood. Presumably the charge, like the one having to do with ethics, had its birth when druggists ceased manufacturing their own preparations and gained its growth as druggists began adding heterogeneous side lines to their business of drug dispensing. If, in order to be dignified, a calling must perpetuate all the practices of its parentage, and if any undertaking laying a heavy emphasis on buying and selling is a trade, then the above indictment is just and retail pharmacy is guilty. Certainly we cannot claim longer to be the elaborators of our own formulas, and certainly our varied departments are mercantile medlies. Manufacturing specialists have relieved us of the former responsibility, while exacting customers and the urgencies of competition have made necessary the latter additions, but what has all this to do with dignity? And when did the art of prescription compounding become reduced to a trade? This whole question is so closely interwoven with the fourth charge against present-day retailing, *viz.*, about druggists themselves being without idealism and actuated altogether by mercenary motives, that it seems well to link the two discussions together. Right here we should recognize that the arguments on these questions take their start from the definitions of the four words—Dignity, Trade, Idealism and Mercenary. Depending upon how one interprets these words, conclusions are reached favorable to, or adversely critical of, the drug business as now conducted.

Dignity is the state, character, or quality of being worthy or honorable. Retail pharmacy is essential, possesses merit, is worthy of respect, entitled to honor, and is, therefore, a dignified calling, a short but sufficient refutation of the slander.

A trade is a mechanical employment which is carried on not necessarily with machines but in a machine-like or automatic manner, as distinguished from one

of the arts in which there is skill in the adaptation of things in the natural world to the uses of human life; or else a trade is a business *limited* to the exchanging of goods by barter, or to buying and selling for money. While retail pharmacy has in its practice certain elements of a trade, it has other qualities that take it very definitely out of the category of a trade. The most appropriate title for modern retailing is, "Scientific Business."

But to pass on: What is idealism? It is the practice of forming and living under the influence of ideals. An ideal is a standard of perfection, of beauty, or of moral or physical excellence; it is a perfect type, whether a reality or only a conception. There is a vast difference between having ideals and being an idealist. Bearing such distinction in mind, one is quite correct in saying that the average—not all, but the average—retail druggist practices idealism, which is but another way of saying that he has standards of perfection and lives up to such standards.

Finally we have the word mercenary. What does it mean? It means serving merely for pay or reward or pecuniary advantage. Are retail pharmacists as a class mercenary and do they serve merely for pay? If the English language had a more forceful negative than "No," I would use it in answering this question. Lacking something more emphatic for use in denial, I shall simply state that retail druggists are mercenary only if all public servants are similarly motivated. The charge is really too baseless and unfair to dignify it with plausible argument.

In summary then we may say, first, that retail pharmacy has a reasonable right to be called a profession, but is contented with the title, "Scientific Business;" second, its practices are now, as always, ethical; third, it possesses dignity; fourth, it is not a trade; fifth, it has ideals; and sixth, its practitioners are no more mercenary than are the members of the learned professions or other callings. All of which brings me to the second part of this paper.

PART II.

It was said just above that retail pharmacy is a scientific business. I want here to dwell upon its obligations as a business, and suggest a code of conduct that can be followed to the advantage alike of the pharmacist and the public. This code, modified somewhat to make it appropriate to pharmacy, is otherwise identical with the "Principles of Business Conduct" recently framed by a committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Much that will be said in the following paragraphs is inspired by an article in *The Nation's Business*, written by Judge Edwin B. Parker, who was chairman of the body that framed the "Principles" just mentioned. At times whole paragraphs will be lifted bodily from Judge Parker's article and given a place in this paper; at other times his ideas will be rephrased and presented.

