

J. M. LINDLY: In reference to the standard fixed for 1917 by the Conference, one reason was that the legislators might know something definite of the proposed standard. When an effort was made to defeat the bill, I went to the Governor myself and took this report along with me and showed him what this standard was.

Just one word more, and that was suggested by Dr. Anderson, and that is we do not wish to ask our legislators for something too radical. We have to meet the present conditions. Our situation in Iowa may be different from what it is in any other state. Our old laws were, perhaps, a little different, and we have to make the change in such a way that it will not seriously inconvenience the people or the druggists. There was an objection to the bill and that was it did an injustice to the poor boy. That is the reason for one clause of the law, allowing these boys, who had started in to clerk and put in their four years' apprenticeship, and those who were thus engaged at the time the law went into effect, to go on and complete the four years, and then take the examination. We do the best we can, all the time trying and striving upward. If we can't get all we want, we get what we can.

THE CHAIRMAN: The bill, as it was originally written, did not say the standards as set forth by the Conference of 1917, but it simply said the standards of the Conference of the Pharmaceutical Faculties. The reason the "1917" was put in was because we felt that we would not be able to pass the bill unless we put in a definite statement, as Senator Lindly has already pointed out. It is a weak point in the law.

W. F. RUDD: We have always to consider the reactionary forces in any community in which we live. We have them in Virginia, and those reactionary forces, while in the minority, somehow or other they manage to stand in the way of good legislation and block it before it gets real headway. It seems to me it is eminently right, that instead of providing a future standard, to have one adapted to present conditions and specific, as in the Iowa law, is best.

---

#### IOWA PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.

The newsy monthly of the Iowa Pharmaceutical Association contains the following appeal to pharmacists, encouraging them in furthering the passage of the Edmonds Bill (H. R. 5531):

##### PHARMACISTS ATTENTION.

All over the country there is a feeling that pharmacists are entitled to greater consideration in the government service than has been accorded them in the past. It is impossible under present rules and regulations for a pharmacist to rise to commissioned rank in the Army on the basis of his pharmaceutical training and service. Conditions in the Navy are somewhat better, but the full rank of lieutenant or higher grades are not accorded those who rise from the ranks in the hospital corps.

No better opportunity than the present emergency has ever presented itself for the organization of a Pharmaceutical Corps officered by pharmacists and offering to the enlisted personnel, opportunities for advancement to commissioned rank.

The Government needs a Pharmaceutical Corps right now.

The people are entitled to proper pharmaceutical service in military as in civil life and will demand it.

The problem of securing the passage of the Edmonds Bill is now squarely up to the pharmacists of the country, and every druggist should write personal letters to his Congressional representatives urging the establishment of a Pharmaceutical Corps. Pharmaceutical organizations should hold special meetings if need be to draw up resolutions endorsing the measure. Active and energetic support of the Edmonds Bill is a duty that every pharmacist owes to his profession and to our armies in the field.