

1. Do you approve of having a symposium on the teaching of major subjects in the Pharmacy course?
2. What subjects should be included?
3. How do you, individual teachers of the Conference, want the organization conducted?
4. What does the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties not do, that could be of aid to you in solving your problems?

The main object of our organization is to promote pharmaceutical education. We have progressed very rapidly along certain lines in the past few years, but our most urgent need, at present, is to improve our teaching methods.

If you have time, send me your answers to the above questionnaire.

W. H. ZEIGLER.

(Pharmaceutical educators and retail pharmacists have been wondering how the program of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties will be received, especially that part of the program requiring a minimum three-year course beginning September, 1925. Professor Zada M. Cooper, Secretary of the Conference, is in a position to secure information regarding the acceptance of this forward step on the part of the Conference. The following article by Miss Cooper shows the wisdom of the pharmaceutical educators in taking this far-reaching, forward step at this time.—C. B. JORDAN, Editor.)

THE THREE-YEAR COURSE.

BY ZADA M. COOPER.

The things that have been said about a minimum three-year course since the Conference, in 1920, voted to put it into operation with the beginning of the year 1925, would make a large volume. There is nothing to be gained now by enumerating the arguments that have been presented for or against the change. Suffice it to say that the ten schools that have already started on the new program are expressing no regrets. To make such an advance when other schools were continuing on the two-year plan was a bit of pioneering that took courage.

Mention should be made of the splendid way in which several editors have championed the course. It was to be expected that the Association's own Journal would be for it but other Journals whose subscribers are chiefly retailers have put themselves on the side of its advocates as well.

I have been impressed with the fact that the number of colleges of pharmacy in the United States is on the increase. There may be several reasons for this but there is one thought that recurs to me whenever I think about it. If there is to be the enormous falling off in enrollment that has been predicted this cannot be a good time for a new college to open. Let us look at a few figures. I am well aware that one can prove anything by statistics properly juggled. So another individual analyzing the same situation might reach quite different conclusions but I am at a loss to see how.

During the ten years between 1914 and 1924 there was a net loss in number of schools of about twelve. Twelve were discontinued. There were two instances of two schools merging, and there were one or two new ones. That reduction seemed a perfectly natural condition of the times and the remaining schools could perfectly well care for all who wished to study pharmacy, at least with a little

expansion. The distribution of these schools was tolerably good; nearly every state had at least one, the exceptions being some of the New England states, where distances are so small as to make traveling expenses for students practically negligible, in the sparsely settled southwest or in the south where the Negro population is large. In 1924, sixty-three schools in the United States were registered or accredited by New York and there were at least three others giving two-year courses of possibly equal rank. Fifty-one of these were members of the Conference but that number has since been reduced to forty-six by the withdrawal of the New York schools.

Several schools that had applied for membership in the Conference but were not quite meeting requirements persisted in their efforts to come up to the standards set and others not ready to apply sought information about the things they would need to do before they would be eligible—all this in the face of the advancing standard in 1925. Perhaps some one will say that these schools hoped that that ruling would never go into effect as a few of the member colleges probably did. Had negotiations ceased after the Buffalo meeting that would seem to be a fair assumption but they haven't. I know of ten schools established for some years that have sought information about what they need to do to get in or have already applied. All of these know about the three-year course and some have announced their intention of going to that plan this year.

But to me the most significant fact is that in a short period of time there are several new schools where none ever existed before. In 1923 a state university in the south opened a new school, in 1924 three more were opened, one at a university, the other two in colleges that had been established for some time. Very recently another university has announced the opening of a college of pharmacy in September 1925. Not one of these is an independent institution that could even be suspected of doing such a thing as a money-making venture if that is conceivable under the present status of operating expenses. Three are in states where one or more colleges already exist.

What the explanation for these new schools may be I am unable to say. In one instance I know it was because the pharmacists of the state urged it and I have reason to believe the same to be true of another which is also in a state where there had been no college. The governing bodies of educational institutions are usually level-headed men and they are not likely to establish new schools that call for expensive equipment in the face of competition with older institutions in the same state or adjoining states at a time when it is predicted that there will be fewer students, unless they believe they will fill a real need. Four of these schools, possibly the fifth also, have announced that they expect to meet Conference standards.

The published statement about the newest one of these is that it is the "first excursion into the realm of medical science;" that the "great advances in pharmaceutical education that have been made within the past five years are little known to the general public," and that "the importance of the pharmacist as a member of the community and as a guardian of the public health is but little appreciated."

If I were to try to interpret the situation I should say that the advancing standards have convinced educators that pharmacy will be more attractive to a better class of young men and women and that they wish to provide for them.

Those who have taught long enough to have seen two years of high-school preparation increased to four and the six months' college year to nine months and the prerequisite laws go into effect have no hesitancy in saying that the type of student is very much better now. Students themselves at those transition periods have said that they were not attracted to a profession that had to compete with the product of plugging schools.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE STATUS OF THE HOSPITAL PHARMACIST.

BY EDWARD SWALLOW.

Mr. C. Dyna, in his interesting "reply"* to an humble effort of mine last year, seems on the whole to agree with the statements I put forth. As my paper expressed the views of one who had many years of experience as a hospital pharmacist in New York City, maybe the statements made were not broad enough to embrace the situation generally all over the country. Several years ago, with the one idea of trying to gather into the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION as many hospital pharmacists as possible, we interested E. R. Squibb & Sons, who very generously had their traveling representatives calling upon American hospitals, to send the Association the names and addresses of as many hospital pharmacists as they could. In this way we collected, I believe, about 700 names and addresses. At that time there were about 75 per cent of women pharmacists engaged in this work. I must sadly re-echo Mr. Dyna's question, "Did anything materialize?" Somehow, only a comparatively few women and men engaged in hospital pharmacy have joined the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. The Section for Hospital Pharmacists is pitifully small, considering the number of persons in this important work, a number that is ever increasing.

It certainly would be worth while to make another effort to reach all of this class of pharmacists. How is it to be done? The mere act of meeting together of well-meaning men and women and talking this matter over year after year is only waste of breath and valuable time. These persons need to know personally how much to their advantage generally it would be if they became members of either the local branches of the ASSOCIATION or clasped hands with their parent—the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.

A great and glorious future is possible for the hospital pharmacists of America, but they never will reach it without organization within the ranks of the only ASSOCIATION representing pharmacy as a real profession. The men and women should be given an opportunity to learn all about this Hospital Section devoted to their interests and advancement generally. We have some of the finest men in the world as members of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, who know the value of advertising and publicity. Surely, a little difficulty like reaching every hospital pharmacist by mail can be overcome! The addresses of all hospitals can be obtained. Why cannot the ASSOCIATION get busy and write to the pharmacists engaged therein?

APRIL 24, 1925.

AN APPRECIATION.

It is with great sorrow that I have learned of the passing away of Ex-President L. C. Hopp.

We have lost a member who rendered loyal service to the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, a leader in his profession and a pharmacist of the finest type. Our friendship was one of long year's standing.

I esteemed him for his ability, kindness and honesty. We shall miss his cheery countenance and warm handclasp at our meetings in the future.

JOHN G. GODDING.

BOSTON, MAY 23, 1925.

* March JOURNAL A. PH. A., p. 255.