

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BOARDS OF PHARMACY.*

BY A. L. I. WINNE, PRESIDENT.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, Our Canadian Guests and Visitors:

I appreciate the privilege of greeting you at this, the twenty-ninth annual meeting of our Association, in the great Canadian convention city of Toronto. I appreciate the distinction of presiding at this, our first annual gathering, held anywhere outside the United States, and the first in which we have the pleasure of the presence of any appreciable number of gentlemen of another nation engaged in similar work to our own.

To our Canadian guests I extend a most cordial welcome. We are happy to have you with us, glad of the opportunity to hold our meeting in a friendly and



A. L. I. WINNE.

hospitable neighboring country, and we want to express our thanks to you for extending the invitation to us to visit with you for the few days we are in session, and for the privileges of mingling with you and of sharing with you in the mutual exchange of viewpoints. We extend to you the privileges of the floor and will welcome your comments on matters which may come before the body for discussion.

We are all going to profit greatly by this joining together in our deliberations. We will each gain a greater understanding of the educational system and the licensing procedure of the other country. That we, who have come over the lines from the States, for a few days' sojourn in your midst, will not only profit by the visit, but that we will not fail also to take note of the pleasurable opportunities

such a visit affords, goes without saying.

Turning from the extension of welcome, we come to the more matter-of-fact discussion of the affairs of the organization. In taking up the several topics I have tried to pay regard to brevity, and have only partially succeeded. I have consideration for those who sit and listen, and yet I feel that a reasonably full presentation should be made of the thoughts which attach to the matters discussed. I have, in most instances, compromised by leaving unsaid much that might have been included.

ASSOCIATION AFFAIRS.

Annually it has been customary for the presidents of this Association to comment on the affairs of the Association. The comment has usually briefly referred to the financial condition of the body, and then has devoted itself to taking note of the

* Toronto, Canada.

progress made during the year that had passed. It has been the privilege of most of my predecessors to come before you with paragraphs of assurance that all was well. It is, therefore, somewhat reluctantly that I feel I should at this time inject comment that must of necessity be a little different in its tone.

The finances of the organization are not at present in a particularly healthy condition, and I feel that this important matter should be discussed.

In looking back over our proceedings, for a period of five years, I observed that in 1927 the president reported that the affairs of the Association were in a healthy and prosperous condition. He was correct in that observation.

In 1928 the president reported the affairs of the Association in excellent condition, but he took note of the fact that the income at that time was below the expenditures for the year that was then closing; but he did not regard this as a serious matter, observing that our income varied from year to year.

In 1929 it was noted by the president that for the past few years expenditures had exceeded income. The budget of the organization, he stated, was to him a matter of serious thought, in view of the trend he then observed.

In 1930 the report of the president covered only a nine-month period, and the president observed that for the first time in four years income and expenditures practically balanced for this short period. He felt that the organization had weathered the storm.

In 1931 the president observed a small loss, attributed by him to extra activities of the Association. The income of the organization for 1930 and 1931 had been exceedingly good, and the president last year felt that it had been conclusively proven that the organization could definitely count upon a substantial income from reciprocity.

We have found during the past year that this assumption is erroneous. The receipts from reciprocal applications have fallen far short of the several preceding years, and the organization has again suffered a cash decrease to an amount approaching, if not exceeding, \$3000.

I feel that the time has come for us to seriously consider our financial condition. If you will bear with me for a little more delving into the records for the past five years, I may state that an examination of the secretary's reports for this period shows that at the beginning of our fiscal year in 1927 the secretary had a cash balance of \$9922.94. In 1927 he reports receipts of \$18,927.49, and expenditures of \$21,405.89. This indicates a decrease in his cash balance of \$2478.40 for the year.

In 1928 the receipts were \$17,806.13, and expenditures \$20,356.91, with another decrease in his balance of \$2550.78.

In 1929 he reports receipts of \$18,172.40, and expenditures of \$18,794.26, showing a decrease of \$621.86.

In 1930 he reports receipts of \$16,966.05, and expenditures of \$17,000, even, showing a decrease of \$33.95.

In 1931 he reports receipts of \$29,474.64, with expenditures of \$31,042.44, showing a decrease of \$1567.80.

The total decrease in the cash balance in the hands of the secretary for the five-year period amounts to \$7252.79, leaving him with a balance at the end of the period of \$2670.15. The above figures are not particularly significant, except that they indicate a trend. These figures are merely the record of the money passing

through the hands of the secretary, to the treasurer of the Association. The fact that his cash balance gradually decreased would indicate that there has been a necessity to convey to the treasurer amounts in excess of our receipts.

Of more importance to us are the figures carried in the annual reports of the Executive Committee. In 1927 this committee reports receipts of \$18,049.74, and expenditures of \$20,734.25, showing a deficit of \$2684.51.

In 1928 receipts were \$17,236.13, expenditures \$21,209.85, showing a deficit of \$3973.72.

In 1929 receipts were \$17,484.40, expenditures \$18,562.52, showing a deficit of \$1078.12.

In 1930 receipts were \$21,275.14, expenditures \$21,176.41, showing a gain for that year of \$98.73.

In 1931 receipts were \$23,053.10, expenditures \$24,002.94, showing a deficit of \$949.84.

The net loss over this period of five years, as shown by these reports, amounts to \$8587.46.

More significant than the above figures are the following: Under date of June 30, 1926, the Net Worth of the association was stated to be \$24,765.81. On June 30, 1931, the Net Worth is stated to be \$17,726.17. There is indicated a loss in the assets of the organization of \$7,039.64, or an average loss of almost \$1200 a year in the six-year period covered. These figures include the office equipment, books and other incidental inventory items which are not reflected in the cash balance items. For the purpose of comparison, I would also like to include the budget figures for the five-year period. There was appropriated for the use of the Association during the fiscal year ending in June 1927, \$21,542.50; in 1928, \$20,372.50; in 1929, \$20,487.50; in 1930, \$19,502.70; in 1931, \$19,832.70. In addition, \$3500 was spent in the publication of bulletins of the Department of Education during this period, covered by a separate appropriation.

I believe that with these figures before us, and with the report from the Executive Committee this year showing the trend still in a downward direction, that the Association should recognize the fact that we have been living beyond our income, and that retrenchment appears to be a matter of necessity. Just where this retrenchment should be made is for the Executive Committee to decide. I feel sure that this committee will need your counsel and will welcome it in arriving at a solution of the problem. The secretary realized the necessity for economy some months ago, and without any action of the Executive Committee, he and his associates voluntarily put into operation a salary reduction of 10%. This action is commendable, but it falls short of offering a complete solution to our difficulties. Other economies must be practiced if the organization is not to gradually use up all of its reserve fund. We have been compelled to make inroads on this reserve, in order to meet current obligations, and this practice, while a convenience from time to time, should not be a policy of the organization. Its continuance much longer, under present conditions, will entirely wipe out our reserve fund and reduce the activities of the Association to the point where it will be difficult to function satisfactorily.

While I feel that it might be a prerogative of the president to make recommendations with reference to just how these problems should be handled, I prefer to

confine myself to suggestions, as we have an Executive Committee charged with that duty. I do suggest that serious consideration be given to a cessation of the extraordinary activities which the Association has undertaken, until such time as our financial condition will warrant resumption of these activities; and that such contributions as the organization has customarily been making to outside activities be discontinued in all instances where we are not obligated to continue the contribution.

Article 2 of our Constitution states the object of this organization to be the "promotion of interstate reciprocity in pharmaceutic licensure, based upon uniform minimum standards of pharmaceutic education and uniform legislation, and to provide the standards of pharmaceutical education and licensure by coöperating with state, national and international agencies, and associations having similar objects." I take it that these objectives should be our first consideration, and certainly the major activity of this organization is the promotion of interstate reciprocal licensure in pharmacy. There should be no abatement in our activities in the promotion of reciprocity nor in the sphere of rendering a direct service to member boards. These objectives should come before other considerations. I realize fully that an organization should continue to make effort to increase its usefulness, but it seems to me that there come times, such as the present, when it is expedient to stop and take stock of where we stand, consolidate the ground we have won, and make sound preparation for the next steps we contemplate taking. This organization has every reason to feel proud of its past accomplishments, and I believe that in the future its record will merit equal commendation, but I also believe that we should measure our activities in accordance with our financial ability to execute them.

I may here mention that in the interest of economy no meeting of the Executive Committee was held during the past year at the Chicago office. While such a meeting might have served a useful purpose it was not felt that there was sufficient necessity to warrant the necessary expenditure, and the only meeting of the committee held since our last annual convention was that of a day or two ago in the city of Toronto.

RECIPROCITY.

The subject of reciprocity has been so thoroughly discussed in the presidential addresses of this organization and in the reports of the secretary, that I deem it unnecessary at this time to go extensively into a further discussion. We have been reasonably successful in the working out of a satisfactory system of reciprocity, and this has been due to a willingness on the part of most states to make the necessary concessions, and to not adhere too drastically to arbitrary ruling. In almost any instance an applicant for reciprocity might be barred through resort to technicalities. The whole system is one of the application of common sense.

A stricter adherence to the rules may reasonably be expected in cases of our more recently registered pharmacists, but for the older men applying to us for reciprocity we should show considerable consideration, as few of these were registered under rules and regulations similar to those obtaining to-day. To hold them to a strict accountability under present conditions amounts to a retroactive application of our rules and our laws. It has been with reference to situations of this kind that the annual plea for tolerance has appeared in our proceedings.

It is probably true that the laws of most states give the boards of pharmacy the widest kind of latitude and ample opportunity for the exercise of discretionary power. Few of these laws specify the qualifications for reciprocal registration in other than general terms. It is usually through arbitrary rulings, and sometimes through misunderstanding, that reciprocal registration is denied to many applicants who probably should be registered.

