

Section on Commercial Interests

Papers Presented at the Sixtieth Annual Convention

A SYMPOSIUM ON "THE CAUSE OF THE COMMERCIAL TREND IN PHARMACY."

Mr. E. L. Scholtz, of Denver, opened the discussion and began by saying that the question of commercialism in pharmacy was one that was attracting a great deal of attention at this time, and that there was more or less criticism from those who were supposed to run ethical stores. In reading the proceedings of the Los Angeles meeting he had noticed that a member present from one of the Dakotas had read a very interesting paper on the subject of what he did not do. It was particularly interesting from his standpoint, but it should not be forgotten that circumstances and conditions varied, and that each man must look to the development of his own business. Everybody who had traveled about the country must have noticed how the drug business had developed from conditions existing thirty years ago. He well recalled the store in which he had learned the first principles of the business, and not for a moment would they have thought of having cigars, stationery, soda-water and other merchandise of that character. But the demands of the public had had a great deal to do with the development of the drug business in this country. Drugstores, for a long time, had been looked on as places of convenience. The public had gone for years to the corner drugstore for all sorts of information, and when a man visited a city where he was a stranger, he naturally stepped in at a place that looked like it was alive and as though the people knew their own city. Strangers in a city did not go to the department stores for information, and if they did they didn't get it. He related an amusing experience of his own, in going into a department store in Denver, directly opposite his own place of business, where he asked the young lady who waited upon him, and who apparently possessed but slight information of her own department, the question, "Can you tell me where the Scholtz Drug Company is?" to which he received the reply, "No, I don't know." She was interested enough, however, to turn and ask the man behind the counter if he knew, and this brought out the response, "It is somewhere around here, but I don't just know where it is." Drugstores, on the contrary, were intelligence headquarters, and that was where people went when they wanted to know things. It was wonderful, really, to think of the great variety of knowledge that the real student in a drugstore gathered in the course of a lifetime. He acquired a knowledge of science, history, botany, his own business, physics, chemistry, and frequently of the languages, and if he was a man of capacity, he possessed a fund of information that placed him far above the average business man.

The modern drugstore was an evolution, coming not from the desire on the

part of the owner to drift into side lines of merchandise, but as the result of repeated suggestions induced by the conditions of modern life. For instance, a community of cultured people would want magazines, and where the bookstore was located two miles downtown, various members of the family, young and old, would repeatedly come in to the corner and inquire, "Why don't you have such and such in the way of magazines." And it would be the same with stationery and other articles. The druggist would naturally say to himself, "Here is an opportunity of furnishing this family what they want. They are evidently too healthy to need drugs; therefore, why not sell them what they ask for?" It was the needs of the community that decided the character of the business done. The introduction of confectionery and the like had thus come into the modern, "progressive" drugstore. This evolution had continued until the regular drug feature of the business, with this class of stores, was rapidly approaching the *nil* point. If the druggist happened to be located in a Christian Science community, he would starve to death if he depended on his sale of drugs.

American travelers abroad were often inconvenienced in going into the chemists' shops of England, or the apothecaries' shops of Germany to buy familiar articles dispensed in American drugstores, only to have them refer him to the specialty stores that handled these particular goods. He illustrated by the experience of a friend of his, who went into one of the real pharmacies of Germany to buy a hot-water bottle, and they sent him to the rubber store. The rubber store was closed, and the patient had to suffer for the want of a hot-water bottle. In this country, rubber goods has been made a regular department in the drug life of the country, and the modern progressive druggist could scarcely find fault with the fact that he was required to carry such goods, as they were quite profitable.

Mr. Scholtz, recurring to his early days in the drug business, went on to say that he first worked for a German, who conducted a real apothecary-shop. In the afternoons, he had every opportunity of taking a nap or putting up Seidlitz powders. The prescription business was very limited, and there was plenty of leisure time.

As touching the prescription phase of the business, Mr. Scholtz said that it was a singular fact that the progressive druggists in this country, the ones that handled the general lines of merchandise, were the ones that put up the greatest number of prescriptions. He thought this was absolutely true, all the way from New York to San Francisco. He had investigated the subject, and with but one exception had found it to be true. This exception he had found on the Pacific Coast, in a chain of stores there. The manager had explained to him that for a long time their policy had been to avoid the prescription business—to ignore the physicians, for the simple reason that they could make more money in those lines to which no responsibility was attached, whereas in the putting-up of prescriptions the compensation derived was not sufficient to offset the danger always accompanying the compounding of prescriptions. Finally, a physician had suggested the establishment of a department for the filling of prescriptions, to be put in charge of a perfectly competent man. They had adopted this suggestion, and had been gratified to find that this department bade fair to make as

much money as any other, and this policy of catering to the needs of the physician would be continued.

