

being a graduate of some reputable and properly chartered college of pharmacy;" and still further, "must produce satisfactory evidence of having had not less than two years of high school training, or pass an examination equivalent thereto." And yet, after having successfully fulfilled all these preliminary requirements, and then successfully made the required 75 percent passing mark before the pharmaceutical examining board, the pharmacist can, under the pharmacy law, leave his business temporarily in care of one who has managed to emerge safely from a pharmaceutical board examination with such meagre knowledge as he may have been able to grasp while being employed, in any capacity, in a drug store for two years. Does the absurdity of the situation dawn upon you? Apart from his being a convenience to the pharmacist, has the assistant pharmacist a recognized position of value under our pharmacy laws? Is the public amply protected under the present requirements for registration of qualified assistants? Is he qualified? Is it worth while to continue provisions for his registration? Yes, but under more amplified prerequisite requirements than those that now obtain, which are but little removed from being farcical. Have I succeeded in making it apparent that a third cardinal point in pharmacy should by all means be Intelligent Service Always?

Sufficient Education, Practical Experience, Intelligent Service—given these three cardinal points, coupled with honesty, sobriety and a clean conscience, no man can fail to make his life a success.

MORE CONSISTENT PHARMACEUTICAL STANDARDS.*

BY FREDERICK J. WULLING.

Why camouflage any longer in pharmaceutical, educational and practical standards? Camouflage is a deception in favor of self-interest and is only justified as an expediency toward a right and righteous end. It is of two sorts: affirmative and negative. The affirmative is the justifiable kind. Nature indulges in this kind when it gives arctic animals white fur and the beasts of the tropic stripes and spots to make them one with the snowdrift and the jungle, respectively. The tree toad is of the color of the bark of the tree and green insects blend with the foliage. Nature's camouflage is intended to protect and preserve life and is therefore good. This idea has been applied to modern warfare. To deceive the camera and the telescope of the aviators and observers has become one of the chief aims of the firing line. Negative camouflage is the kind that is without affirmative results. It often produces the opposite.

In failing to adopt higher educational standards, except in spots, has not pharmacy camouflaged itself negatively? Hasn't the great body pharmaceutic deceived itself in believing its present standards high enough? Ought it not derive a lesson from the fact that medicine and dentistry, so akin to pharmacy, have prospered so significantly of late because of their accelerating educational standards? Does the fact that professional pharmacy has suffered dilution and attenua-

* Read before the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and the joint session of the Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.

tion through commercial activities, make a continued passive attitude toward standards commensurate with the times and with the responsibility of pharmaceutical practice, justifiable or wise? Does the pharmacist who dispenses five prescriptions a day need to be less safe and reliable than the one who devotes his full time to professional practice? Is it defensible that the physician who treats five patients a day be less qualified than the one who attends fifty daily? May the railroad engineer who runs a train fifty miles be less able and reliable than the one who runs a train through an entire division? The pharmacist, the physician, the engineer in each case needs the fullest measure of qualification irrespective of the service each gives quantitatively in his respective field of work. With higher standards go higher aims and purposes and proportionately better service. The higher the standards of a calling, the higher is the grade of those it attracts as its practitioners and trustees. I maintain that as pharmacists we are the trustees of our calling, morally obliged to administer upon it with the highest degree of efficiency and to hand it down to the next generation in a greatly improved condition. That is the method whereby civilization grows and evolves. Development and progress go forward through and by the highest degree of efficiency and achievement of the living generation, not by the measure of the mediocre. This fact is so self-evident that it hardly needs statement and yet, as a whole, the body pharmaceutic has camouflaged itself negatively concerning it. If in the past professional ideals and forethought had been more universal among pharmacists, standards would have increased more rapidly and the insidious aggression of commercialism would not have been possible. Commercialism is right and good and just as respectable as professionalism if in its place and if recognized as such. This fact is being increasingly recognized not only by the advocates of pure pharmacy, but also by the ultra-commercialists, who probably through economic allurements have entirely banished pharmacy from their establishments, thus creating the so-called "drugless drug stores" and releasing a certain amount of professional pharmacy to others.