Occasionally a situation develops in one of the states where the trend appears to be all in one direction. These states find themselves besieged with applicants who want to come in, and at the same time they observe that very few of their own pharmacists are desirous of leaving the state and registering elsewhere. They apparently come to the conclusion that reciprocity is not a balanced procedure, and in some instances they attempt to set up barriers which are almost insurmountable; and in a few instances consideration has been given to a cessation of admission of pharmacists into the state on the basis of reciprocity. I can appreciate that under present economic conditions, with many pharmacists unemployed in their own states, that a certain amount of unrest has developed, and that there have been many instances where pharmacists, in a desperate effort to find employment, are resorting to trying to secure reciprocity in states where they think they may find work; and I can likewise appreciate the feeling of the board of pharmacy in any state that such opportunities for employment as may arise, should be open to their own unemployed pharmacists. The situation is not a pleasant one, and a decision as to how it shall be best disposed of is not easily arrived at. We should bear in mind, however, that although many of our laws are working very poorly the law of supply and demand is still working smoothly. In a very large majority of the cases where applications for reciprocity are presented, the applicant has a tangible idea of where he will secure employment if he is granted a license. In most instances the applicant has already secured a promise of such employment, and boards of pharmacy should weigh this question very carefully before arbitrarily denying registration.

There are, of course, many attendant factors which must be taken into consideration. The past record of the applicant, his moral character, his experience, and other considerations in addition to his education and his registration grades, may be, and should be, carefully investigated.

I call attention to this phase of reciprocity, as it has been given serious consideration in several of the states recently. I would likewise like to point out that where a state considers the suspension of granting the reciprocal right to applicants from other states it of necessity deprives the pharmacists of its own state of the right to apply for reciprocity outside that state. The secretary of such a board of pharmacy could not consistently subscribe to the obligations carried in our application form in certifying for reciprocal purposes to the grades of a person registered by his board. The system of reciprocity cannot hold up and cannot be successfully conducted if here and there boards are going to arbitrarily discontinue the granting of reciprocal registration.

LEGISLATION.

A little later on our program the Association will hear the reports of the Legislative Committee and the Committee on National Legislation, and the secretary's

report will undoubtedly briefly cover this subject. I will therefore pass over any detailed comment on the activities in the legislative field during the past year. My purpose in mentioning legislation at all is to direct the attention of such states as contemplate making changes in their pharmacy law to the fact that this organization has prepared and holds available for any state board of pharmacy a draft of what is designated a Model Pharmacy Law.

There have been numerous instances where a copy of this model law has been very useful to states undertaking a legislative program, but apparently there has likewise been a misunderstanding of the purpose meant to be accomplished in the preparation of this model act. In some quarters it is apparently assumed that the model law was drafted as a substitute in toto for the existing pharmacy law of any particular state. That decidedly is not the end sought to be accomplished. The scope of the Model Pharmacy Law is such as to embrace practically every phase of pharmaceutical legislation. It has been carefully considered with reference to its phraseology and to its terms, and it serves its purpose admirably in any state contemplating a revision of any particular phase of its pharmacy law.

The sections of the model law are so drafted that they can be lifted from the body of the bill itself and utilized as sections for inclusion in the pharmacy law of almost any of the states, without offering serious conflict to the adjacent sections of the state law. States contemplating making changes in their pharmacy law would do well to secure a copy of the model law and shape their proposed amendments in accordance with its terms. This does not necessarily mean that the model law must be followed in a verbatim way. In many instances its sections could be somewhat modified to suit local conditions, and still prove helpful to those undertaking new legislation. The Chicago office of the N. A. B. P. holds itself ready at all times to offer suggestions, make criticisms, and otherwise be helpful to the states in promoting their legislative programs.

DISTRICT MEETINGS.

During the past year we had joint district meetings in six of our nine subdivisions. These were District No. 1 at Boston, District No. 2 at New York, District No. 3 at Cleveland, District No. 4 at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, District No. 6 at St. Louis and District No. 7 at New Orleans. All these meetings are reported to have been well attended, and that great interest was displayed in the proceedings. It was my privilege to attend only one of these meetings, that held in New York. The program at this meeting was very interesting and the meeting was largely attended, as those in District No. 2 always are. In my own District No. 5, although considerable effort was put forth to hold a meeting, the effort was abandoned because we could not get assurance of representative attendance. In two other districts no meetings were held. These were Districts No. 8 and No. 9. These two districts cover most of the western part of the country, where states are large and distances are great, and undoubtedly the reason this year, as in the past, for not holding such district meetings has been the consideration of the cost involved. The board members and faculty members do not have the funds at their disposal to attend such meetings.

In connection with the above situation I have the feeling that we should as far as possible get back to our former methods of contacting the boards in the states

which do not seem able to hold district meetings and which do not regularly send delegates to our national meetings.

In the earlier days of this organization it was customary for the secretary of the organization to visit these states, preferably when their state boards were holding sessions, and to personally contact the members; and to observe their examination methods, to offer such advice as was acceptable to the boards; and to generally confer with them about matters of educational standards, examination questions and reciprocity. Our activities during the past few years have been such as to consume a great deal of the secretary's time in attending to affairs which are perhaps not strictly association objectives. In other words, I believe that it is important that we get back to some of our first objectives, even if we must, to a certain extent, slight some of the more recently acquired activities. I believe that it is just as important to-day that this Association keep in close contact with those states, that for any reason may not be able to send delegates to our national or district meetings, as it was in former days. We have neglected this activity in recent years and there has consequently appeared in some of these states a certain amount of misunderstanding of N. A. B. P. work.

This can undoubtedly be attributed to the fact that there are constant changes taking place in the personnel of many of the boards. In some instances entirely new boards are appointed. It is practically impossible to convey the viewpoint of the organization to those new members by correspondence methods, and if our secretary could visit with such new board members or newly appointed boards I feel sure that many of the points of misunderstanding could be cleared up and a more cordial coöperation could be expected.

We also occasionally have some points of misunderstanding with boards in states which do attend this organization. There appears to be from time to time some misunderstanding on the part of some of the members with reference to standards adopted by the organization, and particularly with reference to the attitude of some other member boards with regard to points involved in reciprocity. Generally a board of pharmacy must consider an application for reciprocity in the light of the laws of its own state. These may differ in some respects from the laws of the state from which the applicant comes, and it frequently is a matter of disappointment, and sometimes of strong feeling, when an applicant fully qualified in one state is not granted reciprocity in another.

In some of these instances the standards of the N. A. B. P. are held responsible. This attitude on the part of any state is not well founded. The standards of the N. A. B. P. are merely the set of rules adopted by a majority of its members for the guidance of the several state boards. These rules, be they constitutional articles or by-law sections or adopted resolutions, have only the weight of being suggestive and advisory. They in few instances have the weight of law.

It is true that where a number of boards subscribe to the constitution and by-laws of an organization, such as this, they assume a moral obligation to abide by these, but this obligation only reaches to the point of where these rules do not conflict with the laws of a particular state. For this reason there should be a greater understanding of the objective of this organization, or the extent to which its rules are binding upon the member board; and an appreciation of the fact that the laws of the various states differ in many details, and that the boards of the

individual states are bound first, by the laws of their own state, and secondly, by the rules of this organization; and that often these boards are powerless to comply with conditions which entirely meet the legal requirements of another member state, from which an applicant for reciprocity may come. In other words, to use a term which has almost become hackneyed by its employment in the annual addresses of presidents of this body, there must be a considerable amount of tolerance if reciprocity in pharmacy is to continue a successful procedure; but in addition to tolerance there must also be sound understanding. For this reason I believe that as ample provision as we are able to make should be made for our secretary to make such trips as are possible to member boards, to personally confer with them over such misunderstandings as arise from time to time.

REDISTRICTING.

By virtue of a by-law of this organization, the United States is divided into nine districts. Each district is composed of a certain number of states, more or less geographically adjacent to each other, and we have elected a vice-president from each of these districts annually. It has been customary to try to hold district meetings in each district once each year, with the vice-president presiding, and of late years these meetings have become joint meetings with district groups from the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy; and the chairmanship in each district has after a manner alternated between the boards group and the college group.

In some districts it has been possible to hold a meeting each year. In others it has seemed almost impossible to ever get together a representative group, and many of these district meetings have had to be omitted. I believe that this is due somewhat to the districts being badly arranged with reference to distances that must be traveled by some of the delegates, and I believe that a redistricting of the country would help the situation.

I would like to suggest that the incoming president appoint a committee to study this problem and to make recommendations with reference to regrouping the states, for consideration of this body next year. Several of the districts in the east are suffering from the difficulties referred to above, and several of the western districts are so extensive in territory that a district meeting is next to impossible. It might be advantageous to divide some of the western territory into a larger number of districts. That would be for the committee to consider and for this body to finally pass upon. I make the suggestion here because it has been a subject of comment for the past several years, and I believe the time has arrived to take some definite action toward a solution of the problem, notwithstanding the disapproval by the Executive Committee, last year, of increasing the number of districts.

Any action taken, involving a change from the present set-up, would necessitate amendment of Article 7 of the By-Laws.

OUR PROGRAM.

The sessions of the N. A. B. P., at its annual conventions, have customarily been confined to a limitation of two days, and half of the second day is devoted to a joint session with the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, thus leaving, as a rule, three sessions for the business program of this organization. Our routine

business seems to fairly well consume our time, leaving very little opportunity for such general discussions of the problems confronting board members, such as have been found extremely interesting and valuable in some of our district meetings.

I have had brought to my attention from several sources the desirability of setting aside a portion of our time at each annual meeting for something in the nature of a round-table discussion of matters of moment which might not have been discussed in any of our reports or brought before the convention by resolution. I believe that such a period of time could be provided for in one of our afternoon sessions, either by prolonging the session or by omitting the reading in full of some of our more lengthy reports which will find a place in our printed proceedings a little later on.

I am not making any recommendations with reference to this, but am merely presenting it to the convention to sound out the sentiment of the members regarding the desirability of setting aside an hour or so of our time for informal discussion. I am aware that this organization has customarily had before it some very excellent reports, showing evidence of a good deal of work in their preparation, and it is a courtesy we owe to the committees who have labored so earnestly in the interest of the association to give their reports proper consideration; but an examination of our past proceedings will disclose many very wordy documents which might easily have been condensed into a few paragraphs and have accomplished their ends quite as well.