Mr. Scholtz went on to state that when, within the past two years, he had suggested to one of the Denver physicians that he had in mind to establish a strictly physicians' drugstore, carrying nothing but what the physician needed in his profession, he was greeted with the admonition: "Don't do it; it will never pay here." This physician gave as his reason for his opinion that it would be impossible to get all the prescriptions that all the physicians would write, and it was doubtful if he could even get the larger part; that the contrary condition had existed for years, and the physicians naturally leaned to the druggists in the localities where they lived or had their offices, and they would certainly get some of the business. Mr. Scholtz said he had even been discouraged in this project by the owner of a building where he designed establishing such a store, on the ground that it would not pay, and that the physicians themselves wanted a drugstore of the modern type.

Mr. Scholtz concluded by saying that he personally felt the cigar business ought to be thrown out of the drugstore; that although he used the "weed" himself, he considered it about as senseless a habit as a man could have, and he wondered why sensible druggists catered to the use of tobacco.

Mr. Kendall said he had not yet been able to get all the "soda-fountain" out of his system, despite his repeated efforts, and asked Mr. Scholtz to discuss that proposition.

Mr. Scholtz replied that he knew he was treading on toes to say it, but the soda-water business had entered into the druggist's life in a peculiar way, and must be regarded as a permanent part of the business. Many years ago, when carbonated waters first became popular, it was discovered that bicarbonate of soda and sulphuric acid were required, both of which articles were obtained in the drugstore—that by the decomposition of the bicarbonate of soda, the carbonic acid gas was liberated and put into the water under pressure. People then said, "Why, that belongs to the drugstore!" Naturally, the druggist believed it, and took it up and has been at it ever since. From that first suggestion to the chemist of making carbonated waters himself, there had been evolved the modern drugstore soda-fountain.

Mr. Scholtz said that the man who had a good soda-fountain and served the proper drinks, became well known in his neighborhood, and was the man that would get the largest volume of business. The reason was that children and young people were the ones that favored the use of soda-water, and many of the older people enjoyed these drinks, as when well served they were delicious and never harmful. He doubted very much if anyone had ever drunk too much sodawater. There was no question but what a soda-fountain drew trade—though the soda business in relation to the whole volume of business was oftentimes very small. In his own business, it had never exceeded one-sixth of the entire volume of business. The cigar department, with him, was only about one-fortieth of his business, and it could be very well left off.

Another good thing about the sodawater business was, that the oftener people came to the store the more impressed they were with the character of the estab-

ishment, and they came to have confidence in the other departments, and that led to the reasoning that the drugstore they patronized in that way could put up medicine as well as the man who had no soda-fountain and who did not handle a general line of merchandise.

In conclusion, Mr. Scholtz said there was no particular advantage in the strictly prescription drugstore, from his point of view, in city life. Of course, if a man wanted to have leisure to read the newspaper all day,—as his first preceptor used to do,—or to read the drug journals, that was another point of view. He admitted that the word “drugstore” was not applicable to such stores, and he could not say what name would finally be evolved to describe them. When the term “drugstore” was used in ordinary conversation, people expected to find a place where they could get anything they wanted. It was simply a question of evolution, after all, and it would be a short-sighted business man who did not take advantage of the public demand, with the constant revenue to be derived from its recognition, and the increase in the pleasures of life resulting from an increase of income. Cameras, films and photographic supplies were striking illustrations of such demands on the part of the public. Ten years ago, the “camera craze” was hardly dreamed of, but the public began traveling, and every tourist had his camera, and went to the drugstore for his supplies. “You must supply the people with what they want,” said Mr. Scholtz, “or you are not a good merchant.”

Mr. Dick asked Mr. Scholtz if he thought it was good policy to meet cut-rate prices in the retailing of goods, and Mr. Scholtz replied that there was but one answer to such a question: That the wise man never permitted his competitor to beat him out.

