

how competent or efficient he may be. The writer is of the opinion that our higher courts would not sustain such a position. A druggist is one who buys and sells drugs. When he becomes skilled in compounding and the preparation of drugs and versed in their identification he is an apothecary or pharmacist. To withhold license from such an one because he obtained his knowledge outside of college walls, seems to me not to be tenable.

At the Denver meeting one of our foremost teachers of pharmacy—one who has spent his whole life in the lecture room and laboratory—clearly and explicitly expressed himself that in his opinion no board has a right to question the source of a candidate's knowledge. Such a position taken by one who could well take the opposite view, should have some weight with those grappling with the problem of interstate registration. Would that our vocation were wholly professional; then could we exact higher professional training.

This is, however, not the case; the business of the pharmacist is more one of a mercantile character; that is we are more druggist than apothecary or pharmacist. The logical and sensible view to take of the situation is that of the Professor. When we do this, justice will be done to the applicant for registration, and reciprocal registration will be readily brought about. A person being licensed in one state, should have the right to cross the line into another state and register without again having to pass an examination. It seems foolish to think that one competent to compound and dispense drugs in one place, is not competent to practice just across the line in another state. An injustice is being done to the pharmacist and the public gains nothing thereby. Where improvement can be made is with the boards. It is evident that the business of examining boards is to pass on all applicants alike, no matter where from, and that special recognition of college graduates should not be their business. Let us expend our energies in harmonizing examinations and bring about a more uniform standard, on a *common sense basis*. Persons equipped with good college and laboratory training will take care of themselves. They don't need any special consideration, moreover the non-recognition of diplomas will at once remove all danger of recognizing weak and inferior schools. When the several boards will stand on such a platform, the establishment of a national examining board will be feasible, and the registered pharmacist will receive his just dues and proper consideration. After all is said, it depends almost wholly on the individual, be he a graduate pharmacist, or a self-made pharmacist, whether he succeeds in business or not. Confidence of the people gauges his success, and gives him his proper professional and commercial standing.

---

## THE NEED OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION IN PHARMACY.

---

ALBERT H. DEWEY, PH. G., M. S., PURDUE UNIVERSITY, LAFAYETTE, IND.

---

One who knows enough to fill a prescription on the north bank of the Columbia River should know enough to fill the same prescription on the south bank of the same river even though it is in another state. A man who is qualified to practice

pharmacy in Kansas City, Mo., should be competent to do the same thing in Kansas City, Kan., without additional qualification, examination, or registration.

It should be apparent without much argument that the nature of the practice of pharmacy, and incidentally, that of medicine as well, is such that it cannot be hemmed in or limited by the arbitrary confines of state boundary lines. It differs no more in different states than it does in different localities in any given state. Our Pharmacopœia and National Formulary are national standards and are the same in every state. In fact, so well recognized is this principle, that an organization of most of the state boards of pharmacy has been effected "to provide for interstate reciprocity in pharmaceutical licensure based upon a uniform minimum standard of pharmaceutical education and legislation."

Worthy as this object may be, and earnestly as we may all hope to see it accomplished, I desire nevertheless to point out that such an association is purely voluntary and that under existing laws there is no way of making the rulings of this association authoritative or binding upon any state. Moreover the conditions under which interstate reciprocity is granted should not be subject to the whim or caprice of any future board of pharmacy in any given state. Some of the states at present will not become active members, while others will not affiliate themselves with the movement even as associate members and there is no way of compelling them to do so. Universal reciprocity is therefore by no means a certainty near at hand and can never be guaranteed for the future.

From all quarters comes the heartiest commendation of the happy idea of a federal law controlling the handling and sale of narcotic drugs. All thoughtful pharmacists are agreed that state laws, however stringent, are inefficient to cope with this problem. There are many other fields in which the need of federal legislation is recognized, and it seems to me that the situation is analagous with reference to pharmaceutical licensure.

What we need is not universal interstate reciprocity, but a United States licensure by a properly constituted authority. We need a federal pharmacy law, creating either a United States Board of Pharmacy or a Bureau of Pharmacy, with powers to examine candidates, to grant licenses valid in the United States and its possessions, and to revoke such licenses for cause, fixing the minimum educational requirement for examination and defining the rights and privileges of such licensed pharmacists.\*

Doubtless a more efficient plan would be an extension of the scope and powers of the Public Health Service to include the above functions save, of course, those things defined in the act so extending its powers.

The practice of pharmacy certainly bears a most vital relation to the public health and it would seem that both could be better conserved and protected by a federal control of pharmacy than under the present system of control by state boards.

The same is doubtless true of medicine, dentistry, and all allied professions which have a bearing upon the conservation of the public health. I am, here, however, speaking only of pharmacy and I am free to confess an utter inability

---

\*Amendment of the Federal Constitution would, of course, be necessary to make such a law valid.—EDITOR.

to see any hope of a "uniform minimum standard of pharmaceutical education" or "uniform legislation" when this uniformity must be sought at the hands of forty-eight different state legislatures. Uniform enforcement of the law by forty-eight different state Boards of Pharmacy might indeed be questioned even if the impossible were accomplished in securing uniform legislation. On the other hand a federal pharmacy law with federal enforcement would be uniformity itself.

Recently there has been considerable agitation concerning a distinction between a pharmacist and a druggist. In some parts of the country this has taken the form of an effort to certify certain pharmacies or to certify certain pharmacists (a point upon which published accounts are not clear) but so far it has met with no success.

This agitation is partially the result of a commendable effort on the part of physicians to establish a means of *knowing* for a certainty where their prescriptions will be properly filled with "pure and standard drugs as ordered." It is also partially the result of the experience of the past, which proves the wisdom of separating pure pharmacy and the dispensing of prescriptions from the heterogeneous merchandizing of the drug store. Such a separation would remedy many of those. Unsatisfactory conditions of present-day pharmacy which have contributed to this agitation, would be in perfect accord with the wisdom of the ages, would injure no man now in the business, would result in better service to the physician and the public, and therefore should be made.

I should like to point out that the enactment of such a federal pharmacy law as above indicated would afford an effective means of distinguishing between a pharmacist and a druggist and of separating the pharmacy from the drug store, a consummation which cannot be attained under state laws no matter how devoutly it be wished.

---

#### ADVERTISING NOT AN OCCULT ART.

Too many people acquire the idea that advertising is an occult art. The merchant in a small town is too apt to say to himself: "I can't afford to hire an advertising expert, and there are none in this town, if I could. I don't know anything about the magical art myself. Therefore I won't attempt to advertise." And he doesn't.

Advertising is not a black art. The larger towns, of course, have advertising men who get very expert in their lines, and who can tell you how to engineer to the best advantage any sort of an advertising proposition from a two-line reading notice to a \$100,000 campaign. This is an age of highly trained specialists, and advertising has its specialists. Most of them, by the way, trained themselves. They are still in the pioneer stage, and men now living are blazing the trails.

You can write an advertisement. You might not be able to plan a large campaign without any waste, but you can write an advertisement, and possibly a good one.

To write an advertisement, you proceed almost exactly as in writing a telegram. That is, you omit all unnecessary matter; you boil it down. You choose short, plain words, which are not likely to be confused with similar words of different meanings.—*W. S. Adkins, in National Druggist.*