

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN  
PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION.

BY ROBERT L. SWAIN.

Due to an unusual spirit of forbearance, the address of the president has become one of the time-honored customs of these annual meetings. And, relying upon a continuance of your good nature, I am happy to conform to the custom to-night. But first, let me admit my indebtedness to that line of fine men who have preceded me in this high office. I confess freely that much of the inspiration which has come to me is the result of an interested and diligent study of their distinguished work. Nowhere is there to be found evidence of a higher ideal, a more earnest and practical point of view or a more consistent purpose than in the presidential addresses delivered before this body. As I look back upon this great mass of constructive material, I can only venture the hope that I have measured up, as best I could, to the high standard they long ago set up.



R. L. SWAIN.

One of the very first things the president of this ASSOCIATION faces is the vast responsibility which he must carry. To be compelled to pass judgment, to make decisions, and to take a real part in working out policies and problems is vastly different from sitting in idle contemplation on the passing scene. No president, I am sure, ever sought to shirk his responsibility. I, in my own way, have attempted to face mine.

As I look back over the eight months of my term of office, I am certain that some worthwhile things have been done. I am conscious that I have approached my problems in my own way. I am aware that I have seen the office through my own eyes. In other words, there is such a thing as the presidential interpretation of the presidency.

This address, then, is my interpretation of the presidency. I want to emphasize that I am expressing my own views. I am submitting personal evaluations and interpretations of the many things which have demanded my attention. I stress the personal nature of this address so that the ASSOCIATION may be completely free to act as it seems best regarding the proposals I advance or the suggestions I submit. The ASSOCIATION is fully absolved from any collusion or collaboration in these respects.

For these reasons, I shall make no attempt to give you a detailed statement of the general work the ASSOCIATION has carried on. Fortunately, much of this is done year in and year out with little thought to the one then holding the presidential chair. This work is peculiarly and preëminently the work of the secretary and he should present it. I have purposely sought not to infringe upon his field. It is to the secretary that we should look for portrayal of the ASSOCIATION year, and for an analysis or interpretation of the work carried on. The secretary's

report should be printed in advance of the meeting, and be made an outstanding feature of the annual program.

At the outset of this address, I desire to express my real devotion to the principles which have actuated the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION since its inception. A high note was sounded at the very beginning. Within their sphere and for the fulfilment of their purpose, the great Constitution and Code of Ethics formulated at the first meeting of the ASSOCIATION in 1852 stand with the finest expressions of professional opinion to be found anywhere. Even at this late day, they challenge our admiration, and impel us to renewed devotion. Throughout its history, the ASSOCIATION has been steadfast in its adherence to sound ideals. Petty politics have not crept in, self-seeking has not asserted itself, and nothing has been able to entice it away from the early precepts. It stands to-day as the embodiment of sound thinking, unselfish leadership, and as pointing the direction in which pharmacy might safely move. In spite of the changes which have come about on all sides, and in spite, too, of the uncertainty and confusion of the moment, the ASSOCIATION should continue its efforts to advance pharmacy as an essential public health profession. The ASSOCIATION is faced with a magnificent destiny. The future of pharmacy may well be said to rest upon its integrity. To-day the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION has become recognized as a national, non-profit, professional body of pharmacists, pharmaceutical educators, law-enforcement officials, research workers, and others interested in the protection of public health and the treatment of disease. It is my earnest hope that its activities may be confined to the fulfilment of these high and inspiring purposes.

This meeting of the ASSOCIATION will long be remembered as one of great historic significance. The center of the stage is held by the American Institute of Pharmacy, as the headquarters building of the ASSOCIATION has been so rightfully named. The dedication exercises, to be observed to-morrow, mark the close of one important phase of this great undertaking. This magnificent building, a real epic in marble, represents one of the most important accomplishments of our profession. It typifies, in a peculiarly beautiful manner, the highest ideals of pharmaceutical efforts. It proclaims, in wondrously pleasing notes, the meaning of the service which pharmacy carries on. It stands, as it will long continue to stand, a classic tribute to those who have seen beyond the confusion of the moment to the deep cool pools from which come intrinsic and lasting things.

While the dedicatory services are not to be anticipated at this time, I do want to point out the necessity of using the building as a real pharmaceutical workshop. A magnificent plant has been provided, and is now ready for the best possible use. Every group, devoted to the professional advancement of pharmacy, should center its activities here. No more fitting place can be found for the offices of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. The work which they do is closely connected with the basic purposes of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. These two organizations would immediately find themselves more closely in touch with national thought. They would become, in every sense of the word, the national authorities in their respective fields.

Not only should these two great groups be brought in, but there are many other activities which the ASSOCIATION should inaugurate as promptly as possible. There is an urgent demand for additional publications. Surveys and special professional and economic studies await only the facilities with which to proceed. Statistical, legislative and legal departments should be set up. Research studies bearing upon the United States Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary should be provided for. The drug industry should look here for the establishment of drug standards, and for working out the important technical and scientific bases upon which they rest. With these functions in full swing, little would be needed to make this building a practical and effective pharmaceutical institution.

