

Committee on Research, and the latter writes as follows:

"Your letter announcing my appointment as chairman of the Committee on Research is at hand and I accept the honor.

"As I understand them, the duties of the Committee on Research are two-fold: (a) The formulation of rules and regulations as to how awards from the A. Ph. A. Research Fund shall be made; (b) the formulation of plans for the encouragement of research.

"In performing the first duty, it is highly desirable that the fiscal agents of the Association be represented on the Committee; in performing the second duty, we should select those whose research work speaks for itself.

"It will be seen that in fulfilling the grave responsibility of selecting associates, I have had this thought in mind, choosing from the Council Committee on the Financial Status of the National Formulary, from the Research Committee of the Scientific Section and from the Research Committee of the Conference of Faculties. I hope my selections will meet with the approval of the Council.

"With this explanation, I designate the following Committee on Research: Harry V. Army, Chairman (appointed by the chairman of the Council), George M. Beringer, Julius A. Koch, Henry Kraemer, Charles H. LaWall, Edward Kremers, Wilbur L. Scoville, Alviso B. Stevens, Frederick B. Power and Henry Milton Whelpley."

The above recommendations for membership of Committee on Research will now be voted upon by the Council. Do you approve the names as recommended? This will be regarded as *Motion No. 17 (Approval of Membership of Committee on Research)*.

Upon the occasion of the funeral of Prof. Joseph P. Remington, on January 4, 1918, flowers were sent in the name of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and the following letter of acknowledgment has been received:

"1832 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dear Mr. England:

Please convey to the American Pharmaceutical Association most sincere thanks for their thoughtfulness in sending the beautiful flowers. They were greatly appreciated.

Very sincerely,

(Signed) ELIZABETH B. REMINGTON."

January fifth, 1918.

*Motion No. 18 (Election of Members)*. You are requested to vote on the following applications for membership:

- No. 63. Crosby B. Washburn, 32 Adams Ave. W., Detroit, Mich., rec. by Leonard A. Seltzer and A. Alton Wheeler.
- No. 64. Andrew J. Cromer, 32 Adams Ave. W., Detroit, Mich., rec. by Leonard A. Seltzer and A. Alton Wheeler.
- No. 65. Silverio A. Tamayo, Bayamo, Oriente Rep. of Cuba, rec. by J. G. Diaz and José P. Alacán.
- No. 66. J. Max A. Schneller, 111 Wall St., New York, N. Y., rec. by E. G. Eberle and J. W. England.
- No. 67. A. Elsa Schmidt, 814 Madison Ave., Peoria, Ill., rec. by E. H. Wisner and G. D. Timmons.
- No. 68. Charles Emmett Bosserman, Newport, Pa., rec. by Charles H. LaWall and Ivor Griffith.

J. W. ENGLAND,

Secretary.

415 N. 33RD ST., PHILA., PA.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

### NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE PHARMACEUTICAL SYLLABUS.

#### BULLETIN XVII.

In Bulletin XV, sent out on September 20, the chairman stated that he was working on some general plans for the work of preparing the new edition of the Syllabus, and all members of the committee were requested to send suggestions along this line and to express their opinions on several specific questions relating to the scope of the Syllabus. Replies were received from a few members at once but others asked for time in which to consider the matter. Some of these sent in replies later, and others will find opportunities to present their ideas as the work progresses.

Helpful suggestions were received from several members, and H. H. Rusby submitted a carefully prepared statement of some aspects of the work. Free use of the replies was made in preparing this Bulletin.

War conditions are so disturbing that it is difficult to do routine work and doubly difficult to accomplish an extra task like the preparation of a new edition of the Syllabus. Nevertheless, we shall endeavor to complete the work of revision and to bring out the new edition on time. As the third edition is scheduled to become effective on July 1, 1920, it should appear in advance of that date, and we have less than two years in which to complete the work of revision. It will be greatly to our advantage if the greater part of the work is completed at an early date, leaving only perfecting of details for the later part of the time available.

It has been conceded generally that the first two editions of the Syllabus show great progress towards the ideal which we are striving for, and that the second edition is a great improvement over the first. The duty of the present committee is to bring out an edition which shall nearly approach the ideal. To accomplish this we must retain what is good in the second edition and replace what is defective with new and better material.

The chief difficulty confronting us in preparing the Syllabus arises from the existence of two distinctly different kinds of pharmacy schools in the country. In the cities of the East we have the small number of large independent schools giving the traditional two-year course in pharmacy leading to the degree of Graduate in Pharmacy, which may be followed by a one-year graduate course; while in the West we have the relatively large number of university departments of pharmacy, giving four-year courses leading to a bachelor's degree. The briefer course is almost purely technical and is the one for which the Syllabus is prepared. The university course, presumably, should contain all that comprises the briefer course with the addition of cultural and other subjects that would justify the granting of the bachelor's degree at its completion.

Dr. Rusby submits the following pertinent questions along this and similar lines:

1. Is the new edition of the Syllabus to be so framed that it will suffice, with mere modifications, for the period when high school graduation is required for admission, or is it to be prepared expressly for the two-year high school period and radically changed thereafter? The treatment of the subject must be different in the two cases, especially as to the earlier portions.