APPLICATION FORM.

We have had under consideration a revision of our official application form and I believe the secretary has been working on such a revision. I believe that our present form could be improved upon and made a little more useful to board members. The Executive Committee, last year, accepted certain additions to the official blank and ordered the inclusion of three additional questions when the next supply of blanks were printed. These had reference to revocation of the applicant's certificate of registration in any state, the revocation of a liquor permit or narcotic tax stamp, and to whether the applicant had ever been held for violation of the pharmacy law of any state. These additions are useful ones and will be welcomed by all state secretaries.

My purpose in commenting on the application form is to suggest for inclusion in the form a suitable space for certification of graduation by a responsible official of the school from which the applicant graduated. While this might not be of material interest to the few states that have not at present prerequisite requirements, it would be useful to more than three-quarters of the states making up the membership of this organization.

It also would not be out of place for the form to carry a suitable space for a certification of experience. If this were included it might be necessary to provide two or three similar spaces, as the applicant may have acquired his experience under different employers. I believe that these several suggestions could be carried out without increasing the size of the present form. For instance, on page 2 of the present form, we provide for the moral character certification. The present set-up of that page could be materially abridged without sacrificing its intended purpose. The page would thus afford space for forms for certificates of experience. On page 4

of the present form there is plenty of room for a form for certification of graduation. With these additions a completed certificate would become a one-piece record. Under present conditions many of us have to resort to securing certificate of graduation and certificates of experience on separate forms and attaching them to the official application form. I would be glad if these suggestions were given consideration by this body, and if thought worthy of adoption to have them referred to the Executive Committee.

With reference to rerouting the application the Executive Committee, in its report last year, submitted several material objections, which seem to me to outweigh the benefits which might accrue from handling the application from certifying board directly to the recipient board, rather than have the certificate returned by the certifying board to the applicant and allowing him to then forward it to the board to which he is applying for reciprocity. It was suggested that in the few instances where tampering with the record was suspected the certifying board could be consulted for a verification of its original certification. The course suggested in the report of the Executive Committee seems to have been well considered and their attitude in the matter appears to be justifiable.

CONSOLIDATED EXAMINING BOARDS.

Due to the trend of the times, and perhaps influenced somewhat by the necessity for retrenchments in the finances of states, there still seems to be agitation here and there for more simplicity of governmental structure, and a tendency to combine boards, bureaus and departments, in the interest of what is termed economy and efficiency.

Within the past year or so there has been unusual activity looking toward measures of economy in almost all of the states, and the temptation to combine the various examining and licensing boards has been great. The actual effort during the past year has been limited by the fact that a large majority of the states did not have their law-making bodies in session during the past winter. Boards of pharmacy must be on the lookout for this type of legislation, especially during the coming year, and should oppose it vigorously whenever and wherever it is proposed. Where such legislation is adopted a politician is usually placed at the helm, and the identity of the board of pharmacy is, in most instances, lost, and an examining committee usually takes its place. Such a committee is selected by the political director of the department, often with political consideration in mind, and the results have not been happy, as we all know, where such conditions exist. It is seldom that any coöperation with the profession is forthcoming from the director. The functions of a board of pharmacy embrace many things other than the giving of examinations, and most of the usual activities of such a board are hampered or cast aside when these consolidations occur.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

For the past several years we have had in operation what we have styled our Department of Education. This activity has been carried out under a director, who has been empowered to name associates on an advisory committee. A number of bulletins have been issued covering various phases of modern developments in the pharmaceutical field. I believe it is generally conceded that these bulletins

have been of a high order and that they have been thoughtfully prepared, and that the movement generally has been a creditable one to this organization.

There has been some question regarding whether the undertaking is a justifiable enterprise. It has been expensive to the organization, the bulletins having averaged in cost something close to \$1.00 per board member per issue. The question in the minds of all of us is whether these bulletins are serving their intended purpose. That intended purpose is to convey to board members the information carried in the bulletins. The information has been prepared, printed and mailed to every board member in the country. The question arises as to whether, after all this has been done, the recipient board member takes the trouble to read or study material placed in his hands. Personally, I believe that very few of them do read these bulletins. If this is so, then our activities are largely wasted and our objective is thwarted. It appears to be something similar to the old adage that you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. We have gone a little further in our effort and have carried the water to the horses, and few of them have appeared to be thirsty.

The whole question of whether this activity is serving its intended purpose is one which must be decided by the Association. My purpose in mentioning it in this address is to emphasize the fact that regardless of whether the results of the effort have come up to our expectations or not, we have had an excellent piece of work competently handled by the director and his associates.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON PHARMACEUTICAL EDUCATION.

During the past five years we have been hopeful that a comprehensive study of pharmacy might be made and that the schools of pharmacy in the United States might be officially standardized. Reference to our records would indicate that in the summer of 1927 this organization made a substantial appropriation to be used in making a survey of pharmacy schools in this country in order that state examining boards might know which schools were worthy of recognition. The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy was later invited to join with the boards in this enterprise, and still later the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION was invited to participate. Both organizations joined in the work.

A committee, representative of these three groups, was appointed and consulted with the American Council on Education. This council furnished the group with general information about similar surveys and expressed the belief that the council might supervise a survey of pharmacy if it were requested to do so. They pointed out the cost of such a survey, and the three organizations mentioned pledged respective contributions of \$15,000 for this work, provided a like sum could be anticipated from certain foundations.

The joint committee has been able to report little more than progress, until quite recently. The contributions from the foundations have not been forthcoming, and we are to-day little further advanced in our effort to establish standards in this field than we were five years ago. With the depressed condition of business it is not reasonable to expect that we will receive financial aid from outside sources in the immediate future. In fact, it would appear that the probability of this is very remote. In the meantime we have made slow headway in an important sphere.

I am ready to suggest to this organization the advisability of abandoning any

hope of securing outside assistance, and the withdrawal from any understanding we may have with outside agencies, and continuing this effort in coöperation with the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy and the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. The financial condition of the N. A. B. P. at the present time would not warrant our adhering to making a contribution as large as \$15,000 for the purpose under discussion. It is likely that the other two organizations also feel the effects of the present depression. It seems to me that these three organizations might, through their committee, consider this matter independently of the American Council on Education, or with the advice of a representative of the council, as suggested in the report of the committee, and to formulate plans for an adequate survey, at an outlay of an aggregate of not exceeding \$25,000. It might well be that an acceptable survey could be accomplished for much less than this amount, but I suggest this as a maximum; and the burden, falling equally on each of the three organizations, would greatly lighten their obligations.

Under date of May 20, 1932, in Council Letter No. 12 of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION, the committee, representative of the three organizations, renders a report which substantially recommends that a survey of pharmacy be undertaken by the three above-named associations, and that the cost of this survey be underwritten equally by the three bodies, and that the expenditures made annually be properly budgeted. The committee suggests an expenditure of about \$1500 as a sufficient sum for the first year's work. The committee has submitted a plan, and suggested as a name for the body that of the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, and has submitted a proposed constitution and by-laws which would seem to adequately cover the subject under consideration, and to protect the interests of the participating associations. I assume that a full report will be made to this body by the committee, and hope that it will be thoroughly discussed, and recommend that the suggestions of the committee, as carried in the Council Letter, be adopted and put into effect at the earliest reasonable time.

THE FOUR-YEAR COURSE.

It is needless for me to waste words on the discussion of the merits of the four-year course in pharmacy. This course is an accomplished fact, and it starts in most of the pharmacy schools in this country in the fall of 1932. Its justification has been satisfactorily established for this Association, and for the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. The active member boards of this organization will put into effect the four-year requirement following June 1936. These member boards should now be giving thought to the matter of recognition of schools and the admission of applicants to state board examinations following the close of the college year ending in June 1936.

It is apparent that these boards should have well-worked-out admission requirements, taking into consideration the graduates under the two-year course, which was recognized until June 1928, and graduates under the three-year course, which should be recognized until June 1935, and lastly the graduates under the four-year course subsequent to June 1936.

In adopting standards for approval of schools and colleges of pharmacy giving the four-year course boards should take into consideration the kind of courses these institutions offer. Recognition should be withheld from any institution offering a

makeshift curriculum, and only such schools should receive recognition as give courses worthy of university credit. Such courses should include the basic sciences underlying pharmacy and an adequate amount of cultural work. Both the scientific and cultural training should be presented in approved manner. These courses should meet at least the minimum time requirement suggested by this organization, and no three-day or four-day a week course should be recognized, even though they cover, or more than cover, the minimum number of hours approved by this association. No school should receive approval which offers any intermediary degrees such as Ph.G. or Ph.C. for two or three years' work in the four-year course. I do not believe that a school of pharmacy offering any degree for less than the full four years should be accorded recognition. It goes without saying that recognition should be withheld from any institution offering courses in pharmacy from the present time onward of less than four years.

Unfortunately, it is yet necessary for states to establish their own list of approved schools of pharmacy. All of us, I feel sure, hope that the time will come in the near future when we may look forward to having a list of approved institutions supplied to us by our committee on the Study of Pharmacy.

EXPERIENCE UNDER THE FOUR-YEAR STANDARD.

The subject of the proper amount of experience to be required of applicants for the pharmacist examination has been debated in this body for a number of years. The basic requirement for examination and registration has been a four-year period, or 48 calendar months. The putting into operation of the four-year course in pharmacy has called forth considerable comment on what, in the shape of experience, should be demanded of the applicants for registration. It has been the expressed opinion of this body that, in addition to the four years' work in college, one year of drug store experience would ideally meet the situation.

It has come to my attention that this one year of experience has been under criticism from some sources, being spoken of as a fifth year of training. This is not necessarily so, and need not in any instance be so. The usual course in pharmacy occupies, each year, from eight to nine months, and the four-year course would occupy from thirty-two to thirty-six months, thus leaving a possible twelve months in which a student might acquire the necessary amount of experience to enable him to appear for his examination before a state board by the time he graduated in pharmacy; or if he was able to utilize only three-month periods in the summers between his college work he would be even then able to complete his experience in a period of about three months after graduation.