It is recognized, of course, that any such program requires funds. When the building project was first launched, the objective was one million dollars. The half-way mark has been nobly reached. There remains the second, and perhaps equally important part. Adequate financial support must be forthcoming if the ASSOCIATION is to carry out its magnificent plans, and do the job that must be done. With this thought in mind, I recommend that the Committees on Campaign Funds, Site, and Plans for the A. PH. A. Headquarters Building be discontinued, and that a new committee be set up to consolidate the work done so far and to push on to the ultimate objective. I would suggest that the title be the American Institute of Pharmacy Maintenance Committee. This committee should be empowered to undertake the collection of funds for the maintenance and development of the ASSOCIATION'S activities so that the best use may be made of the facilities now enjoyed.

I further recommend that Doctor H. A. B. Dunning, chairman of the present Campaign Fund Committee, be asked to assume the chairmanship of the Maintenance Committee. No one knows more than I the great load he has carried, and the fine job he has done. Under other circumstances, I should feel that he has earned the right to retire. However, as great as has been the success of his labors, I believe a larger opportunity awaits him. Without his judgment, his faith, his idealism, it is certain that the headquarters building would not have been so promptly realized. With his great talents placed behind this final phase of the job, I am sure it will be brought to a successful conclusion.

I should like to pay my personal tribute to all who contributed in any way to the erection of the headquarters building. Over thirteen thousand people pledged funds for this great undertaking. I especially desire to express thanks to the members of the various committees engaged in this work. For ten years they labored for the attainment of their goal. They have made a contribution to the ASSOCIATION and to pharmacy which will stand as an inspiration for ages to come. The joy which comes from doing the job should be theirs on this great occasion.

The past year has been an outstanding one in the A. PH. A. For a long time, the ASSOCIATION has been working for the recognition of pharmacy as a requirement in every hospital. It is with pleasure that I announce that the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association has accepted this view, and now lists pharmacy among the essentials of a registered hospital. The Council states that "the handling of drugs should be adequately

supervised, and should comply with State laws." The AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION is to be congratulated in bringing this great effort to a highly satisfactory conclusion.

The final publication of the Prescription Ingredients Survey and the Studies of Professional Pharmacy as carried out by the St. Louis Drug Store Survey impress me as basic contributions to the betterment of pharmacy. They supply the structural data upon which the profession depends. I strongly urge these publications upon the educational and registrational groups, and upon all interested in the development of pharmacy along professional lines.

The fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the National Formulary is fast approaching. The ASSOCIATION should mark the occasion in a fitting manner. It is noteworthy that the New York Branch has already commemorated the fore-runners of this highly significant event. The National Formulary is one of the great pieces of work the ASSOCIATION has developed. It is recognized, together with the United States Pharmacopœia, by federal and state food and drug laws as a legal standard. In many states, the pharmacy laws demand that a copy of the current standards be kept in all drug stores at all times. It is recommended that a determined effort be made to have such a provision in the laws of every state. The National Formulary has become an essential adjunct to medical practice. It is a most fitting expression of professional pharmacy. The ASSOCIATION should never lose sight of its responsibility in this matter, and should bend its every effort to maintaining the National Formulary in the high position it has attained. The ASSOCIATION is greatly indebted to Doctor E. N. Gathercoal and his colleagues on the Revision Committee for their devoted work preparatory to issuing the sixth edition.

The annual observance of Pharmacy Week had its inspiration in this ASSOCIATION, and has always been regarded as peculiarly within the field covered by this body. I have always felt that setting aside one week for the presentation of professional pharmacy to the people of this and other lands is as little as a professional group can do. I have not the slightest doubt that the future of pharmacy depends entirely upon its professional service. It is the basic thing in every pharmaceutical effort. Pharmaceutical legislation, pharmaceutical education, the whole of pharmaceutical service rests upon the professional character of pharmacy. Pharmacists should be keen to recognize this, and diligent in their efforts to impress it upon the public mind. I cannot be too emphatic in urging pharmacists to embrace every opportunity to advance and elevate their professional work as a basic and fundamental thing. The principles underlying it are sound, and the whole idea is a dignified and worth-while approach to a most important subject. I hope that 1934 will witness the most zealous observance of Pharmacy Week.

The Remington Medalist this year is Sir Henry S. Wellcome. This medal is awarded by the New York Branch of the ASSOCIATION to that pharmacist who has done most for pharmacy. Sir Henry would seem peculiarly worthy of this honor. He is one of the truly great men developed in this profession. His research studies have benefited the entire world. He is regarded as one of the most enlightened philanthropists. It is fitting, I think, that the award should be made an outstanding feature of this meeting.

There are some defects, so I believe, in the organizational set up of the ASSOCIA-

TION. It is my judgment that the retiring president should become a member of the Council. Such a procedure would benefit the ASSOCIATION by keeping the president in active service for at least two years. I, therefore, recommend that the Constitution and By-Laws be amended so as to bring this condition about. I have no hesitancy in making this recommendation because, under the rules, it could not become effective until the close of my successor's term of office.

I am also constrained to suggest that study be given to the custom which has sprung up of nominating the chairman of the House of Delegates for the presidency. In this matter I speak from experience. Inasmuch as the chairman of the House appoints the Committee on Nominations, I have felt that it was an embarrassment to him to be the recipient of honors at the hands of his own committee. If the chairman, by virtue of his office, is to be nominated for the presidency, then the By-Laws of the ASSOCIATION should so state. A study of the matter over the past few years will show an almost unbroken precedent in this respect. I have no real objection to the matter although the House of Delegates was not organized with this thought in mind. However, simply to bring the question squarely before the ASSOCIATION, I recommend that the chairman of the House of Delegates be ineligible for nomination for the presidency during his term of office. In case this is favorably acted upon, I further recommend that it shall not apply, in any sense, to the incumbent chairman or vice-chairman.

