

He dwells also upon doctors who cannot cure themselves, and upon doctors who prescribe absurdly so that it is necessary for apothecaries quietly to rectify their blunders. He proceeds to catalogue with much shrewd discernment the blunders of which some of the medical profession were guilty and points out in an able fashion the qualities and duties of an honest and capable physician. He answers Lisset's charge concerning the complexity of the apothecaries' remedies in this fashion:

"Master Lisset blames us, saying that we cause many drugs to be used by the sick, in order that we may get more money; it is very much the contrary, for the sensible apothecary will take heed how he gives to the sick anything about which he is not assured by experience, and of which he does not clearly know the properties. He will not be like many doctors, who prescribe confusing recipes, that is to say, great triacles, a quantity of drugs, to make believe that they are very wise, where two or three things having good relation to the malady would be of more use than all the triacles. If anybody would examine the physician who prescribes them, he would find him pretty well puzzled to explain the use of half, and would find his prescription an inextricable knot; for it is impossible that so many drugs can produce an action favorable to the malady, without setting up another which is hurtful and obstructive, and which may have some occult virtue that is out of place. Therefore I hold that practitioner to be wise who combines into one prescription few medicaments."

Other foibles and fads of the healing art of that day are touched upon with ridicule, such as the use of powdered glass, gold, sapphires, rubies, emeralds, and coral dust as medicaments. Briefly, the whole work is a shrewd and illuminating satire on some of the practices common in the 16th century which were dignified by the name of science, and some of Palissy's observations could be heeded with profit by merchants and practitioners of our own times.

If there be any moral in the tale, it is found in the closing words of Palissy's preface:

"Here are not blamed the learned and wise, and not to be prolix, I will pray to God very heartily that He will give his grace so well to exercise our estates and vocations into which it has pleased Him to call us, that it may be to His praise and glory, so that we may have no just occasion to blame and abuse each other, to the great prejudice and debasement of our profession."

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY,
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
ANN ARBOR.

THE STANDARDIZATION OF SCHOOLS OF PHARMACY.*

BY WILLIAM B. DAY.

Standardization is the topic of the day. Standardization of drugs, chemicals and galenicals occupies the attention of the revision committees of the United States Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary. Standards for state licensing examinations, drug store experience and educational qualifications are prominent in the deliberations of our affiliated organizations, the National Association Boards of Pharmacy. The American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties is discussing educational requirements, standards for admission to schools of pharmacy, standards for the courses given by these schools, standards for the equipment of the schools and even suggests standardizing the faculties themselves.

* Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Cleveland meeting, 1922.

The American Pharmaceutical Association is vitally interested in all these matters but in none more than in the standardization of the schools of pharmacy for this bears directly on the one thing that is of supreme importance to the A. Ph. A., namely, the development of pharmacy and the determination of its status as a profession.

Our schools of pharmacy are making progress—for which the A. C. of P. F. deserves much credit—but we are still far behind our allied professions of medicine and dentistry. Will pharmacists and the public support more rapid progress toward higher standards?

We hear much of the commercialization of pharmacy, and even a casual observer must note that conditions in pharmacy have changed greatly in the last decade. Such commercialization seems unavoidable—it appears also in other professions—but it does not necessitate a lowering of ideals, for the pharmacist of to-day remains primarily a pharmacist—his professional knowledge and skill fix his status in the estimation of his patrons, and since he has accepted the responsible duties of the pharmacist he is bound to discharge them faithfully.

With the change in the manner of conducting drug stores comes a change in the value of the experience gained therein—at least in so far as this “practical experience” is a qualification for the license to practice. Hence the need for schools of pharmacy to supply more comprehensive training and more extended laboratory courses. Yet, the education of the pharmacist and the development of pharmacy go hand in hand. Neither can make headway without the other.

For these reasons I venture to present to this section rather than to the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties this brief discussion of the standardization of colleges of pharmacy and to sound a warning against the establishing of standards that may hinder rather than promote the professional development of pharmacy.

