

ducting a school of pharmacy are steadily increasing. The demands upon student as well as institution are increased. The expense to the student for the opportunities offered is materially decreased, while the expense to the institution is increased more than five-fold and yet the supply of students is less. That such should be the case is but natural and but the sequence of unnatural, unjustifiable and uncalled for competition. It cannot be remedied by forcing a time limit of twenty-five weeks in two separate years, under the plea of helping the student on the installment plan, ostensibly to give him a chance to earn his living and tuition, but in reality to keep the institution alive. These self-sacrificing institutions increase their probabilities of securing the student's total earning capacity in a period of two and even three years, when the actual time devoted to the whole course amounts to one hundred and fifty to two hundred days of six hours each. It is a method that does not redound to the glory and honor of pharmaceutical education. When dollars and cents are the consideration, the student body can figure as well as the best mathematician and hence avoids schools until forced into them to maintain his earning capacity. The opportunities for acquiring pharmaceutical knowledge must not be restricted to time or place; some acquire it in one year while others may take ten years. Under present conditions, boards of pharmacy are the censors of this knowledge and aim to harmonize the commercial and professional status of pharmacy, and as a result true pharmacy does not progress. To remedy the existing evils, all state pharmacy laws need revision. Druggists with specific privileges and pharmacists with specific education must be created; both under the control of a State Commission composed of qualified men and having the means at their disposal to carry out the provisions of legislation.

---

#### SCHOOLS, STATE BOARDS AND PREREQUISITES.

---

J. F. RUPERT, HOSPITAL STEWARD, U. S. NAVY, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

---

Pharmacy certainly is associated with troubles in this day of persecution and prosecution. Every pharmacist is likely to be charged at some time or many times in his career with practices beneath the standing of manhood and with being a corruptor of morals and a parasite, preying upon the superstitions, ignorance and innocence of an uninformed public. The responsibility for this situation must be charged to a certain few, who are guilty of all these offenses, and have brought disrepute and disgrace upon our calling. Added to this the passage of the pharmacy laws has caused a further distrust in the minds of many people who do not understand their intent. Next, the "Pure Food and Drugs Act" caused another spasm of distrust and open accusation. Now the anti-patent medicine crusade is taken by the public to be directed against the poor, helpless, struggling druggist. It is a case of "The man is down, don't hit him—kick him!"

Must I mention further, another thorn in the flesh of the druggist—the question of counter prescribing? Here, some unscrupulous ones have incurred the dis-

pleasure of the powerful and well organized medical profession, the very people we desire above all others to have with us. The anti-narcotic laws and liquor legislation and pure drug crusades thrown under the nose of the public at times have not helped to make things better, as all of these are taken as evidence of prevailing conditions in the drug trade and of the insincerity and criminality of the ever persecuted druggist. Add a little financial difficulty and just a little domestic trouble, and the existence of Mr. Druggist will certainly not appear to be the most enviable.

To these external discomforts are added internal intricacies in the way of preliminary educational requirements, prerequisites, pharmacy school standards, uniform state board examination, and what not! Now, according as to how we clear all these hurdles in our path, so will our troubles and distresses in the future be relieved.

These internal troubles have largely been brought upon ourselves, I believe, in the attempt to correct the erroneous ideas of the public. But in our anxious attempts to remove these erroneous ideas we have hopelessly muddled ourselves between professionalism and commercialism. On the one hand, we readily understand that commercialism is essential to the density of our trousers' seats, while on the other hand, professionalism rather hovers over our heads, not always settled complaisantly.

In connection with pharmacy training we have, on the one hand, preparation (schools and home study) for fitness, and on the other hand, determination of that fitness (state boards). Now, if our boards are thoroughly qualified to determine that fitness, why establish prerequisites of any nature? A man without a common school education will have the utmost difficulty in attaining to a position of fitness as determined by a qualified board. As regards prerequisites, I would make the same general remark. On the other side of this question, I want to say, that if we set the standard of work for the pharmacy schools, and provide for the preliminary general education of the student, and then require graduation from these schools, why put the man to an examination?

I do not believe we should make any comparison with the dental, medical or veterinary professions. Their work as professional men covers much more than ours, and I think it is just this mistake we have made in the past. We have problems peculiar to our work and we must solve them by our own initiative, rather than by following the lead of other professions.

Personally I believe that a young man with a high school training, or even less, who is a student and has good stuff in him, working in a small store where he will have considerable time to study, or in a large store where he will have from two to five hours per day to study and is allowed a little space and material to experiment with, together with his observation at the prescription counter, the study of drug journals and general recipe work with good texts on general chemistry, pharmacy and materia medica, all supplemented with the use of eyes and ears and the most commendable virtue of stick-to-it-ive-ness, will make a pharmacist, as good as any state board might require. Schools do not make pharmacists.