I have come to the conclusion that it is probably unwise to nominate three candidates for the presidency. Such a three-cornered contest seems to me unsuited to the purposes of the ASSOCIATION. I should prefer to see two candidates only. As the matter now stands, the Committee on Nominations can be regarded more nearly as a Committee on Elections. By a strategic grouping of the candidates, the election of one can be readily brought about. I think it would be much more in harmony with fair practice to make nominations on the basis of merit, and leave the election to the wishes of the membership. A Committee on Nominations is a helpful thing only so long as it restricts itself to making nominations. It goes beyond its province, and renders the ASSOCIATION a pronounced disservice when it seeks to control the election. I think the successive Committees on Nominations should be instructed to study the general prevailing conditions, and to select men from different sections of the country for nomination for the presidency, so that all sections might be honored in this way. Of course, the governing principle should always be the good of pharmacy and the advancement of the interests of the ASSOCIATION. However, it is believed that this principle can be served and all sections of the country recognized at the same time. For this reason, I recommend that the By-Laws be so amended as to provide for the nomination of two candidates only.

I have given careful thought to the work done by the Committees on Prescription Tolerances and Weights and Measures. As the work of these two groups develops, it will be found mutually inclusive. I thus suggest that the chairman of the one shall be an ex-officio member of the other. I recommend that the chairman of the Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing be an ex-officio member of each of these committees. This section is peculiarly concerned with prescription tolerances, and the actual conditions under which compounding and dispensing are carried on, and should have an official part in furthering these two ASSO-

CIATION projects. The annual reports of these committees should be submitted to the Section on Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing as a regular routine.

Some notice should be given the great questions raised by the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Pharmacy, in all its branches, became immediately involved in the machinery thus set up. Some have criticized the ASSOCIATION, because of its strong place in the professional field, for taking a part in what the critics have wrongfully considered a purely economic problem. However, the NRA movement is not necessarily economic. I would prefer to state its purpose in terms of social adjustment. In other words, pharmacy, together with all other interests, was drawn into an effort, the ultimate purpose of which is to effect profound social change. With this view clearly in mind, I doubt that anyone can deny that this ASSOCIATION had a real place in working out whatever was thought best for pharmaceutical interests. For my part, I think the ASSOCIATION would have been grossly derelict in its duty had it failed to take its share of the responsibility. Whatever may be the ultimate results of the recovery program, every one knows that it has brought about profoundly significant changes in our national thinking and point of view. The present manifestations on the political screen may be understood and accepted with less difficulty if they are seen as an effort to work out a sounder social creed, and to make social forces more compact and articulate. Undoubtedly, it is a profound experiment in the realms of sociology and economics. But, the mere fact that it deals in vastly important human equations, and is devoted to the betterment of human relations, makes it an experiment in which all must participate.

The NRA program, the whole code effort, as imperfect and contradictory as it undoubtedly is, is simply the first manifestation of forces seriously devoted to the task of creating a new economic system which will be more responsive to the social impulse. Much of what is being done is highly controversial. Some see in it an attempt to overthrow existing political institutions. Some have gone so far as to declare that we are in the midst of a social revolution, the aims of which are in open hostility to constitutional government as that term is generally understood. I think there is real evidence of some such desire on the part of those who are easily influenced by philosophies they cannot understand, and who fall a prey to silly and half-baked generalities. Specifically, I am content to leave these mental scarecrows, whether they be in the Government service or outside of it, to sizzle in their own pot. They are no more than mildly pathologic pimples on an unusually healthy body. Whether they disappear or whether they remain is not of the slightest importance. America, thank God, rests on something more secure.

I am certain that in due course, and time must be given to working out any fundamental concept, the general principles recognized in the codes will be shown to be advantageous to all branches of industry and society. Already it must be apparent that the imperfections and contradictions are being ironed out. In all of the present disturbances and confusion, we should seek to see things over a long range. The mere fact that an attempt is being made to meet certain situations is a far cry from an abandonment of our basic institutions. I am certain that we shall emerge from the present strife a more intelligent and a more awakened people.

I am truly proud of the great part played by the ASSOCIATION in this national drama. I am proud that its prestige was recognized, and that its sane and con-

servative view was relied upon in working out the problems of the past few months. Undoubtedly, the ASSOCIATION has won a larger place in the hearts and affections of pharmacists themselves. I know that the Government has come to a much sounder appreciation of what pharmacy is from the mere fact that the ASSOCIATION faced into the fight rather than standing on the side-lines while issues of such terrific importance were being fought out.

At this point, I should like to suggest that some study be given to the formation of state codes. I am inclined to feel that much of the Federal systems of codes will prove unsound and unworkable. There is grave doubt regarding their legality. Aside from the national emergency, they would undoubtedly be given little consideration. They are in direct and flagrant conflict with constitutional government in this country. To make them permanently effective requires a complete abandonment of the principles for which the country is understood to stand. After the emergency has passed, there will still be good reasons for outlawing unfair business practices, and for retaining public supervision over hours and wages of employment. While there is no assurance that state codes will be free from legal defects or constitutionally sound, it is believed they offer some promise of permanently dealing with certain aspects of the matter. State codes have been set up in a few states. It is recommended that a special committee be appointed to make a thorough study of all state codes, and the legislative acts under which they have been created, as many of their provisions are certain to affect the conditions under which pharmaceutical service is made available.

