

JOINT SESSION OF THE SECTIONS ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION, CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES, AND NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY.

MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS HELD IN THE RED ROOM OF THE BELLEVUE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 1915, AT 9:30 A.M.

Chairman F. H. Freericks, of the Section on Education and Legislation, in calling the joint session of the Section on Education and Legislation, the Conference of Faculties, and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy to order, said:

"I might say that in the past few years, to my knowledge, the attention which the Conference of Faculties and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy merited has possibly not been given it by the Section on Education and Legislation, and we are seeking to make an effort to bring about a greater interest, to show that these two organizations, which are serving such a splendid purpose, are in close relationship with our Association, and that we should be in harmony at all times and work for a common purpose and end.

"We have with us, and it is proper, I think, that the meeting should be presided over by the three presiding officers of these various bodies, but I would consider it a special privilege to have Dr. F. J. Wulling preside over this joint session, and I will therefore ask him to do so."

Dr. F. J. Wulling then, acting as chairman, stated that he was ready to proceed with the regular order of business as outlined on the printed program, and that the first matter to be considered would be the report from Secretary W. J. Teeters, of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

Secretary Teeters then read his report. This report was printed in the September number, 1915, p. 1092, except that portion which follows.

At the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, held at the city of San Francisco on August 6, 1915, action of special interest to the colleges and faculties was taken, as follows:

Several recommendations contained in a report made by Dr. H. H. Rusby, of New York, as chairman of a special committee created at Detroit last year to investigate and report upon the question of teachers' salaries, were made, viz.:

1. That it is neither practical nor desirable to advise that the Conference make any schedule of salaries, either minimum or maximum, at the present time.

2. That the dean should receive a salary for that office aside from and in addition to what he may receive for his teaching position.

3. (a) That the salary of an associate professor shall be two-thirds that of a professor.

(b) That the salary of an assistant professor shall be four-fifths that of an associate professor.

(c) That the salary of an instructor shall be three-fourths that of an assistant professor.

(d) That the salary of an assistant shall be half of an instructor.

(e) That each of these salaries be fixed on an advancing scale, from a minimum to a maximum, and that the minimum for one grade be equal to the maximum of the grade next lower, three years being required for the maximum to be attained; and that the salary should pertain to the position, and not the man.

The last clause (*e*) of the third recommendation was amended to the effect that an increase of salary shall go with every promotion in rank, without having to wait for a year for such increase.

The recommendations as thus amended were then adopted as the recommendations of the Conference.

The question submitted to a special committee last year as to whether the regular two-year college-of-pharmacy course should be extended to three years in 1920 was reported upon adversely, as not warranted by present conditions, in a report submitted by Chairman H. M. Whelpley, of St. Louis.

The Conference adopted a motion to refer to the secretary and Executive Committee, with power to act after conference with the Publication Committee of the American Pharmaceutical Association, a proposition made to consider the publication of the proceedings of the Conference in the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

President Caswell A. Mayo moved that the report be referred to the Committee on Publication, stating that it was his understanding that the report did not require any other action from the body; that this was a joint session of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and that these proceedings constituted a part of the general proceedings, which motion was seconded.

Chairman Wulling then put the motion, and Mr. Mayo stated that the publishing of the report was discretionary with the American Pharmaceutical Association; that the joint session could hardly direct the Association to do it; but that the action taken would indicate the wishes of the joint session. Whereupon the motion was put, regularly seconded, and declared carried.

Chairman Wulling then called for a report from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy by Mr. H. C. Christensen, secretary.

Mr. Christensen then presented his report. (This was printed in September number, 1915, pp. 1087-1091.)

Secretary Christensen stated that the joint session considered the recommendation from the Conference with reference to reconsidering the proposition of continuing to hold the meetings previous to that of the American Pharmaceutical Association, but that the best they could do now was to have the matter referred to the Executive Committee. Secretary Christensen said that the officers of his organization would prefer to hold the meetings prior to those of the American Pharmaceutical Association, but that the majority of the members held a different view.

President Caswell A. Mayo moved that the report take the same course as the previous report—be referred to the Committee on Publication of the American Pharmaceutical Association—which motion was seconded.

Dr. J. H. Beal called attention to the fact that the definition proposed in the report for proprietary medicines was materially different from the definitions accepted by the supreme courts of the various States; that it was also at variance with the definition adopted by the Conference on Pharmacy and Medicine of the American Medical Association, and materially different from the definition adopted by the Commission on Proprietary Medicine adopted by the American Pharmaceutical Association; that, with the permission of the Section, he desired to read the definition by the Commission.

