

JOINT SESSION OF THE SECTION ON LEGISLATION AND EDUCATION, WITH THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES, AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY

The joint session of the Section on Legislation and Education, with the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy was called to order by Chairman F. H. Freericks, of the Section on Legislation and Education at 8.00 P.M., September 6th.

CHAIRMAN FREERICKS: Mr. Burton is not with us, but we have with us the president of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, Prof. H. V. Army, and I will ask him to preside during this meeting.

(Professor Army takes the Chair.)

CHAIRMAN H. V. ARMY: The first order of business will be the reports of the Philadelphia meetings last week. Professor Teeters is here; we will ask him to read the reports of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties.¹

Report read by Professor Teeters.

Moved by Charles Gietner and seconded by Philip Asher that the report be received and take the usual course.

Motion carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business will be a similar report of the 13th annual meeting of the Boards of Pharmacy,² by Secretary H. C. Christensen, of Chicago.

Report read by Mr. Christensen.

E. G. Cox moved that the report be received and take the usual course. Seconded by Geo. C. Diekman.

Motion carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next two items on the program are, first, the Summary of Important Discussions and Conclusions at the respective meetings of the A. C. of P. F. and N. A. B. P., to be presented by representatives of the respective bodies, and, second, Presentation of Resolutions adopted by the A. C. of P. F. and N. A. B. P. to be acted upon at this session.

It was the intention of Chairman Freericks that the personal touch in these reports should be given by President Burton and the present Chairman. President Burton not being here, I would say that Mr. Haussamen of North Dakota has kindly consented to speak for the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, with the full understanding that it will be an entirely informal statement.

Now, that being the case, the Chair will speak very briefly on this admirable report of Chairman Teeters and from an entirely informal and personal standpoint. I also want to say that I believe we all would appreciate the value of having this discussion entirely informal, and I hope that the members present at the meetings of this organization will be good enough to enter into the discussions. There was

¹ A report of the meeting was published in the September number of the JOURNAL, pp. 929-943.

² A report of the meeting was published in the September number of the JOURNAL, pp. 944-948.

a large amount of work done, and we should follow these reports, because the American Pharmaceutical Association is deeply interested.

Taking up the subject of the meeting of the Conference, there were three very important accomplishments.

The first one, which I think was of very great importance, was the action of the Conference in regard to the requirement passed at the Detroit meeting, that a two-year high school course should be required as an entrance requirement, beginning January, 1917. This, as the Secretary read, was finally arranged, after very considerable discussion on the subject, to make its adoption mandatory in 1917. I want to speak of this and explain this situation.

It was not a case where the Council has really backed down from its original stand, but was due to changed conditions during the past year. I believe the most important factor that caused this change, from a compulsory to a mandatory resolution, was due to the fact that in the interim, since the last meeting, the New York Pharmacy Law has been so amended that this requirement will begin in 1918. I want to add that the value of the Conference was never more clearly shown than in the way the situation was handled. It was a conference in the truest sense of the word, where men of different opinions assembled and discussed the matter, and when it came to a final result they met in the attitude of forbearance, which is the true ideal of a conference.

There were a large number who favored immediate action. In other words, some of the schools were demanding two years high school work, and there were others who were entirely ready and prepared to begin this in 1917, but there were quite a number, notably those who are directly dependent upon the New York situation, who did not feel that we were quite ripe for the situation, and the result was that for this year, instead of the provision being mandatory, it is recommendatory.

There is another point in connection with this and that is to make this requirement absolutely mandatory, we will have to change our by-laws, and I have no doubt that by next year the time will be ripe for the change.

This is not merely a statement of facts, but I give it to emphasize the value of a conference where men of different minds finally adjusted differences.

The next thing was the handling of the 1920 Resolution. At the San Francisco meeting, or to go further back, at the Detroit meeting, it was recommended that in 1920, a four-year high school course should be made an entrance requirement for admission to the Conference.

At the San Francisco meeting the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, as we all know, put themselves on record for prerequisite legislation based on four-year entrance requirements and a two-year college course, and that this was to become effective in 1920. This was, of course, a declaration of principles, but no special plans were provided at that meeting whereby this high ideal could be crystallized. The result was that a recommendation was made that this be put in more tangible shape. It was agreed that the Joint Committee referred to in Secretary Teeters' report should try to work up sentiment in each state by submitting a referendum vote, and when a state declared its readiness for prerequisite

requirements, every possible assistance should be given by the Association and the Conference. The idea is eminently practicable, because the legislative committees in each state will realize that behind them are the Association of Boards and the Conference.