At the outset it seems necessary to get clearly in mind the functions of the drug business as well as to clarify its obligations to the community. Briefly these are to procure intelligently and distribute efficiently not only the material agents necessary in the prevention, palliation, and cure of disease, but in addition meritorious substances and articles necessary to the comfort and pleasure of health. This duality of function, seemingly unrelated but joined by long custom, requires

the exercise of scientific skill and commercial ingenuity, and its successful performance constitutes a high order of public service—contributes really to the happiness of life. Its direct reward is individual profit, but it is important that the function of the drug business should not be confused with the motives which may prompt an individual to engage in it. If man has ability and employs it unremittingly and efficiently, he may make money whether he is engaged in the business of pharmacy or in the profession of law or engineering, but making money is not the sole reason for, nor the measure of, his success. The drug business in the abstract, as distinguished from the individual enterprise, must have a basic purpose, which is to provide for certain material needs of humanity. The immediate end may be profit to the individual engaged in serving the public, but whenever retail pharmacy ceases to perform the basic function of business, then it is no longer entitled to exist. A livelihood and, where practicable, a competency is due every man, but the drug business owes no person a living merely because he elects to engage in it. On the contrary a druggist, like all other members of society, enjoys an individual and a corporate protection and an equality of opportunity which cause him to owe civilization a debt which can be discharged only by increasing the wealth or promoting the health of the world; or by putting into life more than he takes out—by producing more than he consumes. The slothful, who use not their talents but bury them, should, through the operation of economic law, have taken from them even that which they have, further to enrich those who have most and who have demonstrated their capacity and willingness to exercise the godlike power of creating and producing, adding through spiritual, mental, or physical effort to the wealth of the world. Wealth so produced is property, the title to which inheres in the producer, increasing his capacity further to produce and his corresponding responsibilities to his fellow-man.

In the early history of retail pharmacy, the purely business side of the enterprise was subordinate to the professional; the activities of an individual pharmacist were limited to a relatively small area; and all business intercourse was personally conducted as between acquaintances. Such conditions no longer prevail; in fact the very reverse of the above is now a fact. It would be untrue to say that the professional side of retail pharmacy has in any qualitative sense become incidental or subordinate to the business side, but it is correct to say that such is true in a quantitative sense. It follows as a practical consequence that the major amount of a druggist's time, thought and talents must be directed nowadays to the purely commercial phases of the business. Again, modern drug stores, particularly the greater ones, far from limiting their area of activity to their immediate environs, reach out farther and farther for business, and cater to and win the trade of a clientele distantly placed and personally unknown to any member of the sales force. It becomes necessary, therefore, to recognize that confidence and goodwill are to a greater degree than ever before indispensable assets in permanent business. The measure of a drug store's success is not in the number of customers who buy something *once*, but in the number who *repeat* their buying regularly. Any shrewd merchant can attract any particular customer for one sale, but only an honest merchant who recognizes that the very essence of successful selling is scrupulous accuracy in the representation of product can hope to *hold* the trade of the buying world. Implicit confidence between producers, distributors and con-

sumers is the bulwark of modern commerce. The greater the business, the greater its need for confidence and good-will in order to endure. Hence

Rule 1. The foundation of business is confidence, which springs from integrity, fair dealing, efficient service and mutual benefit.

In order for a retail drug business to prosper, in fact to exist, the owner must realize the cost of his goods, plus a safe reserve, plus a fair profit. Efficient management is entitled to reasonable rewards. The risks in the drug business are not equalled in any other form of retailing; they are diverse for proprietor, manager and all employees; capital and health are continuously endangered. Any losses resulting from such risks must be borne, not by the public for whose benefit they were taken, but by the business running them, and such business in turn is entitled to a compensation on the gamble. And too, it is to the public interest that drug stores should accumulate a reserve large enough to enable them successfully to continue performing their service, notwithstanding adverse conditions or general depression over which they have no control. But, on the other hand, the policy of charging "all the traffic will bear" if in excess of a reasonable profit is economically an unsound principle. In unusual instances it may bring temporary prosperity, but no permanent good can come of such a course since sooner or later an outraged public will penalize the practice. A better policy is to keep stock moving, the overhead down, the volume up and realize profit from multiplicity of sales. Hence

Rule 2. The reward of the drug business for service rendered is a fair profit plus a safe reserve commensurate with risks involved and foresight exercised.

