

SECTION ON EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION, AMERICAN  
PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.\*

ABSTRACT OF THE MINUTES OF THE SESSIONS HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, AUGUST 27 AND 28, 1919.

Chairman W. F. Rudd called the first session of the Section on Education and Legislation to order, Wednesday, August 27, 1919, at 2.00 P.M. Secretary C. A. Dye presided while Chairman W. F. Rudd read his address; which follows:

ADDRESS OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SECTION ON EDUCATION AND  
LEGISLATION, A. PH. A.

The spirit of *laissez-faire* so dominant in a large majority of those responsible for the well-being of pharmacy during the past generation has, within the past two years, received a rebuke that has shaken the very bed rock of our conservatism. As never before, the scales are falling from our eyes. Old ideas about pharmacy and old ideals of what we ought to be have been shattered. Slowly, but surely, we are beginning to see ourselves as others see us. It seems highly probable that the greatest humiliation we have ever suffered, will, within the next decade, prove to be the greatest blessing in the long history of our profession.

Individuals are seldom able to make a correct diagnosis of their own troubles, whether physical, mental, moral or what not. The same is true of groups of individuals. The cold judgment of disinterestedness is the only safe arbiter. Sometimes it is even good to know what our most critical friends and, perhaps, our enemies think of us. It has taken a world cataclysm to give us the right perspective, but we are getting it. All of this is a most circuitous way of saying that the failure of pharmacists to obtain recognition in the Army has taught us the lesson we needed most to learn.

In a general letter sent recently to the druggists of Missouri, Dr. H. M. Whelpley made the following statement: "Also raise the minimum of preliminary education in Missouri so that the pharmacists themselves, as well as the public, will feel the dignity of the calling. The United States Army would have had a pharmaceutical corps before now if the rank and file engaged in compounding medicines measured up to the educational standard that the calling deserves." Is this the correct diagnosis? What about the claims that envy or jealousy or ignorance on the part of those having the power to make or break us was to blame for our humiliation? I doubt that any of us would give these charges more than a passing thought. I believe Dr. Whelpley is right. We failed because we have persistently refused to set for ourselves standards that were already set in similar lines of endeavor.

We have camouflaged in Pharmaceutical Education. Many of our colleges of pharmacy (my own among the number) have been saying to the youth of the country for years, we can take you after one or two years in high school, put you through our mill and turn you out a professional man. Some of our respectable drug journals conduct and advertise quiz courses to fit men to pass State boards. A "question and answer" system sold to promising young men and women under the guise of education! Many of the same bright young men and women, naturally having confidence in the leaders in pharmacy, have gone out into the world believing themselves educated because we told them they were. Imagine their state of mind when they find out the truth.

In many, many instances they have been led to accept the form for the substance. Little wonder is it that we find so much discontent and unrest among those so misled.

Referring again to the statement made above about our failure to obtain recognition in the Army, I am led to say that in my judgment it is already the biggest single impetus to a thorough house-cleaning that we have ever had. Truly, the treatment has been of a most heroic type, but a radical and permanent cure seems to be in the making.

In the first place, a great many of us are now willing to admit for the first time that the low average of professional education and standards constituted our heaviest handicap. This is rapidly bringing a determination on the part of many of the very conservative among us, that from now on we are unwilling to be connected with any type of professional education

---

\* Papers, with discussions thereon, will be printed apart from the Minutes. The report of the Secretary will be printed in a succeeding issue, time not permitting for this number, on account of considerable statistical matter relative to legislation, schools, etc.

that is not fundamentally sound. With this phase of the situation on a safe basis (and no stream ever rises higher than its source) the outlook for the future takes on a radically different aspect. If these premises be correct, how will the impulses which have been thus begotten function into an improved condition of things pharmaceutical? How will it all work its way out in a practical, every day way? It seems to me there isn't but one answer. It is the same answer that thoughtful, competent men have always given to this question.

Every president of the Conference and every chairman of this Section has said the same thing in one form or another. It is this, sound, thoroughgoing, practical education of every man and woman going out to practice pharmacy will ultimately take care of all the problems that now give us so much trouble. There is probably not one here who will not in the main agree with this statement. But you ask at once, with only about one-third of the States requiring college training as a prerequisite for board examinations, how is the thing to be done? What changes must be made in our old methods of organization and effort? Is it possible to accomplish in the next five years as much as has been done in the past twenty-five? If so, how?

This brings me to the first recommendation in my address as Chairman of this Section.