Mr. L. G. Blakeslee, of St. Louis, in taking up the discussion, stated that when he suggested the “trend of commercial pharmacy,” as a subject for discussion, he expressed the hope that the discussion would take the direction of the ascertainment of the real fundamental causes involved. He was sure that no one could better enlighten the members on the existing situation than Mr. Scholtz, but it had occurred to him that perhaps away back of all this there was a real cause, which was apt to be overlooked, and it was his idea to draw out that thought and have it discussed.

No one, said Mr. Blakeslee, had at the beginning, nor had today, higher ideals as to pharmacy than himself. He had purchased Professor Stevens' store in Detroit when the latter left to take a chair at the University of Michigan, and in this store there were no patent-medicines exhibited at all, but there was a large and lucrative prescription business, which it was his idea to perpetuate, and which he did to the best of his ability. After remaining in business for some time, he saw the coming cloud of commercialism, which had now so fully enveloped pharmacy, and disposed of this store, because he desired, if he was to become a commercial man, to follow another line. It was with the purpose of finding out just what this evolution was, and what it meant, that had led him to make a close study of the subject. It seemed to him that its causes lay very largely with the manufacturing pharmacist—though he expressed the hope that no one would draw the conclusion that he was saying a word derogatory to that interest,

as nothing was farther from his thoughts. The aggressive and extensive manufacturers had progressed so far in the manufacture of remedies which the pharmacist had formerly compounded himself that it left very little for the real scientific dispenser to accomplish. He had gone into Mr. Scholtz's drugstore and asked the clerk to go back through fifty prescriptions he had compounded today, and had found that approximately half of them were already prepared—such as elixirs, pills and the so-called pharmaceutical specialties. In smaller places, like towns of ten or fifteen thousand and downward, the percentage of prescriptions actually compounded was almost *nil*, as the manufacturer had made these preparations so scientifically, so neatly; and when he gave the doctor his therapeutics, he bought his remedies. Under these circumstances, what was left for the pharmacist to do? He recalled that, in Michigan, three large stores had given up the retail business, and were now manufacturing pharmacists; he thought possibly Mr. Scholtz some day might have a manufactory of his own here in Denver—as he realized that he was of the kind to get in the “band-wagon” and follow the procession or lead it. The manufacturer had made the commercial pharmacist, by making it easier for the physician and the public, as well as for the pharmacist himself.

Mr. Blakeslee, continuing, related an experience of his boyhood days in the country, and of his interest in the contents of a bottle that his father kept in the cupboard, a bottle marked “Hartshorn.” When he got to the University, he found it was called ammonia hydrate, or, more scientifically, NH_4OH . He learned there that this was the name he would use for that article when he went into business. He went into an old apothecary-shop in Ann Arbor and asked the clerk to give him two ounces of ammonia hydrate, and he well remembered the expression upon the face of an old gentleman back behind the counter, working on his books, as he looked over his spectacles and remarked, “That is one of those darned fools from the University. He wants ammonia water.”

Mr. Blakeslee said that, at one time, he was engaged in a very high-class prescription store, which did practically nothing but prescription work, and where they used from three to five pint bottles of syrup of hypophosphites a day. It was a simple compound, and he asked the physicians, if they would object to his dispensing a preparation he could make for them, instead of the proprietary articles they were accustomed to dispense, and they agreed to it. He made a satisfactory preparation, but when the representative of the manufacturing house came along and found that his order for syrup of hypophosphites was curtailed, he had taken a “fall” out of him that he would never forget. He afterwards found that this representative had such influence with the proprietor of the store that he made him discontinue the syrups he had prepared and go back to the manufactured preparation. This was the starting-point, said Mr. Blakeslee; this was where his eyes were opened. There lay the difficulty, he said.

Prof. Homer C. Washburn, Boulder, Colo., said he looked upon the trend of commercialism in pharmacy as an evolution of trade conditions parallel and analogous to the evolution of manufacturing clothing as compared with the early days. In the Colonial days every family had its spinning-wheel and its carpet-

weaver, and they made these things. But all this was changed, and now all business was specialized. Only a few years ago an engineer leaving an engineering-college engaged in all kinds of engineering projects. Today, he was a specialist in some branch of engineering. If a man was a good railroad engineer, or a good bridge engineer, or architectural engineer or civil engineer or electrical engineer, or chemical engineer, or naval constructor, he would succeed. It was the same with pharmacy. Likewise, the physician of thirty years ago knew very little about diseases, as also of materia medica. He knew nothing of bacteria. Today, on the other hand, one man devoted his whole time to pathology; one treated this form of disease, and the other that, and far better results were reached than in the days of the general practitioner.