Four elements have a common focus in retail pharmacy: capital, management, employees and the public. Each of the four has obligations to itself but each also has obligations to the other three. No business is entitled to survive, much less to prosper, until it discharges its responsibilities to all four. Enlightened self-interest should prompt each class to deal fairly with the others, because to do so pays in the end. When owner, manager, clerk and customer add to their motive of gain an earnest desire to be of service each to all others, there is then born a spirit of harmony and coöperation which is happy and profitable in its effects. Hence

Rule 3. Equitable consideration is due in the drug business alike to capital, management, employees and the public.

Coöperation between retail druggists which looks to the promulgation and maintenance of sound standards of business conduct, and to the acquirement and dissemination of knowledge essential to the intelligent conduct of the business under such restrictions as will prevent abuses, is in the public as well as the private interest. Predetermined policies, framed without ulterior motives; voluntary in their application; based upon sound economic theory; and exercised to enable the drug business effectively to discharge its true function to public and practitioner, are both lawful and laudable. No creed or code can or should be static. The complexion of an act changes when its application to changing conditions brings a changed result. Therefore, what is ethically and economically sound and legal to-day may be unethical, impractical and illegal a generation or even a decade hence. No group

of men, however intelligent, carefully picked and far-sighted, could formulate doctrines for the drug business that would for long be useful. To-day's demands are to-morrow's discards, and only by regular and frequent counsel can plans of activity and formulas of procedure be framed and altered with changing circumstance. Individual initiative, while valuable *per se*, is wasted in the drug business if not supported and enlarged by correlated mass endeavor. No calling can realize or attain its legitimate entitlements unless the human components not only agree upon but carry through certain programs necessary to a successful existence. In no other way so well as by means of organized associations can such programs be carried to satisfactory conclusions. Hence

Rule 4. Lawful coöperation, operating through regularly constituted and conducted associations, is essential to the welfare and progress of the drug business.

To-day as never before it is vital that druggists have an intimate knowledge of every phase of their business. Statutory requirements in twenty-odd states make obligatory the acquirement of technical skill in manipulative pharmacy, but only a self-imposed law can make a druggist acquire a knowledge of business facts. No enterprise can be safely conducted, in its own or the public interest, on guesses or inaccurate information. It will fall short in its several duties if it does not constantly improve the service it renders in quality, quantity and in costs. Such improvement can be gained only by constant and intensive study. Therefore

Rule 5. Knowledge—thorough and specific—and unceasing study of the facts and forces affecting the drug business, are essential to a lasting individual success and to efficient service to the people.

No business can realize its potentialities of success unless it is started and conducted as a permanent rather than as a day-to-day enterprise. A drug store operated without regard to the future is a drug store that can have no future. The establishment of confidence, good-will and a reputation for excellence of service and fair dealing is essential, but it has a slow development. More druggists than should seem to regard their stores as mushroom affairs from which quick profits must be obtained irrespective of permanent profit, which is the only kind on which a store can thrive. Such a short-sighted policy is opposed to good business, wherefore

Rule 6. Permanency and continuity of service are basic aims of business, in order that knowledge gained may be fully utilized, confidence established and efficiency increased.

Whether in office, store or plant, workers of every type—inventive, managerial and manual—should be so employed that each individual has every opportunity that the business and his position make possible to increase his ability to serve and the value of the service he renders, to himself, to the business and to the public through the business.

Rule 7. Obligations to itself and society prompt the drug business unceasingly to strive toward continuity of operation, bettering conditions of employment, and increasing the efficiency, the opportunities and the rewards of individual employees.

Contracts should be entered into cautiously, and recognition taken of the fact that no contract is a good one unless good for both parties to it. After being made,

a contract should be faithfully and fully performed regardless of the immediate consequences due to changed conditions or other causes. Upon this principle rests the security of all commerce. Therefore

Rule 8. Contracts and undertaking, written or oral, are to be performed in letter and in spirit. Changed conditions do not justify their cancellation without mutual consent.

In few other forms of business is it so necessary as in retail pharmacy that all claims made as to the value of goods be based on fact. The druggist, more than any other merchant, possesses the confidence of the public. To violate this confidence is as dangerous economically as it is wrong morally. Hence

Rule 9. Representation of goods and services should be truthfully made and scrupulously fulfilled.