In my judgment, prerequisite legislation in every State, based upon four years of high school training, is entirely feasible, at least within the next decade. Those of us who have passed through the throes of legislative fights on this matter know full well of the nerve-racking, heart-breaking hours when a measure hangs in the balance. So far as I am informed, up to the present time each State has fought it out and lost or won, as an individual State. There has been no organized effort among the States to back-stand one another in those trying hours. We have, it seems to me, thus lost a great opportunity to lend the weight of a great nationwide organization at times when help was sorely needed. To make available at such critical times the influence of all the forces (state and national) and to give the utmost publicity to the needs of such legislation I desire to recommend the following plan:

#### FIRST RECOMMENDATION.

The employment by the American Pharmaceutical Association and the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties of the best man in America to give all of his time to prerequisite legislation until it is an accomplished fact in every State of the Union. He should be a man of varied talents, a good speaker and writer, an organizer, tactful, enthusiastic, energetic, nationally known in pharmaceutical circles, and universally trusted. His salary should be ample. Working in collaboration with such a nation-wide organizer, should be the most influential man in pharmacy in each state of the Union. These men should not receive salaries, but should possess, as far as possible, all the qualifications, potentially at least, outlined above. Once such an organization gets under way, its influence will be irresistible. Any State could send out the Macedonian Call and competent, thoroughly informed help would be furnished promptly. How different from the methods now employed—each State fighting alone. It will take money. So does everything that brings results that are worth while. But in what better way could a substantial part of the funds at the disposal of the organizations named be spent? I do not believe this plan is a pipe dream. It seems to me highly feasible. I believe it will do the job, and do it promptly.

Coming now to another and an entirely different part of this paper, I desire to preface it with a sentence from a very striking address delivered before the State Pharmaceutical Association of Indiana by President Stone of Purdue University. Please hear his opening sentence; he says, "I cannot help associating in my mind the profession of the pharmacist with that of the physician. It seems to me that they are inseparably connected with each other." He says this not as the president of a university having a pharmacy school, but as a scientific man taking a broad view of the whole situation. Just a little further along he says this: "But it is apparent that this association between Medicine and Pharmacy is not so close as it used to be, that the profession of Pharmacy has not kept pace with the profession of Medicine on its scientific side. At least this is my impression." There seems to be a very marked tendency on the part of a great many good men in pharmacy to criticize and antagonize the medical profession publicly whenever occasion offers. Personally, I greatly deprecate this; I think there is probably no more dangerous spirit among us. The success of the medical men of this country

in outlining a plan of action and of perfecting an organization for carrying it out to a most successful consummation is a monument to their far-sightedness and ability. They have done this while we pharmacists were floundering around and criticizing them. It seems to me a great pity that we, as pharmacists, do not avail ourselves of every opportunity to get in closer touch with the organized medical forces of this country. I have no patience whatever with those who claim that the interests of the physician and the pharmacist are in any essential way antagonistic. I believe that medicine is a four-fold profession, Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy and Nursing, and that the four are intimately interdependent.

At the present time there is much more sanity and clearness of vision among physicians than among the other three branches. They saw twenty-five years ago what changes both Medical Education and the Practice of Medicine would have to undergo. They made their plans deliberately and thoroughly and we know to-day what they have done. It is simply marvelous. The number of men in medical colleges to-day is probably less than half what it was ten years ago. The result? Well a much better class of doctors, and a decent living for practically every one of them. What have we done in pharmacy in those same ten years? We have made just as many potential proprietors as we possibly could; the result? A cut-throat policy and working conditions often intolerable. Instead of using our energy in criticizing and antagonizing it would be much wiser to emulate their type of organization and education. To this end, I desire to make a second recommendation:

#### SECOND RECOMMENDATION.

A committee should be appointed from this body to coöperate, with the Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the A. M. A. Its function should be to coördinate, so far as possible, all the problems common to the two professions, and to bring about a feeling of common purpose and aims between Medicine and Pharmacy.

The third and last matter that I desire to bring to your attention has to do with Pharmacopoeial Revision. In a large measure this has gotten in a rut. Every ten years the convention is held, a revision committee elected, and five or six years later the Pharmacopoeia comes out. Realizing that under existing conditions such a plan could hardly be changed, I sent out a questionnaire to a large number of prominent men throughout the country to ascertain, if possible, if they thought a discussion of the whole matter of Revision would be apropos at this time. The answers were so overwhelmingly favorable to the plan that such a symposium has been made a part of this program. As you see, one whole session is given up to it, and those taking part are certainly among the most representative men in pharmacy in America. In the case of a large number of those on the program I have no idea what they are going to say. Judging, however, from the enthusiastic manner in which they have helped to make the program a live one, the things they have planned are going to be worth while.

Anticipating somewhat the conclusions that may be reached from this discussion, as this will be my only opportunity to make a recommendation in a form where it will receive due consideration.

#### THIRD RECOMMENDATION.

I recommend, that a committee of five be appointed to consider fully the whole matter of revision in the light of what may be said here and any other information that they may be able to obtain, and to have ready at Washington next May a practical working plan for doing one of the biggest jobs we have to handle.