The third important point was the report which was given in our Conference and then also in the Association of Boards and then at the joint session held last Saturday, and that was the report of the Joint Committee on Examination Questions. As already stated by the Secretary, there are a number of exceedingly important committees in the Conference, each did very valuable work, and, therefore, it is not a question of invidious distinction when I single out this Committee. I do not mean to say that the others did not do as good work, but this Committee was rather fortunate in the fact that they had the most important work that the Conference and Boards could do, and that is, establishing uniformity in examinations. If they are put on a basis of uniformity, the strongest argument against interchange of certificates will be done away with.

This Committee has collected five thousand questions, which are being classified, and I think that there is no work that these two organizations are doing that is of greater service.

The last point will be very brief. That is the very valuable report of the Committee on Prerequisite Requirements. In appointing this Committee, Professor Day was made chairman for the simple reason that three years ago he presented the most valuable summary of prerequisite requirements it has ever been my pleasure to read. Professor Day was equal to the occasion, and his recommendations, which were read by the Secretary are of tremendous value, and will be of still greater value to the state legislative committees.

These were found so significant that the Conference requested that they be published in the *JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION*,³ and not merely the recommendations, but also the arguments against prerequisite legislation, such as are always advanced whenever we desire to amend pharmacy laws.

If we can pass good prerequisite laws and establish uniformity in examinations, all the other things we desire will come to pass.

While I am on my feet, I will say that there is an exceedingly important report which was specifically referred to this Association at the joint session of the Boards and Conference of Faculties, and that was the report of the Committee on Scholarships. Dr. Alpers, I think, will be here this evening, and when I see him I will ask him to present this report.

H. F. FREERICKS: I do not think we should allow this opportunity to pass for expressing to Professor Army our appreciation of the nice manner in which he has related to us the important things that transpired at the Conference of Faculties last week, and I am certain that I voice the sentiments of all here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion on the subject of the work of the Conference?

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION.

WILBER J. TEETERS: There is one report by the chairman of the Executive Committee of the Conference which, it seems to me, would be of interest to us all. The report was given

³ This report was printed in the September number of the *JOURNAL*, pp. 939-943.

statistically, showing the advancement in preliminary educational matters. These statistics show that at the present time, in the colleges belonging to the Conference, fifty-six percent of the students had four years' high school at the present time.

W. C. ANDERSON: I think that assertion of Prof. Teeters ought to be qualified to the extent that this percentage was based on the colleges heard from. It was not a record of all the colleges, only those who had replied to the request. When you base this number of high school graduates, entering a college of pharmacy, upon the number of men and women who are licensed to practice pharmacy in the United States each year, the proportion of high school people going into the drug business is much smaller. I understand that about twenty-five hundred took examinations during the year, and when you compare four or five hundred high school men with twenty-five hundred, the proportion of high school boys and girls who are taking up the study of pharmacy is quite different.

H. H. RUSBY: That is one thing that impressed me. I was greatly surprised at these figures and I can hardly accept them even yet. I believe that I could find three schools in the Conference which, together, have more students with only one year high school work than the total number covered in that report. I believe that to be true, but I have not looked it up.

Another thing struck me as important. That is, how many persons enter pharmacy during the year and are licensed that have not had even one year. There is nothing said about those who have had no work whatever. All those questions came up in my mind and they were not answered in that report, and I would like to get some information in regard to it. I think the most encouraging thing I heard was, that the Boards of Pharmacy are so strongly inclined to high school graduation. That is most hopeful. Alone, the Conference cannot do much, but if the Boards of Pharmacy are in favor of it they can do a great deal toward bringing it about, and I am more hopeful about seeing four-year requirements at a relatively early date than I have ever been before. That, in my opinion, was the most important result of both meetings.

JULIUS A. KOCH: If I recollect rightly, out of twelve hundred and twenty some odd students matriculating last year, fifty-six percent were high school graduates, and about seventeen percent had one year of high school. The other figures do not run so clearly in my mind, but there was a steady progression. I think that four years ago—the first statistics were four years back—the percentage of high school graduates was in the neighborhood of thirty-five percent, and there has been a steady progression up to fifty-six percent. The men admitted with one year of high school work started, I think, with thirty-four percent four years ago and dropped down to seventeen percent last year.

H. V. ARNY: The question raised was, out of the twelve hundred and twenty, did that represent most of the schools in the Conference?

