

# SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES

The seventeenth annual meeting of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties convened in Philadelphia September 1, in the Philadelphia Bourse. Howard B. French, president of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, spoke the words of welcome, and the response was made by President H. V. Army, of the Conference. The succeeding meetings of the Conference were held in the Rittenhouse Hotel.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT H. V. ARMY.

## INTRODUCTION.

The admirable address of my distinguished predecessor in the chair of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties so fully covered the field of thought coming within the sphere of the activity of the Conference, that apparently he left but scanty gleanings for his successor. And even here our good friend, Dean Wulling, had a thought as to the gleanings, since the recommendations made in his address resulted in the creation of a number of committees designed to carry out the policies so strikingly enumerated by him. In fact, the present chairman said to a friend upon his election to the presidency of the Conference that his position would be largely of the nature of a sinecure, since Dean Wulling's address not only covered the problems of the Conference up to the time of the San Francisco meeting, but had also provided material for discussion for several years to come.

However, events occurring during the past twelve or thirteen months have brought new problems, and these we must face and discuss at this, the 1916 meeting of the Conference. The matters brought up by my predecessor will be well handled in the reports of the several committees appointed for the purpose, so your chairman will deal largely with the events of the past year. Of these, the most important are:

(1) The passage by the Ohio legislature of a "prerequisite" law, effective July 1, 1917, demanding as preliminary education the successful completion of two years of high school work.

(2) The passage, at the San Francisco meeting of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, of a resolution expressing the opinion that, after 1920, candidates for registration as pharmacists should be graduates of a high school and of a recognized college of pharmacy.

(3) The filing by the representatives of the Pharmacy Council of the State of New York, at the close of the last session of the Conference, of a protest against the resolution that, beginning in 1917, pharmacy colleges should require 30 credits for entrance. Since that time, the New York law has been so amended that the 30-credit requirement will be effective after January 1, 1918.

(4) The inauguration in a technical high school in the central west of a course in pharmacy as the third and fourth year of the high school course.

(5) The issuance of the ninth edition of the United States Pharmacopœia and of the fourth edition of the National Formulary.

(6) The establishment in this country of a Fairchild Pharmaceutical Scholarship.

Widely remote though the six topics mentioned above may seem, there is a connection between them that is so direct that they may be discussed together. In most of their phases, the topics apply more forcibly to the internal affairs of

the Conference, but from several points of view they have a distinct bearing upon the relations of the Conference with the Association of Boards and with our parent organization, the American Pharmaceutical Association. Let us first consider what Dean Wulling aptly termed:

#### THE CONFERENCE AND ITS INNER RELATIONS.

##### HIGH SCHOOL COURSES IN PHARMACY.

Of the six topics mentioned above, none is of more vital importance than is the establishment, in a technical high school in Detroit, of a 1300-hour course in pharmacy. This action—the inauguration of pharmacy courses in high schools—is, in my opinion, a matter of as great moment to the Conference, and to Pharmacy as a whole, as the institution of courses of pharmacy in state universities almost a half century ago has already proven itself to be. The facing of the situation at this time in a predetermined spirit of antagonism will, in my opinion, prove as futile as was the opposition shown the representatives of the university schools of pharmacy when they first appeared as delegates at meetings of The American Pharmaceutical Association. Turning to pages 29 and 47 of the *Proceedings* of that Association for 1871, it is interesting to note that the first delegates accredited to the Association were rejected by unanimous vote after the presentation of a report of a committee consisting of sixteen of the most prominent members of the Association, which declared:

The University is not, within the proper meaning of our Constitution and By-laws, a College of Pharmacy; it being neither an organization controlled by pharmacists, nor an institution of learning which, by its rules and requirements, insures to its graduates the proper practical training to place them on a par with the graduates of the several colleges of pharmacy represented in this Association.

Still more interesting is it to note that the leader of the rejected delegation was, about one-quarter of a century later, honored with the presidency of the association which had declined to receive him in 1871.

The introduction of university pharmaceutical training did not injure the pharmaceutical body as much as the above report considered it would, and we meet to-day, happy in the thought that our Conference offers the opportunity for the representatives of university schools and the independent colleges to meet in harmonious discussion. We may differ as to exact methods of procedure, but we are one in our aim to benefit Pharmacy of to-day and to improve Pharmacy of to-morrow by our work in the class-room, in the laboratory and in the busy world. But how about the new "intruder," the technical high school, as a competitor in the field of pharmaceutical instruction?

