

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Practically all scientific professions are devoting more attention to research to-day than they have given to it at any previous time. The importance of research was well emphasized during the war and the result is this greater activity above mentioned. Pharmacy should do its part in this work. The article by Dr. E. V. Lynn of the College of Pharmacy of the University of Washington which appears in this issue of the Journal is timely and sets forth some of the salient facts regarding pharmaceutical research.

C. B. JORDAN, *Chairman and Conference Editor.*)

“What is the matter with pharmacy?” This question has been asked at various times during the last few years and the resulting discussion has been rather voluminous. At least one eminent writer has come to the conclusion that there is nothing the matter. We can all safely agree with this if we care to assume a blind feeling that present conditions are satisfactory, for it is obvious that there can be nothing wrong with us, in our own opinion, if we are perfectly content with our present position. But the writer is firmly convinced that the majority of our profession is not so self-satisfied.

In times not so recent the pharmacist was one of the revered in his community, on a par with the minister, teacher, and physician, treated as an equal by all of these and by the layman in general. Since then the educational standards of the people as a whole have been constantly raised until to-day a college training of four years is not an unusual experience. The medical and pedagogical standards have been increased consistently and adequately during this general elevation of education so that the teaching and medical professions still retain the same relative position in commanding the respect of society. Pharmacy has lagged woefully in this matter and to-day might well be compared in the public opinion with the butcher and grocer. Do not most of us feel that there will always be something wrong until our profession regains its lost position as an equal with the physician in public regard? Why then have we lost this equality? The answer to this is apparently obvious in a lack of educational standards and a consequent absence of pharmaceutical research.

There is no doubt that we are confronted with an economic and even vital necessity for raising the standards of schools of pharmacy. Slowly but surely the function of the Conference in promoting this cause has been manifesting itself in a general move among the members toward a higher set of requirements in all respects. It is true that many of the colleges are very slow in responding to this universal movement and that some few have even delayed a recognition of the minimum set by the Conference, but the majority of our pharmaceutical institutions are behind the movement and we cannot but be pleased with the general tendency toward higher educational requirements. We can now easily foresee the time when four years in college will be required of all practicing pharmacists. But can we afford to stop there? Will we not fall far short of our goal if we do not foster a spirit of research in those who graduate with a bachelor's degree? We cannot expect satisfactory results in research until we have placed the schools on higher standards, since adequate training is a prerequisite to original work, but neither

can we attain the objects which should be ours until we can show such results to our critics.

The large drug manufacturers have not been slow in realizing that research means advancement in more ways than financially. Perhaps they have been inspired by entirely selfish motives but the fact remains that, although some of them are mistakenly reticent as to the publication of results, they are undoubtedly doing their share. Nevertheless, it is certainly true and evident to most of us that the original work, which would replace the profession of pharmacy on its former plane of equality with that of medicine, must be multiplied many times beyond what the manufacturer can undertake. Granting that there is such a need for a multiplication of the volume of results, where else can we look for a source of these than to the schools of pharmacy? Several of them have already instituted a rapidly growing graduate department and we must congratulate them and the profession of pharmacy on being in a position to promote such a movement. The propagation of this, however, needs stimulation and encouragement from the profession in its entirety. Individually and collectively, we can accomplish a great deal towards the attainment of our goal by nursing in our schools this research spirit which is so essential.—E. V. LYNN.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE LOCAL BRANCHES

"All papers presented to the Association and Branches shall become the property of the Association with the understanding that they are not to be published in any other publication prior to their publication in those of the Association, except with the consent of the Board of Directors."—Part of Chapter VI, Article VI of the By-Laws.

Article IV of Chapter VII reads: "Each local branch having not less than 50 dues-paid members of the Association, holding not less than six meetings annually with an attendance of not less than 9 members at each meeting, and the proceedings of which shall have been submitted to the JOURNAL for publication, may elect one representative to the House of Delegates."

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.

CALL FOR CONFERENCE ON U. S. P. AND N. F. REVISION WORK.

The very extensive data obtained by E. L. Newcomb—regarding the wide range in degree of fineness of commercial powdered drugs and the apparent impossibility of preparing from many drugs a powder of fairly uniform degree of fineness—which he recently presented to the U. S. P. and N. F. Revision Committees, has opened up a wide range of inquiries which not alone concern the pharmacognosist and drug miller, but also every department of pharmacy concerned with the extraction of drugs.

This and a number of other unsolved problems before the Revision Committees show the great need of frequent conferences for their discussion and solution.

The Chicago Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association is extending an invitation to hold such a conference at Chicago, January 11–12, 1924.

E. L. Newcomb has agreed to come from Minneapolis, and we have the promise of Messrs. A. H. Clark, Bernard Fantus, George D. Beal, C. M. Snow, Wm. B. Day, E. H. Wirth, Wm. Gray, Hugh McGuigan, S. C. Henry, and others to be present. We are at this time sending invitations to Messrs. Henry Kraemer, C. A. Dye, John M. Francis, A. John Schwarz, E. A. Ruddiman, W. L. Scoville and L. A. Seltzer, all of whom are relatively near to Chicago, and to Messrs. George M. Beringer, E. Fullerton Cook, Charles H. LaWall and Hermann Engelhardt, from the East.