

CLINICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC
METHODS.

Fleury, P., and Awad, Y.

**New process for the estimation of acetone and
its application to urine***J. pharm. chim.*, 3 (1926), 406

Southgate, H. W.

A chemical test for alcoholic intoxication*Medico-Legal Soc.* (Jan. 1926), *Lancet* (1926),
210, 207-209; through *Am. J. Pharm.*, 98
(1926), 311WHAT MEANS CAN BE FORMULATED FOR HASTENING THE
ENACTMENT OF NATION-WIDE PREREQUISITE LAWS?*

BY LEO G. PENN.

In a recent article by J. G. Beard, on Education and Legislation, appearing in the JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, Professor Beard raises the following important and interesting question and suggestion:

"What means can be formulated for hastening the enactment of nation-wide prerequisite laws? Heretofore this has been a problem left largely to each State for solution, when in reality it should have a central direction."

By nation-wide "Prerequisite Laws," I take it that Professor Beard means *uniform* prerequisite laws. I take it also, that the suggestion made by him after the question raised is, that the matter of legislation be taken from the States and placed in the hands of some other legislative body and, as the only other legislative body in addition to the legislatures of the various States is Congress, I take it that the "central direction," which is suggested implies the United States Congress.

For the purpose of this article, therefore, I will assume that uniform prerequisite laws are desirable and I will concern myself with the means whereby they can be obtained.

It is true that the matter of prerequisites, having been left to the several States, has resulted in a very uneven standard of excellence; in the 48 States, there are almost as many varieties of preliminary requirements.

When a young man has satisfactorily completed his college course and passed the requirements of the State Board in one of the States, is it not merely logical that he should be enabled to practice in the capacity of pharmacist in any of the other States by passing a required State Board examination? Yes, you answer, if his preparation for the profession is equal to that of students in the other States.

Under existing conditions, it most assuredly is not. For illustration:

Some States provide as their only stipulation that candidates for the profession pass the State Board. They do not question how or where the necessary knowledge has been obtained, nor do they concern themselves with the preliminary training a man has received.

Pennsylvania, on the other hand, does not merely insist upon the successful completion of a college course, but demands a four-year high school course in order that the members of the profession may have some cultural and intellectual training. These are only two examples, but the preliminary requirements range through all degrees from the slightest and most negligent to the highest yet required. I am not pleading here for an increase in prerequisites, but surely it is obvious that the more carefully the requirements are looked into and the sounder the

* Section on Education and Legislation, Des Moines meeting, 1926.

preliminary training, the better will be the status of men entering the profession and, in times when the spirit of gain is so predominant, we could well profit by a more select group of men. However, no matter what the preliminary requirements decided upon, the vitally important thing is that all of those requirements, throughout all the states, be *absolutely uniform*.

Then the question arises as to how we are to achieve this state of uniformity?

The mind of one not learned in the law naturally offers the solution that if we desire to have uniformity all over the United States, then let the Congress of the United States enact a nation-wide law.

Unfortunately for this argument, though perhaps fortunately for our scheme of government, there are limits to the law-making powers of Congress. Under the Constitution of the United States, Congress may pass only such laws as are in pursuance of the powers given to it by the Constitution.

On the other hand, the individual State may pass any law, except such as it is forbidden to pass by its own constitution and the Constitution of the United States.

In other words, if we wish to know if Congress may pass a certain law, we look to see if the Constitution of the United States permits it to pass that law. If we wish to know whether a State can pass a law, we look to see if its own Constitution or the Constitution of the United States forbids it from passing the law.

It would, therefore, seem to follow, that the enactment of a uniform Prerequisite Act by Congress is impossible. Such legislation has nothing to do with any power given to Congress by the Constitution of the United States, and would therefore be unconstitutional. The United States Congress being eliminated, the only other law-making bodies left for that purpose are the Legislatures of the several states.

The next question that is therefore raised, is: "Is it impossible to secure uniform prerequisite laws because such action is left to the several States?"

The suggestion by Professor Beard seems to indicate that unless it is taken away from the several states, there can be no solution. However, this does by no means follow.

Those who have been subjected to the greatest inconvenience by reason of the diversity of laws have been the lawyers. To overcome this great source of annoyance, they have organized a commission for the purpose of securing uniform state laws on matters where uniformity is desirable.

This commission has drafted a considerable number of uniform laws which it has through its efforts succeeded in having numerous states pass. Thus, 41 states have adopted a uniform Negotiable Instrument Act, 48 have adopted the Uniform Warehouse Receipts Act, 26 have adopted the Uniform Bills of Lading Act, 16 have adopted a Uniform Partnership Act, 27 have adopted a Uniform Sales Act, and 18 States have adopted a Uniform Desertion and Non-Support Act. Such a commission has proved itself to be an invaluable aid to the lawyers. Could not, then, the pharmacists utilize some such plan in this problem?

To me, it seems that the State Boards of the various States which represent the legal side of the profession are most fully equipped to do so.

The plan that I would suggest is very simple. Let interest be aroused throughout the State Boards on this question of uniform prerequisites.

Then, what the Lawyer's Commission has done for their profession, a commission formed by the State Boards would do for our profession. In their hands would be the necessity of meeting, discussing this problem and coming to a satisfactory conclusion.

If the ground already has been broken for passing uniform State laws, as I have above indicated, there is no reason why we cannot have uniform prerequisite laws.

Therefore, my suggestion is:

First: Let the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy through the State Boards and the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION agree upon a law. Second: let this influence cause a uniform law to be adopted by all the States.

Third: Secure in the knowledge of uniform purpose, for with unity there comes strength, this movement can be carried to the central government for the enactment of a national law.

THE OLD-TIME DRUG STORE.*

BY JOHN W. BALLARD.

May 6, 1865, I walked into a drug store located at 106 West Second Street, Davenport, Iowa. For fifty-five years after that date I was in that one location either as apprentice, clerk or proprietor.

It was a real drug store. Paints and oils were the only side line. It did not resemble the present-day drug store. On the lower shelf of the first section were one-gallon tincture bottles. In these were tincture of arnica, gentian compound, Huxham's tincture, and other popular articles.

On the second shelf one-half gallon bottles in which were kept the aromatic waters; spirit of nitre, spirit of lavender, etc. On the third shelf, quart tinctures, in which were the remainder of the pharmacopœial tinctures from *Aconitum* to *Zingiberis*. The bottom shelf of the second section was given to specie jars; there were quite a number of two-gallon jars in which were kept some of the most frequently called for herbs: Senna, buchu leaves, uva ursi, etc.

On the second shelf were also half-gallon bottles in which were aloes, hiera picra, roots, barks, etc., and quarts occupied the third and top shelves. The bottle labels were of gilded paper, as the glass labels had not then appeared.

All tinctures, syrups, etc., were manufactured in the store and these from the whole roots and barks, so that Swift's drug mill and the big iron mortar were in frequent use by the apprentice. The first "ready to wear" remedy prescribed by physicians was the "Elixir Cort. Peruv. cum Ferri Protox," made by J. R. Nichols & Co., Boston.

A well-arranged prescription case was on the rear counter where the most used powders, extracts, etc., were kept. Blue mass, extracts of nux vomica, gentian, dandelion, etc., were prominent, and Dover's Powder, tartar emetic, lead acetate, etc., were conveniently at hand.

We had a fairly good prescription trade. In those days prescriptions were really compounded, for physicians prescribed the officials instead of proprietary

* Section on Historical Pharmacy, A. Ph. A., Des Moines meeting, 1925.