All of the above is academic. What I would like to point out in this connection is that the standard presented is not primarily a N. A. B. P. requirement, so far as reciprocal exchange is concerned, but is a part of the state pharmacy laws in most states and the various state boards are under obligation to enforce the provision. Some few of the states do not require any experience as a prerequisite for pharmacy licensure, and some difficulties have arisen where applicants from these states have attempted to register by reciprocity in other states which require a certain amount of experience. My own state of Virginia is among the few states which do not require experience. It is regarded by some that these few states are a step in advance of those which still require experience. It is my own personal thought that

drug store experience, as commonly acquired, is of very little value other than to help young pharmacists accustom themselves to meet the public and to deal with drug store routine. I have no faith in what has been termed supervised experience unless the facilities for controlling this are immeasurably increased. Such solution of this problem seems at the present time a rather remote contingency. We are forced by circumstances to keep our feet on the ground and to deal with conditions as we find them.

It also seems to me that there is little possibility of a large majority of the states abandoning some period of experience as a prerequisite for registration, and I believe that in the interest of uniformity it would be well for such states as do not now require any experience to shape their plans to secure legislation requiring one year of experience in addition to graduation as a prerequisite for registration. I would gladly put forth my efforts in my own state to make this concession in the interest of greater uniformity. We will never attain generally satisfactory working conditions so long as some of the states remain out of step with the majority, and it would seem to me a sensible thing if those who have attained legislation, which they regard as desirable and in advance of the majority of states, would be willing to sacrifice some little of the ground they have won, in the interest of the common welfare.

In a like manner a number of states are out of line in the opposite direction. These states also should be willing to make the effort to have their laws so amended as to contribute toward the gaining of uniformity throughout the country. Many states now require by law two and even three years of experience, in addition to requiring the applicant to be a graduate from a recognized college of pharmacy. In the light of our present conception of an equitable standard such lengthy experience periods are a hindrance to those who must submit to them, and they work in numerous instances hardships on those who apply for reciprocity from states having lower experience requirements. In instances where the experience requirement is established by board ruling, correction is easy. Where legislation must be undertaken a greater effort is necessary and a measure of patience will be required.

I would like to request all such states as have not at present the one-year experience requirement to give serious consideration to the suggestions made above. It will of course take time to work out this problem throughout the country, but if there is a willingness on the part of our member boards I feel sure that ultimately we can accomplish the desired end, just as we have accomplished many other things in this Association.

THE DEGREE GRANTED IN THE FOUR-YEAR COURSE.

In the past annals of pharmaceutical education we have had a motley assortment of degrees and near-degrees conferred by various institutions on those who have completed pharmaceutical courses. The most common certificate awarded to the graduate completing the two-year course was the somewhat questionable degree of Graduate of Pharmacy. Some schools conferred for a little additional work a degree of Pharmaceutical Chemist. Then we had such degrees as Bachelor of Pharmacy, Master of Pharmacy and Doctor of Pharmacy, all given for two, three or four years' work, and given indiscriminately. We observed the award of a doctor's degree for two years in courses and often the bachelor's degree for a like

amount of work, and the master's degree was often handed out without any additional work.

With the adoption of a standard four-year course in pharmacy the schools have rather generally come to the conclusion that the proper degree for the four years of work would be the bachelor's degree, and I believe that most of these are in favor of granting the degree of Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy. It is probably in keeping with the best style in educational circles to confer this degree, yet I have a feeling that pharmacy loses much by the adoption of such a designation for the degree it confers. The work done in a course in pharmacy is distinctive, and it differs materially from many other courses in which the bachelor's degree is earned. In my judgment it does not do pharmacy justice to designate the diploma earned by a pharmacist in a manner little different from those earned in many other unrelated branches.

I would like to see the schools of pharmacy in this country bold enough to strike out on a course somewhat independent of the lock-step procession of educators, at least to the extent of awarding a degree in pharmacy that would be distinctive. I believe that the straight step and the short step would be to award a degree of Bachelor of Pharmacy. This would be no more inconsistent than the action of the medical faculties in awarding the degree of Doctor of Medicine.

THE ASSISTANT PHARMACIST GRADE.

This Association has gone on record as favoring the discontinuance of the assistant pharmacist grade, and a good many of the states have secured legislation which will enable them to discontinue granting licensure of this type. In all such states I believe it has been the policy to preserve the constitutionality of their legislation by not making the provisions of the act retroactive, and by preserving the rights of such persons as already hold certificates of registration as assistant pharmacists. States undertaking such legislation should carefully examine their prepared bills to see that these two points are considered.

There has been an effort made in most states which have secured this type of legislation to have the legislation automatically confer on those already registered as assistant pharmacists the certificate of registration as a pharmacist, without the formality of an examination. I believe that this demand has been uniformly denied, as it should be. There is no good reason why an assistant pharmacist should be granted registration as a pharmacist without meeting the same conditions that the applicant for the pharmacist examination has to submit to, namely, an examination of a higher type than that given to the assistant applicant.

Many states which have a prerequisite law for pharmacist registration, in abolishing the assistant examination, have incorporated in their law a provision which would enable the assistant pharmacist in such states to take the pharmacist examination without the necessity of being a graduate in pharmacy. Such a provision is sometimes useful in having a law of this kind adopted in that it removes a certain amount of opposition. There would seem to be, however, no real necessity for making this concession. It is merely a matter of expediency.

I hope that the question of abolishing the assistant grade will be considered by more and more states as times goes on and that eventually we will have but one type of licensure throughout the country. In my judgment, there exists no good

reason for having a licensed assistant to the pharmacist. The policy is out of line with other professions and its continuance is not likely to reflect credit on pharmacy.

THE APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM.

In commenting on the value of the apprenticeship system in pharmaceutical training I am fully aware that in a great many states the procedure of registering apprentices and strictly keeping record of their activities is held to be valuable. I cannot agree with such states, either with reference to the value of the registration of apprentices or the effect of retaining the grade, especially now that we are entering upon the four-year training in schools of pharmacy as a prerequisite for registration.

It seems to me that in view of our effort to establish ourselves more firmly on a sound professional basis we are still clinging to a heritage which smatters more strongly of a trade than of a profession, and it is my thought that pharmacy has progressed to the point where it could, with propriety, discard this feature of pharmaceutical training. We are making headway in the work of discarding the assistant pharmacist grade, and thought should be given to devising means of abandoning the apprenticeship system in such states as still retain the system. I am aware that a good many states have already discarded this provision through legislative action or board ruling. My own state is among these, but a good many states still retain the system and regard it as valuable, and it is to these that I address my thoughts on the subject.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PHARMACY.

As a matter of record I wish to include as a paragraph of this address reference to the breaking of ground for the Pharmacy Headquarters Building in the city of Washington. Members of this body are fully informed of the conception of this monument to pharmacy, of the great amount of work that was put into the organization of the movement, and the raising of funds for the structure, and of the enthusiasm and hard work that has been contributed to the undertaking by many of the leaders in pharmacy; and it is gratifying to note the progress made to date. A large portion of the fund necessary for the erection of a headquarters edifice has already been pledged and paid in to the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. The architectural plans have been worked over for several years and are now in acceptable form, both to the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION and to the commission in the District of Columbia which has in its hands the approval of plans for such buildings as have a public or semi-public character. Our headquarters building will face the beautiful Lincoln Memorial and will be in keeping architecturally with other buildings along Constitution Avenue facing this fine memorial. Ground was broken on the afternoon of July 1, 1932, and there was gathered together in Washington for the occasion a group of some fifty or sixty persons interested in the undertaking. It was my privilege to have been present on this occasion. I believe that it is the purpose of the building committee to go ahead as fast as possible with the erection of the headquarters building, and within a few years we may look forward to being privileged to pay visits to a national headquarters of our own; for this building will surely be the one spot in America which will be looked upon as the center of pharmaceutical activity, when the plans of those who have labored so faithfully for its erection materialize.

ST. LOUIS SURVEY.

I want to take note of the comprehensive survey of the retail drug business which took place in the city of St. Louis and in its immediate vicinity under the guidance of the United States Department of Commerce, with the assistance of a committee delegated from numerous pharmaceutical organizations. I need not comment in any detail on the thoroughness of the survey nor of the value of its findings to the drug trade. I am sure that every pharmacist in America is more or less familiar with the purposes of the survey and many of its findings, some of which have already been published. I mention it in this report more as a matter of record than to make any extensive remarks about it. It is a commendable piece of work, and I believe that this organization had a part in its promotion, and I do not think that so important a piece of work should fail to be noted in the records of our Association.

PHARMACY AT CHICAGO WORLD'S FAIR.

I desire to briefly refer to the place which pharmacy has been accorded at the Chicago World's Fair in 1933. I am sure that all of our members are familiar with the general proposition that pharmacy is to be represented there in a scientific way, in addition to the numerous commercial exhibits which will be installed by manufacturers. Pharmacy will have in the Science Building one of the finest locations of any in that section of the exhibition; and arrangements are under way to put on an exhibit that will be in every sense of the word a credit to professional pharmacy.

Our own secretary has been honored with the chairmanship of the committee that has this very important duty to perform for pharmacy. He has been laboring for the past twelve months, and will have on his shoulders the burden of responsibility during the coming year of seeing that pharmacy is creditably presented to the millions who will pass our exhibit. It is, in my opinion, a good deal of an honor that the secretary of our organization was selected for this position from among the many able men in pharmacy in America. I feel that in his having received this honor the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy has likewise been honored, and I feel equally sure that the task has been entrusted to able hands, and that all American pharmacy will deem this selection a wise one when the great exposition finally is thrown open to the public.

THE CHICAGO OFFICE.