J. A. KOCH: That represents all of the schools in the Conference from which we had statistics regarding the high school work the students had. I explained when making my report that, for instance, the State of Pennsylvania now requires that pharmacy students present a certificate from the Bureau of Professional Education: we admit our students on this certificate and most of the schools do not report on how much high school work the students had—simply report John Smith on Certificate No. 394 of the Bureau of Professional Education. I presume these twelve hundred and twenty-nine represent approximately half of the students of pharmacy entering schools, which hold membership in the Conference.

H. V. ARNY: Do you think, Professor Koch, that the other half, if heard from, would show a similar ratio?

J. A. KOCH: I think so. Very nearly so.

H. V. ARNY: I would like to ask—among the number given for Pennsylvania, you had no percentage—you just got those whom you knew specifically—there were a good many other students, but you simply have a number?

J. A. KOCH: The only school in Pennsylvania from which statistics were available was the Pittsburgh College of Pharmacy, and I had statistics from these; of the other schools I know only the certificate numbers. The same applies to New York State. Many schools in New York simply note the registration number, the Regent Certificate, on which the student was admitted.

W. C. ANDERSON: Was it not stated in a paper given before the Conference that the schools of pharmacy requiring four years of high school for entrance admitted only one hundred and seventy-six students?

H. H. RUSBY: That does not have any relation whatever to the number of students who had four years of high school, but the schools that demanded four years for admission, only had one hundred and seventy-six.

J. A. KOCH: Therefore, there must have been over a thousand admitted into schools which do not have a four-year requirement.

CHARLES GIETNER: I believe there were four or five states that adopted a prerequisite of four years high school, and Pennsylvania was mentioned as one. According to your statement, Pennsylvania does not have such requirement.

J. A. KOCH: Pennsylvania has no law demanding preliminary requirement. It was simply by common consent that we adopted, first, one year and now, two years.

H. V. ARMY: Has Pennsylvania adopted two years?

J. A. KOCH: The schools in Pennsylvania have.

R. A. LYMAN: To me the most hopeful thing is this, that so many young men and women are themselves seeing the advantages of a high school course before they study pharmacy. That is a most hopeful thing, because that induces public opinion, and they are doing so in spite of the fact that boards are not requiring that for examination at the present time, although they may have recommended it last year. But that recommendation could not possibly have affected the students in the schools last year.

It is certainly hopeful, as Dr. Rusby says, to see this progressive tendency among the examining boards of the United States and to see so many schools take a stand for higher education. I trust that before a great many years we will see a lot more of the schools take that progressive attitude.

GEO. D. TIMMONS: I appreciate the roseate view of the last speaker, but is it not really a fact that progression along the line of education is really the whole thing after all; that there is a larger percentage of young people to-day that take advantage of the opportunities they have and become high school graduates. If you will follow statistics you will find that, not only in pharmacy, but in all other lines a greater percentage have had four years of high school. We have high schools everywhere, and the whole tendency is on an upgrade normally and not because we are asking for it.

GEO. C. DIEKMAN: There is still another phase that seems to me to be of interest, and that is, we can ascertain what percentage of young men and women who pass boards of pharmacy each year were four-year high school people. I do not underestimate at all the value of education. I believe in education and agree with the speakers who uphold four-year requirements, but I fear that a great many of the young men and women who have four years of high school experience are lost to retail pharmacy. They do not stay in retail pharmacy; they do something else. Of course, the education is just as valuable, but I am afraid they do not stay in retail pharmacy—they take up something else, and I would be very much interested if Professor Koch could take up that tabulation.

J. A. KOCH: I think that could be best tabulated by the Association of Boards of Pharmacy. These papers have been so interesting and such a surprise to me that I expect to go into this much more deeply and expect to obtain from the schools statistics which will be more complete, for next year.

CHARLES GIETNER: There appears to be a sentiment that anyone who does not talk two, three or four years' high school is objecting to higher education. That is not so. I came here, not to oppose higher education. I came here to give it a lift, but I came from a State where the time is not ripe for such requirement.

Now, the remarks of Professor Diekman struck me as a valuable thought. Why not let the different State Boards keep such records in tabulated form? I think there are very few in Missouri that come with two, three or four years of high school, a majority have had only one year. I heard only yesterday from Professor Jordan that in Indiana high school education does not enter into the requirements of their Board.

CHARLES GIETNER: I would move that it is the sense of this meeting to have the secretaries of the different State Boards of Pharmacy to tabulate the high school graduates coming up for examination from now until the next meeting.

Motion seconded by Geo. C. Diekman.