In the past, some representatives of the independent schools of pharmacy have characterized the university school of pharmacy as a more or less unfair competitor, inasmuch as the latter institution has support from the state and is, therefore, able to meet financial conditions that are not attainable by those institutions supported by instruction fees. If the pressure is felt when there is scarcely more than one competitor of the character in each state, how much more serious will be the competition if technical high schools, now found in practically every large city, enter the field of pharmaceutical education?

This is not the time to discuss the encroachment of the modern high school upon the field of college endeavor, but I cannot resist the temptation to suggest as a simile the fact that, even as the new boy in the drug store prefers prescription work to his regular duties, so the average high school teacher seems obsessed with the idea of giving his pupils a spurious college course rather than a genuine high

school training. How far these activities are going to be permitted, especially along technical lines, the future alone can tell. But what we, as pharmacy teachers, are interested in is the fact that every technical high school, with its fine plant, its modern equipment and its staff of teachers paid by the tax-payers of the community, is a potential competitor of the already existing colleges of pharmacy.

What shall be done in the matter? Shall we use our influence to curb this new aggression, or shall we extend to the pharmacy high schools the right hand of fellowship?

The direct answer to this question is one that should be given by the Conference, not by an individual delegate.

The following thought, however, is thrown out by way of suggestion. The entrance of high schools into the field of pharmaceutical education makes our problem a triangular one in which the three corners are the independent college, the university college, and the high school. Looking around for a standard of comparison, we might compare the pharmaceutical educational situation with the present-day status of so-called business education. In that field, we have (a) the independent commercial colleges, many of which are serving a distinct need at profit to the promoters; (b) the commercial high schools, which, by the way, do not appear to have made as great inroads into the field of private teaching as was originally predicted; (c) the schools of business of the universities, which are designed to train business *thinkers*, rather than stenographers, typists and bookkeepers. In business, there seems a need for the three classes of educational institutions enumerated above. In pharmacy, it has already been demonstrated that the university course and the independent college course can exist side by side; and the future will show us whether the high school course will prove its fitness to survive. Now the question before us is whether there is not room in our Conference for the three classes of institutions just enumerated.

At the San Francisco meeting, the Conference created a new committee (denominated on page 214 of the *Proceedings* of 1915 as Committee No. 3) which was directed to study the advisability of establishing two classes of membership. While the "two classes of membership" referred to meant our present members and those outside the Conference who have not yet come up to our minimum requirements; while the report presented at this meeting will undoubtedly deal with that problem only; the question occurs to me whether Committee No. 3 should not be continued and requested to study the problem of three classes of our own membership, chiefly to bring about a discussion of this topic:

I RECOMMEND that Committee No. 3 be continued and be requested to study (a) the status of those high school courses which comply with all of the requirements of our Conference; (b) the advisability of eventually creating within the Conference three sections, one participated in by university schools, one by such high schools as may hereafter be admitted into the Conference, and one consisting of the independent colleges; the three sections to hold general sessions for discussion of matters of general interest and for the transaction of the routine business of the Conference; each section to hold special sessions for the discussion of topics peculiar to the institution composing the section.

In studying the problem of courses in pharmacy given by technical high schools, we should apply to these institutions three tests: (a) Will they fill a particular need? (b) Will they conduct efficient courses? (c) Will they demand sufficiently high requirements?

*As to the need*, I think that all of us present agree that what Pharmacy needs is not more schools, but better ones. There will be no debate on the subject of

"a long-felt-want," provided we of this Conference do not create a need by pulling ourselves over the heads of our clients.

*As to the efficiency of courses offered*, that also is within our hands. Admirably equipped though our modern technical high schools are, they cannot compete in that respect with many of the schools represented in our organization. Again, there are many interested in pharmacy who are old-fashioned enough to believe that pharmacy schools should be run by pharmacists and not by high school teachers, and to those the present type of independent colleges of pharmacy will ever appeal.

*As to requirements*, let us honestly face the fact that the one high school course so far offered has a technical advantage that is worthy of the most careful consideration of this Conference. This 1300-hour course represents the third and fourth years of the regular high school courses, whereas the present minimum requirement of this Conference is a two-year course of 1200 hours of work based on preliminary education of one year of high school "or its equivalent."

Are those of us who are following this minimum requirement merely running a second and third year of a high school course? Or are we conducting trade schools like business colleges, or printing schools or electrical schools? In either event, are we in a position to criticize the courses offered by the technical high schools?