“ In its widest sense, a proprietary medicine is any drug, chemical, or preparation, whether simple or compound, intended or recommended for the cure, treatment, or prevention of disease, either of man or of lower animals, the exclusive right to the manufacture of which is assumed or claimed by some particular firm

or individual, or which is protected against free competition as to name, character of product, competition, or process of manufacture by secrecy, patent, copyright, trade-mark, or in any other manner."

The custom of taking out patents upon medicinal mixtures ceased, but the custom of selling them in packages of distinctive form and size continued, and so they have continued to bear the same designation as formerly. The term is now wholly inappropriate, but is apparently so firmly fixed in usage that it seems likely to persist as long as the class of remedies to which it is habitually applied continues in existence.

The distinction between the two classes of proprietaries finally approved by the Commission is expressed in the following definitions:

Proprietary Medicines Exploited in Accordance with the Requirements of Medical Ethics, or so-called "Ethical Proprietaries": Proprietary medicines, the active ingredients of which, with their proportions, are stated on the label or otherwise published, and which are not advertised to the general public, either through the public press, by accompanying circulars or in any other manner, and not accompanied by printed matter calculated to encourage their use by the laity without the advice of a physician.

"Proprietary Remedies Advertised Directly to the Public," or so-called "Patent Medicines": Proprietary medicines, whether of secret or open formula, which are advertised directly to the general public through newspapers, by circulars or in any other manner, and the packages of which are accompanied by printed matter specifying the affections, symptoms, or purposes for which the remedies are recommended, and directions for their use.*

Chairman Wulling then suggested that possibly the Section ought to dispose of the motion first, stating that it might be well and entirely appropriate for Dr. Beal to make a motion later offering the definition, which he had read, to the consideration of the boards, and that if there was no objection he would put the motion for the disposition of the report and that thereafter it might be discussed.

On vote the motion was declared carried.

President Mayo said that he thought the only point that could be brought up, it seemed to him, in connection with the matter, would be to direct the attention of the members to the difference in the point of view of the Commission and the boards, and he therefore moved that, in the event the Committee on Publication should publish the report, it be requested to direct attention to the fact that the Association had accepted the definition of the Commission. This was seconded and carried by vote.

Dr. Beal then read the following from the report of Mr. Christensen:

"That the term 'patent' or proprietary preparation or remedy be defined as one the name of which does not appear in the United States Pharmacopœia or National Formulary or the complete formula of which is not printed on the label of the container."

Dr. Beal stated that the committee which had presented the report made no claim for the originality of the definition; that it was copied, he believed, from the law either pertaining to pharmacy or the Pure Food and Drug Commission of Louisiana and also the Canadian Law.

* The terms "ethical" and "non-ethical" as employed in this report are intended merely to distinguish between remedies exploited in accordance with the rules of medical ethics regarding the advertising of medical agents, and those advertised to the general public in contravention of such rules. The terms have been used for want of better, and are not to be understood as implying any idea of relative merit.

President Caswell A. Mayo remarked that the phraseology indicated that it had probably been based upon the report of the British Parliamentary Commission, and that it was used as a basis of a definition adopted by the Board of Health of the city of New York. This was almost identical with the definition read by Dr. Beal, only that they were termed "proprietary medicine, patent, proprietary medicine," and that it provided for the registration of the formula. President Mayo thought a part of it was based on that; that the point Dr. Beal wanted to bring out, and one which he thought desirable, was the difference between the two, so that there would be no misapprehension on the part of the casual reader.

Chairman Wulling said that where there were two definitions by two representatives of two different organizations a little confusion might arise, and it was very desirable to harmonize the definitions, but that it would be a matter for the Boards of Pharmacy to take up.

Secretary Christensen said that it seemed to him that the discrepancy only showed more plainly the advisability of the two sections getting together more closely, not only regarding legislation, but on other matters; that the proposed committee on legislation could find some way out of the difficulty, even though the resolution had been adopted, and that it might be the means of enabling the joint session to avoid like disagreements in the future.

Dr. Beal then stated that his object in bringing the subject up now was to avoid the apparent inconsistency of the two associations, presenting the matter in different sections, adopting the two different definitions for the same thing; that he was sure the definitions which had been submitted from the Boards of Pharmacy would not stand the test of the courts; that secrecy had nothing to do with proprietorship; that he believed it would be advisable that some joint committee be arranged for, to harmonize the two definitions.

