

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

(Continued from p. 514, June issue.)

### MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES WITH THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOARDS OF PHARMACY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, AUGUST 13, 1918.

Through a closer spirit of coöperation and adherence to some standards, such as the *Syllabus*, we will be able to bring about a greater uniformity, clearness and understanding in the forming of the board questions. The standardization of the questions is, we know, a much debated topic and will no doubt be thoroughly discussed when we hear the report of the Committee on "Uniform Questions and Examinations." We therefore do not wish to open the question other than to emphasize the value of the conference and coöperative idea and the great possibilities that may come therefrom in bringing about clearer and more uniform examinations. In this connection we wish to present, without comment, a few questions that have been submitted to us by various members of the Conference, in the hope that we might be able to use them in a plea for the need of a real conference and development of a closer coöperative spirit between the boards and the colleges. The following were selected at random from among those submitted: "Give the chemical formula for S and Hg." "How may we classify all matter?" "Name the most positive and most negative element." "Why is sodium cacodylate official?" "Name the sulphites found naturally," etc.

Last year, at the joint session, there was evident throughout the entire discussion a general expression of feeling that the boards, after all, were the ones who could best raise the standards of pharmacy by demanding higher educational requirements of candidates for registration. As, for example, by requiring at least as a minimum, high school graduation from all candidates seeking registration as pharmacists and where possible at least two years of college work. In reply to these suggestions the statement is frequently made that the boards have no authority to advance the standards. Such statements, however, are not always based on the actual facts in the case, but rather on personal opinion and preference. There are, of course, instances where the requirements for registration are specifically expressed in the law. In such cases they may usually be divided into two groups, one in which only a minimum requirement is specified and the other where the law is more specific and fixes a maximum and minimum requirement. In the first case the requirement may be raised by the board without conflicting in any way with the spirit of the law; the question is a matter of judgment of the board. In the second instance, if the requirements seem too low, and it is deemed advisable to change them, the standard of the examinations could be raised, thereby practically necessitating, on the part of the candidate, a secondary school or even college training.

Another reason why we believe the boards should take the lead in raising the standards, both for preliminary school training as well as their examinations, is found in the practice of reciprocity now generally adopted by the boards of most states. We believe in reciprocity and feel that it is an evidence of marked progress but, while we may, the question naturally arises, are the requirements and the standards of all boards the same? If not, how are they adjusted so as to make them equitable? Are the examinations of one board of the same pedagogic value and fairness as a test of a candidate's qualifications as those of other boards? We doubt this, if the general average of the examinations is taken into account, and believe our opinion will be sustained by the admissions made by various members in the discussions of the question that have taken place in our individual and joint sessions.

The prospective candidate soon learns where the "easy boards" are located and, barring the extreme distances sometimes necessary to reach them, he will usually seek out the examinations of least resistance. On the other hand, we may have states where there are practically no educational requirements other than the ability to pass the examination. In such instances we believe that it is fair to assume that the examinations given are not of the same standard as in those states where specific educational requirements are demanded.

Some insist that the colleges should lead the way in all educational advances and, we believe, we are safe in saying that most of them have. But even though they should raise their requirements to two years of collegiate work, before one could begin the study of pharmacy, such a requirement would have no influence on the requirements of the boards, or the educational training of the candidate, unless there was a prerequisite law back of it. It is, however, needless to argue the point at any length for we all know how it works out in actual practice. Most candidates for registration, barring law requirements, will seek out the board of least resistance for registration. This attitude of getting through with as little training as possible is well illustrated by an instance reported by a member of the Committee when a pharmacist remarked to him that he did not care to have his clerk know the difference between an atom and an atomizer. This is unfortunate and it is humiliating to have to admit that we have such men in the ranks of pharmacy. It is just this attitude, however, on the part of so many pharmacists that has prevented our obtaining our just rank and position in the Army. We must have respect for our calling and ourselves if we expect to command respect from others. We believe this can be done very largely by raising the standards and educational requirements. We believe further that the boards are in position to do this better and easier than any one else since all persons seeking registration must pass their investigation. As a further argument against the boards taking the initiative in raising standards, we are told that the medical boards have not raised their standards and that the present high standards for the practice of medicine are all due to the colleges. This is true, but in considering the case we should remember that while the Medical Boards did not go above high school graduation they had a prerequisite law back of them, thereby enabling the colleges, with the aid of aggressive associations, to bring standards up to where they now are.