I cannot forego this opportunity of expressing officially and personally my profound appreciation of the part played by Doctor E. F. Kelly in the great scenes of the past few months. Pharmacists everywhere should know just what a burden he has carried. With no intention of disparaging in the least the work done by other pharmacists and other pharmaceutical organizations, I am confident that Doctor Kelly has carried a large part of the load. Against his will, he was drawn into the center of the fray from the very outset. He was called upon to work out the problems which became acute under the President's reemployment agreement. When the whole matter became deadlocked over the hours under which drug stores were to operate, and pharmacy stood to suffer extremely heavy burdens, other pharmacists and other organizations called upon Doctor Kelly to iron things out. In all of this, he consistently refused to appear except as coöperating with others for the general good. He bore the brunt of the negotiations which finally resulted in the Retail Drug Code. Upon the insistence of national pharmaceutical leaders, he became a member of the National Retail Drug Trade Authority. Later, by the same forces, he was placed on the Committee on Service and Distribution, to make a study of distribution factors which affected the retail field. He has been in almost continuous contact with NRA officials, and has done much in bringing them to a sounder and more equitable view of many problems bearing upon the professional and commercial phases of the drug store. Pharmacy owes him a debt far beyond its power to repay.

I should like to devote a few serious remarks to the so-called "labor controversy" that has sprung up in pharmacy as a result of Paragraph 7-a in the National Industrial Recovery Act. This paragraph provides for collective bargaining between employer and employee. I have publicly stated that I was opposed to col-

lective bargaining in pharmacy. I am certain that my position has not been fully understood. I am certain, too, that it has been deliberately misunderstood and misinterpreted by some. Some have attempted to make it appear that I was hostile to the interests of those employed in retail drug stores. While such criticism is utterly unfounded and directly opposite to my feeling in the matter, I shall make an effort to clearly present my views on this very important question.

By stating that I was opposed to collective bargaining in pharmacy, I merely meant to express the feeling that pharmacy could and should manage its own affairs. I meant to voice my opposition to bringing labor tactics into a professional field. In no sense did I mean, even by implication, to create the impression that I was opposed to a betterment of the conditions under which some employee-pharmacists work. Employee-pharmacists are members of the pharmaceutical profession, and should be entitled to all the benefits and privileges which come to members of a professional class. It is my honest and serious conviction that, in the long run, bringing labor methods into pharmacy will result disastrously to all pharmaceutical interests.

By this statement, I do not mean to enter upon a discussion of the merits of any labor movement when confined to a purely labor field. I do not claim to be sufficiently informed regarding general industrial conditions to voice the slightest criticism of the methods labor feels are necessary to its security and welfare. I am merely attempting to emphasize the dangerous consequences which are likely to follow when a professional calling is made to conform to policies and procedure which have been worked out in industrial and labor pursuits. I am convinced that there are basic and insurmountable objections to making pharmacy subject to the forces that control in a purely labor enterprise.

First of all, and this is of basic importance, no great distinction exists between pharmacist-employer and pharmacist-employee. In fact, the distinction which may be said to exist is purely artificial. In most cases, it goes no further than to impose greater business responsibility upon the employer. The employer must of necessity assume the burdens which go with ownership, and he must exercise sufficient authority to make his plans and policies operate. This is unavoidable if the store is to function in a satisfactory manner. However, I am certain that this does not constitute a disparaging distinction. Disparaging distinctions, if they do exist, should be brushed aside as inconsistent with the close relationship which must exist between the pharmacist-employer and the pharmacist-employee.

Pharmacist-employer and pharmacist-employee hold a unique relationship to each other. They come in close personal contact, and are engaged in exactly the same duties. The law requires that both shall conform to the same educational and professional standards. Both must measure up to the same degree of competency and skill. Each is a graduate of a recognized educational institution, and frequently it is the same institution. The law prescribes their duties, and confers the same privileges. Their daily work touches vitally the life and happiness of people. They are mutually dependent upon each other. The reputation of the employer is in the hands of his employee, and the reputation of the employee is in the hands of the employer. Mutual obligations and mutual responsibilities rest upon both. There would seem no possible justification for industrializing this



peculiarly intimate relationship. It would seem the one place where mutual confidence and respect should have full sway. Anything which disrupts or attempts to destroy this relationship comes very close to being inconsistent with the public welfare.

However, for fear this statement may be construed as submitting the ideal instead of what actually exists, let it be admitted frankly that there are many cases in which pharmacist-employees have not received the proper treatment or been accorded proper recognition with all that the terms convey. Studies by the NRA and others have shown inadequate pay, long hours and other unwarranted conditions. Employees are well within their rights when they insist that such conditions shall be remedied whenever and wherever they exist. Pharmacy, as a whole, should encourage the expression of honest opinions, and should make no attempt to escape a facing of the facts. If unfair conditions exist, no progress worthy of the name can be possible until the facts are recognized and dealt with as they deserve.

I believe that remedial measures can be applied within our own ranks. Nothing is required beyond an awakened professional consciousness. Organized pharmacy, as that term has been understood, should make every effort to learn the facts and to deal with them. It should be regarded as a family affair to be dealt with as family discipline demands. An immediate survey should be made of every drug store in the United States to ascertain the hours of employment and the prevailing pay for pharmacist-employees. While state and local pharmaceutical organizations might well carry out the survey, I suggest that the United States Government be requested to do it so that there can be no question as to its accuracy and fairness. This whole question goes to the very heart of professional integrity, and I believe the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION should take the leading part in working it out.