#### THE CONFERENCE'S 1917 RESOLUTION.

On top of this comes the resolution submitted by the New York Pharmacy Council during the closing hours of the last meeting of the Conference, expressing disapproval of our action taken in Detroit concerning an entrance requirement of two years of high school work by September, 1917. In the opinion of your chairman, the rescinding of the two-year entrance requirement for 1917, passed by the Conference at its Detroit meeting of 1915, would be an open avowal of the fact that the Conference stands for courses inferior to those now proposed by technical high schools, and to thus meet what may eventually turn out to be real competition would be the height of folly. It will also be recalled that, at its session of 1915, the Ohio Legislature passed a prerequisite law which anticipates the Detroit resolution by one year. That is, the two-year preliminary high school education, as well as the diploma of a college of pharmacy, will be demanded of all candidates for registration who apply after July 1, 1917. In other words, all colleges wishing their graduates to register in Ohio after July 1, 1917, will have to demand two years of high school experience from those matriculating this fall. Lastly, on the twenty-sixth of last April, Governor Whitman signed a bill passed by the New York Legislature which so amends the pharmacy law of that State that, after January 1, 1918, matriculants at pharmacy schools recognized by the board of regents must show a preliminary education representing 30 academic counts. This confusion seems still another reason why we should stand to our original resolution, and, in order to bring the proposition squarely before the Conference,

I RECOMMEND that the Detroit resolution of 1915, relative to an entrance requirement of two years of high school work in September, 1917, be reaffirmed.

#### THE N. A. B. P. 1920 RESOLUTION.

Germane to the subject just discussed is the resolution, passed at the San Francisco meeting of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, expressing as the aim of that organization prerequisite legislation in all states by 1920

based on four years of high school training and graduation from a reputable college of pharmacy.

This is the goal toward which the eyes of all of us interested in the future of Pharmacy have been turned for many years past and of its ultimate accomplishment there is no doubt. Particularly happy should we be that it is the men who enforce pharmaceutical legislation who have taken this advance step. We of the Conference have talked much about such a move, but legislative action is difficult of accomplishment unless the board of pharmacy in each state is with us and unless the registered pharmacists of each state are behind the board.

As said above, the ultimate securing of prerequisite legislation, based upon college graduation preceded by four years high school training, is merely a question of time, coupled with patient and persistent work. Whether our brethren of the association of boards are over-sanguine in declaring 1920 the time for bringing about the reform, we have yet to see.

The reformer must, of course, be years ahead of the mass of the people, but if the reform itself is too far ahead of the people, it will defeat its own purpose. In the present instance, are the registered pharmacists of to-day yearning for a four-year high school, two-year college of pharmacy law?

On this point, there is a vast difference of opinion. We have heard at previous meetings of this Conference that the drug trade is ready for the change; we have read that the N. A. B. P. resolution of last year was passed only after a most vigorous discussion. There is but one way to arrive at the point where we can view the situation in its true light and that in a way appropriate to the democratic spirit of our land. Therefore,

I RECOMMEND the appointment of a joint committee from this Conference and from the Association of Boards, which shall endeavor to secure the co-operation of the legislative committee of each state pharmaceutical association in arranging for a referendum postal card vote on the subject, participated in by all of the registered pharmacists of the state in question.

#### THE NEW UNITED STATES PHARMACOPŒIA.

The ninth edition of the Pharmacopœia of the United States has been in our hands only long enough to furnish us profound food for thought. I think it is agreed by all teachers of pharmacy that their main duty is to train their pupils to understand and to make intelligent use of our national standard. If this aim is to be maintained, as far as the new Pharmacopœia is concerned, we must certainly insist on a four-year course of instruction. Taking merely the chemical side of the work, how can a man intelligently conduct the volumetric, gravimetric, electrolytic and polariscopic tests prescribed for official substances, unless he has had thorough training both in laboratory and in classroom in the principles of physics and of chemistry underlying the particular operation?

As an individual teacher, I feel that the best we can do in a two-year course is to train the student to have a general acquaintance with the Pharmacopœia, but if we wish our students to have a genuine mastery of our standard, at least four years of study is essential; in short, while two years may suffice for the *kennen*, at least four years are demanded for the *wissen*. And this difference pervades the whole of American pharmacy. The average registered pharmacist is becoming a mere vendor, chiefly because he is a *peruser* of the Pharmacopœia rather than a *user* of it. We of the colleges turn out many graduates in pharmacy of

whom it may truthfully be said that they have the "know about" of the Pharmacopœia, but only few who have a real knowledge of our national standard.