The Chair suggested that there was a joint committee to whom this matter could be referred.

Dr. Beal moved that the two definitions be referred to the Joint Committee.

The motion was duly seconded, and after voting the same was declared carried.

The Chair then stated that he had been asked by two different persons whether he would request the Secretary of the Boards to explain briefly what the procedure for reciprocal registration was.

Secretary Christensen then read the following from the Constitution and By-Laws of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy:

ARTICLE II.

Any pharmacists who are registered by examination in any State which is an active member of this Association may secure registration in any other State by sending the fee of \$5 to the Secretary of this Association and applying for the necessary blanks, which will indicate that this fee has been paid, and filing said application with the Secretary of the State Board in which they desire registration, which has been certified to by themselves and by the Secretary and President of the Board where they first obtained registration. Said applications must indicate the following:

(a) They shall be twenty-one years of age.

(b) That they shall have had at least a grammar school education or its equivalent.

(c) That they must present evidence of good moral character from two registered pharmacists in the State from which they come.

(d) That they shall have had at least four years' experience in a pharmacy where physicians' prescriptions are compounded and dispensed under the direct

personal supervision of a registered pharmacist; *Provided, however,* That graduates of recognized colleges of pharmacy, who have acquired at least two years' actual drug-store experience, as described above, shall be considered as complying with this section; *Provided, further,* That they must have had, prior to their examination and registration in the State from which they apply, the legal experience necessary for applicants for examination and registration in the State to which they apply.

(e) That they shall have passed an examination on pharmacy, chemistry, materia medica, and practical work, and have made not less than 75 percent general average and not less than 60 percent on any one branch.

(f) That the applicants must have practised their profession at least one year prior to making their application for reciprocity and subsequent to their examination by the board from which they come.

(g) That they shall certify that they expect to reside in the State from which they are asking reciprocal exchange.

(h) That they shall have paid a fee of \$5 to the Secretary of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

(i) That they must be in good standing in the State in which they were originally examined and granted a certificate.

In the first place, an applicant for reciprocal registration had to be registered by examination; that he must have received in that examination an average of not less than 75 or not less than 60 in any one branch or subject on which he was examined; that the minimum number of subjects on which he must have been examined, which examination included the subjects of pharmacy, chemistry, materia medica, and practical work; that he must have been twenty-one years of age when he passed that examination; must have had at least a grammar school education or equivalent. The latter phase would probably be changed now; that he had to furnish two affidavits of good moral character and he must have (the applicant) practised his profession at least one year since being registered by examination either in the State in which he was examined or in some other State, some States holding that the applicant must have practised in the State in which he was registered, other States requiring only that he must have practised a year since registration. Also that they shall have had at least four years' experience in a pharmacy where physicians' prescriptions are compounded and dispensed, under the direct supervision of a registered pharmacist; *Provided, however,* That graduates of a recognized college of pharmacy who have had at least two years' druggist experience, as stated above, prior to their examination and registration from the State in which they filed the application.

That was done for the reason that some States allow a full two years, or a two years' course in a school of pharmacy, while other States grant only the actual time put in at the school.

Now, as to the direct procedure: When an applicant wants to make application, the by-laws provide that he must remit a fee of \$5 to the secretary for an application blank with instructions for proceeding.

When I receive that fee I send them an application blank with a form letter which I have, giving instructions for proceeding; he sends that application to the secretary of the board in the State in which he was examined for certification of registration and grades; then it goes with the fee which was required in the State in which he wishes to be registered. That, as a rule, is the same as they require for registration by examination, and it therefore varies from \$5 to \$15.

There are some States that require only \$5 (two or three) for taking an exam-

ination and then require \$25 for a person coming in by reciprocity, but we are trying to discourage that. I believe that there are only two States left.

Dr. Whelpley: I would like to ask Chairman Christensen this question: Is there any way to prevent a state board, recognizing that certificate of registration, from licensing an applicant without going through this process?

Secretary Christensen: There has not been up to this time. Resolutions were passed at this meeting making it compulsory for them to make application on the regular blank or regular form.

The Chairman: We are particularly fortunate in the next department of our program, since the paper to be read covers an exceedingly interesting phase, two very interesting subjects, and they have been prepared by three gentlemen of great pharmaceutical eminence.