Employee organizations, on the mere basis of recognizing the employee status, are, in my opinion, unfortunate. They serve to fan prejudices and perpetuate distinctions which should not exist at all. They also serve to accentuate differences and problems which may not be nearly so acute once the facts are known. It would seem much better to organize, if the employees really feel that separate organizations are needed, so that their professional status always stands out. My own feeling is that the existing pharmaceutical associations afford every necessary means of meeting their problems, and I urge that these bodies make every effort to cooperate as fully as possible with the employee-pharmacist in solving their mutual problems. However, in spite of what form the employee movement finally takes, there is a great responsibility resting upon both the employer and the employee. Neither should countenance any act by the other which is damaging to the inherent thing so necessary to both. Both sides should regard themselves as saddled with mutual responsibilities and as faced with mutual obligations. The welfare of the profession is the basic thing, and this is larger than any issue which either side can raise.

In any consideration of this subject, it should be borne in mind that retail pharmacists have felt their full share of the economic distress. All over the country, city and town alike, operating costs have steadily mounted while sales volume has dropped to unprecedented levels. Profits have disappeared, and hundreds,

if indeed not thousands, of retail drug stores have been operated at an actual loss. Undoubtedly, some employers, in pharmacy and outside of it, have taken advantage of the unfortunate period through which we are passing. However, I shall be much surprised to learn that the great majority of pharmacist-employers have not done their very best under most difficult and discouraging conditions. The facts, once they are ascertained, can be understood only in the light of circumstances.

Some reference should be made to pending food and drug legislation. At the 1933 meeting, the ASSOCIATION took the position of favoring all changes necessary to the protection of the public and as in opposition to delegating sweeping and unregulated powers in its administration. I have adhered to this position strictly. Personally, I was opposed to many of the provisions contained in the original Copeland bill. The very extensive and general powers conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture impressed me as unnecessary to the proper protection of the public, and as inconsistent with many established principles of constitutional government. Some went so far, so I firmly believe, as to set aside basic concepts of the common law which have been cherished as essential to a liberty-loving people. I have always felt that it was unwise, and in most cases unnecessary, to place great undefined powers in the hands of administrative officials. It is a tendency in government which I think is definitely dangerous, and which I shall always oppose. If this country is to move forward in the realization of the great purposes to which it is dedicated, it must continue to be a government of laws and not of men.

From the very beginning, it has been my opinion that the present Food and Drugs Act should be amended, and nothing which has transpired has shaken this view. It has been said, of course, that the act was so hopelessly defective that it could not be amended so as to meet current needs. This, to me, is mere propaganda, and has no support from the actual facts. Following through the policy adopted by the Government is certain to throw out of gear State and Federal cooperation, and to produce a confused mass of contradictions which will plague us for years to come. It seems to me the most impractical means of meeting the situation. However, the Government seems committed to the impractical means, and I set forth this view simply to make my position clear.

I am confident that sounder legislation will result from the criticism which the various Copeland bills have received. There is no longer any intention of conferring arbitrary and unnecessary powers upon administrative officials. The whole job is being looked upon in a saner and altogether sounder way, and thus is certain to result in a much safer, and a much more effective piece of legislation. As a personal view, I desire to concur fully in Senator Copeland's statement that he would rather have no legislation on the subject than to accept a meaningless and spineless compromise. I believe there are great defects in the present act, and thus great public reasons for bringing it up-to-date. I agree with the desirability of every objective which these bills have sought. I regret that an arbitrary position by the Government, calling forth an equally unyielding attitude from the industries involved, has made the outcome very much confused.

In all of this, the ASSOCIATION should hold fast to certain principles. The Food and Drugs Act should be rewritten so as to include cosmetics, and to bring

advertising under federal supervision and control. No necessary power should be denied the enforcing agency. The public interest should be the paramount consideration. On the other hand, broad, sweeping and uncontrolled powers should be withheld as unnecessary to the purposes of the act, and as inconsistent with our theories of government. Industry should not be unduly harassed, but should be given every freedom consistent with the basic purposes of the act.

It is my belief that the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION and the National Drug Trade Conference rendered a real service to the country in opposing certain features of the Copeland bill. Their position, presented in a forceful and logical manner, centered attention on the bill's dangerous provisions, and was the most potent influence in having them substantially modified.

This ASSOCIATION asserted the need for higher drug standards back in 1852, and since that time has stood steadfastly behind all efforts to bring this about by legislation. Many times its voice was the only one raised to this end. It stands to-day, I have no doubt, ready to coöperate in all efforts to protect the public by demanding the highest practical standards for foods and drugs. Its position throughout the present controversy has been in keeping with its high professional standing, and consistent with a sound regard for constitutional government. And this, let me insist, is vastly more important than extreme views whether they be advanced by overly zealous governmental experts or by selfish reactionaries in the food or drug industries.

It will be recalled that some few years ago the ASSOCIATION, in coöperation with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, sought to have a comprehensive survey made of pharmacy to ascertain the basic facts underlying it. This survey was not actually begun because of the lack of funds. It is to be hoped that this undertaking can be carried out as promptly as possible. The time has come, I fully believe, when pharmacy must be seen in terms of social force if it is to keep step with the thought and tempo of the times.