C. B. JORDAN: I have attended these meetings year after year, and every one is saying "We are going forward." Our National Association of Boards of Pharmacy have made recommendations as to what State Boards would do, and I went home and braced myself for something to happen, and nothing has happened. I visited Mr. Christensen in Chicago and asked for this same data, and I could not get it. I sincerely hope that it will become available now, if the meeting will ask the Secretary to prepare it.

As Mr. Christensen says, let us go ahead as far as the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy is concerned and say two, three or four years, but let us also get after our State Boards, if it is possible.

E. G. COX: As a member of the State Board of Missouri, I advocate higher education in Missouri, but I think the recommendations of the Board should not become effective until after two or three years, and when the colleges are on such a basis; I endorse Mr. Gietner's motion.

C. S. KOON: It was suggested in Michigan that a compilation, such as has been suggested here, would be very valuable. As the Secretary of the Michigan Board, I would be glad to make this compilation and send it to Secretary Christensen.

The motion was carried.

PHILIP ASHER: Prof. Diekman made the statement that a good many who graduated from colleges of pharmacy do not continue in pharmacy. A great many of these four-year high school graduates who study pharmacy intend afterward to take up medicine, and I think it would be a good thing for the colleges to report each year on their graduates to see how many have continued their work as retail pharmacists.

Therefore, if I am in order, I would move that the Secretary of the Conference be requested to write to the various colleges for such information from year to year.

Seconded by Geo. C. Diekman.

L. E. SAYRE: It seems, we have here two problems: We have, what I might designate as a minimum requirement, which is represented by the boards, and the maximum requirement which the colleges are trying to reach.

The instructor looks upon education itself, and asks the question, what shall he do with regard to people who come to him and how should he prepare them? I do not see how these statistics can help him at all.

Our Chairman remarked in his address the other day that a majority of the students were simply perusers of the Pharmacopoeia and not users of it. I believe that in order to teach a young man to use the Pharmacopoeia—not peruse it—the best foundation is a four years' course in an accredited high school.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that Secretary Christensen be requested to write to the deans of colleges of pharmacy, asking them to start statistics, beginning with 1917, as to graduates in reference to the question, how many four-year high school students remained in the retail pharmacy business, and how many took up other lines of work?

C. B. JORDAN: I would be perfectly willing to do this, if there is any advantage to come out of it. But, after we get the information, what are we going to do with it? Of what value is it, how long are we going to keep these men under

observation? They may go into retail pharmacy and remain three years and then enter some other business or profession.

GEO. D. TIMMONS: Another question is, what percent can we keep track of?

R. A. LYMAN: I maintain that a man cannot be a good dean unless he does that very thing. I think that is one of the duties of an institution—to keep track of its alumni, who they are and what they eventually amount to.

PHILIP ASHER: Last year I received a request from the State of New York, asking this very question, and I took the pains to give them a history, as to the personal status of all our graduates. What reason these gentlemen had for wanting to know what our students were doing, I have no idea. The thought was suggested by the remark of Dr. Diekman. It may not serve any good immediately, as far as the Conference is concerned, but you want to know something of the progress of pharmacy, and it is simply a matter of interest to us to see what our men are doing. If it is too much trouble for the deans, of course, we could not expect them to prepare such records.

L. F. KEBLER: I was discussing with one of the deans of a medical school the question of increasing the entrance requirements of the medical schools, and I asked him, "Are you getting any better results by the higher requirements?" and he said, "I don't know, it is a question."

I think it would be valuable information to know how the work of high school men compared with that of the men who have one year, two years, or no years of such education.

H. P. HYNSON: It seems to me that if we are to learn anything at all from experience in the past, some such statistics as these will be of great value to us.

I remember some years ago, just after I graduated, Dr. Simon read a paper in which he stated that all the better graduates had left pharmacy and taken up some other course. It touched my pride, and I at once went to work and ascertained what had become of the honor men in our college and I was glad to find that eighty-five percent of them had stuck to pharmacy and were making a success.

If we find out that the four-year high school students had stuck to pharmacy and made a greater success than the others, we would then be encouraged to require high school admission. But, if we find that a large percentage leaves pharmacy, and that the man who has had a practical course in a drug store sticks to pharmacy, I think we had better go back to the four-year apprenticeship. I think this will give us the very information we want and I hope that this motion will prevail, and that the deans will be somewhat stimulated to get in touch with their students and find out what does become of them.

Motion carried.