We are going to ask Professor Remington to read his paper on "Coöperation a Necessity." Why should there not be activity between the medical and pharmaceutical professions in this direction?

(The paper by Professor Remington was published in the October number of the Journal, pp. 1237-1240.)

The Chairman: You have heard this paper; what do you desire to do with it?

Professor J. U. Lloyd: Mr. President, it always does me good to hear Professor Remington speak or read a paper. And when he reads a paper such as this, that conforms so to the ideals I have been taught, it brings back to me a courage that I will confess is sometimes almost departed.

I wish to personally thank Professor Remington for the privilege he has given me of hearing this paper. It would have well repaid me to come to San Francisco to hear Professor Remington dwell upon the ethics of pharmacy that came to us in the olden times when pharmacy was somewhat different from what it is now; but the ethics still stand as they stood then. And coöperation is merely *justice*. It is *right*. The druggist has his right and so has the pharmacist, and together they are working for the people. That is the object of pharmacy and medicine.

The Chairman: This paper is before you; what is your pleasure?

Mr. Nitardy: I move it be received and published.

The Chairman: It has been moved and seconded that this paper be published; any remarks on the motion?

Mr. Freericks: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that Professor Remington at the very close of his paper brings out a point that should have our more mature consideration, and that is the suggestion that there might be a committee appointed, of physicians and pharmacists, who would give closer attention to the differences that exist at the present time and have existed.

Now, that is a most important suggestion, and I think it contains within it the very crux of the difficulties that have existed for years past.

There would be nothing that would be so helpful as this coming together of people who are of different opinion. And if it were possible for our Association in some manner to appoint a committee, and if it were possible for our Association to know that a similar committee would be appointed by the American Medical Association to act upon and give consideration to the differences as we find them to-day, I believe that pharmacy and medicine would be splendidly served.

I do hope that the suggestion made by Professor Remington for such a committee will not be passed over lightly. It is something indeed that will mean a great deal to pharmacy.

The Chairman: Professor Remington has placed before us the situation. Mr. Freericks voices the sentiment of the Chair. We are only voicing the senti-

ments. The paper will be discussed like all other papers, and the recommendations they suggest ought to be acted on.

The motion having been regularly made and duly seconded, and the question called for, was declared carried.

The Chairman: Now the paper is open for discussion.

Mr. Freericks has already contributed a very apt contribution. I think somebody on the floor should initiate a motion to appoint a committee to cooperate with a similar committee with the American Medical Association. I wonder if there is any objection?

While Mr. Freericks is looking up the matter of committees, possibly you will allow me to say that we have discussed this matter for many years in Minnesota, and have done some fruitful work by getting together with the physicians.

The physicians have for a number of years, have a number of times, in fact, been the guests across the table and across the board, and matters of mutual interest were discussed; and the physicians have reciprocated a number of times and invited the pharmacists; in fact, we covered the State; we had these joint meetings between pharmacists and physicians at Alexandria, Duluth, and practically all the larger centres of population in the State, and as a result there is a very excellent and harmonious communication between the two callings in Minnesota.

It can be done anywhere if some one will initiate the movement; much propaganda work was done at those meetings, and the work of the pharmacists was always endorsed by the physicians. They said, "We want you to tell us what you can do for us and how you can help us."

Mr. Charles Gietner: A movement of that kind was inaugurated about a year ago in St. Louis, which the Alumni Association controlled. They had a "get-together" meeting where many physicians were present and we assembled three hundred people, and the propaganda was thoroughly gone into and a lot of literature was distributed. The St. Louis Medical Society took quite a great deal of interest in it, and I think that meeting will be duplicated again this coming November. That is an effort along the same line as outlined here.

Dr. W. C. Alpers: A movement of that kind has existed in Cleveland. There is, in Cleveland, the Cleveland Medical Association, in which they have a pharmaceutical section; the pharmacists all over the city are invited to come there and become members of that section.

Now, so far as that goes, it has done good work; that is to say, good work for those who attend. At the last meeting there were present 37 physicians and 7 pharmacists. That is the great trouble—to get them out—and the question was put to me at that time, why do the pharmacists not attend such meetings more; why can they not see it to their advantage as the physicians do, to have these joint meetings?

