

tical art. They pursued the prescribed course of studies, took the state examinations and received their diplomas which put them on an equal footing with their lay colleagues; and the adjustment was a happy one, as is proved by the excellence maintained in the conventual dispensaries in our day, both in Europe and in America.

A LAYMAN'S POINT OF VIEW.*

GOVERNOR W. S. HAMMOND, OF MINNESOTA.

It gives me great pleasure to come here this morning at the very beginning of your deliberations to bid you welcome, to greet you, and to express the hope that the work that you do here may be of benefit to the Pharmacists of the State, to the Pharmacists of the United States and to all the people with whom in your various capacities you come in contact. The pharmacist is a great deal more than the apothecary of old or the druggist of even more recent days. There was a time when the apothecary shop, the drug store, was a sort of gather-as-you-please place to gossip over the events of the day and incidentally and between times to compound various medicinal preparations. The work of the apothecary was a particular and technical kind of work and there was so little of it that the compensation was necessarily quite large. But there has come a great change in recent years. The pharmacist is the scientific man as was the apothecary of old. He is the technical compounder, the registered druggist, but he is more of a business man than his predecessors were, and because of that fact the people, those who trade with the pharmacist, have been the gainers. The whole calling itself seems to have taken on another form. I imagine there is not so much compounding to-day as there was a few years ago. Great pharmaceutical establishments do a great deal of the work that the old-time apothecary did. Now, under these changing conditions, it is very, very advisable, it seems to me, that there be frequent meetings for communication of ideas and thoughts relating to the business among the pharmacists of the state. The average pharmacist has become somewhat of a business man; he has always been to some extent a business man, but I am inclined to think that to-day he is more of a business man than professional man, while sometime ago, he was more of the professional man than the business man. Now, is there any danger growing out of this? Is there anything that you ought to think about in connection with this change, if I am correctly advised and my conclusions are warranted by the facts? It would be unfortunate if this old time-honored profession should become merely business. So much of the sentiment, so much of the romance would be taken away that we might feel somewhat sad at the change, but more than mere sentiment, more than mere romance—it would be another development of the dollar idea. I admire the successful business man. We cannot but be astonished at the great efforts of the captains of industry. We like the strong, pushing, virile business men who start with little or nothing, and build up gigantic enterprises, but they are business men. We

* Address delivered before the Thirty-First Annual Convention of the Minnesota State Pharmaceutical Association, February 9, 1915,—St. Paul, Minn.

would not want our lawyers, our doctors, our apothecaries, our clergymen, to be distinguished principally as mere business men. We like to have them remain in the realm of professionalism, and be as great and as useful in professional work as others are in the business field. Now, I trust that with these great houses compounding so many of the things that the apothecaries themselves compounded not many years ago, that we will not have a change in this line of work, and that the apothecary may remain the professional instead of the business man, realizing, of course, the necessity of good judgment and of business skill in the conduct of any business enterprise. There are very important matters connected with pharmacy that are wholly unrelated to the mere question of bookkeeping and income and outgo. We are all interested, and you are particularly interested, in the legislation tending to restrict the use of noxious drugs. Here is a line of endeavor that of course should be absolutely divorced from the business end of the work. Here is a question that appeals to you as professional men and as men who desire to adapt their profession to the best interests of their brothers and sisters, and any attempt, I fear, to connect this kind of legislation with the business end of the pharmacist's occupation and profession would tend to detract from the high professional standard that the apothecary has always had, and that the modern pharmacist should endeavor to maintain. I am not a pharmacist, but a mere observer. I have spoken simply as a layman in a general way. My purpose in coming here was not to deliver a lecture. I could not hope to impart advice to men and women like yourselves who have studied the subject for years, but I may in a way represent the layman who looks upon the pharmacist as the majority of laymen do—who wishes him well and desires to see the time-honored and highly-respected profession maintain all that is good in it, and push on to high and better results. I welcome this body here this morning. I repeat my greeting. I trust that you will accomplish much for yourselves and much for the benefit of your profession throughout the state and country. I thank you.

THE HARRISON ACT.

F. H. FREERICKS.

All comprehensive narcotic legislation is of comparatively recent origin. The first state in the Union to pass a law governing the sale of cocaine was New York, only twenty-three years ago. This was followed within the next five or six years by similar laws in all of the states. It is with considerable pride that we note all of these laws, as enacted in the various states, to have their origin with, or to have been enacted because of the strong support which they have received from pharmacists.

However, after their enactment, it soon became apparent that the narcotic evil had grown to such proportions that these laws in the different states were insufficient to control it. This was due in part to the inadequacy of the state laws, and in greater part to the fact that state officials were either unwilling, unable, or indifferent with reference to the enforcement of them.

It was about seven or eight years ago, that the matter of a general federal law