Suppose, said Mr. Washburn, continuing, the druggist attempted to make a fluid extract or tincture of digitalis. Digitalis was a drug that did not respond to chemical analysis, and the strength of various specimens would vary very widely, a dozen different batches of drugs having as many different strengths. Not one retail pharmacist in 10,000 had the apparatus to assay physiologically the fluid extracts or tincture of digitalis, nor could the average pharmacist do so, even if he had the apparatus.

The manufacturing houses, on the other hand, would make a barrel of fluid extract of digitalis, and after it was thoroughly mixed they would put it in charge of an expert, a specialist in that line, and he would try it on one hundred or two hundred frogs, dividing the frogs into lots of five or ten, giving them successive doses. In this way would be determined the strength of that digitalis in heart-tonic units, and if the assay showed a greater number of heart-tonic units than called for he would cut it down, and if it contained less he would concentrate it until the right amount was reached. This manufacturer sold the jobber, and the jobber sold the retailer, and each cc. of the extract had exactly the same physiological power as any other cc. The pharmacist, on the other hand, if he were capable and had the necessary apparatus, would make perhaps a pint of the fluid extract or tincture of digitalis, and it would take as long to assay that amount of the tincture as it would the manufacturer to assay his barrel of tincture. Here the question of economy played an important part.

Mr. Washburn concluded by saying that he believed the pharmacist should be *able* to make a good many things, and some he *should* make, but many things the manufacturer could make so much cheaper than the retailer that he could not afford to undertake them. He thought one mistake that schools of pharmacy made was to give the student the idea that he was to be absolutely ethical in the highest sense of the term; that he was going to be an apothecary, and was not to stoop to trade conditions that maintained in other lines of commercial pursuits. Such teaching was an injustice to the student. He should be made acquainted with actual conditions, so that he might know exactly what he would have to meet, and in this way he would be far better off.

F. W. Nitardy, of Denver, said that he had presented a paper before the Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing, in which he had quoted a list of 100 of the most commonly-used pharmaceutical preparations of the U. S. P. and N. F., which he was sorry to say all druggists did not make. He knew

exactly what it cost to make these, including the cost of material, allowance for waste and full allowance for time required, and also allowance for what might be called "overhead charges," or the cost of doing the business. He had compared the prices of these 100 or more pharmaceutical preparations, ranging from elixirs, syrups, spirits and solutions, ointments and tinctures and aromatic spirits,—all through the list of commonly-used preparations,—with the very best prices to be obtained from the leading pharmaceutical manufacturing houses, taking the jobber's discount off their list, and found a very wide margin. The difference was so great that if 50 percent, all the way through, were added to the cost of these goods as given by him, the cost would still be about on a level with the manufacturer's prices. The reason for this was that the manufacturers had heavier expenses than the retail pharmacist had when he made these articles himself.

Replying to Mr. Washburn's remarks upon the subject of tincture of digitalis, Mr. Nitardy said there were half a dozen preparations in the Pharmacopoeia that would require that sort of assay, but this was not necessary if he bought the proper drugs. He could find physiologically assayed digitalis leaves, and he could make a tincture from them, and that tincture would be just as good as he could buy, and at half the price.

He did not think Mr. Washburn's drawing of an analogy between the clothing business and the drug business fitted exactly. No such crude ways were employed by the druggist in making his own preparations as some of the forms employed by the manufacturer. Mr. Nitardy said there was another advantage to the druggist in making his own goods, in that he could show the physicians and the public that he was a real pharmacist, and knew something about what he was doing, and not an ordinary merchant handing out wares over his counter. In the drug business, it was absolutely necessary to have the confidence of both the physicians and the public, and when the druggist was able to turn out finished pharmaceutical products, he would gain that confidence.

Mr. Washburn, replying to Mr. Nitardy, suggested that the gentleman had spoken entirely from his experience with the drug company with which he had been connected since he had left college—a company having a large manufacturing department, and making several hundred preparations, as he understood. It was not in the class of the larger pharmaceutical manufacturers, of course, but likewise not in the class of the druggist having a corner drugstore in a small village. He asked Mr. Nitardy if he considered that the druggist doing business in the small towns of the country, of some two or three thousand inhabitants, who outnumbered a thousand to one such institutions as he was connected with, could make these preparations as cheaply as they could buy from the manufacturer. This was the real condition that had to be met.