Standards for schools of pharmacy are necessary, but they should be broad standards, capable of general application and, of course, only intended as a minimum upon which development along several lines may be based. Schools of pharmacy must develop according to their opportunities and their environment, they cannot all, like the victims of Procrustes, be made to fit the same bed. Important as the teaching work is, the activities of the school of pharmacy must not cease there.

Just as the objective of the pharmacist should be service to his community, both as a pharmacist and a citizen, rather than the amassing of personal wealth, so the school of pharmacy should aim to be of service to the pharmacists and to the citizens of its city and state. The school should be a clearing house for pharmaceutical knowledge. Its library and collections should be available to pharmacists and to the public. Its faculty should endeavor to help pharmacists with their problems and be able to take an active part in affairs. It should, in fact, be a center for things pharmaceutical.

Schools that train for leadership deserve our praise—honor to them! But intelligent followers are no less important than leaders. Unless the rank and file select capable leaders and support them effectively, wise leadership is impossible.

Schools must prepare their students *to be pharmacists* rather than to prepare them “for pharmacy.” This implies broadening the courses and giving them

greater cultural value, and yet the young men and women who are graduated by the school and thereby stamped with its approval have the right to expect that they shall also be able to qualify for the practice of pharmacy by passing the state examination. This condition will continue so long as the examination given by the board of pharmacy is the standard whereby the qualification for practice is finally determined. It therefore becomes necessary for the schools to consider the nature and scope of these board examinations in shaping their courses.

Whatever standards are established for schools of pharmacy, their reputation will be fixed and their usefulness judged by their fruits—their alumni. So let us not bind them too closely by material standards, of buildings, of equipment of libraries—important as these are, but let us also consider the use that is made of these advantages, the place which the school of pharmacy occupies in its community, the *esprit de corps* of its faculty and students, and the professional standing of its alumni.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE LOCAL BRANCHES

"All papers presented to the Association and its branches shall become the property of the Association, with the understanding that they are not to be published in any other publication than those of the Association, except by consent of the Committee on Publication."—By-Laws, Chapter X, Art. III.

Reports of the meetings of the Local Branches should be mailed to the Editor on the day following the meeting, if possible. Minutes should be typewritten, with wide spaces between the lines. Care should be taken to give proper names correctly, and manuscript should be signed by the reporter. To maintain its activity and representation each branch should see that at least three of its meetings during the year are reported in the JOURNAL.

NORTHERN OHIO BRANCH.

A special meeting of the Northern Ohio Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association was held August 18, 1922. Chairman Eugene R. Selzer stated that the purpose of the called meeting was to consider the matter of making a donation to the Headquarters Fund of the A. Ph. A. Otto Muhlan moved that the sum of five hundred dollars be donated and presented while the Association was in session in Cleveland. The motion was seconded by W. H. Hagemester, put to a vote and carried unanimously. This being the special purpose for which the meeting was called, the session was adjourned.

EUGENE R. SELZER, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON LOCAL BRANCHES.*

BY IVOR GRIFFITH, CHAIRMAN.

Frankness is the mouthpiece of honesty, and if frankness will make any amends for apathetic activity and for mediocre results,

* The report was received and approved at the Cleveland meeting, A. Ph. A.

this committee headed by its chairman and spokesman will submit a report that will at least stand on honest legs.

In point of accomplishment our record is not particularly scintillating. In keeping with the original function of the committee it is its business to aim at the establishment of new branches and to sustain the old. Establishing new branches is a physical impossibility under existing conditions, and sustaining the old is like feeding oxygen to a case of double pneumonia.

We endeavored at the outset of the year's program to discover just what branches were actually living up to their obligations in point of called meetings and other activities. Oddly enough we failed to obtain any encouragement or information from the major number of listed local organizations. From a few we received notices of marked activities and of a full understanding of their responsibilities. Others entirely disregarded our communications. Eight of the local branches seem to be functioning properly; the others flare up occasionally and show signs of life only to