2. Are we to continue to include in the several subjects the present recognized excess of material, knowing, and all agreeing, that it can not all be taught in the time? If not, what is to be the basis of elimination?

3. Is the Syllabus to be framed exclusively for a course of preparation for the board examination, to prepare for the ordinary clerkship in a pharmacy, being thus complete in itself, but unsuited as the first part of a more extended course? Or, is it to take cognizance of the baccalaureate course and degree of university schools, and to serve for the first year's work of such a course, and at the same time serve for the minimum course for board preparation? This is a very serious question for the committee, for the basic character of its Syllabus must depend upon the answer.

4. Is it practicable to construct a Syllabus for a three-year course that will make a proper basis for a fourth year for the B.S. degree, especially if it be followed by work for the D.Sc. degree? Can an alternative arrangement be provided by which the university schools can be permitted to employ a modification of the three-year Syllabus so that it can serve for their first three years?

5. It goes without saying that the views of all represented should be sought as to the present division of time, inclusion and omission of matter and other general subjects.

With the object of making progress with the work, the chairman will make tentative rulings on these questions, subject to revision later as found to be necessary.

1. The present minimum requirement for entrance to schools of pharmacy which are members of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties is the completion of two years of a high school course, or its equivalent. This requirement has only just gone into effect and high school graduation will not be required for entrance before 1923. It seems, therefore, that the next edition of the Syllabus, probably to be effective from 1920 to 1925, should be based upon the entrance requirements of two years of a high school course, and it is so ruled.

2. While the minimum requirement is 600 hours of instruction for each of the two years of the regular course in pharmacy, it is a fact that the majority of the recognized schools give much more time than this. Therefore, it would seem to be best to retain the present general scope of the Syllabus, but that a strong effort should be made to give proportional treatment to the different subjects which are included. This matter will need more consideration later.

3 and 4. Considering all things, it appears that we can only continue our custom and prepare a Syllabus for the purely technical briefer course in pharmacy with possibly a graduate year of work along advanced lines. The cultural work done in the university schools as a part of four-year courses is elective in great part and it properly varies so much that it would not be feasible for us to limit it in the Syllabus in any way. If we bring out an acceptable edition of the Syllabus it should serve all schools of pharmacy, but in different ways, which must be kept in mind during the work of revision. While prepared as a basis for the courses in the independent schools of pharmacy, it should also be the basis of the pharmaceutical courses in the university schools, these pharmaceutical courses to be supplemented by cultural courses sufficient to satisfy the requirements for the bachelor's degree.

5. At the Indianapolis meeting of the committee, it was decided to secure suggestions and constructive criticism of our work from as many of those who are interested as is possible. The chairman fully appreciates the importance of such help and we should secure it in every possible way, but it must be done in such a way as to allow us to finish our work in time. We can get the help we desire, without undue delay, in at least three ways. First, by considering the criticisms of the present edition of the Syllabus; second, by correspondence with interested persons, and third, by suitable publicity concerning our work as it progresses, which will lead to more criticism, some of which will be helpful.

The most important criticisms of the previous editions of the Syllabus have pointed out that the book has many inconsistencies of treatment and is poorly proportioned, particularly that some relatively unimportant subjects received treatment far beyond what they deserve, also that certain parts of the work have treated the subjects as a text-book or compend should do and not like a Syllabus which should give lists of topics to be included in the various courses, and not develop these topics. These are valid objections and should be kept in mind during all the work of revision. Later we shall provide for editing the revised portions to make them conform as nearly as possible to a standardized method of treatment.

The chairmen of the sub-committees are requested to proceed at once with the revisions of their sections of the work and to transmit the revised separate subjects for distribution as fast as the sub-committees are agreed upon them. In preparing the second edition we found it well to assign different subjects to different members for revision, thus distributing the work. After revision, the part was submitted to the chairmen of the sub-committees for further revision if necessary. Then they were transmitted to the chairman of the whole committee for distribution and final revision before adoption. It is suggested that this method be used as far as practicable.

Nothing has been said in this Bulletin about the proposed Syllabus for the year of graduate work. This is quite different from the matters discussed here, and it will be made the basis for a separate Bulletin.

Respectfully submitted,

THEODORE J. BRADLEY, *Chairman.*

---

PROCEEDINGS OF AN ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL DRUG TRADE CONFERENCE HELD AT THE HOTEL EMERSON, BALTIMORE, JANUARY 4, 1918, IN PURSUANCE OF A CALL OF THE PRESIDENT UPON THE WRITTEN REQUEST OF FIVE DELEGATES.

MORNING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by President John C. Wallace at 10.30 A.M.

The roll being called the following persons answered:

*Representing the American Pharmaceutical Association:*—John C. Wallace and James H. Beal. (Samuel L. Hilton, absent, had written and approved holding the meeting at Baltimore.)

*Representing the National Wholesale Druggists' Association:*—Charles A. West, George W. Lattimer and W. L. Crouse, alternate for C. Mahlon Kline.

*Representing the National Association of Retail Druggists:*—Samuel C. Henry, James F. Finneran and Eugene C. Brokmeyer.