We might as well realize that no permanent progress can be made unless we understand the meaning of pharmacy in the life of the day. It is to be remembered always that a new standard has been set up. The time has come when every effort will be judged and every activity measured in terms of its value to people. The present cry for the socialization of government, the socialization of medicine, and the socialization of industrial and economic forces is no more than an effort to reflect everything against the screen of human relations. Pharmacy cannot escape. It, too, must be measured in terms of its social significance.

I make these observations as supporting my belief that pharmacy has suffered because no effort has been made to fully understand and evaluate it. Failure to understand it has resulted in a failure to adopt and follow through a sound and workable policy of thought and action. At no time has pharmacy coolly and deliberately set itself to the task of working out its problems, and directing its aim to some definite objective. Questions have been considered largely in their own setting, and with no regard to their bearing upon larger and more basic things. It seems to me that pharmacy has been content to live for the moment. There has been too much of a disposition to accept things as they apparently were rather than dealing with them in terms of actuality. Many times pharmacy has been

swept into positions utterly inconsistent with its real purpose. Such a policy, or rather the lack of one, has brought our calling close to professional extinction and on the verge of economic ruin. We too often have fallen a prey to our nightmares, and have been controlled by conditions created by our own folly.

As a result, every possible incongruity has grown up. As pharmaceutical education has advanced, there seems to have been a corresponding slump in professional morale. Pharmaceutical legislation has not controlled unethical practices, and the economic side of the drug store is in a deplorable condition. No relationship exists between the needs of the public and the number of drug stores. Drugs and medicines are sold in every type of retail outlet. Everywhere and on every hand is shown the results of a failure to meet our problems in a fearless and intelligent manner.

I, therefore, urge that every effort be made to complete a social study of pharmacy. I feel that real progress cannot be made until the facts are fully known. Such a study would furnish the basis for a more definite and practical educational program. It would answer all the questions underlying legislation. It would put at rest all questions arising from a lack of understanding of the real factual situation. It should be regarded as one of the major objectives of pharmacy, and should be undertaken and completed as promptly as possible.

The time has come for the ASSOCIATION to take the lead in an organized effort to more sensibly restrict the distribution of drugs and medicines to registered pharmacists. The conditions which now prevail are a reproach to our profession. It should be plain to all that the public will be better served and more safely served by placing the responsibility squarely in the hands of those whose training and experience fit them for this professional function. There is no justification, commercial or otherwise, for permitting such dangerous products to be indiscriminately and promiscuously sold.

However, the field is a difficult one, and must be approached after a careful survey of all of the factors involved. First of all, the court decisions, holding restrictive sales unconstitutional, should be carefully analyzed. It must be apparent that no legislation will stand court action that does not meet the objections raised by these judicial decisions. There are long-established principles of law which must be recognized in this matter, and the legislation must be drawn so as to conform to them. I mention this phase of the subject because, at the outset at any rate, the whole thing must be approached from a legal point of view.

This is no place for experimenting or for following out individual views. Most of the efforts which have been made to restrict sales have been ill advised, and the legislation proposed, in by far the larger number of cases, open to serious legal criticism.

The point to be borne in mind is that all efforts which are not legally and economically sound do much more harm than good. About the only contribution they make is to irritate and solidify the opposition. Already there is an effort being made, on a nation-wide scale, to organize all other dealers so that the present situation may be continued. There are large commercial interests traditionally opposed to permitting pharmacists the exclusive distribution of drug products. These interests are powerful and resourceful. Nothing but the most carefully thought-out plans have the slightest promise of success. The whole thing calls

for the services of informed and careful men. There is no place for the novice and enthusiast.

From the very outset, the ASSOCIATION has contended that drugs and medicines should be made available only through competent pharmacists. It has consistently opposed the doctrines that they were mere articles of merchandise, to be bartered and sold, subject only to the rules of the market place. In 1853, the ASSOCIATION made this historic pronouncement: "The first step to improvement is that storekeepers in boroughs and towns shall relinquish the sale of drugs; medicine is merchandise, and something more; to sell it in a common country store is to make it merchandise only." Drugs and medicine have no purpose other than meeting the demands of public health. They are merchandise in only a most incidental manner. They should be distributed only by pharmacists whose training, experience and sense of responsibility fit them for this important duty.

Too much time has already been lost, and the time for aggressive action has come. I recommend that the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION reaffirm its time-honored position that drugs and medicines should be distributed by registered pharmacists only, and that a carefully selected committee be appointed to draft a model act to bring this condition about in every state.

There is a growing feeling that the whole body of pharmaceutical legislation is in need of a thorough revision. There is no doubt that much of it is obsolete and expressive of conditions and theories of fifty or more years ago. In structure, scope and basic principles, it is hopelessly out of step with the times. It still reflects the period when the handling of drugs and medicines was a purely merchandising and commercial transaction. These laws do not, as a rule, recognize broadly the great advances made in pharmaceutical education. They are based upon commercial practice rather than upon the public health service which pharmacy renders. The exceptions and exemptions in the pharmacy laws are so broad as to amount to a virtual nullification of many of the most important principles in these acts. To make matters worse, the exceptions have no logical foundation, and are based on nothing other than a selfish purpose on the part of certain powerful groups in the drug industry who have always insisted that their products be given unregulated distribution. There is no need to attempt an analysis of these acts at this moment. However, I do desire to express my feeling that the basic philosophy of pharmaceutical legislation should be responsive to current conditions. I strongly urge that it be made more aggressive and more in keeping with the spirit and tempo of the times. It should be based entirely upon the public health importance of drugs and medicines, and not at all upon purely business or commercial considerations. I recommend that the ASSOCIATION give serious study to this matter, and that some agency be set up to study pharmaceutical legislation so that it may be modernized and made consistent with the advances being made educationally and professionally.