H. H. RUSBY: The gentleman on my right spoke for the Missouri Board of Pharmacy, and I understood him to say that they refrained from increasing their requirements until the schools had reached a more uniform basis as to their entrance requirements. I would like to ask the gentleman what inducement these schools will have to bring about uniformity when one demands two years of high school work and the Board gives an equal opportunity to a man who had never attended any school of pharmacy whatever. We have heard that a school in Missouri that wants to increase its requirements cannot do so, because the moment

they do the students leave them and go to other schools, and the Board gives them just as good a chance as they do the others.

E. G. COX: I answer by saying, that our requirements are one year, or its equivalent.

CHARLES GIETNER: If any Board lives up to the national requirements, it is the Missouri Board; we live up to the dictates of the Advisory Committee. The Missouri Board is not pulling back, but is shoving forward.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now hear from Mr. Haussamen.

H. L. HAUSSAMEN: The different recommendations have been acted upon. There is only one recommendation in this report that we would like to have discussed. The recommendation is "Be it hereby resolved, that we request that the Section on Education and Legislation of the American Pharmaceutical Association in joint session with the Faculty and Boards to give consideration to the Prerequisite Provisions. . . ."

The reason for this recommendation is that we have a prerequisite in North Dakota which requires that all candidates for examination must be graduates from a college of pharmacy. This law was passed, and there is a clause in it which intended to provide for reciprocity with other state boards, but this section of the law is not very clear. We secured an opinion from the Attorney-General who said that this certainly was the intent of the law, and we are acting now, really under the opinion of the Attorney-General. We are acting from one session of the Legislature to another until such time when we can change this particular section. I want to bring to your particular attention that the pharmacy boards and colleges of pharmacy should make this section very clear, so that there will be no danger, on account of this particular law, of our being excluded from active membership in the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy.

This is the only recommendation we have up for discussion here. We draw your attention to it so as to make it clear that while we are active members of the Association now, in case another view was taken by a succeeding Attorney-General, we might not be able to retain our membership.

THE CHAIRMAN: The recommendation, as I understand it, might be summarized in a word or two, that it is the sense of the Boards that in framing prerequisite legislation care must be taken not to make it restrictive as far as reciprocity is concerned, and to see that this particular section will not be ambiguous.

H. L. HAUSSAMEN: We want to be active members of the Association. As I understand it, there are only five States in which a college of pharmacy diploma is a prerequisite. In all the others, if the candidates can pass the examination of the Boards, whether they are graduates of a college pharmacy or not, they are accepted.

This makes it difficult for us to get clerks. They say to us, "We would like to go to North Dakota, but we are not graduates of a college of pharmacy." Take also the case of a man who desires to buy a store in North Dakota; his answer is, "I would like to go into business in North Dakota, but I am not a graduate of a college of pharmacy and I could not be registered."

We want to make this clear, that under the ruling of our Attorney-General, even though pharmacists are not graduates of a college of pharmacy, candidates

can be registered in North Dakota now, provided they have been registered prior to 1915.

Recommendation seconded by Geo. C. Diekman.

H. C. CHRISTENSEN: The reason for bringing this matter before this Association really was to refer it to the Voluntary Committee on Model Pharmacy Law. I would like to amend the motion so as to refer it to that Committee, and let them draft and submit a provision that will cover the point under discussion, so that when we have inquiries from different states in regard to prerequisite provisions we can recommend a clause that will be the same in every state.

Forty State Legislatures will meet this coming winter. I know personally of fifteen or sixteen states in which this prerequisite proposition will be brought up and, undoubtedly, legislative committees will be glad to have such a proposal in proper shape, that it would be worded right.

E. L. NEWCOMB: I would like to inquire what the states, that require a man to be a college graduate, do at the present time with regard to reciprocity.

GEO. C. DIEKMAN: I can speak only for New York. I think we differ from other states. We have no reciprocity at all. Everybody must take an examination in New York. We have a clause in the law which in effect says that the State Board may endorse the license of an applicant from another state upon the payment of twenty-five dollars, provided the applicant and the state from which he comes meet all the requirements of the New York State Board. We have so far not had any applicants. The applicant would have to be a college graduate.

H. C. CHRISTENSEN: The only state that you have as an active member of this Association, that has a prerequisite of that kind is North Dakota, and that is why attention was called to the importance of a provision being passed in the different states that will not interfere with reciprocity.

Conditions in New York are a little different from other states. New Jersey, for instance, has just become an Associate Member; they wanted to associate themselves as an Active Member, but on account of the wording of their prerequisite clause, it was impossible for them to do so. That goes to show the importance of getting the right kind of a prerequisite clause.