We believe, therefore, that the boards should go on a high school graduation requirement as soon as possible, thereby demonstrating their belief in the fact that pharmacy does need trained men. If, however, through various limitations in the law this is impossible to do without legislative enactment, then, to demand at least high school graduation from all candidates seeking reciprocal registration. The simple announcement of this latter requirement would then put all boards on more nearly an equality, and do more for the advancement of pharmacy than any one step taken in years. The fact that the boards have gone on record as favoring the high school graduation requirement is a step, but why not take the next one and make it a reality. There never was a time when standards could be raised as easily as now. The people are seeing examples daily of what specialized training will do and they know that a technical training demands a high preliminary training and that both spell efficiency. They are therefore not only believing in this, but are demanding it on every hand.

Most of us, no doubt, are familiar with the fact that the American Medical Association, through its Educational Committee, last January raised the requirement for admission to medical colleges by requiring extra hours of English. This is to take effect at once and to be operative for entrance this fall. There was no postponing the action to some future date and then to another. What is more, it was done in the face of the great demands for medical men and the great effort to protect even pre-medical students. No exceptions were made even for those who had practically completed their pre-medical work. Every one who could not meet the new requirement was compelled to enter a summer school somewhere and make this up. Some of us may feel that this was arbitrary and unwarranted in the face of the present crisis.

The question naturally arises, what did we do in the same emergency, did we raise our standards or, even, make much of an effort in behalf of the men in the Service who were seeking some recognition of their training? From some sources there arose a cry to open the gates and make it as easy as possible for those who wished to enjoy the privileges of practising pharmacy. Others said by all means let us lower the standards thereby making it possible for an increase in the number of licensed men, for there is a great scarcity and we know not what to do. We have been told that some schools sent out letters to their alumni stating that owing to the great demand for men they would not put into effect certain advanced requirements for admission till later, or after the war. In other instances the boards have been more or less remiss in their enforcement of the law requiring a registered man to be in charge of the store, or in the sale of certain prohibited articles. We will admit that these are times when reason and judgment must temper action and we all know of instances where to have maintained standards or rigidly en-

forced laws would have worked incalculable hardships. On the other hand, there are many instances where young men, just starting out in business, with splendid prospects, have been compelled to either sell out or close their stores by reason of being drafted, and were unable to secure a registered man to take charge of their store. Have they objected or asked for lowered standards or special concessions? By no means—they have simply “done their bit” and expect to come back and start over again. In contrast to this we might ask if there have been any chain, syndicate, department stores, drug stores, or stores owned by non-pharmacists, as an investment, closed for the same reason? This is certainly a condition worth considering. To sum it all up in the language of the day, we have been brought face to face with a real emergency and have been stampeded and gassed by those who would have us believe that pharmacy is nothing but a business, therefore, does not need specially trained and qualified men.

In times like these we should bring our forces closer together and work more in harmony, for upon us rests the responsibility of what pharmacy will stand for and be in the future. As teachers, we should see to it that what few students we may have during the coming year are better prepared, not only as pharmacists, but as business men, and filled with the idea of “doing their bit” not alone for their community and their country, but also for pharmacy and the various organizations representing it. In short, we should attempt to prepare real pharmacists with ideals for the future.

As board members we should see to it that our standards are maintained and that the inefficient and incompetent are weeded out. There should be no place made for them now under the plea of an emergency measure. It will be a great deal better for them, for the community in which they work and pharmacy in general if they are kept out now, than to let them in and then have to carry them along in the future as representatives of pharmacy, as it should be.

One member of the Committee has suggested several pertinent questions which we feel may well be discussed with profit, not only at joint sessions like this, but also at conferences of the individual state boards with the colleges.

First, what should be the attitude of boards toward short courses designed simply for passing, or as the students sometimes express it, “getting by State Boards?” It is evident that something should be done to standardize these schools in some way. The question is how may it be done. Little, if anything, can be done by the American Conference. Their proprietors are satisfied with their standing; they know they could not meet the standards of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, and, what is more, they do not care to do so, as long as they are able to have the boards recognize their students. The question is what should be done.

The second question submitted is somewhat more complicated and we present it for your consideration: “Should one State maintain rulings such as this—‘experience before entering college, etc.’ so that this requirement would debar one from applying as a candidate for registration who had acquired his experience after graduation from college?” This raises a very complicated question which seems to be in substance as follows: Should experience obtained after graduation be such a detriment that the candidate who obtained his experience before entering college should be given the preference? In other words, the first man be penalized by not permitting him to take the examination simply because he obtained his experience after leaving school. In short, what is experience?

