

already too many associations in the field, and that another organization to carry on the work that this body has been doing is unnecessary.

While we regret that we are unable to report one hundred per cent coöperation, we feel that the voluntary contributions amounting to \$180.00, and representing almost three-fourths of the Boards of Pharmacy of the United States, are an indication that the work of this Conference has been of value and that its future efforts are looked forward to with interest.

Respectfully submitted,
C. T. GILBERT
F. H. KING
ROBERT P. FISCHELIS.

Upon motion of Mr. Bingham, seconded by Mr. Funk, the Committee on Finance was to be continued.

In the absence of Mr. Winne, his paper on Practical Benefits from Annual Registration was read by Mr. Rowland Jones. The paper was discussed by Messrs. Walton, Hankins, Bingham, Mather, Gilbert, Dargavel and Ford. Upon motion duly seconded, the paper was referred for publication.

PRACTICAL BENEFITS FROM ANNUAL REGISTRATION.

BY A. L. I. WINNE, SECRETARY, VIRGINIA BOARD OF PHARMACY.

The first thought that occurs with reference to the annual registration of pharmacists and pharmacies by boards of pharmacy is probably that of its revenue-producing angle. That is an important slant to most boards in states in which the annual re-registration is in practice. It is an important feature in my own state of Virginia. There we work under a budgetary system, and the board of pharmacy is allotted a fixed sum upon which to operate, yet we are expected to be approximately self-supporting. Our fees for examinations, reciprocity and annual re-registration constitute the bulk of our income. So, the annual registration is of importance to us from that viewpoint.

There are other considerations, however, to the annual registration of pharmacists, assistants, pharmacies or any other class in a state where registrations may be required. We have found the system valuable in getting at least a check on the men registered in the state, many of whom will have had a change of address during the year. We have a peculiar law in Virginia that requires the applicant for any sort of a license, and pharmacy annual registration is a mere form of licensure, to have paid his poll tax in the state for the year next preceding the last tax year, if it was assessable against him for that year. That brings in revenue to the state, indirectly, of course, and not through the board of pharmacy, but nevertheless into the state's treasury. Not many states have such a provision.

We have in Virginia a system of registering the pharmacies as well as the men who practice in them. This also brings in some revenue, but aside from that is a valuable feature of board administrative work. In order for a pharmacy to secure a permit to operate for the calendar year a permit must be obtained by filing an application in which is set forth under oath the name of the store, its location, its ownership, the name of the registered pharmacist in charge and the names of any other pharmacists or assistants employed in that store. The hours the place is customarily open for business are set forth and the hours the several pharmacists are on duty. There is a variety of circumstances stated, but ordinarily, where two or more pharmacists are employed they will be shown to alternate in the usual manner. In the one-man stores the pharmacist must show that he is on duty such hours as his place of business is open for business. He does not get a permit until he subscribes to this under oath. If he fails to take out a permit he is subject to fine for operating without a permit. We find sometimes that the pharmacist, in order to get a permit, compromises with his conscience and stretches his statements. But it is nevertheless impressive in most instances when a man deliberately fills in a statement and goes before a public notary and states that it is the truth, and further that it may be checked up on him, and that he may be confronted in court with the document that he has subscribed to, he having fixed his own hours of his own free will. It is embarrassing to the pharmacist when this is done, and they have a hard time explaining how they came to "slip a cog."

This system is very valuable to us for another reason. No person, registered or otherwise, may engage in the drug business until they have received a permit. The pharmacist acts on

his own credentials and procures his permit. The non-pharmacist who wants to engage in the drug business must obtain his permit through the registered pharmacist employed in charge of his pharmacy. That means that he must have a registered pharmacist employed, and no bluffing goes about that phase of the matter because an additional affidavit executed by the pharmacist in charge becomes a part of the application. We do not accept the statement of a non-pharmacist that he has such and such a pharmacist employed. We allow that pharmacist, so employed, to make affidavit to the fact that he is employed in that particular pharmacy, and state his hours of employment. In order to secure a permit we require that the pharmacist in charge put in at least half the number of hours the place is open for business. Otherwise he comes within the definition of temporary employment. Chain stores and corporations must procure their permits through the registered pharmacists in charge of each particular store. Two permits are not issued simultaneously to any one pharmacist. If he holds one permit that bars him from obtaining another. He therefore may not be in charge of two pharmacies. Do not confuse our use of the term "in charge of" as here used. We have no reference to the business management of a store. We have reference to the responsible man in charge of that intangible portion of the place of business that brings it within the definition of a pharmacy.

We believe that the annual registration of pharmacists and pharmacies also keeps the men in pharmacy in the state in contact with their board of pharmacy and its work, and that is useful in many ways in promoting harmony and securing a measure of cooperation on the part of those practicing pharmacy in the state.

Through the annual registrations we are able to keep records in the office of the board, that through cross indexing, enables us to compile lists of various sorts, as desired. We can list the names of the registered pharmacists by examinations, those registered by reciprocity, the assistants, or the stores in the state, or those in any particular city. We can take a particular city and list the men in the stores in that city without much trouble. We can list up a county or a section of the state, if that is desired. While these things may not often serve any useful purpose, when they are desired they are available, and such lists can be kept up to a reasonable degree of accuracy at all times.

The annual registrations entail considerable work, and the keeping of the records of men and stores is a never-ending job, but it is a source of a great deal of satisfaction in many instances, aside from the revenue aspect. We believe that it is a material aid in securing a better observance of the pharmacy laws, considered from many angles. We do not know what the feeling is in other states where the annual registration is carried out, but we would not want to abolish it in my own state.

P. H. Costello presented a paper on "The Board of Pharmacy Should Designate the Medicinal Preparations to Be Sold by General Merchants." This paper was discussed by Messrs. King, Wilhelmi, Mather, Swain, Walton, Costello and Dargavel.¹ The paper was then received for publication.

THE BOARD OF PHARMACY SHOULD DESIGNATE THE MEDICINAL PREPARATIONS TO BE SOLD BY GENERAL MERCHANTS.

BY P. H. COSTELLO, COOPERSTOWN, N. D.

If it is the desire of this group to discuss and determine the advisability of attempting to confer on Boards of Pharmacy, through legislation, the authority to designate what drugs and medicines may be sold by other than pharmacists, I am only prepared to give you our experiences in North Dakota. We have such authority by legislative enactment; factors leading up to the enactment of this legislation, and it would seem more acceptable and a better weapon for enforcement officials (Boards) than the vague exemptions, general exemptions over a certain distance or enumerated lists of exemptions generally found in statutes. I suppose the fact we have been granted such authority is the reason I have been asked to say something about it. I do not know if ours is the first instance of a legislature granting this authority to a Board of

¹ The decision of the Minnesota Supreme Court, restricting to pharmacists the distribution of Milk of Magnesia, was discussed by Mr. John W. Dargavel, secretary of the Minnesota Board of Pharmacy. This paper created a great deal of interest, and was discussed fully. Editorial reference will be found in the August JOUR. A. PH. A., pages 738, 739.