The firmer establishment of professional pharmacy (it is regrettable that the phrase "professional pharmacy" must be used; the word "pharmacy" ought to imply without qualification a professional activity) is evidenced in every large center of population by the increasing number of ethical pharmacies and laboratories. This transition is under way, but needs for more momentum the assistance and encouragement of higher educational and, therefore, basic standards. These standards can be achieved only by their advocates. The advocates must do more missionary and constructive work and must utilize every legitimate agency toward the desired end, otherwise forces outside of pharmacy will step in and compel proper standards as has already been done in the State of Illinois. The work must be done by individuals and by organizations. The organized avowed advocates of higher standards are the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, named in the order of their establishment, in a happily increasing measure the National Association of Retail Druggists and many State and other associations.

Of these the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy is the most logical and powerful to bring about needed results. In the past the Boards have not,

as a whole, been conspicuous in endeavors to raise standards. Since their organization into a national body, progress is everywhere noticeable. I feel certain that Boards are made up of men whose majority want better things for pharmacy and who are open to suggestion and conviction. The Boards are the only agencies established by law with power to fix legal, educational and practical standards. The standards fixed by them taken together are too low. The mistake that the Boards have made and are making is a serious one and possibly may be construed as a dereliction of duty on part of the Boards in that they created standards largely representative of commercial pharmacy when in fact the legislatures creating them had in mind solely the regulation of the practice of professional pharmacy. Boards of pharmacy are only in the remotest degree related to commerce. No act creating any of the Boards can possibly be construed otherwise. Legislatures would be perverting their powers and functions if they intended otherwise. It is clear, beyond any possible doubt, that boards of pharmacy were created practically exclusively to fix pharmaceutical, educational and regulative standards enforceable at law and thus to regulate not commercial but professional practice. The Boards have absolutely no jurisdiction over the so-called commercial practices of pharmacists. They are powerless to enforce the law against pharmacists, except in its relation to professional practice established by statute. All this has not been sufficiently appreciated and understood, it seems to me, and hence the standards created by the Boards have been in the nature of a compromise when they should have been unequivocally based upon the ethical and professional activity of pharmacists.

The powers of the several Boards should possibly be increased in some respects by the respective legislatures, but it is my opinion that the Boards now have the power to require a four-year high school training of all applicants for licensure and that the great majority, if not all, have the power to require a college training in pharmacy. I have never heard any sufficient reasons why the Boards have not established adequate standards. Members of Boards have dogmatically expressed the opinion that the colleges should establish the standards. The fact is that whatever higher standards there are have largely been created by the colleges and against great odds, but the colleges have not and never can have legal powers to fix standards subject to enforcement by law. The Boards have this power. Some college entrance and graduation requirements are comparatively high now, but none are high enough. It is putting the cart before the horse to expect the colleges to establish enforceable standards. They are powerless to do this, and because of the great variance in the standards of the Boards the colleges do not and can not at present have uniform requirements. *The colleges necessarily are not all of the same grade, but the Boards are wholly or quite uniform in that they all possess practically the same regulative and legal powers.* Because of this it seems to me to be their duty as well as privilege, morally and educationally as well as legally, to establish uniform and adequate standards which the colleges *would be obliged to observe.* It should be particularly noted that the Boards have the power to fix standards which not only practical pharmacy must observe but also the colleges. On the other hand, colleges have no power to establish standards which the Boards would have to recognize. This clearly points to where the power to set standards lies. The National Association of Boards of Pharmacy is

the logical body through which the several Boards should be invited to do their duty more fully in this respect. Many uncomplimentary things have been said of the so-called second and third grade colleges. I am not their defender nor their advocate, but I recognize that in many cases they are the products of the prevailing conditions for which the Boards and other factors are more responsible than they. *The colleges and associations in most cases are the creations of the pharmacists, directly and indirectly, and are supposed to be and are helpful agencies primarily for the uplift of the calling. The Boards, on the other hand, are creations of the States for the benefit not of pharmacy, but of the people.* They are the means whereby the States attempt to protect the people against incompetent practitioners and hence they are part of the people's self-defensive agencies. They are of those parts of the State's machinery which are charged with particular functions, for the carrying out of which they have all necessary power. Some of their particular functions are expressed in the acts creating them. While some of their powers are defined, some are inherent and implied. Under these latter the Boards can and do make reasonable rules and regulations which have the force of law. Part of these rules and regulations could consistently be made to include high school and, for the near future, college prerequisites. If this were done, it would at once put the colleges on an equality, in that respect at least, and would, among other things, do away with the unprofessional and undignified, though in a few cases justifiable, competition for students. The results would be an influx into pharmacy of a better and more uniform grade of apprentices who in due time by their superior training, intelligence and judgment, would elevate the calling to a professional and intellectual standard commensurate with the dignity and responsibility of a very important division of medicine which pharmacy really is. No fear would need to be had that the number of apprentices would decrease, because it is a fact abundantly proved by experience in medicine, dentistry, engineering, law and other learned callings, including the cases of some of the colleges of pharmacy, that increased requirements attract increasing numbers of matriculants. In the case of the College of Pharmacy of the University of Minnesota, increase of the minimum course to three years has resulted in a very perceptible increase in enrollment, contrary to the predictions of many.