To resume the simile used above, a business man wishing a stenographer who can do a little bookkeeping does not call up the school of commerce of the local university for such help; neither does the president of a huge corporation requiring a departmental head turn to the business college for a man to fill the bill. If we delegates to this Conference realized this difference in aims: if we more fully recognized the distinct need for two types of training in pharmacy; if we considered these two types as separate and distinct propositions; if we did not try to masquerade the lesser training in the garb of the higher; if we could consider the higher training without unduly encumbering the lesser training; we would solve our problems with a smaller amount of friction than has been shown at times in our past history.

#### OUR COMMITTEES.

So fully did my predecessor cover the routine needs of this Conference that the only matter connected with the administration of our affairs that occurs to me relates to sixteen committees that it became my duty to appoint.

Up to this year, the affairs of this Conference have been conducted by the Executive Committee and by occasional special committees. Thus, last year the only special committees in operation were one on teaching methods; one on teachers' salaries; one working in conjunction with a similar group from the Association of Boards on examination questions; and, last but not least, even though it was omitted from the list of committees printed in our last *Proceedings*, one delegated to arrange the program for the joint meeting of our Conference and the Association of Boards. The highest compliment that could have been paid Dean Wulling was the action of the Conference in creating ten new committees to deal with topics discussed in his presidential address. By way of passing, it might be mentioned that this compliment brought upon the incoming president the embarrassing task of selecting fifty-one committee members from among the forty to fifty delegates who have attended a sufficient number of our meetings to have become familiar with the work of the Conference. The result was the drafting of several of our members upon more than one committee. To the credit of our personnel, but two declinations were received and in each case the reason was so sound that the declination had to be accepted. Dean Johnson, because of uncertain health, had to ask to be relieved of the chairmanship of Committee No. 9, and requested Dr. Dickman, the second ranking member, to serve in his stead. Dean Wulling, for equally good reasons, declined to serve as chairman of the joint committee on the definition of a proprietary medicine created at the session of the A. Ph. A. Section of Education, of the Conference and the Association of Boards, and your chairman decided to appoint in his stead our friend, Dr. J. H. Beal, former president of the Conference, even though he is not at the present time actively engaged in teaching.

Dr. Beal kindly consented to serve, was made chairman by the joint committee (which consisted of three members from the Conference and three members from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy), and has submitted an admirable report which will be heard by us later.

This incident brings us to a consideration of a modification of the national question: "What will we do with our ex-presidents?" In our case the problem is the utilization of the talents of those no longer active in the Conference because

they are no longer actively engaged in teaching. The complication comes from the fact that not one of us present to-day is a member of the Conference. We are here because the colleges we represent are members of the Conference and so soon as any one of us is no longer delegated to represent a member of the Conference, that one of us has officially no standing in our organization. In many cases, notably in the case just cited, the Conference may lose the services of one of its most valued workers and if the idea of committee administration is to continue it is imperative that the status of former delegates be defined. A similar problem in the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was met by the creation of a list of associate members.

Reading our constitution, I find that the only mention made of individuals interested in the Conference is in Article 3, "Pharmaceutical Faculties represented by delegates"; in Article 5, "properly accredited delegates of any faculty shall have the right to engage in debate"; and in Article 7, where it says that "the Executive Committee shall consist of the President and the Secretary-Treasurer as ex-officio members and five *legally accredited delegates* elected by ballot." In order to open discussion of this matter,

I RECOMMEND that a new article be inserted in the Constitution discussing the personnel of committees and directing that the President select as committee members only those persons who have been legally accredited delegates to the Conference at least twice during the five years preceding the appointment.

A study of our sixteen appointed committees shows that some may be able to report at this session and then ask for a discharge; that others might well be consolidated (example, the program committee and the committee on teaching methods), while others are important enough to be made into standing committees. Even those of us who have given the matter some thought cannot decide off-hand how each of our several committees should be handled and therefore,

I RECOMMEND that the next President be directed to appoint a special committee or committees which shall study the nature of the sixteen special committees now extant, and which, after such study and after consultation with the chairmen of these committees, shall decide which of these shall be made standing committees.

I FURTHER RECOMMEND that the new section of the Constitution, suggested above, shall give the list of standing committees, as decided upon by the committee on committees.