I want to express my deep interest in the efforts now being made to bring the public health profession closer together. Nothing but good can come from such a course. In some sections, this has not gone beyond medicine and pharmacy. In others, notably in Kansas and the Pacific Northwest, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy have consolidated their influences, and have become committed to the advancement of public health as an organized and official policy. The advantages

from such a course are many. The program of one will have the endorsement and support of all. The various professions will come into more intimate relationship, and a sounder and more mutual understanding is certain to result. I urge the pharmacists of every state to participate and cooperate in all such efforts.

The movements to make medicine more familiar with the United States Pharmacopœia and the National Formulary are entitled to whole-hearted pharmaceutical support. The more medicine relies upon official preparations, the more pharmacy will advance as a professional pursuit. This effort should include the students in the medical schools. While the medical curriculum has paid little attention to the practical sides of medication, and has sent the graduate out to practice poorly trained in this important subject, there is evidence that the pendulum has begun to swing in the other direction. One great medical school has recently placed its department of pharmacology in the hands of a pharmaceutical expert. It is to be hoped that this is the beginning of a national trend. The more physicians know about drugs and medicines, the more they know of the U. S. P. and N. F., the greater their value to the public. Pharmacy should cooperate to the fullest possible extent in placing the official standards before the medical profession. No doubt, it would be wise to prepare digests of the official products, with due regard to prevailing medical theories, and make them available for wide distribution to medical men. This is a work peculiarly within the scope of this ASSOCIATION'S activities, and should be done as promptly as possible. With the active cooperation of the Committees on Revision of the United States Pharmacopœia and National Formulary, this should not be an unduly difficult or laborious task.

The question of ASSOCIATION membership has become of critical importance. During the past year, I devoted much time and considerable expense to efforts for building up membership. Literally hundreds of letters were written to persons whose names were furnished by interested persons in the various states. The results, as evidenced by new applications, were most disappointing. Of course, there are many reasons why this year should not be regarded as an average year. In many sections of the country, the depression was most acute. Nation-wide drives by other organizations also diminished the effect of my personal appeal. However, I am constrained to feel that, even in normal years, the membership cannot be built up by anything less than an organized and systematized effort. It almost emerges into a separate ASSOCIATION activity, which goes beyond mere routine. It requires the earnest cooperation of the membership as well as the active support of all groups concerned with professional pharmacy. If the ASSOCIATION is to adequately represent pharmacy and to speak for it in authoritative tones, it must be given greater numerical support. It must be so strengthened that none can assail its position or question its views. Professional pharmacy demands the services of a strong national association, and such an association should be given strong and consistent support.

I think the ASSOCIATION has not, in times past, seen the advantages of making membership in the ASSOCIATION a badge of distinction. Membership in the ASSOCIATION should be synonymous with professional standing. It should bring prestige. It should be something to which pharmacists would aspire. In order that this conception may be realized, I am convinced that membership in the ASSOCIATION should be made more selective. It should be based upon merit as a

major consideration. If pharmacy is to persist as a professional calling, and pharmacists be accorded recognition as an educated group, it must, in the ultimate, depend upon that relatively small number of earnest souls who refuse to be blinded by the flare and glare of the passing scene. In spite of its apparent conflict with prevailing doctrines of social policy, the world will be led back to safety and security, not by the rank and file, but by a few men whose souls have refused to be tarnished by the dust kicked up by the popular hue and cry.

In line with this thought, a determined effort was made to bring the ASSOCIATION directly to the attention of all the graduates of the colleges of pharmacy in this country in the past few weeks. Through the fine coöperation and courtesy of the deans, lists of the prospective graduates were furnished. To each of these was sent a note of congratulation, and a dignified invitation to become members of the ASSOCIATION. These invitations were signed by the president, secretary and chairman of the Council. I do not know how successful the effort may be, judged only by the number of applications, but I am convinced it should be made a regular ASSOCIATION activity, and I so recommend. The response of the colleges was most inspiring. Nearly every dean expressed the feeling that the effort was most timely.

As a wider plan for membership on constructive and basically sound lines, I suggest, first of all, that the colleges of pharmacy be asked to award a certain number of memberships a year. This number should not exceed eight in the larger schools, and proportionally in the smaller ones. These memberships should be awarded on the basis of scholarship considered in connection with whatever factors the schools should see fit to include. In making this suggestion, let it be understood that I am fully aware that pharmaceutical education has given loyal support to the ASSOCIATION. I am merely asking their continued support so that each year the best of their graduates may come into the ASSOCIATION. It is my thought that the wider the influence of the ASSOCIATION, the greater the prestige of the schools, and the more worth while the profession. As a matter of information, it should be stated that a number of colleges have been awarding such memberships for a number of years. In these institutions, the memberships are given in reward for scholastic standing, and have proved an incentive for higher scholarship.

I also strongly suggest that each pharmaceutical association be urged to cooperate in a similar manner. The larger associations might well be asked to grant ten memberships, and the smaller ones accordingly. These state memberships in the A. PH. A. should also be based upon some meritorious qualifications. Simply as indicating the basis of the awards, I suggest that those obtaining the highest marks in the State Board of Pharmacy examinations be recommended for membership.