It has been customary in these annual addresses for the president to make reference to the activities in the Chicago office, and to pay tribute to the secretary and his associates; and to compliment them on the work carried on from our central office. I cannot close this address without also doing likewise, and my reference to this matter is not in any sense perfunctory. I have not had occasion to visit the Chicago office since being installed as president, but I have on several occasions previously visited this office and know that a large amount of work is disposed of there in the course of a year. Since being president I have had very tangible evidence of the varied activities carried on, and I have accumulated a rather voluminous file of only such correspondence as the secretary thought should be brought to my attention. This file contains very little of what might be styled routine business.

I have tried to keep up with the matters that were brought to my attention, and have tried to cooperate with the secretary in the solution of some of the problems that have arisen during the year. Some of these matters have required on the part of the secretary the exercising of considerable tact, and have consumed much of his time. The scope of the material that goes into our Chicago office for consideration is very large. The correspondence from that office is voluminous, and much of it requires delving into records and other forms of research that are time-consuming. Anyone familiar with the many questions that are submitted to our central office for comment and advice will appreciate the large service that this organization is rendering to pharmacy in general.

IN MEMORIAM.

It is annually the duty of the president of this organization to pay tribute in his annual address to those among our membership who have completed their earthly labors. The list this year is not small, and includes an unusually large number of active board members. Since our gathering at Miami, Florida, a little over a year ago, the following deaths have been reported:

William Britt, Alaska	Charles F. Nixon, Massachusetts
G. C. Bond, Illinois	H. C. Tindall, Missouri
Scott Kelly, Indiana	Edgar M. Hattan, Ohio
W. W. Haire, Iowa	Chas. O. Hoffman, Ohio
T. V. Campbell, Kansas	Charles F. Kramer, Pennsylvania
Addison Dimmitt, Kentucky	George E. Sherman, South Dakota
C. S. Porter, Kentucky	O. J. Nance, Tennessee
H. Lionel Meredith, Maryland	Harry S. Arrington, Virginia
David R. Millard, Maryland	Alfred Walker, West Virginia

At an appropriate time during a later session, fitting tribute will be paid these departed members.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

In further consideration of several of the matters discussed in this paper, I would like to make the following recommendations:

1. That the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy take its place in the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, and that the plan of the joint committee be given consideration, and that the constitution and by-laws proposed by the committee be adopted.
2. That a committee be appointed by the president to study the advisability of redistricting the United States for the purpose of National Association of Boards of Pharmacy activities.
3. That the extraordinary activities of this Association be discontinued until such time as our finances warrant their resumption, and also that such contributions as this Association has customarily been making to other agencies interested in pharmacy be discontinued temporarily where the Association is not under obligation to continue such contributions.

CONCLUSION.

The system under which we work out our problems quite clearly demonstrates the advantages of all joining together in laboring to attain the desired results in the form of higher standards, uniform legislation and cordial coöperation. We have made our progress in this manner, and it has been in degree far in advance of anything that could have been attained by scattered individual effort.

This Association has accomplished much for the good of pharmacy, and has great opportunities open before it to accomplish much more. Its influence is large and it has in its power the opportunity to elevate pharmacy to a respected plane and maintain it on that level.

The presidency of this body is the highest honor you have to bestow, and in closing this address I want to express to you my appreciation of the honor which has been conferred upon me. I have tried to serve satisfactorily, although my opportunities for real service have been few, and the actual work done during the year has been largely that of our central office, and of the various committees. I want to express my thanks to the associate officers and committeemen, and to the members in general.

In a short time I will be returning to the ranks, and the labors and the honors of this office will be passing into other hands. In retiring I assure you that I shall stand ready to serve the organization in the future, as I have in the past, to the best of my ability.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOARDS
OF PHARMACY.

Resolved, That the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy take its place in the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education and that the plan of the joint committee be given consideration, and that this joint committee be informed that the draft of constitution and by-laws as submitted by them is acceptable to the N. A. B. P.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed by the president to study the advisability of redistricting the United States for the purpose of N. A. B. P. activities.

Resolved, That the extraordinary activities of this Association be discontinued and also that such contributions as this Association has customarily been making to other agencies interested in pharmacy be discontinued temporarily where the Association is not under obligation to continue such contributions but only until such time as our finances warrant their resumption.

As there is a pronounced tendency to reduce the years of practical experience as a basis for registration, and as this necessarily throws an additional burden upon the colleges of pharmacy, and as it is believed that the benefits of practical pharmaceutical work are well established, *be it resolved* by the N. A. B. P. that the colleges be urged to give a greater amount of time to laboratory work in practical and operative pharmacy.

A recommendation in the Executive Committee report, which urged uniformity in the fee for registration by reciprocity and by examination with the suggestion that the fee be made \$25.00, was also adopted and referred to member states for consideration when legislative changes are contemplated. In medicine, where no attempt to maintain uniform fees has been made, a condition has resulted where, in many states, the examination fee is \$15 to \$25 and the reciprocity fee is \$75 to \$100. It is unfair to shoulder the increased cost of other activities on reciprocity.

A MESSAGE FROM SECRETARY HUGH N. LINSTEAD, BRITISH PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY.

Before we leave America, Mrs. Linstead and myself wish to express our thanks to our American friends who gave us such a kindly and hospitable welcome in the cities we visited. We came hoping to see some of your pharmaceutical buildings and of your places of historic interest. We were not only able to do this but we had the opportunity of visiting many American homes. It will be those visits even more than the things of interest we saw that we shall remember.

Some time may pass before we can write to each one. Can you find space in the JOURNAL for this very brief word of appreciation of the kindness and hospitality we have received?

Yours very truly,

HUGH N. LINSTEAD.

ADDRESS BY T. GLADSTONE HINES, PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY.

Delivered at the Toronto Meeting of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION-Canadian-Pharmaceutical Convention.

It is perhaps not entirely an easy matter to find fitting words in which at once to express our thanks for your wonderful welcome to us—the British representatives.

I wish to thank our Canadian hosts here and now not only for their courtesy in giving us this unique opportunity of meeting you (Ladies and Gentlemen), but for their abundant hospitality also.

And to you all (Ladies and Gentlemen), representing as you do, all parts of the Dominion and the great Republic across the border, I bring the most cordial greetings from my Council and the members of the Society of Great Britain.

I believe I am correct in saying that this is the first occasion of an official visit by the President of the Society of Great Britain to America. It is most appropriate, most happy on such an occasion to find gathered here, pharmacists from the whole of the Northern Continent. Those of us here from my country—Mr. Herbert Skinner, the head of the British Conference, Mr. Thomas Marns, the Chairman of our Law Committee, Mr. Hugh Linstead, the Secretary and Registrar of our Society, we all feel the distinction that falls to us of company with you. Personally, I feel it a great honor to be permitted to voice the feelings and the sentiments of your confrères of Great Britain. In addressing the Joint Convention to-day I feel that doubtless I might most usefully say something of the work and the achievements and the aims of British Pharmacy as embodied in the official organization, the Pharmaceutical Society.

Our field is Great Britain—that is, we cover and control England, Scotland and Wales. Ireland has (unfortunately, if I may be allowed to say so) two Societies of its own. We are nearly a century old—established as we were in 1841, and we are, as you will gather from my remarks, in all essential features, a truly British body. My Society is a voluntary association of men and women engaged in the many spheres of pharmaceutical activity, wholesale, retail, hospital, institutional, together with employed qualified assistants, and even embracing those in His Majesty's forces.

The work of controlling and directing this national organization falls upon an elected voluntary Council of 21 members supported by a host of voluntary scientific workers drawn from the members—the universities and the allied educational colleges.

I am not sure that we are not something rather unusual even for Great Britain. In essence, we are a Voluntary Department of State—we are unusual in that we function under the control of that curious survival, the King's Privy Council. We educate, we train, we examine men and women to act as pharmacists. We supervise a section of research and scientific work and, not least, we act as a state policeman. At the same time we are not a State Department as it is understood, and have no funds from the State for the carrying on of what are, in effect, public and national services. We provide and regulate our own finances. We are rather proud of the services we thus render which include also active coöperation with the Ministries of the Govern-

ment—the Health, the Home, the Agricultural Departments and so on, together with the General Medical Council. An official enquiry into our work, recently undertaken, disclosed the gratifying fact that we did our job efficiently and satisfactorily.

You may appreciate from these points that we are an ethical society. We are not concerned with business affairs and organizations as such. In reality we are expressly barred by a high legal decision from so acting. We provide the men and women, we believe well educated and well trained from a pharmaceutical point of view, to give the community what it needs for that purpose. Our affair, therefore, may be summed up in a sentence—it is the status and the standard of the British pharmacist. So the work and the aims of my Society consist in constantly following the needs of our nation, a meticulous regard for the changes in medical outlook and treatment, all the phases of the development of legal enactments and social services, and in all those things we still adhere to the traditional objects of the founders of our Society.

In the first place it falls to us to set a standard of training in chemistry and pharmacy. That is achieved in a coördinated system based on a definite standard of primary education. The next stage of pure scientific lectures and practical work is given in a large number of schools and colleges which conform to conditions laid down by us. A great deal of actual personal inspection is done by the members of our own Council.

The work for final parts of the Qualifying Examinations again must be undertaken in schools and colleges approved by the Council. Our control, therefore, is very real and I think very thorough.

I lay very great stress on a true Pharmaceutical training—that is, in pure pharmacy—what one might call hand and eye training. We have recently taken powers to lay down conditions under which such pharmaceutical training shall be given. As you may be aware, we call such training “pupilage” and it may be taken in a wholesale manufacturing laboratory, a pharmacy, or in any of large or small hospitals and allied institutions. Specific conditions either have been or will be enforced in all these places.

Personally, I attach the utmost importance to this phase of our work. Efficient and thorough pharmaceutical training is the keystone of the arch. Our own Headquarters in London includes in its ambit our own College of Pharmacy which has a history and a record of no small importance. In the Dean of the School and the head of our research department, Professor Greenish, we have a scientist we delight to honor. The enforcement of legal standards in respect of the important glandular products led to the establishment by the Society, some few years ago, of our Pharmacological Laboratories. I commend to you the important researches embraced in the Annual Reports and in our *Quarterly Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology*.

