

not be given a more prominent place in the education of the pharmacist? More emphasis on this work in our colleges, better equipment and adequate time for instruction, will mean that our college graduates will be better prescriptionists. It will mean more young pharmacists entering business with the determination that no matter what side-lines may be introduced, their stores will be prescription stores. Better prescription service will certainly mean more prescriptions written; it will go far to correct the omnipresent evil of the dispensing doctor. The writer believes that as pharmacists, whether practitioners or teachers, we should spend less time in bewailing the fact that physicians are not writing prescriptions, and more time in preparing ourselves to give dispensing service of the highest possible order.

Let all recognition be given by our colleges to the commercial aspects of pharmacy. Let courses in commercial pharmacy, store-management, drug-store accounting, and show-card writing be introduced and strengthened. The three-year course should give time for these also. But let us not neglect to provide for more instruction and better instruction in dispensing.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY.

PRIVATELY OWNED SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES OF PHARMACY.*

BY EDWARD SPEASE.

This subject is similar to one upon which I offered a paper one year ago. My paper at that time was either too insignificant to merit recognition, or every one endorsed my opinions. I can hardly credit the latter statement as being a fact, and so must content myself with the former one, and try again.

I am not trying to find fault with the views of other people—many of whom have had many more years of experience in educating pharmacists than have I—but as I gain age and experience, the questions present themselves to me—Is pharmacy worth while? and, Does every class of pharmacists make the proper unselfish effort to build up pharmacy? and, Are they all proud of the profession they have chosen?

I ask myself, Why is the pharmacist often a man of small vision? Is it his multitude of small sales that makes him so? Why do the majority of pharmacists—and often now, the layman—make the statement: "Ethical pharmacy is a thing of the past; I must develop the commercial side of my store." By the commercial side is meant, I suppose, the patent medicine business, sundries, cigars, candy, etc., as well as the various lines of preparations put up by various pharmaceutical houses whose sale has made some of these manufacturers immensely wealthy.

The tendency, generally speaking, or at least in the majority of cases, is to draw away from prescription work and the manufacture of our own preparations

* Read before the joint session of the Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, Indianapolis meeting, 1917.

and compounds—even to draw away from the manufacture of U. S. P. and N. F. preparations.

Why do our leaders in pharmacy—many of them—advise us to associate ourselves with the patent medicine interests, yes, even with the vendors, for mutual self-protection in legislation? It must be because we are weak in ourselves.

Why are we not aligned with and on an equal footing with the best in the medical profession? Is the fault altogether that of the medical man?

Why have many of our pharmaceutical manufacturing houses made, and even solicited the making of patent and so-called "fake" medicines?

They will answer, of course—"to prevent these fellows from manufacturing them themselves, and likewise, from an altruistic standpoint, so that these medicines may be compounded by experienced pharmacists, and the danger to the public minimized."

Why do many of our manufacturers sell directly to physicians? Are they fearful lest the doctor manufacture for himself? Why is the physician merely a dispenser of pills and tablets—"canned medicines?" Why does the manufacturer find a market for solutions of cocaine ready for use by the doctor? Why does he make dispensing tablets?

Do our manufacturers all work for the best interests of our pharmacy schools, or do any of them ever interest themselves or permit their scientific men to teach in private schools, run solely for profit, Y. M. C. A. schools of pharmacy, and the like? If they do, does this help pharmacy, and help it ethically?

I have heard many men make the statement that they would be glad if never a prescription came in to them, because their help could make more money for the firm on the floor selling patents.

Why is it that of the many state boards of health commissions, committees and the like on health matters, existing and being appointed in our various states at all times, even those now for National Defense, the pharmacist is never regarded as a necessity? The veterinarian and the dentist, in these latter days, and always the physician—are chosen to serve the public in these groups.

We clamor at times for recognition of the pharmacist, but do we ever get behind the slogan "for the good of the public health?"

Why are not all our pharmaceutical associations in the same chain, and why do they not exist for the same purpose—the good of pharmacy and the uplift of the profession?

Would not the combined money spent by the N. A. R. D., the A. Ph. A., the jobbers and the manufacturers, go a long way towards getting proper legislation for us and placing us once more on an ethical footing?

I have heard one member of the Revision Committee of our own U. S. P. IX. say substantially that medicine is now an exact science, and that only known chemical compounds will be used in the future; that the field for pharmacy is practically eliminated, and that mixtures like tinctures and such preparations of vegetable drugs will soon pass out of use.

We hear the manufacturers say not to make any of our own fluidextracts, tinctures and things that they make; that the retail man's time is too precious to devote to such things, and besides, the trained scientific man in the manufac-

turers' laboratory is better fitted to prepare these things. This statement also came from another member of the U. S. P. IX Revision Committee.

Now, what does all this have to do with "Privately Owned Schools?" Just this: Is it the fault of these schools who first educated our pharmacists and whose graduates are the most active men in our profession to-day? Is it the fault of the university schools who came later, and the majority of whose graduates are comparatively young men?

I ask these questions for information only, and not to criticize. I feel it the duty of our Association to investigate these conditions, even to the point of banishing from our ranks individuals—if there be any—who stand opposed to the uplift of pharmacy.

Our schools should be the places where our pharmacists are trained, and there they should imbibe true pharmacy and a desire for better things. Do they?

Can a pharmacy school exist on tuition alone? Must it not have a large endowment, or receive State aid? I should like to know what it costs to educate a pharmacist, giving him the meagre training we now do. I have it on good authority from one of our medical schools, that the tuition per year is \$125.00, but the cost to the school is \$800.00 per student. Does it cost that to train a pharmacist?

Professors of pharmacy should be so trained that they can command big salaries, and these salaries should be forthcoming to them. Why do I harp on this old string? Because if properly paid, there would be enough of them so they could devote time to research, and not have to turn the eye toward commercial pursuits. Can the time ever come when private schools will ever approach this ideal? Never.

It has been said that universities will not recognize the merits of our schools of pharmacy. This is really so, in some cases, now. We can obviate these conditions by placing pharmacists upon university boards that control these matters, and then our university schools will be provided for properly.

Do our private schools, if there be any, really stand for better things? Is it not time that our Association as a whole desist from merely appointing a small committee on education and legislation—which of course go hand in hand—and really do something more in the matter of proper *education* for the pharmacist? *Legislation* will then come.

I ask you older men if it is too late to begin?

I did not write this paper in the spirit of fault-finding and scolding, but for the sake of receiving answers to my questions, if there are any.

CLEVELAND SCHOOL OF PHARMACY OF
WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY.