I believe the schools are necessary for special training and I do not want to be understood as belittling their value. No young man can do better than to

take a course at a good school, but I would recommend him to do this after a year or two in a store. This will insure much more from the course and will reveal to him just what will be required when his school work is over.

Above all things, I would not stand for allowing two years at school to equal three, four or five years, store experience. Three years' experience, I believe, should be established as a minimum requirement. Experience in a store has value in training which cannot be equalled by any number of years of school work. The firing-line is what "fixes" a man's nerves. All the drilling and technical schooling in the world never made a soldier, but the two must go together.

Not less than two years' store experience in any instance, should be required; however, much credit may be given for school work. Book knowledge might largely make a laboratory man, but it will not make a commercial pharmacist or prescription clerk. In a drug store a man is against a thousand perplexing propositions, and certain qualities of disposition and mind are required to make a reliable, trustworthy and competent man, able to cope safely and successfully with all situations. A man might pass a brilliant examination on paper on technical subjects, but here the ability of the state board to determine the fitness of the man to "practice pharmacy" is concerned.

Selling poisons is a business surrounded by cares and responsibilities that can only be properly appreciated through experience. Compounding prescriptions back of a store counter, to be paid for, and taken home by mother or father for the treatment of disease of loved ones is a more important, responsible and real thing than the same performance at the school bench.

I think the statement made by the Syllabus Committee, as published in the "Bulletin of Pharmacy" in July, 1911, by E. O. Engstrom, as follows, is of some interest in this connection:

"In the determination of the fitness of any applicant to receive a license to practice pharmacy all important facts of his educational history, practical experience, and technical services should be taken into account, including his preliminary general education, his special education in pharmaceutical and other related technical schools, his practical experience in pharmacy and the result of the examinations he has passed, and an average of these three general factors, each assigned its appropriate value, should be adopted as the passing grade."

The practice of pharmacy is very much the same all over the states. Special preparation is naturally necessary, but this special preparation should be in lines which have a direct relation to the practice of pharmacy. Urinary analysis, bacteriology, food examination, analytical chemistry, manufacturing and commercial chemistry, are all special professions, and I do not believe come within the province of State Boards of Pharmacy.

I believe the schools are necessary as institutions for special training, but prerequisite laws will practically bar out many worthy men.

Let us suppose a struggling young man with a little money is married. He is not registered, but has applied himself to study and work and has qualified himself for his profession. He could pass a good examination but the law says he must graduate first. He simply can't afford it. What is he to do? A young man supporting his parents or others of his family might find himself in the same circumstances.

I want to quote from a statement lately made by the "Western Druggist," with which I am on record as being in perfect accord:

"The advocates of prerequisite legislation proceed on the assumption that the colleges have a monopoly of the work of education and without a college course no man can acquire competency in the art of dispensing. The professional standing of thousands of non-graduates of the past and of the present is proof of the fallacy of this assumption, but even conceding that it be warranted in a majority of cases, the exceptions today are sufficiently numerous to make the incorporation of such assumptions in state legislation a grave injustice. Moreover, these two considerations are a governing force:

"First, any man desiring to enter the practice of pharmacy has a constitutional right, if qualified, to demonstrate his qualification before a board of pharmacy and to have those qualifications made effective by the receipt of a certificate of registration conferring the right to practice. Pharmacy laws are not made for pharmacists nor for colleges, but for the protection of the public against incompetency in dispensing medicines. To the extent therefore that such competency is insured the public is protected and no pharmacy act can constitutionally go farther.

"Second, prerequisite legislation means the subordination of the boards of pharmacy to those colleges which under such legislation may dictate to the boards whom they may or may not accord the privileges of an examination. In other words, private institutions are given power over the representatives of the people on the boards of pharmacy, thus surrendering the public interest to private interest—a perversion of legislation not to be tolerated in a free country."

To sum up:

1. If we require the graduation prerequisite, certainly the boards should establish the standards of the schools.

2. Not less than two (2) years' experience in a store (with school work) should be required. Without school work not less than three (3) years' store experience.

3. If we establish preliminary education and graduation requirements, and set the standard of the school, and require store experience, why require examination at all—are not the requirements sufficient?

4. If it is possible for a board of pharmacy examiners to "thoroughly determine the fitness" of the candidate, why establish any requirements at all, other than store experience and examination?

I am not in favor of prerequisite laws. I believe they work great injustice to many worthy men.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE COURSES IN PHARMACY.

---

L. E. SAYRE, LAWRENCE, KANS.

---

At the last meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association in the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties there was a motion offered which, if passed would have tended to put a stigma upon every instructor who would give or offer instruction in any pharmaceutical correspondence course. Fortunately, the motion, after a little acrimonious debate, was lost.

Much may be said against correspondence courses. That which applies to one