The address was on motion referred to a committee consisting of Edward Spease, *Chairman*, R. A. Lyman and W. L. Scoville.

(This committee reported at the second session of the Section, but for convenient reference the report is printed here, with action thereon.—EDITOR.)

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS.

"We approve of the spirit of Recommendation No. 1, and recommend that it be put into effect, providing funds are available for its execution."

H. M. Whelpley moved the adoption of the Committee's report, seconded by W. C. Anderson.

W. G. Gregory asked whether Chairman Rudd had made any suggestions as to the method of raising funds. Chairman Spease stated there were none in the address. The question was called for, and the report of the Committee adopted.

"Owing to difference of opinion of the members of the Committee, Recommendation No. 2 is referred to the Section for action."

After some discussion the subject was referred to a Committee of Three to consider the recommendation and report to the incoming Chairman of the Section. Carried.

"We approve of Recommendation No. 3, and, if adopted by this Section, we suggest that adoption carry with it (1) appointment of the committee at once, in order that they be alert to the matter presented on the subject at this time, and (2) that the committee have full power to draft a plan and submit it to the Pharmacopoeial Convention, without first reporting to this Section."

After considerable discussion the recommendation was referred to the Committee on United States Pharmacopoeia, A. Ph. A.

The report of Secretary C. A. Dye was presented in abstract by him, and, on motion being carried, referred for publication.

(The report will be printed in a succeeding issue of the JOURNAL.)

The following papers were read, discussed and referred to the Publication Committee:

"Where are Pharmacists Ten Years After Graduation from College?" by Miss Zada M.

Cooper.

"Pharmaceutical Education and Opportunities," by Henry G. Goeckel.

"Reconstruction Applied to Commercial Pharmacy," by Charles O. Lee.

"Pharmacodynamics in Schools and Colleges of Pharmacy," by A. R. Bliss, Jr.

Chairman Rudd named the following as members of the Committee on Nominations: Miss Zada M. Cooper, C. B. Jordan and E. F. Kelly.

After the reading of a paper by W. H. Ziegler, on "The Slogan for Successful Legislation," the first session of the Section on Education and Legislation was adjourned.

#### SECOND SESSION.

Chairman W. F. Rudd called the second session of the Section on Education and Legislation to order at 2.30 P.M., August 28, 1919. He stated that the papers to be presented related to the revision of the U. S. Pharmacopoeia.<sup>1</sup>

Papers of Symposium on U. S. P. Revision are as follows:

"Scope of Revision," by C. H. LaWall. Discussion by Henry Kraemer.

"Who Shall Do the Work, and Why?" by R. P. Fischelis. Discussion by Charles E. Caspari and A. G. DuMez.

"Methods of Saving Time in Revision," by Jacob Diner. Discussion by W. G. Gregory, W. L. Scoville and H. V. Army.

"U. S. P. and N. F. Financing," by A. R. L. Dohme. Discussion by H. M. Whelpley and J. A. Koch.

"Best Methods of Getting Results Among the Various Interests Taking Part in the Revision," by E. Fullerton Cook.

Chairman W. F. Rudd called for the report of the Committee on Chairman's address, and asked Secretary C. A. Dye to preside.<sup>2</sup>

Chairman Rudd assumed the chair and called for the report of the Committee on Nominations.

Chairman Zada M. Cooper reported the following nominees: For Chairman, C. A. Dye, of Ohio; for Secretary, Edward Spease, of Ohio; for Associates, E. L. Newcomb, of Minnesota, W. H. Ziegler, of South Carolina and Charles O. Lee, of Indiana.

There being no further nominations, it was moved that Charles LaWall cast a unanimous vote for the nominees, and they were declared elected.

<sup>1</sup> It is contemplated to publish the papers on U. S. P. Revision, beginning with the February issue of the JOURNAL. The discussions on the papers will also be printed at that time.

<sup>2</sup> The report and action thereon by the Section is printed under Minutes of the first session; see preceding pages.

The Section adjourned to convene in joint session with the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

JOINT SESSION OF THE SECTION WITH THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF  
PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY.

President John Culley of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy called the Joint Session of the Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and National Association of Boards of Pharmacy to order at 4.00 p.m. Thursday, August 28.

The report of the Fairchild Scholarship Committee was called for and presented by Chairman E. G. Eberle, as follows:

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FAIRCHILD SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE.

NEW YORK, August 25, 1919.

TO THE JOINT SESSION OF THE SECTION ON EDUCATION  
AND LEGISLATION, AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL  
ASSOCIATION, THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF  
PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES, AND NATIONAL AS-  
SOCIATION OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY:

The first plan of award formulated by the Fairchild Scholarship Committee was not so very different from that approved by the British Fairchild Scholarship Committee. In Great Britain an award of a Fairchild Scholarship has been made annually for a number of years; as far as the Chairman knows, the method has been satisfactory.