Lastly, there comes to us another contingency where we must work in harmony and where we must exercise the greatest judgment and discretion lest, in our zeal to adhere to academic and legal standards, we work a hardship. We have in mind here the solution of the problems that will arise after the war, when the students and those who were called into Service, before passing their state examinations, return. Many of these men will wish to continue their school work. Others who were working to get the experience necessary to meet the boards’ requirement will wish to receive some time concessions. These men are serving in all capacities, in all branches of the Service. Most of them are no doubt in some branch of the hospital service where they are acting as pharmacists, as ward orderlies, nurses, etc. A great many are in the Sanitary Corps, and some of these have attended special training schools. Others are in chemical service, in some one of the many branches. Many are in the Navy, in some branches of pharmaceutical work, and most of these may be said to have had some special school training.

We, no doubt, are all agreed that some credit should be given for this work, but to what extent, we possibly have, as yet, not definitely decided. We believe that the question should be

settled early, so that when occasion arises we may be able to act intelligently and without delay. It certainly would be humiliating to such a man if he were to ask what could be done in his case, to have us quibble over technicalities and put him off from day to day. He has gotten used to action and will feel that we should be able to give him some answer without delay. Whatever is done we feel should be uniform, thus avoiding one standard in Ohio, another in Indiana, and still others in the various other states. Naturally, the question of individual state law limitations will be a deciding factor in the end, but even so, a wise and liberal policy should be our rule.

In conclusion, let us remember that we can no longer continue in this old each-for-himself-way we have been so long following. We must cooperate in the full meaning of the word, to bring about better results. The class of men we turn out and license to represent pharmacy must be better trained, more competent and efficient than they have been in the past. They must be men with ideals, who believe in their work and the profession they represent. The watchwords of the day are cooperation and efficiency and the world has never witnessed a greater exhibition of what may be done through their influence than we see today.

On motion duly seconded the Joint Meeting was adjourned.

### FEDERATION OF AMERICAN PHARMACY.

BY H. V. ARNY, Chairman.

"Federation" has been the slogan during the past year and it is now common pharmaceutical knowledge that the American Pharmaceutical Association, through its Federation Committee, has been trying to stir up American Pharmacy to an understanding of the need of more cooperation.

Efforts along national lines are proceeding slowly but satisfactorily and it is hoped that at the New York meeting of the A. Ph. A., which will be held during August, definite plans of cooperation along the lines of publicity and research will be formulated.

Of even greater importance is the question of a closer bond between the State Associations and the American Pharmaceutical Association, and such cooperation received a distinct impetus at the Chicago meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association by the enlargement of the scope and functions of the A. Ph. A. house of delegates, which, as now agreed upon, is to consist of delegates from State Associations, who can vote, however, only if members of the American Pharmaceutical Association. An important forward step was the formulation of an arrangement whereby a combined State and A. Ph. A. membership may be obtained for one fee.

This will be accomplished if the individual State Associations approve of the advantageous plan suggested at the Chicago meeting of the American Pharmaceutical Association and which, after discussion, was referred to the State Associations for discussion at their annual meetings of 1919. The idea is embodied in a proposed amendment to the A. Ph. A. by-law which, if adopted, will offer membership in the A. Ph. A. at \$3.00 per annum, to State Association members, "if the number of members of the American Pharmaceutical Association, who are members in good standing of any State Association, shall equal 100 per centum of the actual number of members of such a State Association." (See JOURNAL OF THE A. PH. A., October, 1918, pages 883 and 909.)

The foregoing proposition means that if the plan is carried out the Association will furnish its two great publications, the JOURNAL of about 1100 pages and the Year Book of about 500 pages, to State Association members at a remarkably low figure. To non-members, each of these publications costs \$4.00 a year, making a total cost of \$8.00; to its present regular membership, the two are furnished for the annual dues of \$5.00; and now the proposition is to furnish these volumes to members of State Associations (on a 100 percent membership basis) for \$3.00 a year.

In the average State Association, the annual dues are \$2.00. For this, the member gets the splendid legislative protection offered by all live State Associations, the opportunity for exchange of views at the annual conventions, and the annual Proceedings, constituting an attractive volume filled with good material.

If the "club rate" suggested by the American Pharmaceutical Association goes into effect, for \$5.00 a year the State Association member will obtain all of the advantages gained at