Of course, that may be a different case from the two that have been cited. But if we consider all of them, they seem to be more or less local; that is to say, the work that has been done in Minnesota and St. Louis and other cities is local work. As I understand this motion, it is to be a national affair. If we appoint a committee, it must be a committee that covers the whole ground, the whole country, and the American Medical Association should have a similar committee. Whether such a joint committee could do such work or not is something that only the future will tell. I believe it would be very serviceable; but here again we come to the point that I emphasized at another place during this convention, namely, the lack of centralization of pharmacy, the lack of pharmaceutical centralization, that has authority to speak for the pharmacy of the whole country.

Of course, it is a difficult question in itself, but it is brought up here. We will naturally be asked, "Well, whom do you represent; how many do you represent?" And we must answer, "But a very few, but of those few we speak with authority." And naturally that point, the question of central authority, comes up, and in every one of our debates it is a knotty problem; centralization has a great deal to do with this work, in having it done uniformly all over the country.

That this committee will be of service is without question. I heartily support the movement and believe some good will come of it.

Mr. Freericks: In line with what Dr. Alpers has said, it occurs to me that, while there is a lack of centralization, there is no question of the American Pharmaceutical Association being representative of pharmacy; I think that is well recognized by the medical men of the country—that *medicine* generally recognizes that; and while we may not represent numerically the pharmacists of the country, by including all or the majority, yet I think our Association speaks for them, and is recognized as speaking for them. On that account a committee, if it were constituted of men who have the respect of medical men in the various localities, and have the respect of medical men nationally, will have that attention that the subject itself deserves, and will bring about a spirited coöperation that will lead to much, in my judgment. It all depends on how the subject is opened up.

What we quite agree on is, that all the efforts, all that have been made in the past, have been local efforts. They do some good, but, as all local efforts, they last for a year or two years, there is a certain enthusiasm, and it wanes, and the effort is altogether lost. There is no general effort for bringing together medical and pharmaceutical men throughout the country; having them agree upon methods for cementing the relationship between the two will change the situation from what it is to-day. Matters of that kind cannot be taken up locally. They must be handled through the national bodies, and, through these, they must reach the local bodies.

I am quite satisfied that if we can take this matter up as suggested by Professor Remington and really make it appear to the American Medical Association that we aim to bring about a better understanding, that we are seeking that which will be for the benefit of the public as well as of medicine and pharmacy, then we may look for a like spirit on their part.

I move you, Mr. Chairman, that a committee of five be appointed of this Association; that said committee be authorized, be empowered, to submit to the American Medical Association a request for coöperation between the two bodies along the lines pointed out, and ask them to appoint a similar committee for studying matters of common interest.

Dr. W. C. Alpers: I second the motion.

The Chairman: You have heard the motion and it has received a second; are there any remarks?

There being none, the question was called for and carried by a unanimous vote.

The Chairman: That committee ought to be appointed, your present Chairman takes it, by the incoming president; the committee will work with him, and unless there is objection that will be the ruling.

Professor Remington: I wanted to suggest: should this not properly be a committee of the American Pharmaceutical Association; should it not go up to the general session, inasmuch as it is going to speak for the American Pharmaceutical Association, and not for the Section?

President Caswell A. Mayo: I offer a substitute by amending the phraseology,

to make it conform with our usual method of procedure; that this Section recommend to the general session that a committee be appointed.

Mr. Freericks: I will adopt the suggestion as made by President Mayo.

Chairman Wulling: Do we need to take any action on the amendment?

Dr. Anderson: It has always been my understanding that all resolutions affecting the policy of the American Pharmaceutical Association are referred to the general session for approval, being simply a recommendation of the Section.

The Chairman: It is merely a matter of course, then. Is there any further discussion on the paper? Would Professor Remington like to close the discussion?

Professor Remington: I hardly think it is necessary. The idea seems to have met with general approval, and my only concern now is that it will be effective. I do not wish to put forth effort and have it die from inattention. If the Association will appoint a committee, I think it will be able to do something, particularly, Mr. Chairman, because the American Medical Association has done yeoman service in the past and is doing it now, and I think the American Medical Association will be glad to get such a resolution from the American Pharmaceutical Association inviting coöperation.

And another thing: I think now is the time to strike. I think it is the "psychological moment."

The Chairman: Before proceeding with the program, Dr. Whelpley has an announcement that he desires to make.

Dr. Whelpley: I have here the original constitution and by-laws of the American Pharmaceutical Association with signatures dating back to the first president. It has been customary each year to ask members in attendance who have not previously placed their names on this roll to do so.