The State Boards of Pharmacy might work out a similar plan as well. I can see some advantages from awarding membership in the A. PH. A. to the one making the highest mark in the examinations. It would be a recognition of merit, and might stimulate increased interest in the prospective registrant. It may be said, of course, that the funds of the boards are public, and thus not available for such purposes. I believe it can be shown that contributing to those agencies engaged in the betterment of professional practice is well within the letter and spirit of the pharmacy acts.

I also urge that the attention of the pharmaceutical press be directed to the importance of building up the membership in the A. PH. A. along constructive lines. I believe each pharmaceutical publication might find it desirable to award membership in the ASSOCIATION to those contributors presenting the best articles during the year. Simply as a recognition of merit, such a plan might well raise the standard of much that appears constantly in the press.

In addition to these suggestions, I think it high time the ASSOCIATION took notice, officially, of the vast amount of material appearing in the pharmaceutical press. Week after week, month after month, year after year, the press grinds out millions of pages of pharmaceutical interest. These publications present the stuff from which pharmaceutical opinion is crystallized, and out of which is constructed the current pharmaceutical policies.

We have been woefully wasteful and neglectful in this particular. No effort has been made to influence pharmaceutical journalism, or to move it in the right direction. It represents a vast power for good, and yet, so far as we have been concerned, it has been no more than a moving current which soon becomes no more than water over the dam. The force, power and significance of the pharmaceutical press should be recognized by the ASSOCIATION, and some basic attempt made to have it serve, broadly and constructively, the great objective toward which we aspire.

In order that the press may be stimulated to finer service and higher ideals, I recommend that the ASSOCIATION award a medal, yearly, to that publication meeting a certain standard of excellence. There is no reason why this medal should not become to the pharmaceutical press what the Pulitzer prize is to the great daily press. It should be awarded for merit, and for the general excellence of its presentation. The award should be made a pharmaceutical occasion, comparable in importance and dignity to the Remington Medal award.

Now, just how, and by what means can these membership plans and suggestions be worked out? I have given careful thought to this matter. I have canvassed the whole pharmaceutical field, and, after every effort, have come back to this conclusion: There is no group in American Pharmacy more able and better qualified to work out these plans than the former presidents of this ASSOCIATION. These men represent maturity in judgment, and a wide and varied experience. They embrace, in an unusual degree, the essentials of leadership. They measure up to a high educational and professional standard. They have been in close touch with the ASSOCIATION'S affairs, and know its needs and objectives. Geographically, all sections of the country will be recognized, and virtually all branches of pharmacy. It is my recommendation that the former presidents of the ASSOCIATION be formed into a permanent body to be styled, the A. PH. A. Commission on Membership and Awards. This commission should organize by the election of its own officers, and should be given a permanent place in the American Institute of Pharmacy, and given adequate financial support as soon as this can be done.

In making this recommendation, I am mindful of the fact that the past-presidents may feel that they have earned the right to retire. In answer, let me state that they have been greatly honored by this ASSOCIATION and that this alone is sufficient to place additional burdens upon them. But my recommendation is based upon an honest conviction that they are the best qualified for this highly



important task. Upon its success may be said to rest the future of the ASSOCIATION. I urge them to join hands in this new endeavor.

In conclusion, let me pay my deep personal tribute to Doctor Kelly and Editor Eberle for their untiring efforts in behalf of this ASSOCIATION. Only those permitted to work intimately with them can know their fine loyalty, their inspiring devotion, and the high ideals they bring to their tasks. Pharmacy, in its widest phases, has cause for congratulations because of the earnest work these men are carrying on. May they live long, and enjoy the blessings of good health and happiness!

To the ASSOCIATION and its membership, collectively and individually, I express my sincere thanks for the confidence and trust reposed in me. To head this great ASSOCIATION, even for a brief period, is to enjoy the greatest distinction within the power of pharmacy to bestow. To have been thus honored at your hands will ever remain my most cherished memory.

---

#### ADDRESS OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES.

BY P. H. COSTELLO.

*To the Members of the House of Delegates of the American Pharmaceutical Association:*

A welcome opportunity, it is for us who are interested in the welfare and progress of American pharmacy, to figuratively join hands once again at this annual meeting of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION here in Washington.

Members of a great profession devoted to the service of humanity, we, who are gathered here, hold a keen interest in national developments not only as they affect us as patriotic and loyal American citizens but, and naturally so, as they touch upon the course of our own profession. Representing individual pharmacists in this changing order our ASSOCIATION must do its part. Let us hope, therefore, that this meeting in our Capital City will bring about a better appreciation and understanding of the value of Pharmacy and the great purpose it serves.

We can now point with a great deal of pride to our headquarters building, *The American Institute of Pharmacy*, located in this city. It is a monumental achievement. It is entirely fitting and appropriate that an organization, such as ours, should have as its headquarters a building such as this, and it is also proper that it should be located in the Capital. The past several months should show the wisdom of the new location of our headquarters because events, which affect all of us, have been happening daily here in Washington with lightning-like rapidity. Any other location would have proven a mistake and a handicap to our future welfare and progress.

It is a privilege, possibly it may become a distinction, for those who have availed themselves of this opportunity, to be present at the dedication of our building during this convention. The founders of the AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION intended the organization should carry on. Possibly they visualized some of the progress and achievements that were to come, but it is hard to assume