E. E. FAULKNER: Would a graduate of the University of Michigan, who is registered by the Michigan Board, be granted reciprocity in New York State?

GEO. C. DIEKMAN: I am not prepared to answer that question offhand. The gentleman would have to make application and be passed upon by the State Board. We are waiting for some such applications to be made, but nobody has done so. You send us a man who meets our requirements and have him make application and appear before the Board. That will test the question absolutely.

Motion carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish to announce that the General Committee of the Conference and the Boards did make a very important recommendation, and that was the recommendation on the Fairchild Scholarship. We have just learned that Dr. Alpers, who has charge of the matter, is not well this evening and has retired, and it will have to be brought up at the general session of the Association.

(The Chair briefly outlined the conditions under which the Fairchild Scholarship existed and its award.)

The following papers were then read, discussed and referred to the Publication Committee:

"Privately Owned Schools and Colleges of Pharmacy," by Edward Spease.

"How to Study," by Frederick J. Wulling.

"Coöperation between State Medical and Pharmacy Boards, Drug Commissioners Acting under Their Joint Authority and Supervision," by E. H. Thiesing.

"Practical Drug Experience before Entering College," by Otto Raubenheimer.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the joint session held last Saturday, a very important paper by Professor Jordan was referred to this Section. We will now hear that paper. The title is, "Uniform Legislation."

After discussion of the paper, it was moved by Wilber J. Teeters, that the paper be received, the recommendations adopted, and then referred to the Publication Committee. The motion was seconded, the question called for, and the vote was favorable for adoption and so declared.

The fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh tentative new provisions,* as presented by the Voluntary Conference, to be part of a Modern Pharmacy Law, were then called for and read by Chairman F. H. Freericks. They follow:

TENTATIVE PROVISIONS FOR MODERN PHARMACY LAW.

SHALL MEMBERS OF THE STATE BOARDS OF PHARMACY BE GRADUATES IN PHARMACY?

Provision No. 4. "The State Board of Pharmacy shall consist of five (5) members, to be nominated by the State Pharmaceutical Association, and to be appointed by the Governor, etc., at least three (3) of whom shall be graduates of a reputable college of pharmacy, and all of whom shall be actively engaged in retail pharmacy, having had at least ten (10) years of practical experience therein, the requirement for college graduation not to be applicable to those who at present are members of the existing State Boards of Pharmacy."

DISCUSSION.

The really important feature of Provision No. 4 would require that at least a majority of the members of all state boards of pharmacy be graduates of a reputable college of pharmacy, excepting in so far as it concerns those who are now members of existing state boards. There is considerable opposition to such a requirement on the ground that it would preclude many of the older and practically experienced pharmacists from being honored by appointment on state boards. It is argued that the practical experience of the older men fully offsets the advantage of college training, and that no distinction ought to be made on that account. On the other hand it is argued that the Provision is to be more applicable for the future, and that the time has come when at least a majority, if not all, of the board members should be college graduates. It is also argued with force that where the Prerequisite clause prevails it seems absurd that college graduates shall be examined by those who lack college training. It seems that there may be other arguments to present for or against the requirement.

SHALL PHARMACY TEACHERS MEET REQUIREMENTS PRESCRIBED BY LAW?

Provision No. 5. "Colleges, Departments and Schools of Pharmacy, to be recognized as such by the State Board of Pharmacy, shall require for graduation a course of study of at least two (2) years, such two-year course to be divided by an interim of at least two months, and to provide for at least twelve hundred (1,200) hours of study. They shall have a Chair in Pharmacy, Chemistry and Materia Medica, each in charge of a Professor, having besides the necessary special learning and training, either an academic or scientific degree, or both, from some reputable institution of learning: Provided, that nothing contained in this Section shall apply to those who when this Act becomes effective are, or have been, teaching in Colleges, Departments or Schools of Pharmacy."

* The first three tentative provisions will be found in last month's issue of the JOURNAL. All of these provisions will be of value to legislative committees in drafting amendments to pharmacy laws.

DISCUSSION.