Again we have a section given over to the assistance of the General Medical Council for coöperative reports in the compilation of The British Pharmacopœia. This opens up much that I might say to the Convention but I especially hope that my colleague, Mr. Skinner, may cover some of this highly important field to our mutual advantage. Then, too, in the matter of the administration of the Pharmacy Acts some of you will have the opportunity of hearing the Chairman, Mr. Marns. He will, I am sure, most adequately deal with that side of our functions.

I have said nothing yet of our Benevolent Funds. It was one of the original objects of the founders of our Society to provide funds for the relief of distressed members—for widows and for orphans. That tender regard for the perils of ill-fortune has been most rightly cherished throughout the history of our Society. Two Committees of the Council are engaged on this—the General Benevolent Committee and the special War Auxiliary Committee. Substantial funds are at their disposal accruing from invested money and annual subscriptions. The whole of these amounts are expended in necessary relief, all charges being borne by the main administration costs. Beyond all these specific things we hold a sort of watching brief to protect and promote the general interests of our 15,000 and more members. A very active life, I do assure you. And all this activity centers round London and Edinburgh. Scotland has its own Executive—its own resident Secretary—its own Headquarters and its own Board of Examiners to conduct examinations in Edinburgh.

So far as the central London administration is concerned, that is in the very able hands of Mr. Linstead. But no reference to London would be complete without an expression of my high admiration for the efficiency of that admirably organized staff. Both Mr. Linstead and his second in command, Mr. Adams, are not merely pharmaceutical chemists, but both are Barrister's-at-law.

That in itself speaks volumes for the quality of the men and the quality of the services they render to the Society—to its Council and to its President.

Our publications: *The Pharmaceutical Journal*, *The Quarterly Journal of Pharmacy & Pharmacology* and *The British Pharmaceutical Codex*, in particular, demand far more than a fleeting reference—but time, like an ever-rolling stream, is bearing me away.

I have attempted an all too sketchy survey of some of the salient facts and features of your opposite number in Great Britain—a bird's eye view, in fact.

Its policy can be summed up in its functions as I have stated them—to develop a highly trained personnel, a high organized section allied and complimentary to the medical services. The Council responsible for this is a serious-minded body of men giving freely of their time and energies to this form of public service.

Now, if you will bear with me for a few minutes longer, I want to bring my remarks to a close on a broader note. All of us assembled here are conscious of the stress and strain through which the whole world is passing. I want, if you will permit me, to emphasize the real value of these personal contacts which can but create an atmosphere of kinder relationship truly and broadly based on peace and good-will between all men. We all realize the crying need for a sane international outlook. As a public man, I welcome the opportunity to add my humble quota. Will you allow me to express the hope that every delegate present will return to his (or her) home town and city, firmly resolved to carry such tenets into practical effect. We represent a peace-loving nation speaking with you a common tongue, and we are not here merely to promote a common pharmaceutical accord, but, in our small way, a very real friendship between the great nations we unitedly represent.

I close, as I began (Ladies and Gentlemen), offering you our thanks, offering a real regard for a closer measure of coöperation between your Associations and my Society. Individually and collectively I extend to you my grateful appreciation of such a kindly and sympathetic hearing.

Other addresses will be published in later issues of the JOURNAL.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT G. A. BURBIDGE OF THE CANADIAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.

Delivered at the Toronto Meeting of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION—
Canadian-American Pharmaceutical Convention.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the presidential address to our Canadian Association it was appropriate that I should deal with certain problems as they relate to Canadian Pharmacy. I trust that I may now be permitted to discuss a few of these questions in a more general way.

The Canadian Pharmaceutical Association, as you all well know, is a federation of our Provincial statutory pharmaceutical bodies with the object of correlating their efforts in all matters pertaining to their common interests. Its functions are varied and are related to any and every matter that touches Pharmacy that may expediently come within the scope of such an organization. This consolidation is necessary with us because of our comparatively small numbers. Having only some thirty-five hundred druggists in Canada we cannot maintain, even if we thought it advisable, a multiplicity of organizations as is found in Pharmacy in the United States. The general sessions of our Conventions deal as occasion arises with historical, legislative, educational, examinational, administrative or commercial questions. Hence, in an address such as I am permitted to give to-day, there are no limitations as to subject matter. I shall, however, confine my remarks to a few points and in the good old clerical fashion will divide what I have to say under three heads; historical, educational and commercial; with the emphasis, perhaps, on the last.

THE HISTORY OF PHARMACY AND ITS VALUE.

The history of Pharmacy has been exhaustively and most interestingly written by Dr. Charles H. LaWall; the progress of Pharmacy in Great Britain has been recorded by Bell and Redwood and others. We, in Canada, are making an effort to gather up some fragments of our

pharmaceutical history for the day when some one with a gifted pen will make of it an interesting and profitable story.

We have not escaped criticism for this effort. We have been told that we should be too busy making history to be bothered with writing it or even reading it. That is a wrong attitude. It is an inspiration to read of the accomplishments of pharmacists of bygone days, an inspiration to do something for the advancement of science and for the application of science to the improvement of health. We are made to realize that the true measure of our lives is the *unselfish* service which we render our several communities and the world at large, the service which is rendered without hope of gain or reward.

When we read the history of Pharmacy we gain in respect for our vocation; we find an antidote for the professional inferiority-complex with which some of us are afflicted.

We find that the problems we are discussing to-day are not new problems; that much wisdom has been poured out in their discussion in bygone years. It is intensely interesting to read the addresses and papers presented to our associations some twenty years ago. It would be a mistake to discourage any appropriate contribution, but surely it would be better if every contribution were prepared with some knowledge of previous contributions on the same subject; this is the scientific method.

In reply to those who say that we should be too busy making history to be bothered about history, may we not suggest that perhaps it would be better if every man who is called upon to make history, were obliged to study history first.

EDUCATIONAL OUTLOOK.

No drug convention is complete without a discussion of the time-honored question—"What is the future of Pharmacy?" History tells us that since the dawn of civilization, Pharmacy has had a service to render; it assures us that short of the millenium, there will always be need for pharmaceutical service, and that it will be rendered by some one, if not by those calling themselves pharmacists, then by others.

When I started my apprenticeship I was told that I was foolish, that Pharmacy was pretty nearly down and out. Well, Pharmacy is still on its feet. The drug business has been good to me. I like it and if I had another chance, I would again choose Pharmacy. And yet we all know how much Pharmacy has changed in the past two generations. We do not need to be told how statutory pharmacy lost first the wholesale trade, then the manufacturing, and that now the hospitals threaten the extinction of what remains of professional pharmacy in the drug stores.

We may deplore the shortsightedness or supineness of those who in earlier days permitted the wholesale and the factory to become independent of Pharmacy Acts, but we must recognize the fact that the statutory bodies that to-day are restricting registration to those actively engaged in retail drug business are perpetuating the same mistake. We may have traveled too far to remedy this situation except in respect to hospitals. Here we have a clear right to insist on the application of the Pharmacy Acts. The public within the hospital should have the same pharmaceutical protection as outside. In many hospitals they are not so protected.

But I do not believe it is too late to change our policy in respect to the wholesale and manufacturing fields. I believe that statutory pharmacy *should* welcome to its membership all qualified pharmacists no matter in what field of pharmaceutical work they may be engaged. There is need for consolidating the profession of pharmacy. Pharmaceutical manufacturing, wholesale distribution of drugs, and hospital dispensing should be done by pharmacists. These fields should be open to and indeed, as far as expedient, *reserved* for the graduates of our pharmacy schools.

The recognized scope and functions of Pharmacy are of tremendous importance to our statutory organizations and of grave concern to our colleges whose function it is to maintain pharmaceutical service.

This leads us to a question about our colleges. Are they providing courses that will prepare their graduates for the kind of pharmaceutical service that may be required of them in the next two or three decades? It is the duty of our colleges to train for such service, no matter in what field it may be performed; it is not their function to make retail druggists, but to train pharmacists.

One cannot but be glad that our colleges are raising their standards, and the fact that in

so doing they have the support of the craft at large is a most helpful sign. Ability, training and culture are the things that should count in our graduating classes, not mere numbers. It is in the interest of the public as well as of the profession that the over-dilution of Pharmacy be stopped.

Pharmacy, that is, what we refer to as professional pharmacy, is said to be the handmaid of Medicine. *That* in the nature of things, it must always be. In framing our curricula, therefore, it should be our constant aim to approach closer to Medicine, to become more proficient in those medical sciences which enable the pharmacist to know and understand the vocabulary of the medical man, and to appreciate his needs; to keep posted as to the progress of Medicine; and to become skilful in those services which it may be appropriate for pharmacy to render to medicine.

Our curricula should be aimed to meet future opportunities rather than to perpetuate traditional materials and methods. If I were to say that no Pharmacy school should be conducted except in close affiliation with a school of Medicine, there are doubtless many, whose opinions on other points I highly esteem, who would strongly disagree with me. Nevertheless, as a general policy of pharmaceutical education I think such a stand well taken. It is only by contact with Medical schools that we can hope to adjust our teaching to the changing world of Medicine.

It is better to give our students a broad training in the pure sciences and in medical sciences than to provide them with courses having *entirely* a pharmaceutical direction. This is true both for future usefulness and for cultural reasons.

I doubt that there is any better course from a purely educational point of view, taking both head and hand into consideration, than the combined Pharmacy and Bachelor of Science course. The cultural value of the course has a strong appeal, and I think we would do well to stress that value rather than over-emphasize its utilitarian features. After all, as has been often said, the chief purpose of any educational course is to teach how to live rather than how to make a living.