I FURTHER RECOMMEND that in future issues of the Proceedings of this Conference the list of committees be placed in the front of the book immediately following the page devoted to the list of officers.

#### THE CONFERENCE AND ITS OUTWARD RELATIONS.

In discussion of the Conference and its inner relations, several topics have been handled that could well be considered as problems connected with the outward relations of the Conference.

The extremely high quality of the new edition of the United States Pharmacopœia might be considered, as well by the Association of Boards in connection with the discussion of examination questions as in the cloistered seclusion of the Conference, while the recommendations made concerning the 1920 prerequisite resolution passed by the Association of Boards at their San Francisco meeting will, if approved by the Conference, have to go before the Association of Boards for ratification. Of the six events of the past year recorded in the introduction to this address, but one has been reserved for this section referring to the outer relations of the Conference: The generous donation made by Mr. Samuel W. Fairchild for the establishment of a pharmaceutical scholarship.

## THE FAIRCHILD SCHOLARSHIP.

It will be recalled that in his address delivered last year in San Francisco President C. A. Mayo, of the American Pharmaceutical Association, announced the founding, by Mr. S. W. Fairchild, of a pharmaceutical scholarship, similar to the one founded by him in England several years ago. This scholarship, by the terms of the gift, is to be administered by a commission consisting of the president of the American Pharmaceutical Association, the president of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, the president of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and the Editor of the JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION. It will therefore be seen that three organizations—one of them the Conference, another the Association of Boards—are interested in this scholarship, and especially at the present time of laying the foundations for future administration of the gift should we give the matter our serious thought. The report of the commission will be presented for our consideration by its chairman, Dr. W. C. Alpers, during this session, prior to final action being taken on it at the joint session of the Section of Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association with the Association of Boards and the Conference of Faculties, scheduled to be held on September 6; hence details should be deferred until we hear from Dr. Alpers. What we might profitably discuss at our present session is how the gift can be best administered, not merely to the advantage of the beneficiary of a certain year, but for the betterment of pharmaceutical education, the latter phrase being used to imply either the work of the college or of the board. In England, the candidates compete on the basis of general qualifications as shown by credentials backed up by a competitive examination. It is the opinion of the writer that, if the competitive examination idea obtains as far as the American Fairchild Scholarship is concerned, it should be under the auspices of the joint examination committee of the Association of Boards and of the Conference; that it should foreshadow the coming union examination toward which we are all striving, and that each organization should see that its president, as a member of the commission, does his best to bring such action about.

## OUR JOINT COMMITTEE ON EXAMINATION QUESTIONS.

Of the many services rendered to American Pharmacy by the Conference and by the Association of Boards, none is more valuable than the labors of the joint committee on examination questions created by the two organizations. The future of pharmacy rests largely upon the quality of those now entering the ranks of registered pharmacists, and if we keep proper watch at the gate we will have less trouble among those within the fold. That the present haphazard methods of examination of candidates must give way to more orderly procedure, the Association of Boards has already decided; that the teachers are willing to cooperate to the utmost extent is shown by the action of the Conference in participating in the joint committee on questions.

It was a matter of great regret to me that I was unable to attend the meeting of this joint committee that was held in Chicago on the ninth of March, but the Conference was ably represented by Messrs. Beal, Clarke, Day, Dye, Jordan, Koch, Long and Snow. As the joint committee will report on its work very shortly, there is no need for its findings to be anticipated in this address.



## UNION EXAMINATIONS AND RECIPROCITY.

But while we are on the subject it might be well to point out that callings other than ours are interested in the subject of uniform examinations, and that at least one allied branch is attempting to solve the subject in a manner which may be utilized by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. The American Medical Association has interested itself in the subject of medical licensure examinations and through its efforts with the co-operation of the United States Government, acting through the medical officers of the Army, the Navy and the Marine Hospital Service, a National Board of Medical Examiners has been established. Those obtaining the certificate of this National Board will, as yet, have no legal rights, but it is assumed that one by one the several states will permit their medical licensing boards to accept the certificates of the National Board in lieu of an examination, and thus a properly trained and qualified practitioner will be permitted to become a licentiate in several states without repeating examinations.

From what we hear, the reciprocity idea, developed by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, is meeting each year with more and more success. Pharmaceutical reciprocity does not, however, by any means obtain throughout the breadth of this country, and perhaps the last hindrances to truly national reciprocity may be overcome by the application of the principle of the National Board of Medical Examiners by a similar national board of pharmaceutical character.