The really important feature in Provision No. 5, is that it prescribes by law some qualification for those who would teach in our colleges of pharmacy. In a paper presented at the San Francisco Meeting by Dr. Wm. C. Alpers, strong reasons were advanced for holding that there should in some manner be an enforceable requirement to govern those who would teach in our colleges, so that there may be some assurance at least, that those who would teach are so qualified. He urged that all teachers, or at least those who would claim to be professors, be required to have an academic degree acquired by study and work and not by favor. Elsewhere it has been urged that with the more general requirement for the College Prerequisite, schools of pharmacy may be created or may be turned into institutions which seek only to serve the letter of the law and not its spirit in that respect. Admittedly, if schools of pharmacy may exist or may be created to serve only the letter of the law in meeting the college prerequisite, then the very aim of the prerequisite may be undone, if there be not also well defined requirements to govern the teaching staff of our colleges. It is objected, that any legal requirement of the nature referred to is unnecessary on the ground that all teaching institutions will fail which do not have a fit teaching staff; that those entrusted with the conduct of our colleges and schools of pharmacy may be relied upon to secure fit and qualified teachers in order to establish or maintain their reputation. It may be admitted that heretofore colleges and schools of pharmacy have been established because of an altruistic aim, but the vital question seems to be whether we may expect such altruistic aim to continue and generally prevail.

RECIPROCAL REGISTRATION.

Provision No. 6. "The State Board of Pharmacy, may in its discretion grant Certificates of Registration to persons who furnish proof that they have been registered by examination in some other state, and that they are of good moral character. Provided, that such other state in its examination requires the same general degree of fitness as is required by examination in this state, and that the applicant qualifies in all other respects as is required for registration by examination within this state, and provided also, that such other state or states, in like manner, grant Reciprocal Registration to pharmacists and assistant pharmacists of this state. Applicants to the State Board of Pharmacy for Reciprocal Registration shall defray all necessary expense for making an examination into their character and general reputation, as well as pharmaceutical standing in the state where they formerly resided, such expense of investigation not to exceed the sum of ten (10) dollars, and for the purpose of such investigation and report thereon, the State Board of Pharmacy may secure the service of individuals or associations who are engaged in the work of compiling such information at an expense not to exceed ten (10) dollars in each separate case. In addition, an application for Reciprocal Registration shall be accompanied by an original registration fee of \$10.00 which shall be refunded in case registration is not granted."

DISCUSSION.

It has been claimed with much show of sound reason that Reciprocal Registration should be provided for, if the applicant to the state board, having the higher requirements, can prove that he, in his particular case, meets such higher requirements, even though they do not prevail generally in the state where he has first become registered. This has to do principally with such states where the College Prerequisite is now a part of the law as distinguished from states in which the College Prerequisite is not now part of the law. The contention is made that in states where the College Prerequisite does not prevail there are very many graduates of recognized colleges. It is contended further, that in many of such states the examination requirements are fully equal to those in which the College Prerequisite exists, and consequently the examination requirement being equal, and the College Prerequisite having been met by the particular applicant, that he should have the right to Reciprocal Registration. The other features of Provision No. 6, have to do with uniformity and matters of detail regarding which there may not be much difference of opinion. It also seeks to place the activities of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy on a sound legal basis in so far as they concern Reciprocal Registration and its support. In connection with Reciprocal Registration the thought is also advanced, that careful provision be made to safeguard the right to Reciprocal Registration, so that a late adoption of the College Prerequisite may not be retroactive in its effect upon pharmacists of other states who theretofore

in their own states met all of the requirements for registration, and who desiring Reciprocal Registration might otherwise be denied, because of the late enactment of the College Prerequisite in the state where they are seeking Reciprocal Registration.

Broadly speaking, the sixth Provision raises the question, whether each individual case should be considered to determine the right to Reciprocal Registration, or whether only the requirements of the respective state boards should govern. The question is also raised, whether the adoption of the College Prerequisite in connection with Reciprocal Registration should have an effect, which in its nature is retroactive.

AN ASSOCIATION OF PHARMACY STATE BOARD MEMBERS AND A BUREAU MAINTAINED GENERALLY BY STATE BOARDS OF PHARMACY.