While all this is profoundly true, there is a field, perhaps a comparatively limited one, which is peculiarly our own; the Science and Art of Pharmacy—knowledge of drugs and skill in compounding them. I wonder if we are succeeding in imparting this sort of an education. A year or two ago I was asked if I could recommend a young man as a "formula man" for one of our manufacturing houses; some one to devise new formulas and improve old formulas in a pharmaceutical way. Evidently what was wanted was a practical pharmaceutical chemist and pharmacist, one who could successfully solve difficulties in regard to *consistence, appearance and flavor*. I was unable to do so. Every Pharmacy college in Canada may have had the same request; I don't know about that but I do know that the position is not yet filled, and it is a good position so far as salary goes. It is strange that among all the Pharmacy graduates of the past two or three years, that not one can be found capable of filling such a position or willing to accept it. And yet it is not so strange when we come to think of it. Practically all, if not all, of our students come from drug stores, and the drug store to-day appeals chiefly to those with the commercial instinct; and it develops that instinct rather than the scientific. There are very few opportunities in the drug store to-day for a boy to learn the science and art of Pharmacy. For most candidates the only place to acquire that science and art is the College. Do we, while providing a broad scientific and cultural education, at the same time impart real practical knowledge and skill in the art of compounding? I do not mean dispensing, I mean the art of building up pharmaceutical formulas. Are we content with teaching our students simply how to dispense prescriptions and make galenicals? Do we carry them far enough to conduct research in pharmaceutical formulas? To how many of our graduates would we entrust a pharmaceutical problem about a pharmacopoeial preparation, or about a toilet preparation? Should this be so, or should it not be the goal of our pharmacy laboratory work? Time was when every pharmacist conducted experiments of this kind. The younger generation seems helpless judging from the problems sent in to the college from the drug store. We welcome these problems; they are just what we need, but in some cases at least the very fact that they are problems to the drug store, shows a deficiency in the drug store.

I am speaking of conditions in my own territory, and I strongly suspect throughout Canada. Of course I cannot speak of conditions elsewhere.

A striking evidence of the lack of compounding in the drug store is found in the difficulty in procuring from ordinary wholesale houses suitable material for pharmaceutical manufacturing.

One almost suspects that the big manufacturers skim the cream of the market and leave the refuse for the supply of the druggists.

One need not point out again, as has so often been done, the danger to the future of retail pharmacy in this failure to practice the Art of Pharmacy.

As for our Colleges they must not be turned aside from their duty no matter how bad the condition may be in retail pharmacy. As I have already said, and I am sure you will agree with me, it is the duty of Colleges of Pharmacy to teach Pharmacy, no matter in what field pharmacy may be practiced.

COMMERCIAL CONDITIONS.

We are not allowed to forget, however, that Pharmacy is a business as well as a profession. Most of us are painfully aware of this fact. The retail pharmacist has all the problems of other retailers, plus.

His merchandising problems are, nevertheless, the same as other retailers. It is probably because of his superior talents or enterprise that the pharmacist is taking the lead in combating predatory price cutting, or it may be that his higher business costs compel him to do so. The pharmacists of Great Britain gave the lead, and now all over this continent retail druggists are fighting this evil. As old as the hills and the subject of discussion for many years, the problem has been seriously attacked on this continent only within the past decade. In the States an uphill battle is being fought over the Capper-Kelly Bill. We in Canada made a strenuous effort to adopt the P. A. T. A. of our English brethren.

The English law is different from that now prevailing on this continent. Combining in trade defense is recognized there as perfectly legitimate. This was well illustrated in some observations of Viscount Haldane when as Lord Chancellor he was discussing a case before the Privy Council in 1914. He went so far as to say that: "The mere fact that the result of a trade combination is to advance prices is not necessarily opposed to public policy. A combination to advance prices so as to give proper remuneration to labor and capital is *prima facie* lawful." Again: "although cheapness may be a desideratum, a ruinous competition between traders is not to the public advantage." Coming from such an authority as Viscount Haldane, a statesman as well as the leading British jurist of his day, and endorsed by the other Lords of the Privy Council, surely these statements should carry weight. The report of the Federal Trade Commission of the United States in 1931 is in striking contrast.

To say that nothing has been accomplished on this continent in these campaigns against predatory price cutting, that all effort and money expended have been a waste, would be a mistake. To what extent they have exerted a steadying influence upon business we may not know, but it is probably true that they have to a considerable extent. It is certain that the attention of legislators and economists has been directed to a fresh study of this problem, and that an educative influence has been started which may bear fruit in due time.

We are forced to recognize that no effective legislative measures against predatory price cutting can be secured unless and until it is conceded by the legislatures and the courts that stabilization of retail prices is a good policy in the interest of trade and commerce as a whole and not detrimental in the long run to the consumer.

We must recognize that what we ask for ourselves must be conceded to all other retailers. If our branded articles are to be price-stabilized, all other branded goods will be subject to the same rule, and there is scarcely a commodity that cannot be branded. If we demand price protection for ourselves we must be willing to pay protected prices to other merchants, as indeed in many cases we already do. The whole question of distribution of commodities is involved. The problem is enormous. Some of the fundamental teachings of economists must be changed and a new viewpoint taken as to the laws of competition. Much good work is now being done in the collection of data bearing on the problem of wholesale and retail trade, especially by the National Wholesale Druggists' Association of the United States. Such data to be of real value should be not only fairly representative, but should be wisely and impartially interpreted, and should be available to governmental and independent economists. One has the feeling that much of the trade matter published in our Journals advancing this or that trade policy has been propaganda for the manufacturer and wholesaler, and was not written in the interests of the retailer to whom it was addressed. However this may be, there is a real need for greater study of trade problems with a view to the interests of the retailer and the public.

It would be of advantage to the retail trade to employ a corps of capable persons to collect data respecting the whole question of distribution, to offset biased statements made by economists who are in the employ of other interests. This is a tremendously large order, I know, but Big Business employs lawyers, economists and publicity experts, and independent merchants should join forces to do likewise.

The present objective is price stabilization. This may be defined as the adjusting of prices from time to time in order to maintain a margin which will meet selling costs and provide the dealer with a reasonable profit. This is the policy which the retail drug trade is seeking to establish by public consent and by legislative enactment. Is it a sound policy, a policy in the interest of the public? We assuredly believe that it is, but we have to admit that our case is not yet so strongly made out, we have not marshalled sufficient facts and arguments as to convince our respective legislatures.

A time of depression such as we are now undergoing may seem to be an unfortunate time for such a discussion, but that is not so; in times of prosperity we are apt to be careless, but in times of adversity we consider the error of our ways. So in matters of national economies. There is no better time than now to prepare the distributors' argument and put it before the public.

How trade may be stabilized is the present-day problem of economists. The Empire Trade Conference seriously discussed how wholesale price levels may be raised. In a recent letter a prominent economist referred to predatory price cutting as a practice to which sound objection can be raised.

The old idea that cheapness of living, a consumer's paradise is the great desideratum, is gone. The peculiar and exasperating thing about the situation is that while the government concerns itself with the welfare of the producer, the manufacturer and the transportation agencies, it fails to regard the welfare of the distributor. Among those who serve in supplying the world with its commodities from the original source of supply to the ultimate consumer, distributors constitute the one class that is debarred from favorable consideration. It is true that our position is strategically better than in former generations when the very word "merchant" was used as a term of opprobrium, the "tradesman" was a sort of inferior being, and the "middleman" was marked for elimination. While our position is infinitely better than in the long ago we are still working against a current as old as civilization itself, and which is not entirely spent even in this democratic age.

Distributors would raise no objection to distribution working out its own salvation if it were permitted to do so without undue restrictions. We do not object in the main to Section 498 of the Criminal Code of Canada and to the Combines Investigation Act, but we do most strenuously object to their application in such a way as to foster the department store, the coöperative and the chain and to drive the independent retailer out of business.

Theodore Roosevelt is quoted as having said that "a hundred little farm owners are far more valuable to a nation than one large plantation owner." I would paraphrase that quotation—"a hundred little shopkeepers are far more valuable to a nation than one large department store." And another Roosevelt has more recently said: "It seems to be the curse of our modern civilization to do away with small business and put control into the hands of a few big men." A recent article in the *British Pharmaceutical Journal* says: "the proper ordering of distribution—a vital factor in the cost of living—is of paramount importance to the nation."

Distribution cannot be eliminated. It must be carried on by some one and no one has yet demonstrated that the department store, the chain or the coöperative is on the whole capable of rendering a better or more economical service than the independent retailer.

It is not fair to give the corporation special prices and quantity discounts which are not justifiable on a cost basis, and then say that the independent dealer cannot render an economical service. Let there be an equitable adjustment of wholesale prices and the independent retailer will more than hold his own.

Retail predatory price cutting is but one symptom of an immoral trade condition, which if not rectified may lead to an undesirable industrial revolution. Preferential price lists, secret prices, hidden discounts and undue quantity discounts are just as injurious to fair trading as retail price cutting; they are predatory price cutting in the wholesale field. In fact these forms of wholesale price cutting are the chief cause of retail price cutting, since it is such considerations

that give the department store, the chain and the big cutter the advantage over the independent dealer. If you equalize wholesale prices you do much toward effectually stabilizing retail prices. It is the pressure from behind, the greed of the manufacturer, his high pressure salesmanship, choking the markets, that is the cause of most of our present-day commercial troubles.

May I again point out that the discussion of unfair trade practices among ourselves will not carry us to our goal; the public, the legislature and the courts must be convinced of the wisdom of price stabilization and consent to its enforcement.

REPORT OF THE FAIRCHILD SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATION.

In 1927 the Chairman was requested to report on the Fairchild Scholarship winners. The report was made in 1928 on candidates up to and including the year 1928. The winner in 1929 was Herbert Marain of Rutgers University College of Pharmacy. The winner of 1930 was Solomon Gershon of the College of Pharmacy, University of Illinois, and the Chairman understands he continued post-graduate work. Louis Magid won the 1931 prize, a student of Florida University; he has been doing post-graduate work. The Chairman has not continued these investigations of the earlier candidates, but will do so if requested.

