

employed, and he must of necessity be absent for his meals, and for required business conferences, etc. To require him to employ a pharmacist in order that one shall be present during these temporary absences is prohibitory in numerous instances.

On the other hand city drug stores claim the same privilege, although conditions are considerably different, as they keep their stores open longer hours as a rule, and the clerks in the cities demand shorter hours. Hence, when the store is open for 17 hours and the registered man is only there for ten hours we have a store that is operated forty per cent of the time without a pharmacist on duty. Legislatures can hardly be expected to frame provisions of law to fit both cases, and for that reason we are of the opinion that the temporary absence clause will come as near solving the problem as any suggestion that has been made.

In the discussion which followed it was brought out that Iowa, through a vendors' license law, carefully controls the sale of medicinal preparations by itinerant vendors and confines such dealers to the sale of patent medicines. Those entering into the discussion were Messrs. George Judisch, L. L. Walton, M. N. Ford, the Chairman and the author of the paper.

ENFORCEMENT POWERS OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY.

BY M. N. FORD.

At the request of Chairman Swain "The Enforcement Powers of Boards of Pharmacy" was discussed by M. N. Ford, secretary of the Conference and also secretary of the Ohio Board of Pharmacy. This subject embraced a consideration of the general law enforcement powers vested in the boards, and also the broader aspects of law enforcement resulting from a merger of the boards of pharmacy with other branches of the state government or when vested in some department independent of the board of pharmacy. Secretary Ford reviewed the various pharmacy law enforcing agencies, and said that in many instances the boards possessed wide powers which could be called into play as a means of securing a more satisfactory observance of the pharmacy laws. It was stated, as a controlling principle, that the enforcing agency should be fully informed as to the purpose of the law and also sympathetic with this purpose. As a general thing the Board of Pharmacy is laboring under a load of administrative detail which would make it welcome a transfer of enforcement work to other agencies if this could be done without sacrificing efficiency. Experience, however, in many states has shown that this phase of the work suffers when it is removed from those directly interested in maintaining the proper legal status. Because of this basic principle, the speaker expressed the opinion that the public benefits to greater extent by vesting enforcement in the hands of the board of pharmacy. Mr. Ford urged every state to give serious attention to the powers which the boards possess and to extend them by legislation when this is required, or by board ruling, when this is provided for, so that better conditions may be brought about. The opinion was expressed that increased professional prestige and a more secure economic position would follow a satisfactory observance of the law.

In discussing Secretary's Ford's paper Robert P. Fischelis said: "Mr. Ford's remarks were very interesting to me. New Jersey has been giving attention to recommendations for reorganization of the state government. The recommendation was that the examining boards be consolidated in some way under the state department of education in the interest of economy. I could not see where the state would be the gainer if the activities were transferred to another department. We have only a sufficient number of clerks and other assistants to actually take care of the work which comes to our attention, and we know that if we go into enforcement work it would require additional help. To carry on the work there would have to be as many people in the Department of Education as we have, so I fail to see where there would be any economy. But it is my opinion that to turn over the enforcement activities to any agency who is not interested would seriously hamper the work. I am interested in knowing whether Mr. Ford or anyone can furnish me with any arguments outside of the one which I have given for retaining the enforcement by the Board of Pharmacy, and if there is anyone here who has had experience in the enforcement activities removed from the Board of Pharmacy and taken over by another department and whether the enforcement is less efficient. Of course, the case of Maryland I understand is a very sound one. But I don't know just how efficient it would be if the secretary of the Board of Pharmacy and the drug commissioner positions were held by anyone else."