Cornelius Osseward, of Seattle, said that this was a subject after his own heart, and that what applied to the large store applied to every store in the United States. One great advantage in the preparation of his own articles by the pharmacist was in the fact that he could say to the physician and the public that he was dispensing absolutely fresh drugs, which could not be truthfully said where he bought from the jobber. His claim was now, and had always been,

that the druggist knew nothing as to whether the preparations he bought and had on his shelves were active or not. He was decidedly of the opinion that he should make his own simple preparations. He was willing to admit that the manufacturer had his proper place, and that he should make a certain line of goods, for the very reason that he could do so cheaper than the small dealer. These were comparatively few, however, and there were a great many things the manufacturer made today where he was infringing on the rightful occupation of the retail pharmacist, and, as for himself, he was opposed to the manufacturer's "getting more out of him" than he could help.

Charles Clayton, of Denver, agreed with Mr. Osseward in the statement that what applied to the largest retail drugstore in respect to manufacturing its own preparations applied to the small store as well. While it was true that the druggist could not make one pound of compound syrup of hypophosphites at the same cost that he could buy a gallon or more from the jobber, he could make it cheaper than he could buy a single pound from the jobber. As was commonly known, the manufacturers usually had a very much lower price, proportionately, on bulk quantities, and it was a constant temptation to buy the larger quantity to get the better price. This was bad policy, however, as it was frequently a long while before the goods could be disposed of. Mr. Clayton said he thought that the average retail druggist could afford to do many things for himself, as, for instance, the filling of quinine capsules—although in his own experience he had found that he only saved about 15 cents a thousand on them, and he thought his time was worth more than that, considering how long it took. On the other hand, he could buy Seidlitz powders of U. S. P. strength and composition for less than he could afford to put them up.

As to the commercial trend of pharmacy, Mr. Clayton said he did not think it was so much a result of supply and demand, as Mr. Scholtz had asserted, as it was the absolute necessity of adding these things to the druggist's line "to keep his head above water." He believed that a large proportion of those who went into the retail drug business did so with the idea that they were to conduct ethical pharmacies; but when they found that the landlord demanded his rent money, and that they had to have something to live on, which demands the legitimate drug business did not supply, they had to add other lines.

A. V. Pease, of Fairbury, Neb., thought that the discussion illustrated forcibly that many times in propounding and elaborating theories men lost sight of their exact application. The druggist should not be a one-idea man, but a man of many ideas, many faculties and many talents. He should also be a manufacturer as well as professional man. But, at last, he was a merchant. He had long ago made up his mind to make everything he could, even if it cost him as much as to buy from the manufacturer, for the benefit of the practice and the maintaining of his skill. He had likewise given close attention to accurate and careful buying, and it had appealed to him from the first that cooperative buying with his neighbors was the sensible thing to do. This was the trend of the times, and he suggested that the members would find it profitable to take up this subject for discussion in their several home towns and put it into active practice. "Experi-

ence meetings" sometimes brought out the best there was in men, and an interchange of ideas, with friendly criticism, meant progress.

Continuing, Mr. Pease went on to tell how the idea of cooperative buying had so impressed him with its value that he was led to investigate the matter and gather such data as he could, and finally got some drug friends to go in with him and form a straight-out wholesale drug house, which had earned dividends from the very start—dividends not only on his stock, but on his purchases.

The history of the Rigsdale stores in England, which did a business of hundreds of millions each year, had given him his inspiration. He was also a member of a similar club in his State (Nebraska), and had found it a decided advantage; its members got together occasionally and talked over conditions. He had just today received by mail proof of a half-page ad in one of the great dailies of his State, and every man of his club in Nebraska had his name on that page. This was a chain of stores, but the stores were owned individually by the members. Every member was a part of this chain, and tied to the company by actual investment, but controlled their own stores. He believed the business would constantly grow, as it had been doing, and that cooperative buying and cooperative manufacturing was the inevitable trend.