Under the first plan formulated by our Committee there were a number of applications and an award was made. Under the present demands, adopted at the Convention in Indianapolis, there have been no applicants and hence no further awards.

The scholarship should be made available for a student, or prospective student, of pharmacy; unquestionably, that was the object of the donor. In order to do this it may be necessary to change existing requirements, and so that the matter may be brought up for consideration the Chairman has taken the liberty of handing a copy of this report to the Chairmen of the respective bodies represented here in Joint Session.

Copies of the transactions relating to the Fairchild Scholarship were sent to the schools of the Conference and a request made that they indicate whether the present plan was satisfactory, or, if not, to submit suggestions for award of the Scholarship to the Secretary, Theodore J. Bradley; these are made part of the report. The first letters received are included in the printed folder; typewritten copies of the others are attached.

Should you decide that the present requirements be continued the Committee will act accordingly; if you deem it advisable that a change be made, the Chairman would be pleased to have your instructions.

Hoping that the subject may have your consideration,

Respectfully submitted,

E. G. EBERLE, *Chairman.*

Chairman E. G. Eberle explained that while the Fairchild Scholarship Committee was not appointed by any of the bodies represented in the Joint Session, it was made up of the presiding officers of these and the editor of the JOURNAL A. PH. A. He stated that there were eleven letters from Schools of the Conference expressing their views relative to the award of the Fairchild Scholarship; of these four were in favor of the award being made for post-graduate work, and seven that the Scholarship be awarded to a second year student and that the candidates have the endorsement of their school.

Chairman John Culley stated that he had proposed a plan of award as President of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and this had been adopted by that Association. (See p. 879, October 1919, issue of JOURNAL A. PH. A.)

R. A. Lyman stated that he was responsible for the present method of award; that it made no great difference whether one or more persons go into pharmacy or not, but it did make

a great deal of difference whether pharmacy as a science was developed. He said that conditions had been unfavorable in the last two years, and that he would like to see the present plan of award continued so it might be given a fair trial, and therefore moved that the present plan of award be continued another year. Motion was seconded by C. B. Jordan, and so announced.

C. B. Jordan inquired as to how the Scholarship would be awarded under the plan as at present. J. W. Sturmer, Chairman of the Committee of Award, said that the conclusions of the Committee were, inasmuch as the Scholarship should go to a research worker, that the candidate be selected, not by examination, because this is not feasible, but by past record, and there were three specific points to be observed; his non-pharmaceutical record was to be taken into account, his professional pharmaceutical record, and then the research work done, set forth in papers, published in Journals, by thesis, deposited in colleges, etc.

W. G. Gregory moved that the plan of award adopted by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy be approved by this Joint Session.

R. A. Lyman asked the privilege of accepting the Board's suggestion in the place of his own, with the consent of his second.

Theodore J. Bradley offered the suggestion that the candidates show their qualification for doing research work by submitting a thesis embodying the results of an original investigation.

The motion as accepted by R. A. Lyman was put to vote and carried. The suggestion of T. J. Bradley was referred to the Fairchild Scholarship Committee.

R. A. Lyman suggested that in view of the fact that the catalogs bearing the announcement of the Fairchild Scholarship had been issued the award for this year be made on present basis, and for next year the new method now adopted should apply. Agreed.

Secretary Theodore J. Bradley presented the report of the Proceedings of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties. (See p. 877, October issue JOURNAL A. PH. A.)

Secretary Bradley called attention to two recommendations of the President's address, namely, numbers 3 and 6: "That the Executive Committee take steps to have the Conference coöperate with other organizations to suitably memorialize the service rendered by pharmacists in the great war;" "That the Conference appoint a special committee to collect and distribute information on prerequisite legislation to aid in the securing of such legislation in States not yet having a prerequisite in pharmacy, this committee on the A. C. of P. F. to act jointly with a similar committee of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy."

A motion was made to adopt the report, which carried.

E. L. Newcomb explained the Minnesota prerequisite law.

Jacob Diner inquired whether he had understood rightly that one year of college work was accepted as one year of practical experience in a drug store, *i. e.*, 7 months at college as the equal of 12 months in a drug store. He was informed that this was the case. Dr. Diner continued, that in New York the relation was month for month, up to a certain period, but that 48 months of practical experience in a drug store must be shown. He moved the adoption of the report. Carried.

Frantz Berg, of St. Louis, moved that not less than two years of practical experience be required for registration as a fully registered pharmacist.

This motion was concurred in.

Secretary H. C. Christensen read an abstract report of the proceedings of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. (See p. 878, October 1919, issue of the JOURNAL A. PH. A.) The report was on motion accepted, and the Joint Session of the Section on Education and Legislation A. Ph. A., the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was adjourned.

---