

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

applies to all. But much may also be said for them. It depends upon the point of view whether one may favor or oppose them. It is the writer's purpose to take the favorable view point in the present article, and what he may briefly say may be regarded as an expression of opinions formed as a result of experience.

Some years ago (1895) I had the pleasure of contributing to a series of correspondence lectures for a correspondence course published in one of the leading pharmaceutical journals. I considered myself fortunate in this work to be associated with such men as H. H. Rusby, Henry Kraemer, Dr. Oldberg, Dr. Charles Rice, and others. I happen to have at present a young man in the University School of Pharmacy who, several years ago, took this correspondence course. This young man next year will be a candidate for the B. S. degree in pharmacy. He will have then completed the four years' course. I asked him to state frankly his opinion of such a correspondence course. He said that he took this when he was clerking and found it exceedingly helpful. It gave him a taste for study and furnished an incentive to attend a school of pharmacy where he could obtain what the correspondence course is not designed to give, a thorough, systematic training. This testimony is practically a repetition of the statements of many others who have taken such courses offered by different institutions. It is not an uncommon thing to have students who had finished a correspondence series come to the university for further study.

In a state such as Kansas (400 by 800 miles) of sparsely settled communities with an immense number of very small towns, it becomes an interesting, if not a serious problem how to reach these various towns and hamlets. For one situated as one is at the State University, whose ambition is to extend the educational influences to the remotest corners of the state, one has to use his ingenuity to reach out to these various districts with education of a technical type. Many of the young men and young women, for various reasons, cannot attend the University or any institution of such a nature, hence it is putting an increasing demand upon the institutions to provide for such as desire instruction such as a university may offer. The criticism of many interested in the training of young men and young women in pharmacy has been that the University of Kansas was blocking the way of pharmaceutical education by requiring higher attainments than the ordinary boy or girl could offer, and as a consequence the Extension Division of the University of Kansas, created by the Board of Regents, conceived the idea of adding to its numerous courses in the various departments that of pharmacy, making itself responsible for such a course and in the support of its efforts asked the cooperation of the School of Pharmacy. It formulated such a course, consisting of 120 assignments, which, if properly studied, would be equal to at least 720 hours of work. This special course the Governor of the State, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents of the University heartily approved. In addition, the Board of Pharmacy of the State of Kansas approved the efforts by a formal resolution. This extension work the members of the Board of Pharmacy believe will raise the educational average of applicants seeking registration through the Board. Undoubtedly there are many who will surely become so-called pharmacists without school training or without even correspondence training. It stands to reason that they will be the better pharmacists if they take advantage of either.

If we were to summarize the advantages of such a correspondence course we would say that it provides many opportunities for those who could not attend the University. Among them are: (1) Home-study courses for persons who contemplate the vocation of pharmacy, but lack some of the entrance requirements exacted by the State Board of Pharmacy; (2) means of becoming a registered assistant pharmacist; (3) means of preparing for registered pharmacist's examination; (4) means of keeping abreast of the times in those subjects applicable to the practice of pharmacy, in which science is making additions to our knowledge.

For those who are interested in the details of correspondence courses, we might cite as an example one of the courses in *Materia Medica*. This one embraces classification, physical description, and chemical constitution of crude drugs and their physiological properties, methods of dispensing them, their action, and their physiological relationships.

As previously stated, it depends on the point of view whether one may favor or oppose such courses. No one will deny that the ideal course in pharmacy is the one which is known as the regular course, as offered in a well-established curriculum approved by the trained educators of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties. No one who is an advocate of correspondence school work should be considered as inconsistent if he enthusiastically urges the necessity of such ideal courses for the proper training of pharmacists. On the other hand, if one takes the point of view as above referred to—that of striving to reach those who can ill afford, and hence will not attend a systematic course and receive its superior training, one is compelled to take the position of advocating most strongly such courses as are offered by Extension Departments.

AN IMPROVED METHOD FOR ENFORCING PHARMACY LAWS.

LOUIS SCHULZE, PH. G., BALTIMORE, MD.

As we are constantly reminded that the present system of conducting examinations, supervision of pharmacies (as to whether or not competent persons are in charge) and prompt prosecution of violations, are not as satisfactory as they might be; having had nine years' experience as a member of the Board of Pharmacy as at present constructed, the writer has come to the conclusion that a radical change in the general order of boards would be highly beneficial in more fully protecting the public from incompetency on the part of those engaged in conducting stores, and would also elevate pharmacy in the eyes of the public.

It would no doubt be better if the present system of a board consisting of five were entirely abolished and in its stead created a Commission of Pharmacy, into whose hands should be given all matters pertaining to pharmacy in the state, namely, the enforcement of the pharmacy laws, poison and anti-narcotic laws, pure drug laws, and any others that might be enacted, to protect the public against incompetency on the part of those engaged in pharmacies or the sale of