Mr. Nitardy said that, if not out of order, he would like to go back to the first subject under discussion, to reply to one of Mr. Washburn's statements, to the effect that the laboratory with which he was connected was out of the ordinary class of retail drug stores. This might be true as to a few preparations that he made in large quantities, but his list comprised something like 650 different pharmaceutical preparations, and the great majority of them were not made in quantities of over a pint at a time. He was satisfied that if Mr. Washburn would come to his establishment and compare his prices with those of the pharmaceutical manufacturing houses he would be converted to the idea that it would pay the druggist to make these things for himself.

Gus C. Kendall, of Meridian, Miss., said that he had not intended to participate in this discussion, as he had been so much in evidence yesterday, but could not refrain from making the suggestion that if the members were to discuss some of these propositions "from now until the next session of the A. Ph. A.," they would be no nearer their solution. He commended the remarks of Mr. Scholtz as being one of the most intelligent discussions of the subject he had ever listened to on the commercial side of the drug business; but he nevertheless maintained, and defied successful contradiction, that the pharmacist of today was the only professional man that was not living up to the standard of his profession.

Specialization was the order of the day in every line but pharmacy. This was noticeably true in medicine and surgery, not to mention dentistry. In these days of progress and advancement, a man didn't even have to go to an old-time practitioner when his horse or his cow got sick—the veterinarian attended to that.

All this was a plea for the specialist in pharmacy—although Mr. Kendall admitted that conditions would have to govern this matter to a large extent.

He closed with a tribute to the progressive little city in the South, where he lived, where it was supposed generally in the country that "everybody was suffering from the hook-worm, when, as a matter of fact, since the discovery of 'Vinol' they were getting rid of that."

Wm. D. Dick, of Lawrence, Kans., added his testimony to the value to the druggist of manufacturing a number of elixirs and other preparations himself, and said his experience had proven that it could be done at a profit by anyone who would undertake it. He had no manufacturing chemist, but that was not really required, with the knowledge that was furnished by the Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary. He thought any good, ordinary druggist could manufacture these things and be thoroughly safe in saying they were up to standard. If the druggist was very careful, it would mean a profit to him, and he would have the satisfaction of knowing that his preparations were absolutely such as he would like to recommend. It would be a preparation of quality—which could not be said of every preparation bought of the manufacturing pharmacist. There was no "cutting" in his town, and he thought it always unwise to cut prices, and that the druggist would sooner or later "cut his own throat" by engaging in that practice. The druggists in his town had educated the people to understand that when they wanted medicinal products they must go to the drugstore for them. A department store had started on a line where the druggists found it was injuring them, but they had succeeded in getting them to withdraw that and a number of other preparations they were selling even below cost, thus saving a profit to themselves. He realized that conditions in the larger towns and cities—as Denver, for instance—were different. He and his fellow-druggists were all on good terms, and whenever a "proposition" came along two or three of them would get together and buy and get the discount, thereby purchasing as cheaply as any jobber could do.

H. H. Whittlesey, Pocatello, Idaho, continuing this discussion, said it seemed to him that the drug man or pharmacist, be he a man of commercial instinct or high ideals, was entitled to the profits which came with the evolution in pharmacy, and which had made it a commercial business rather than an ethical one. He lived in a town of 30,000 inhabitants, and they had no cut prices. "It is a land of eternal sunshine and fair prices," said Mr. Whittlesey. He had watched the evolution of the drug business, had noted the many different products which had been exploited, and it seemed to him that it was proper for the druggist to embrace any opportunity to make a profit out of any side line that did not conflict too strongly with his ideals. He was also of the opinion that he could make many of his own preparations, as Mr. Nitardy had suggested. He thought the pharmacist who had spent time and means to prepare himself for the skilful practice of his profession was entitled to all the profit that he could legitimately realize, and he believed in extending the business to embrace those things that would pay a good profit. He was opposed, however, to making an entire sacrifice of ideals. He had been taught pharmacy by Remington and materia medica by Maisch away back in 1874, and naturally he had started in with high ideals. He spoke of the vast difference in conditions between the time when he started

out in Chicago, where it required three prescription men to make pills and fill the prescriptions that came in, and those of the present, as illustrated in his own experience, when he had to do this work himself because of the lack of experience the average drug clerk had in the preparation of pills. He advocated the buying of supplies that could be secured to better advantage than if the druggist prepared them himself. He concluded by the statement that under the modern conditions of life, where everybody wanted an automobile, and desired to have a good house to live in, with electricity to light it and gas to cook with, and to dress his family well,—all of which he considered legitimate expenditures for the pharmacist to make,—it was all the more necessary for the druggist to embrace every opportunity to make money legitimately in his business. But he might do this and not sacrifice his ideals.