A novel proposition which might ultimately be utilized in the development of the union examination idea is the suggestion of M. I. Wilbert, concerning federal pharmaceutical licenses for the handling of narcotics and of alcoholic preparations. The several phases of Dr. Wilbert's proposition are: (a) The establishment of one federal license permitting pharmacists to sell narcotics and alcoholics, thus relieving the druggist of the odium of being considered by the Internal Revenue Bureau as a retail liquor dealer; (b) the granting of the new certificate, not indiscriminately but only to those pharmacists who are equipped to practise Pharmacy and possess high acquirements in the way of educational credentials and in actual knowledge shown by examinations. In short, the licensed pharmaceutical handler of narcotics and alcoholics will be placed upon a civil service basis; (c) such federally licensed pharmacists would be the products of a federal examination conducted by a federal board under the auspices of the Civil Service Commission and as such could eventually obtain registration as pharmacists within the several states, by virtue of having passed the federal examination.

This plan, while highly suggestive, presents several difficulties. In the first place, from what we hear, it will require much work to secure the legislation permitting a joint license for the sale of alcohol and narcotics, since the Internal Revenue officers want to hold all they now have. From the pharmaceutical standpoint, while those wishing narcotic-alcoholic licensure may be willing to submit to a federal examination which, at the present time, would mean a second examination, the plan savors too much of compulsion to make it popular as a road to union examinations. These, if conducted at all, must be at the option of those who, feeling the advantages of a broader exchange of certificates as registered pharmacists are worth some extra work, voluntarily submit themselves to a special examination.

## OUR OTHER JOINT COMMITTEES.

The committee on examinations is not the only group of workers which we have in common with the Association of Boards. First of all, we must mention

the joint committee to which we are indebted for the well-planned program of the joint session of the Conference and of the Association of Boards. Then it will be recalled that at the joint session of the Section of Education and Legislation of the A. Ph. A. with the Conference and the Association of Boards held at San Francisco on August 11, 1915, the question of the proper definition of a proprietary medicine was discussed and that it was voted to refer the matter to a joint committee of the Conference and of the Association of Boards. This committee has performed its duty and its report is ready for submission to us at this meeting.

At the joint meeting of the Conference and the Association of Boards held last year, the creation of a joint committee on prerequisite arguments was authorized and we await with pleasure the report that will be brought in. Lastly, the Conference ordered the appointment of a committee to consider with the N. A. B. P., the A. Ph. A. and the N. A. R. D. the desirability of higher educational standards. While this committee has four organizations with which to coöperate, it is highly desirable that we should discuss the topic first with the Association of Boards and then at the joint educational session which will be held next week at Atlantic City.

#### THE FEDERATION OF PHARMACEUTICAL ORGANIZATIONS.

The subject of a federation of all American pharmaceutical bodies was discussed at some length last year in the address of the president of the Conference, who suggested the appointment of a committee clothed with the authority to initiate the federation movement. This suggestion was approved by the Conference and in appointing this committee, I chose as its leader the man who, during the past few years, has been battling to bring about this highly desirable condition of affairs. Dr. Hynson's report will inspire all of us, I am sure, so I need merely point out that with two such fine nuclei to work with—the joint sessions of the Section on Education and Legislation of the A. Ph. A., of the Conference and of the Association of Boards, on one hand, and the Drug Trade Conference on the other—it should by no means prove an impossible task to crystallize the different groups of drug organization into one splendid unit. But let us remember that ideal crystallization is one of the most uncertain of all physical phenomena.

#### CONCLUSION.

The last part of this address is delivered at a joint session of the Conference and the Association of Boards. There is no greater privilege that has ever come to me than this opportunity of taking an active part in the deliberations of two such important bodies. As I stand here I look back over twenty-seven years at my first impressions of a faculty—that of my Alma Mater; and of a board—the one but newly organized in my home state. The impression of awe that those two bodies then gave me has given place to familiarity and with the familiarity has come the feeling of affection for the men both of the Boards and of the Faculties who are doing so much to bring Pharmacy into her rightful place.

Last year it was fittingly said that the more we of the Faculties and of the Boards got together, the better we liked each other. We are now bound together in the bond of mutual interest; we have great work that we can perform well only with the help of the other; we are ready to march forward, shoulder to shoulder, enlisted in a common cause—the betterment of Pharmacy.