

to be magnanimous and generous in tying up with customs, traditions and other public interests, rather than to attempt any cheap and rather forced tie-up with store's own merchandise.

The druggists who have used "Pharmacy Week" windows know this. Those who have made a display designed primarily to show the professional nature of pharmacy have been uniformly complimented and have earned the respect and good-will of their patrons. Those who have made "Pharmacy Week" an excuse to conduct a cut-price drive on home remedies have produced this reaction among their patrons—"Oh, this Pharmacy Week is just another scheme to get our money away from us." Thus neither the store nor "Pharmacy Week" has profited.

(Another article in this series will appear in the next issue.)

TOO MANY DRUG STORES.*

BY WORTLEY F. RUDD.

I had the privilege of reading a paper on this subject before the Section on Education and Legislation a few years ago. Under the auspices of the Drug Trade Bureau of Public Information it was syndicated and rather widely published or commented on. All of the comments that I saw were favorable except one—that came from Philadelphia. At the time the paper was read Dr. Jacob Diner, somewhat in defense of the situation in New York City, said in concluding his discussion of the subject "So while the figures are interesting and some deductions may be drawn therefrom, they are not conclusive that there is an over-production of pharmacists or an over-production of drug stores." We agree, of course, that the truth or falsity of the statement contained in the subject is a matter of opinion. The writer's opinion is that there are at least twice as many drug stores as there should be, taking the country as a whole. He believes further that the organizations whose close coöperation can gradually decrease the number of stores, *viz.*, the Colleges of Pharmacy, the Examining Boards, the A. Ph. A., the N. W. D. A. and the N. A. R. D., are not yet united in their acceptance of the principle that there are too many stores nor has any one of them really worked out a plan for decreasing the number even when they have assented to the policy itself.

From the most reliable information that I have been able to obtain on the subject, there is a net increase of about 500 stores per year in the country as a whole. On the 1924 basis of 2236 potential customers to a store on the average and an increase in population of the country of between one and two million a year, the new stores are actually raising this average slightly but too slowly to have any practical effect upon the situation.

Information has come to me recently that in one large city 62% of the retail pharmacists can buy goods only on a C. O. D. basis, in another 32% and in another 42%. Such an economic unsoundness must ultimately be a breeding ground for unethical and even irregular practices. Is it not our business to consider well such conditions? Is it not time for somebody in pharmacy to take action?

* Read before Section on Commercial Interests, A. Ph. A., St. Louis meeting, 1927.

I am bringing this subject before the section a second time with the hope that we may discuss it very thoroughly. It may be that such discussion will lead to the formulation of some motion embodying the composite judgment of the group on this important question. I believe we must act if we are to save the modicum of professional and economic integrity that is left us. I hope to see the section on Education and Legislation initiate some movement which will spread through the parent organization and eventually find its way into the other national pharmaceutical organizations to the end that the independent retail pharmacy may function as an economically sound and professionally efficient unit in public service.

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION.

Jacob Diner said that the author of the paper had quoted him correctly but had failed to state that his remarks relative to the number of drug stores in New York compared that number with those of the United States as a whole. The paper referred to was read in 1923 and since then an ownership law has been passed in New York. He maintained that education was one thing and ownership another; also that it was the duty of the university or college to offer every man and woman an opportunity for education. Limitation of students might interfere with prospective students who would develop into good pharmacists; after all, success depends largely on the individual. He agreed with the author of the paper that there were too many drug stores but he questioned whether a school had the right to refuse students the opportunity for an education in pharmacy.

John Culley contended that there were too many classes of people in business. He was of the opinion that personality and business ability draws trade and that the people will gravitate to the store which evidences the best business methods. He did not think anything worth while would be accomplished in cutting down the number of drug stores.

E. R. Serles referred to the experience of banking institutions in some sections of the country. He referred particularly to a community in which a large number of banks had been developed. The public at that time did not know there were too many banks, but they do now.

Robert P. Fischelis was of the opinion that the colleges shared in the responsibility to limit the number of those going into pharmacy. He implied that five hundred stores, each with a fully registered pharmacist in attendance at all times, would require, at least, one thousand graduates in pharmacy.