Mr. Scholtz said he thought the discussion had drifted far from the real proposition under consideration, viz: commercialism in the drug business. Referring to the statement by Mr. Kendall that in his city of 25,000 inhabitants they only had fourteen drugstores, he said that if the laws of the United States were similar to those in Germany, which practically established an apothecary-shop on the ratio of 1 to every 2,000 people, "we would all be ethical druggists." But, the situation was different in this country, and conditions varied with different localities. Referring to his own experience, Mr. Scholtz said that he had not even observed that there was not a place in Denver to get a decent glass of sodawater until his attention was called to it by someone else, and whether good or bad from an ethical standpoint, he went right at it, with the result that his soda business had grown from nothing at that time to \$100,000 a year at the present, as the total of the several stores the company conducted. At the time he embarked in business for himself the store with which he was connected was doing a business of \$16,000 a year, whereas his own business was \$22,000 the first year—because he had put in soda-water. The second year it was \$28,000, and it had continued to grow until it had now reached an amount which it took "six figures" to express. The reason of such remarkable growth was because they had "started something different, and supplied a demand."

Mr. Scholtz went on to draw a vivid picture of the contrast between the old-fashioned drugstore, "a place that made you sick when you went in it and sicker when you came out," and the "modern emporium of fashion, the progressive drugstore of today." Right or wrong, he said, this was what they were, and the druggist of today must meet the demands of the people of his community. Mr. Scholtz set his face firmly against the serving of luncheons in drugstores, however, and said he was going out of the business when it came to that. Recurring to his early days in the drug business, Mr. Scholtz said that the trouble with the man he had started out with was, that he was an old Philadelphia-College man, a German, indifferent to conditions as they existed, bent on following out his ideals, without regard to the public demand. He attributed the marked progress he himself had made to the fact that he took an exactly contrary view of the matter, and the fact that his energy was of a "different sort" from that of his first employer. He said he wished that all were pharmacists in the strictest

sense; that he himself had made all of the elixirs and fluid extracts of different kinds that Mr. Nitardy now made. He had prescription men now, who did nothing else but fill prescriptions. But the modern drugstore, in his opinion, could not ignore the public demand for other things in the drugstore than medicine.

Mr. Osseward said he wished to call attention to the mistaken idea that because a druggist ran a commercial business he could not be an ethical pharmacist. He had visited one of the stores of Mr. Scholtz a number of times, and he was satisfied that he ran a prescription pharmacy as good as he himself was running in Seattle, and he did nothing else. He disliked commercialism, and that was why he ran a prescription drugstore only; that Mr. Scholtz did not lose sight of the ethical side of pharmacy, although he ran a commercial store. He thought the idea that the two things were incompatible was ridiculous.

Mr. Kendall disavowed any purpose of intimating that a man who ran a commercial drugstore could not be an ethical pharmacist. The real point of discussion was, whether conditions were such that a man could run a strictly ethical drugstore, and yet go so largely into the commercial end of the business.

This discussion reminded Mr. Clayton of the story of the man who met a stranger on the street and asking him what his business was, elicited the reply, "My business is saving souls, but I dig ditches for a living." He thought this aptly applied to a lot of those whose business was pharmacy, but who had to sell other things for a living.

W. Bruce Philip, of Fruitvale, Calif., called attention to the fact that the example of the larger stores in successfully handling a number of side lines frequently had an injurious effect upon the smaller druggist, in leading him to follow suit, with the result that he did not carry sufficient stock of any one thing to make a success. His advice was to start out with a drugstore, pure and simple, and not put in a side line until it could be properly handled. Then, if it should develop that that line was a mistake, it should be eliminated. He had tried putting in a first-class assortment of candy, and had advertised it extensively; but when he found that the demand was not sufficient to justify it, he had cut it out. He thought it was a great mistake for the small stores to jump from one side line to another.

THE MEN WHO HAVE ARRIVED.

Every man that ever amounted to anything in this world had the habit of doing things alone, unaided and in new ways. He followed untrodden paths, struck off alone and boldly, without calling a meeting of all his friends to advise him. He learned to trust himself, to recognize his own thoughts as good thoughts, and to grasp an opportunity ere it was too late.—*Western Druggist*.