While a committee was appointed, at the request of the Chairman, by President Townes R. Leigh, to study the Fairchild Scholarship examinations and report on a method for carrying on these examinations, he has taken the liberty of making some notations covering a period of ten years. The new edition of the Syllabus is about ready for publication, or will be very soon and should form a basis for future examinations. The interim, *i. e.*, the requirements of the members of the American Association of Colleges have changed somewhat from the last edition of the Syllabus.

The Chairman was instructed that there should be no restriction as to the number of years included in a course of pharmacy, the question having specifically been asked whether limitations should be made relative to preliminary qualifications, except that the admission shall be the requirements for a student of a school or college of pharmacy of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy and that he shall have completed the course in pharmacy, and that there was no intermission in his studies in pharmacy—see report of 1922.

There were 14 candidates in 1922—the highest general average was 89.25. In 1923 there were 24 candidates—the highest average was 88.75, the lowest average 46; the general average 76. In 1924 there were 24 candidates—the lowest general average was made in pharmacy. The highest average was 83.45; the lowest percentages were Chemistry 38, Pharmacy 30, Arithmetic 43, Botany, etc., 37. In 1925 there were 33 candidates—the highest average was 85. In 1926 there were 20 candidates—the highest average was 88.75; the lowest, 38. In 1927 there were 13 candidates—the highest general average was 90; the lowest, 33. In 1928 there were 33 candidates—the highest average was 94; the lowest, 47.88. In 1929 there were 31 candidates—the highest average was 89.75; the lowest, 36.75. In 1930 there were 37 candidates—the highest 79.75; the lowest, 46.30. The general average in Bacteriology—Physiology was 78; the lowest candidate made 51.5; the lowest in Chemistry less than 27; in Arithmetic 25; the highest in Arithmetic, 100. In 1931 there were 40 candidates; the highest average was 92.4; the lowest, 44.5; in Therapeutics-Bacteriology the highest was 93; the lowest 49; four averaged 100 in Pharmaceutical Arithmetic; the lowest made 25; the highest record in Chemistry was 96; the lowest, 27. Dean Bergy graded the examinations.

The general plan was followed this year in letters to the members of the Committee and also in writing to the deans; several were ready to prepare questions for the Committee. It should, perhaps, be stated that conditions at the time it is necessary to have the questions prepared are sometimes different and, hence, there is encroachment on time which lays the Committee on greater obligations to the dean accepting of this work. We are, therefore, under greater obligations to Dean Bergy for responding to our request; as stated, he generously helped us out last year by grading the examinations. Dean C. B. Jordan, who had prepared the examinations in 1930, aided us by grading the examinations this year. To both Dean Bergy and Dean Jordan we express our thanks, realizing that it requires time and, perhaps, when other duties are heavy. It should be understood that we request the favors from faculties of schools having no candidates.

The Deans are familiar with the letters sent out in recent years and therefore they will not be repeated.

Twenty-nine candidates took the examinations and nineteen schools were represented.

The subjects were Pharmaceutical Chemistry, U. S. P. Assay and Testing, Organic Chemistry, Physiology, Materia Medica and Botany, Bacteriology, General Pharmacy, Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics.

The results of the first nineteen candidates are tabulated:

	Phar. Chem.	U. S. P. Assay and Testing.	Organic Chemistry.	Physi- ology.	Materia Medica and Botany.	Bacteri- ology.	General Phar- macy.	Toxicology and Pharma- codynamics.	Aver- ages.
1.	82.90	98.00	85.00	73.00	85.50	67.67	64.00	72.00	78.51
2.	76.20	88.00	77.00	66.00	85.40	66.60	69.00	76.00	75.27
3.	72.60	86.00	73.00	70.00	87.20	49.67	91.00	57.00	73.31
4.	73.90	98.00	65.00	79.00	76.00	30.67	50.00	60.00	66.57
5.	88.00	96.00	55.00	48.00	89.20	44.00	55.00	49.00	65.52
6.	76.40	72.00	47.00	91.00	81.60	29.50	64.00	59.00	65.06
7.	84.40	78.00	57.00	78.00	67.80	32.20	60.00	48.00	64.17
8.	76.00	82.00	51.00	58.00	82.60	52.00	57.00	46.00	63.07
9.	83.40	94.00	87.00	45.00	82.90	48.67	30.00	31.00	62.74
10.	62.00	78.00	48.00	70.00	73.90	31.00	60.00	45.00	58.49
11.	57.50	86.00	29.00	60.00	82.90	46.50	50.00	45.00	57.11
12.	58.30	82.00	47.00	65.00	78.70	20.00	56.00	47.00	56.75
13.	71.40	82.00	36.00	46.00	76.10	25.34	57.00	48.00	55.23
14.	70.00	86.00	66.00	53.00	62.70	22.67	36.00	45.00	55.17
15.	74.20	76.00	38.00	56.00	70.80	20.00	60.00	43.00	54.75
16.	73.80	70.00	33.00	65.00	79.20	23.75	35.00	58.00	54.72
17.	51.20	72.00	37.00	71.00	82.90	26.34	51.00	37.00	53.55
18.	70.10	80.00	45.00	63.00	74.40	11.00	35.00	41.00	52.44
19.	62.20	80.00	38.00	32.00	82.50	11.00	42.00	60.00	50.96

The general averages for the nineteen candidates are: Pharmaceutical Chemistry, 71.81; U. S. P. Assay and Testing 83.36; Organic Chemistry, 53.36; Physiology, 62.57; Materia Medica and Botany, 79.06; Bacteriology, 34.66; General Pharmacy, 53.78; Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics, 50.89.

The first candidate in general average, 78.51, was 4th in Pharmaceutical Chemistry, 82.90; tied in U. S. P. Assay and Testing, 98; was 2nd in Organic Chemistry, 85; was 4th in Physiology, 73; 3rd in Materia Medica and Botany, 85.50; highest in Bacteriology, 67.67; ranked 3rd with another in General Pharmacy, 64; 2nd in Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics, 72.

The second had a general average of 75.27; was 6th in Pharmaceutical Chemistry, 76.20; 4th in U. S. P. Assay and Testing, 88; 3rd in Organic Chemistry, 77; 7th in Physiology, 66; 4th in Materia Medica and Botany, 85.40; 2nd in Bacteriology, 66.6; 2nd in General Pharmacy, 69; 1st in Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics, 76.

The third candidate was 10th in Pharmaceutical Chemistry, 72.60; 4th in U. S. P. Assaying and Testing, 86; 4th in Organic Chemistry, 73; 6th in Physiology, 70; 3rd in Materia Medica and Botany, 87.20; 4th in Bacteriology, 49.67; 1st in General Pharmacy, 91; 5th in Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics, 57.

The fourth candidate had a general average of 66.57; was 8th in Pharmaceutical Chemistry, 73.90; ranked with the first in U. S. P. Assaying and Testing, 98; 6th in Organic Chemistry, 65; 2nd in Physiology, 79; 13th in Materia Medica and Botany, 76; 10th in Bacteriology, 30.67; ranked 9th with another in General Pharmacy, 50; 3rd with two others in Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics, 60.

Calculations were made as to the effect on general average of the first four of the candidates if Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics had been omitted from the examinations; all would have improved their respective averages. The general averages of the first four were 78.51, 75.27, 73.31, 66.57.

If Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics had been omitted from the examination the third

man would have had a very slight advantage over the second; the averages would have been 79.44, 75.33, 75.6, 67.3. The places would not have been changed if Bacteriology had been omitted; the averages would be 80, 76.80, 76.6, 71.70. If both of the subjects had been omitted the third candidate would have advanced to second place, otherwise no change in place; the averages would be 81, 76.80, 79.9, 73.6.

(It should be stated that in the branches indicated the curricula of schools differ. The new edition of the Pharmaceutical Syllabus is now being completed.)

The fifth candidate made good averages in Pharmaceutical Chemistry, U. S. P. Assay and Testing, and Materia Medica, but his averages would not have advanced him above any of the first four, if Bacteriology, Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics had been omitted. The ninth candidate made good averages in four subjects, but the results would not have been changed sufficiently to bring him in the class of the first four.

The fifth candidate was highest in Pharmaceutical Chemistry, 88; the ninth candidate was highest in Organic Chemistry, 87; the sixth candidate was highest in Physiology, 91; the first candidate was highest in Bacteriology, 67.67; the third candidate was highest in General Pharmacy, 91; the second candidate was highest in Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics, 76. Thus the first were: Candidate 5 in Pharmaceutical Chemistry; candidate nine in Organic Chemistry; candidate 6 in Physiology; candidate 1 in Bacteriology; candidate 3 in General Pharmacy and candidate 2 in Toxicology and Pharmacodynamics. Schools having two candidates can hardly be compared for very close grading, although comparison might be made of some subjects in which there is related efficiency—this, however, was not undertaken.

Committee:

WALTER D. ADAMS, President, A. P. H. A.
 TOWNES R. LEIGH, President, A. A. C. P.
 A. L. I. WINNE, President, N. A. B. P.
 E. G. EBERLE, *Chairman*, JOURNAL, A. P. H. A.

THE WINNER OF THE FAIRCHILD SCHOLARSHIP FOR 1932.



JULIUS MESSINA.

Julius Messina, of Baltimore, won the Fairchild Scholarship for 1932. He graduated from the Baltimore Polytechnic Institute in 1929 and matriculated at the School of Pharmacy of the University of Maryland, August 10, 1929, graduating from this institution June 4, 1932. He passed the Theoretical Board in June 1932.

In 1931 Mr. Messina was awarded the Membership Prize of the Baltimore Branch of the A. P. H. A. He received the second Certificate of Honor from his Alma Mater in June 1932. He is a member of Rho Chi.

The Fairchild Scholarship is awarded by competitive examination to a student of a College of Pharmacy, member of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. The scholarship has a value of \$500.00. The money is to be used in post-graduate work at any school of pharmacy the winner may select and Mr. Messina has selected his Alma Mater. The scholarship was founded by Samuel W. Fairchild of New York.

This year twenty-nine students competed, representing nineteen schools.

Mr. Messina was born in Baltimore, August 23, 1911, the son of Frank and Concetta Messina.