Competition in every field of effort not only spurs to greater endeavor the particular enterprise engaged in it, but it increases the benefits to the recipients of that enterprise's service. The keynote of American business is competition: it is called the "life of trade." But unfair competition is intolerable; the seeking of a business advantage through efforts which harm a competitor is unethical; charges against and insinuations about a rival are in bad taste. If a drug store cannot command trade because of the excellence of its own products and service rather than because of the shortcomings or misfortunes of its competitors, it had better be placed under more effective management. "Knocking" deserves and will receive the unqualified condemnation of all right-thinking men.

Rule 10. Unfair competition, embracing all acts characterized by bad faith, deception, unjust and unfounded criticism is despicable and a public wrong. Business will rely for its success on the excellence of its own service.

Sound business policy requires the speedy and amicable settlement of all controversies between employer and employee, between buyer and seller, between producer and distributor, and between competitors.

Rule 11. Controversies will, where possible, be adjusted by frank discussion and voluntary agreement.

Retail pharmacy requires and rightfully demands unhampered opportunity for existence and expansion. Having as it does a vital relation to the public health, it is in the interests of safety that certain restrictions be thrown around its practice, but these restrictions should go only so far as to regulate and not to throttle legitimate business. It must be admitted that an occasional druggist will carry on methods and practices designed to secure immediate gains without regard to their effect on the general public or to the ultimate effect on his own store, but it is neither in keeping with principles of justice nor in harmony with the foundations of American government for the acts of a few far-spaced individuals to be construed as the course which the other members of their group might be expected to pursue unless handcuffed by ropes of regulation. The drug business impatiently resents legislation of such a character just as it welcomes wholesome laws intelligently worded and humanely enforced which have for their avowed and actual purpose the furtherance and protection of the public health. Having tried in every way

consistent with honor and dignity to get removed from the statute books of the states and from the regulations of federal bureaus those enactments and decisions which hopelessly hinder and fail to better the conduct of the drug business, the industry has one procedure left. At first blush it appears identical with what has been almost universally customary, but reflection will disclose a difference. Instead of continuing to ask law-makers to cancel unnecessary and burdensome legislation, which in the light of past events would be futile, suppose the drug business resolved itself to regulate, restrict and control those few of its own members who give excuse for the passage of hindering and hampering laws, what would be the result? The first fruits, of course, would be the stoppage of impending legislation which now looms large as a threatening development; the second result would be a public sympathy, respect and support that would eventually force a cancellation of what had been proved to be totally unnecessary restrictions thrown around a law-loving, law-abiding industry. Hence

Rule 12. The drug business should so conduct itself and regulate its members that a deserved and inspired public confidence would render impossible unnecessary and hampering regulations and restrictions.

Every one of the above twelve rules or principles of business conduct have their source in motives of enlightened self-interest. Still they are permeated with ideals reduced to practical terms. The drug business is in a state of flux, out of which will issue something unexistent yesterday and unborn to-day. It is in our hands to determine whether this something shall carry the calling to a plane of greater honor or sink it to a low level of inferiority. This much is certain: the fortunes of retail pharmacy are our fortunes, and as they ebb or rise so will our material fate be fashioned. Destiny will not decree for us a pleasant path nor will it fill our trail with thorns; the road we follow will be constructed by ourselves. Shall our highway be built of shifting sands good only for fair weather travel, or shall we put into its construction a practical idealism, sound judgment, and foresighted management in a manner so blended and cemented as to make for safe travel and permanent progress?

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION.*

BY G. A. BERGY.

Following the plan of Prof. Edward Spease—who suggested the continued use of questionnaires by which information on both educational and legislative matters could be assembled, studied, and progress noted—the Secretary directed questionnaires to the secretaries of the various state boards of pharmacy of the United States while a questionnaire of a different nature was forwarded to each of the deans of the colleges and schools of pharmacy holding membership in the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

* Reference to the report of the Secretary, G. A. Bergy, was made in the minutes of the Section—December JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 1131. Printing was delayed as the Editor thought there was a possibility of joint printing with the Proceedings A. C. P. F.