Chairman Wulling: The next paper is by Dr. W. C. Alpers on "Qualification Requirements for Teachers in Colleges of Pharmacy."

(The paper was printed in the November number, 1915, pp. 1330-1332.)

The Chairman: You have heard this very timely paper; what shall we do with it?

President Caswell A. Mayo: I move that the paper be received and referred to the Publication Committee.

Mr. F. H. Freericks: I second that motion, Mr. Chairman, and in so doing I want to accept the opportunity of thanking Dr. Alpers for the most interesting way in which he has brought this question before us. It is, undoubtedly, a question to-day that either finds or should find the consideration of all teachers in pharmacy schools.

Now the motion has been duly seconded. Are there any remarks on the motion? What is your pleasure?

The vote was called for and decided in favor of the motion.

The Chairman: Now the paper is regularly before us.

Mr. Freericks: Mr. Chairman, if this matter is brought more closely to the attention of our various colleges it will serve a good purpose. As Dr. Alpers so well points out, we have requirements and we have restrictions for the students, but we seem to have none for the colleges and teaching staffs, and one is quite as important as the other. And, in line with the thoughts conveyed to us in this paper, it seems to me we should have the paper of Dr. Alpers brought more directly to the attention of the various colleges in the country.

The Chairman: If I had gained the floor before the previous speaker I should have attempted to say what he has expressed, but, of course, not so well as has

he; so I will merely follow by making a motion that the Editor of the Journal be instructed to have one hundred reprints of this paper made when it is published and a copy sent to each teaching pharmaceutical institution in the country.

Dr. Whelpley: I commend all that Mr. Freericks said, and I feel the author has been particularly happy in expressing himself in this paper, so it should be sent to all who are in any way interested in pharmaceutical instruction.

Mr. Freericks: Will Dr. Whelpley allow that I make the suggestion that there be added the State Boards of Pharmacy as well?

Dr. Whelpley: Yes, make it two hundred copies, and that a copy be sent to each teaching pharmaceutical institution and to the secretary of each board of pharmacy.

I might add, while on the floor, Mr. Chairman, that I feel the American Pharmaceutical Association can do a great deal of work along this line by giving more publicity to the papers brought before it.

The Chairman: Does it receive a second? First, Dr. Whelpley, let me ask, does it contemplate direct instructions to the Committee on Publication? Would it not go to Council first?

Dr. Whelpley: All items of expense must be approved by the Council.

The motion having been regularly made and duly seconded, and the question called for, the same was declared carried after voting.

The Chairman: The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Faculties states that some of the matters referred to by the reader of the paper are already taken cognizance of by the Conference. Will you state in what way, Dr. Koch?

Dr. Koch: While it is not pertinent here, one of the statements made by Mr. Freericks was to the effect that colleges of pharmacy were multiplying or increasing. I do not believe this is the case; I believe we have fewer colleges of pharmacy at the present time than we had years ago.

Mr. Freericks: I believe the point raised by Professor Koch is quite well taken, but I think I have had opportunity to observe that such new institutions are about to be created, and that there may be institutions of the kind that to-day are not recognized as colleges of pharmacy, but which, because of changes in the laws of their State, are being rearranged to at least satisfy the letter of the law by becoming so-called colleges of pharmacy.

The Chairman: I wanted the Chairman of the Faculties to say that, in considering applications from the colleges, the personnel of the faculty is inquired into quite fully, is it not?

Dr. Koch: Yes.

The Chairman: I wanted that fact brought out.

Now we have the additional great privilege of listening to a gentleman who honors us by his presence. I need not speak of Professor Lloyd to anybody.

He is not very much my senior in years, but he presumes to speak on "Pharmaceutical Apprenticeship Fifty Years Ago." I am not going to compliment the author on the very efficient way he has of remaining with us; I know that is in all your hearts; we should compliment him for the wonderful way he has of remaining with us and absorbing our youth and making it his own.

Professor Lloyd: Were it not for this young man (pointing to Mr. Freericks) I would not presume to bring to you what I hold in my hand now (referring to paper). If I mistake not, it was Longfellow who wrote

In thy journey look not backward.

And I should certainly not have presumed to have looked backward and attempted to systematize what I hold in my hands, had it not been for the personal request of my good friend Freericks.

(The paper by Professor J. U. Lloyd was printed in the November number of 1915, pp. 1333-1342.)

The Chairman: You have heard this admirable and interesting paper by Professor Lloyd; it is now before you.