I hope I have succeeded in pointing out the underlying basic position and duties of the Boards, and that it will not be regarded as presumption on my part for having done so. I feel the Boards are under obligations which they have not, as a rule, fully recognized and fulfilled. Have they not been, possibly unconsciously, a deterrent factor when they should have been a leading one in the establishment of consistent and necessary basic standards? No more time and prestige should be lost, but prompt and energetic action should be collectively taken to make up for past remissness or indifference in the respect pointed out.

It should be said that the entire body pharmaceutical is partly, even largely, at fault in the matter because it has not been sufficiently interested and aggressive in the very element fundamental to the welfare of the profession and, therefore, fundamental to the welfare of those whom the calling serves. All organizations should encourage and rally to the support of the Boards in an effective and whole-hearted way by every proper means at their command. It would be patriotic and loyal to do this at once. The Government has practically implied that we

pharmacists as a class are not sufficiently educated and intelligent to be recognized as among the agencies qualified to be called upon to help prosecute this terrible war. Although we deny this the implication is not pleasant to contemplate. We ought forthwith to create such standards that this blot on our escutcheon would be forever removed. Talking and commiserating about the matter will not remedy the situation. A little courage and determined and united action are the remedies. The N. A. B. P. should take the initiative and all other associations should back it up energetically, forcefully and fraternally.

Possibly I should say in closing that all this is said in the most friendly spirit. We are all bound together in the bundle of life. I merely want to be helpful.

SUMMARY OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1918 MEETING OF THE
AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES
AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, AUGUST 12-13, 1918.

BY THEODORE J. BRADLEY, *Secretary*.

The nineteenth annual meeting of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties convened at the Congress Hotel, Chicago, on Monday, August 12, 1918, with representatives of twenty-six schools in attendance. Three sessions were held, and, in addition, a joint session with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

Henry Kraemer of the University of Michigan was President of the Conference for 1917-1918 and presided at all sessions of the meeting. In his presidential address he discussed several topics of interest and importance to pharmacy and colleges of pharmacy, the most prominent of which was a strong plea for two distinct classes of drug stores, the commercial and the professional, with corresponding courses in colleges of pharmacy, one preparing for the practice of commercial pharmacy and the other for the practice of professional pharmacy. F. J. Wulling of Minnesota read a paper supporting the plea of President Kraemer for two kinds of pharmacies.

After consideration of recommendations made by President Kraemer, the Conference adopted the following resolutions:

1. That a special committee of three be appointed by the incoming president to consider and report on the question of the establishment of two distinct classes of pharmacies, namely, the commercial drug store and the professional pharmacy, this committee to work with a corresponding committee of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, if such a committee is appointed by that organization.
2. That a committee be appointed by the incoming president to work out methods of presenting the advantages of pharmacy as a calling to high school students of the country.
3. To continue the agitation for the standardization of degrees granted by colleges of pharmacy.

The report of Secretary-Treasurer T. J. Bradley of Massachusetts showed that the Conference now has forty-six member schools, and that the finances of the organization are in a prosperous condition, there being a balance of slightly more than a thousand dollars in the treasury, with all bills paid. On recommendation of the Secretary-Treasurer it was voted to request that the proceedings of the joint session of the Conference and the Association of Boards of Pharmacy be published in the JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.

Chairman J. A. Koch made a report for the Executive Committee, in which it was shown that 58 percent of the new students matriculated in 1917 in the colleges of pharmacy of the country were graduates of high schools, or had an equal or better preliminary education, and that the other 42 percent of the new matriculants had completed one to three years of high school work. It was also