Provision No. 7. "In order that the State Board of Pharmacy may be informed, and properly determine the status of the Boards of Pharmacy of other States desiring Reciprocal Registration, and that it may be generally advised regarding progress in pharmacy throughout the country, the said Board shall annually select one of its members, who shall meet with like representatives of such other State Boards of Pharmacy, as may be arranged, for the purpose of discussing and determining the degree of fitness required by such Boards, and the general advancement made in pharmacy. The expense of such representative shall be paid and allowed as are all other lawful expenditures of the members of the Board of Pharmacy. At meetings arranged for between the representatives of this State Board of Pharmacy with the representatives of other State Boards of Pharmacy desiring Reciprocal Registration there may be adopted uniform regulations and requirements which are deemed desirable by each of said representatives for their respective States to govern Reciprocal Registration, but such rules and regulations shall not be construed as based upon agreement by an official of this State with officials of other States, and they shall be binding only, if adopted by the State Board of Pharmacy as its own rules and regulations, and then only to govern within this State as the result of independent decision on the part of the State Board of Pharmacy, without any agreement by or with other State Boards of Pharmacy. The representative of the State Board of Pharmacy as such shall not enter into or join in the formation of any association depending upon agreement between the officials of this State with the officials of other States, but this shall not be construed to prevent such representative in his individual capacity from joining or being a member of an association which may be constituted of the representatives of State Boards of Pharmacy, also acting in their individual capacity. Any association so existing which is engaged in the compilation and study of the work of State Boards of Pharmacy, and which has for its object the general advancement of pharmacy and the keeping of records pertaining to the Reciprocal Registration of pharmacists, may at the discretion of the State Board of Pharmacy be given such information as it possesses pertaining to such aims and objects. The State Board of Pharmacy at an expense not to exceed one hundred (\$100) dollars annually may subscribe for and secure the services of an association, engaged in the compilation of pharmaceutical information and progress, especially adapted for securing the greatest efficiency in the work of said Board."

DISCUSSION.

One of the serious difficulties which has confronted an organization of the state boards of pharmacy is found in the constitutional restrictions which must govern them. Article I, Section 10, Paragraph 3, of the Constitution of the United States provides that: "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State." A strict interpretation of this provision in the Federal Constitution precludes actual agreement between the several states or between the officials of the several states acting in their official capacity with a view of in any manner binding their respective states. Certain joint actions by officials of the several states have from time to time been held not to be based upon agreement between such states, so as to be in violation of the Federal clause, but it does not appear that actual agreement which would be alike binding on the part of states who might enter into it would be upheld. In so far as the matter concerns joint activities of our state boards of pharmacy, it is involved also with the receipt and distribution of funds necessary in connection with joint activity. It will be noted that Provision No. 7 while carefully avoiding what might

be construed as an agreement between the several states, or between the state boards of the several states acting for them, respectively, yet provides the means for active coöperation between them, and legalizes in that connection contributions and expenditures to serve their common purpose. It would remove from the field of correct coöperation between our state boards of pharmacy such doubts as now exist with reference to the legality of action and authority to act. The advisability of having a provision in our several state pharmacy laws, such as is contemplated by Provision No. 7, must rest in the need for legal and systematic coöperation between our several state boards. It presents for decision also, whether it is advisable to establish and maintain a Central Bureau through which the several boards would act in their relationship with each other, and which would be supported by them respectively, so as to permit its operation in a sound business-like manner. The question is, whether the existing National Association of State Boards of Pharmacy is so equipped as to properly serve its intended purpose, or whether it should be placed upon a more solid foundation with assured support, authorized by law in the several states.

JOSEPH P. REMINGTON: I move that this report be received and take the usual course, and that Chairman Freericks and the Committee be extended the thanks of this Section. Motion seconded.

H. C. CHRISTENSEN: These provisions have been given much thought by the individual members of the Boards, as well as by the Association as a whole and we are heartily in accord with the recommendations made. We realize that the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, as constituted at the present time, can be improved, and we are glad to have the subject brought up. It is unfortunate that we are not able to discuss these provisions further. This is a legislative year, and I was in hopes we could get some of these recommendations in shape to answer some of the inquiries we are bound to have from different states. I hope something will be done, in spite of the fact that we cannot discuss the propositions, so that we may have the information to convey to those who will ask for it.

Motion carried.

A motion to adjourn was seconded and carried.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE.

BY BERNARD FANTUS, M.D.

I note with regret the unfriendly attitude displayed by an editorial in the November issue of the JOURNAL toward the Health Insurance Bill drafted by the American Association for Labor Legislation, a movement which is in line with the latest developments in the care of the workingman's health in Germany, England, and in other countries of Europe. To characterize such legislation as charity is as erroneous, as to apply that designation to accident insurance laws or to compulsory education. Public Health Insurance could lead to a neglect of the insured only, if it is grossly mismanaged. It does not have that tendency in Europe, as far as I know. The neglect of human health and the lack of care of the sick, that exists at present, makes human life and health appear extremely cheap. We protect all other kinds of property by law upon law; we have so far done next to nothing toward protecting our most precious possession—namely, health. It is one of the boasts of the modern hygienist that health can be bought; and, to a certain extent, this is true. Sufficiently comprehensive legislation of the kind contemplated could not fail to take cognizance of the prophylaxis of disease. Human society is responsible for all the contagious and infectious diseases, for