Dr. H. P. Hynson: I move that the paper be referred for publication with the favorable endorsement of the Joint Section, and with the thanks of this body, representing as it does the Association; that thanks be extended to Professor Lloyd for this paper, which I believe will go down as one of the most interesting contributions that has been made to American pharmacy.

Dr. Alpers: In seconding that motion I desire to add only a few words. It is my firm conviction that if I had seen or heard nothing else but this one paper, I would have felt that my journey from Cleveland to San Francisco was largely rewarded. I myself feel very happy that I have been here and heard this wonderful paper.

The motion having been regularly made and duly seconded, and the question called for, was declared unanimously carried.

Professor H. P. Hynson: As I look around I realize that probably I am the only one here who can thoroughly be in sympathy with Professor Lloyd in his travels through pharmacy, and appreciate the troubles he has had in equipping himself for pharmacy. I will not take time to recite my own experiences. Some day, possibly, if the Association will permit me, I will set forth, as you have, Professor Lloyd, some of my own experiences.

Dr. Blake: Mr. Chairman, as one of the younger generation of pharmacists, I would like to thank Professor Lloyd.

Mr. F. H. Freericks: If I were a pharmacist actually engaged in the business; I would want that paper in order to give it to every young man who engaged with me, and I really hope that those who truly love pharmacy will not miss the opportunity of having this splendid story appear in book form.

This is merely a thought on my part; but I do not believe there is anything that would be more helpful for a young man entering pharmacy, that would make him more appreciative of his duties as an apprentice to-day, and it would most certainly tend to instill in him a little more love for the calling that he will pursue, and will enable him to follow somewhat in the footsteps of Professor Lloyd.

The Chairman: An excellent suggestion. I shall undertake to give the students in the University of Minnesota an opportunity to receive the benefits of what Professor Lloyd has told us.

Dr. W. C. Anderson: In accepting the remarks of Mr. Freericks in reference to bringing this before the young pharmacists—the apprentice—and particularly those entering the college, may I say that to-day there are boys, as we all know, who have no idea of the work that engaged the early apprentices. I also believe that in presenting this matter some arrangement should be made whereby the work of Professor Lloyd, the means by which he has progressed, the manner in which he has grown into pharmacy, should be adequately set forth.

The manner in which he has grown into pharmacy is a science; the manner in which he has grown into the hearts and affections of all men interested in pharmacy should, and could, be brought to the attention of these young men, showing that even a humble beginning with the right principles, with insight of purpose, and with perseverance such as Professor Lloyd has had, what results

may be attained, and what such a man with such ideals may obtain in the hearts of the pharmacists of this country.

The Chairman: It is a very admirable idea, and I move you that the Editor of the Journal provide extra reprints of the article.

The motion having been regularly made and duly seconded, the vote was called for and unanimously carried.

Professor Lloyd: I want to say to you, my young friends, that you do me too much honor. I know of what I speak. But listen: the one to whom the most credit should be given, the one to whom everything is due—the *ones* rather—are father and mother.

We know that our father and mother always had those ideals; and we naturally had the same ideals; mother and father always instilled them into us boys. They taught us that we lived not in the world for ourselves but for others, and that whatever we did, however little we might do, whatever it might be, we should try to serve the good of the community of which we were a part, whether it be local or large; and as opportunities came we should increase that which we could do for others. It has been the ideal which has guided me and my brothers.

Chairman Wulling: In closing this part of the program I desire especially to thank the last three speakers who have given us such excellent and valuable papers. I will now ask the Chairman of the Education and Legislation Section, Mr. Freericks, to take charge of the meeting.

Professor H. P. Hynson: I move that the three presidents of the bodies represented in this joint session be requested to act jointly and to constitute a committee for considering the relationship of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties to the American Pharmaceutical Association and present the subject for consideration at the next annual meeting of the three organizations.

An informal discussion followed, and, after a second to Professor Hynson's motion, a vote was called for, resulting in a favorable expression.

Chairman Freericks: This is, as I understand it now, the conclusion of the program for the joint session, and a motion to adjourn will be in order.

The motion was made and seconded, and, after a vote, Chairman Freericks declared the meeting adjourned.

The true rule, in determining to embrace or reject anything, is not whether it have any evil in it, but whether it have more of evil than of good. There are few things wholly evil or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of government policy, is an inseparable compound of the two, so that our best judgment of the preponderance between them is continually demanded.—*Abraham Lincoln.*