

tives, the writer has saved for this last sentence, the statement that this change has been enacted already into the law of the State of New York and the first examination under it has been held.

---

### SO-CALLED COMMERCIAL PHARMACY SHOULD NOT BE TAUGHT AT COLLEGES OF PHARMACY.\*

BY FREDERICK J. WULLING.

From a list of suggested titles for papers I will speak indirectly and collectively on the following:

1. Teaching of Commercial Pharmacy—Suggested Methods and Materials.
2. Psychology as Applied to Business Should Be Taught in Our Colleges of Pharmacy.
3. The Qualifications of a Teacher of Commercial Pharmacy.
4. What Percent of Our Curriculum Should Be Devoted to Commercial Subjects?

From these titles it would appear that it is taken for granted that commercial pharmacy, whatever that is, should be taught by the colleges of pharmacy. I dissent from this view unless by the term "Commercial Pharmacy" is meant the commerce incidental to the practice of pure pharmacy. In that case the phrase would be entirely misleading. It is clear that the term has quite another meaning and that by it is meant the commerce in all the multifarious commodities and products other than drugs and medicines carried by the so-called modern drug store. Much of that kind of commerce is not related to pharmacy in any wise, except that it is carried on vicariously by pharmacists. If the same kind of commerce were carried on, as it is in a large measure, in other places of business it would certainly not be called commercial pharmacy. In fact there is no commercial pharmacy at all. The term is an incompatibility. Pharmacy is a department of medicine and not trade. We have the contradiction of persons called pharmacists, specially privileged and empowered by the state to render an important professional service to the people, engaging in trade and calling it commercial pharmacy. There can not be any objection to the trade itself carried on by the pharmacist; the objection is to the fact that it is allowed to overbalance in many cases the activities of pharmacists who are especially licensed to do something else. It is unquestionable that the legislatures when they enacted the pharmacy laws and established the boards of pharmacy intended to have them apply solely to the practice of pharmacy and not to trade. In enacting pharmacy laws the legislatures intended thereby to provide trained and educated persons to render competent pharmaceutical service to the people. Such training is not necessary for carrying on trade nor for the protection of the public in such trading. *In return for the highly specialized service intended and expected by the legislatures they gave to pharmacists all the benefits and advantages of a privileged class by restricting the practice of pharmacy to them and excluding all other persons from engaging in the practice.* It is true that the law does not specifically prohibit licensed pharmacists from engaging in trade while exercising and enjoying the special privileges

---

\* Read before Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Chicago meeting, 1918.

bestowed by the state, but as I see it the voluminous trade activities, especially of the larger so-called commercial drug stores and departments, exhibit on part of the proprietors a disregard of ethics and a lack of the sense of obligation and of good faith owing to the state for the privileges granted. Is this increasing commercial practice, especially on the larger scale, not an exploitation of an honored and highly responsible calling? It seems so to me and I believe the coming generation and the many high-minded of the present generation will not tolerate an unabated continuance of it. There are many things pointing that way. Some legislators have already expressed themselves as favoring a limitation by law of the number of pharmacies and of restricting the activities of registered pharmacists to the practice of their calling. Personally, I am in doubt of the wisdom of such measures in this country, but we may come to them.

There is also indisputable evidence that many persons, even entire families, are seeking and enjoying in increasing numbers the pharmaceutical service of those who are devoting themselves exclusively to the rendering of that kind of service. Professional pharmacies are increasing in number and, although the increase is slow, it is gaining momentum. Concurrently, some of the larger department drug stores, probably for economic reasons, are relinquishing entirely their dispensing and pharmaceutical departments. I am told that there are now five such drugless drug stores here in this city of Chicago. A new name will have to be coined to designate these establishments.

Can we consistently blame the Government for failing to recognize pharmacy as it is generally practiced to-day as a profession and as worthy to be included in those higher and specialized agencies upon which it called to help prosecute this war? While I feel that the Government ought to recognize and avail itself of that membership of the calling capable of purely professional practice, there is some force in its implication that the excessive and dominant commercial practices establish a general standard not fit to be recognized as commensurate with those of other more highly standardized callings. As I have often maintained, commercialism is just as necessary and respectable as professionalism, but is it not wrong for the practitioners of any department of commerce to usurp the privileges and to lower and sophisticate the standards of a profession?

The claim sometimes made that the commercial activities of pharmacists are a necessary economic development is not well taken if viewed from the standpoint of the legislatures which created the laws regulative of pharmaceutical practice, except possibly in the cases of small towns who could not support a purely pharmaceutical establishment and whose inhabitants would otherwise be deprived of necessary pharmaceutical service.

I now ask: Is it consistent for the colleges of pharmacy, the most important and fruitful agencies for the maintenance and uplift of professional pharmaceutical standards and ideals; the chief evidences of the recognition, on part of the better qualified and of those possessing discernment and good judgment, of the professional nature of pharmaceutical practice; the very factors which by their teaching and example have more than any other endeavored to stem the tide of commercialism and which have had their origin in the perception of the necessity of a thorough scientific and ethical training of practitioners, now to lower their standards and repudiate the very basis and ideals upon which they were founded? I say a

thousand times No! Colleges are to set standards and to lead, not follow. They are to be true and faithful to the purposes for which they were established; to train men and women to become scientific, safe and thoroughly efficient pharmacists. There are other and better schools and colleges for commercial training.

It is proper for colleges of pharmacy to give limited instruction on subjects that would make students more intelligent in the conduct of the business connected with the practice of pure pharmacy. A few lectures by specialists on each of the subjects of pharmacy laws, contracts, agency, commercial paper, property, insurance, bailments, partnership, transportation and the like and an introduction to general psychology would greatly help the student in all business matters connected with his professional practice.

It is significant that not many colleges of pharmacy teach "commercial pharmacy."

---

### A SQUARE PEG IN A ROUND HOLE.\*

BY CHARLES W. HOLZHAUER.

This is a day of specialization. No matter what may be the nature of the career a man may choose for himself—professional, commercial, military, literary, artistic—be his calling what it may, his first aim and desire is to train himself so efficiently that he fits his job, and his job fits him. When he has achieved this "perfect fit," then, indeed, is his future success assured.

If you expect to make a man a good foot-ball player, you coach him in every intricacy of the game, teach him all the styles of play, prepare him physically at the training table, harden his muscles by systematic exercise—in short, the good coach tries to develop a finished product, capable of meeting any situation which may arise in the course of the game.

Pharmacy is not foot-ball, true enough, but some of the methods of foot-ball may be copied with profit to pharmacy, and it seems to me we should try in just this way to perfect our students of pharmacy for the actualities of the profession ahead of them. Our pharmacy courses are not comprehensive enough when we consider the future demands upon the student. Many of our graduates are "square pegs" and the work they are called upon to do proves to be the "round hole," *and they don't fit.*

But why this misfit? At the outset it might be well, perhaps, to define our ideas of what we expect our colleges to do. My own idea is this: the first consideration in shaping the course of instruction should be to make of the student a good prescriptionist—a capable and safe man to handle drugs. Naturally this is paramount. The second consideration should be to make of the student the most valuable and useful man behind the counter. Of course my view-point is that of the drug store, but is not that the very best view-point from which to consider the product of our schools? I have no figures available, but I think it is safe to say that at least 80 percent of our graduates spend their careers within the confines of the drug store, and if this is true, certainly the proprietor of a drug store ought to be as good a judge as any as to whether the young graduate measures up to his task or not.

---

\* Read before Section on Commercial Interests, A. Ph. A., Chicago meeting, 1918.