John Culley questioned whether any law relating to pharmacy provided for restriction of the number of drug stores by refusal to issue certificates, provided the applicants were entitled to them. There are some boards that confer with those who desire to go into business and as far as possible investigate the ability of the prospect in making a success of a business venture in the locality selected.

Robert P. Fischelis said that the New Jersey Board was not admitting more than one hundred to the examinations at one time.

C. Leonard O'Connell thought all applicants could demand an examination.

W. C. Anderson questioned the method referred to and stated that he desired to help Dean Rudd in his proposal, but thought that he had not offered a solution of the problem.

Dean Rudd replied that the way to reduce the number was to have a very few graduates.

W. C. Anderson thought it was impossible for educational institutions to refuse an education to applicants provided they had the necessary qualifications. In his opinion a graduate in pharmacy should be compelled to serve at least a year of apprenticeship in pharmacy and that this record should be carefully checked by the Board of Pharmacy before a full license is issued. He also suggested 2-, 3- and 4-year courses and that after completion of the first two years such applicants could serve as clerks but not operate pharmacies. Those who had completed the full four-year courses would be entitled to become proprietors.

He asked if there was any demand on the part of the public for a less number of pharmacists and expressed the belief that the process of elimination was now going on.

In every locality physicians are favoring certain pharmacies and the qualification of pharmacists is thereby aiding in the elimination. In some stores a large number of prescriptions are

filled and in others only a very few. He also referred to the fact that a certain percentage of college of pharmacy graduates entered other fields of activity.

C. B. Jordan said that there were too many graduates in pharmacy and too many colleges of pharmacy. In Indiana there are four colleges of pharmacy and these have been in operation for a long time and he considered this a problem and as important as too many graduates. He thought that the resolution should be passed by the Section holding that there are too many drug stores and he would be glad to make such motion.

The motion was seconded by **Edward Spease**.

A. R. Bliss asked whether it would be possible to refuse a taxpayer entrance to a school of pharmacy provided his qualifications were otherwise up to the requirements.

Robert P. Fischelis remarked that the rules of the New Jersey Board were based on the fact that five examiners cannot conscientiously examine more than one hundred applicants at one time.

E. R. Serles said that he was not fully convinced that we have too many drug stores. Such a situation might obtain in certain localities. He did, however, concur in every effort to raise the standards of pharmacy.

Jacob Diner considered the ideas of Professors Jordan and Rudd good, but he did not think the wording of the motion covered the ground.

W. C. Anderson stated that the motion could be changed in effect to discourage the unnecessary opening of drug stores. Dean Jordan agreed with this charge.

Edward Spease held that this was a good idea embodied in the statement made by Dr. Fischelis and he thought the plan of limiting the number of candidates before State Boards advisable.

R. J. B. Stanbury, Secretary of the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association, said that he had just come from a meeting of that organization where a somewhat similar discussion had taken place. A great many druggists protested against the limitation and also the requirement for having a registered man in charge *at all times*. He agreed with Dr. Diner that it may be questioned whether an institution has the right to refuse an education to an individual provided he meets the requirements of the institution. In Nova Scotia provision has been made for registering applicants who have not completed the full college course, but such men cannot become proprietors.

The following resolutions bearing on the discussion were adopted at the convention of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION in St. Louis:

On Opening New Drug Stores.

WHEREAS, an outstanding menace confronting retail druggists to-day is the ever-increasing multiplicity of new stores,

WHEREAS, this condition is due in a large measure to a desire on the part of students in pharmacy to embark in business immediately upon graduation,

Resolved: That college professors, wholesale druggists, manufacturing pharmacists and others with influence urge said prospective retail druggists to acquire stores already established.

On Number of Drug Stores Dependent upon Need for Service.

WHEREAS, the security, well being and health of the community depends, to a large extent, upon the proper type of professional pharmaceutical service, and whereas the proper type of professional pharmaceutical service is determined by the professional personnel, the general fitness and equipment of the pharmacists themselves and the degree of public support received, therefore be it

Resolved by the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, in its traditional purpose of fostering and developing the highest type of pharmaceutical service, that all persons desirous of opening new stores be earnestly urged to study the needs of communities and to refrain from opening new stores in neighborhoods that are being adequately and properly served in this important matter.