

to debar him from engaging in outside work on the ground that it would be incompatible with his being considered a full-time instructor. Likewise if an instructor's income from these outside sources exceeds that received from the school we can hardly require that he restrict his activities so that the major source of income will be from teaching. More important than the time or salary elements is the relationship of his extracollegiate activities to his teaching duties. If the two are closely related and the outside interests do not interfere with the proper performance of his college work he should not be disqualified from classification as a full-time officer of instruction. A regulation providing that all outside professional work be performed in the college building appears to work out very satisfactorily.

It might be advisable and it surely is desirable that definite statements regarding the proper interpretation of the term "full-time officer of instruction" be formulated. While it is difficult to explicitly define this phrase, it is probable that the following statements would apply satisfactorily in a majority of instances.

1. One who gives the greater part of his working time to teaching in the institution by which he is employed.
2. One who receives the major portion of his income from teaching in the institution by which he is employed.
3. One who is regularly retained by the college or university on a yearly contract and who fulfils faithfully all academic duties assigned him.

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

---

## STANDARDIZATION OF EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION.\*

BY B. OLIVE COLE.

The standardization of education and legislation is not a new idea, but is a serious duty which must be performed if pharmacists are to take their proper place in the life of this great nation; and the Section on Education and Legislation can be of great assistance in this very necessary work.

Pharmaceutical education and legislation have by slow degrees been advanced, but these advances have not been uniform in the different states. It is true that most of the schools of pharmacy are pledged to demand four years of high school training or its equivalent as an entrance requirement at an early date, which is a great step forward, but to enable American pharmacy to serve the public as it should, and at the same time secure for itself the proper position and prestige, an aggressive demand should be made that the schools of pharmacy of the entire country be standardized. Pharmacy should establish a concrete, practical intellectual ideal, and the public should be made aware of that ideal. A specified degree from a school of pharmacy should mean the same thing in every state. And it is desirable that this standardization be made from a more or less academic standpoint. This is brought out very clearly by Prof. J. G. Beard in the tabulations of "The Opinions of Teachers Concerning Degrees in Pharmacy" in the July number of the *JOURNAL OF THE A. PH. A.* The majority of teachers desire standardization of pharmacy schools from an academic standpoint. To further illustrate—

---

\* Read before Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Cleveland meeting, 1922.

the "Pharmaceutical Syllabus" refers to the course leading to the degree of Pharmaceutical Chemist as being graduate work, which course in reality corresponds to the junior year of a standard arts and science course. The suggestion is made that the courses beyond that of Graduate in Pharmacy be designated in terms corresponding to standard arts and science courses. This standardization should also apply not only to the technical pharmaceutical subjects included in the course, but sufficient cultural subjects should be included and standardized to give pharmacists a broader education, and free the course of the criticism that it is too technical.

Ways and means of securing this standardization have from time to time been suggested, but if it cannot be promptly done by outside agencies, such as the Rockefeller or Carnegie Foundations, then the American Pharmaceutical Association through the Section on Education and Legislation, in conjunction with the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, and the Pharmaceutical Syllabus Committee should at once undertake the work. The work done by the Committee on Higher Educational Standards of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, of which Prof. D. B. R. Johnson of Oklahoma is chairman, is a step in the right direction, and assistance should be given this committee of the Conference, or a joint committee representing the four bodies mentioned above should be put in operation for the completion of the standardization of pharmaceutical education.

Pharmaceutical legislation should also be standardized. A great many of the states have enacted prerequisite laws, demanding that candidates for registration as pharmacists be graduates of an accredited school of pharmacy, and some states have supplemented this with the requirement that high school training or its equivalent be a prerequisite for registration as a pharmacist. Next, there should be complete interstate reciprocity, and it should be the duty of the State Boards of Pharmacy to become members of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. The fact that two or three of the State Boards of Pharmacy are not now members of the N. A. B. P. retards the adoption of uniform prerequisite laws. Then, the relation of pharmacy to the public health should be standardized. Pharmacists should have control of the enforcement of the drug section of the Pure Food and Drug Law. In some states this enforcement is in the hands of the Board of Health and in other states in the hands of the Board of Pharmacy, but under any condition the real control of the drug section should be in the hands of a pharmacist.

How is this standardization to be done? The work of the American Bar Association may well be cited as an example of what may be accomplished in this direction. About twenty years ago the New York Legislature adopted an act authorizing the appointment of "Commissioners for the Promotion of Uniformity of Legislation in the U. S." The same year the American Bar Association recommended the passage of the laws proposed by these Commissioners by each state and by Congress for the District of Columbia and the territories. Since that time such conferences have succeeded in having passed in most of the states uniform laws controlling negotiable instruments, sales, transfer of stocks, bills of lading, warehouse receipts, etc. The American Pharmaceutical Association could in the same way procure uniform laws for pharmacy. The work of the Committee on

a "Model for a Modern Pharmacy Law" as reported in the July number of the JOURNAL OF THE A. PH. A. has prepared the way, and it would be ideal if through the concerted action of the State Boards of Pharmacy, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, and this Section on Education and Legislation, this model law could be enacted in the different states. However, it might be suggested, rather than try to have the proposed law enacted in its entirety, to keep it before pharmacy as an ideal law, and concentrate efforts to have three or four of the sections of the law which are most needed, and which are very vital to pharmacy, enacted first, to be followed by concerted action to have the other sections enacted in the different states as expeditiously as deemed advisable.

Incidentally, it is hoped that by the time the different states are ready for enactment of pharmacy laws pertaining to the recognition of colleges and schools of pharmacy, it will only be necessary to have the different Boards of Pharmacy accept the standards that will have been established by the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and the Section on Education and Legislation of the A. Ph. A. for such colleges and schools, rather than to have the Boards of Pharmacy themselves make and promulgate the requirements for recognition.

In closing let me urge that the American Pharmaceutical Association pay particular attention to the standardization of pharmaceutical education and legislation.

SCHOOL OF PHARMACY,  
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND.

---

#### STANDARDS OF ARTICLES DELETED FROM U. S. P. AND N. F.\*

BY OTTO RAUBENHEIMER.

The object of this paper is to show the necessity of a clear understanding as to the standards of articles, be they drugs of animal, vegetable or mineral origin, or preparations, deleted from the U. S. P. and N. F. This is no doubt a subject of vital importance to manufacturers, wholesale and retail druggists and the officials charged with the enforcement of the "Food and Drugs Act."

Sec. 7, I, of the latter states: "A drug is adulterated when it differs from the standards, etc., laid down in U. S. P. or N. F., *official at the time of investigation.*"

Regulation 7 as to Standards of Drugs states:

b, Name recognized in U. S. P. or N. F.

In this Regulation no statement is made "official at the time of investigation," and consequently the meaning of this Regulation can be construed that, when a name of a drug official in an older edition of the U. S. P. or N. F. is used, the standards of that edition will apply. Or, in other words, if a drug is deleted from the U. S. P. or N. F. the last standard will hold good. This seems reasonable and plausible, and any well-meaning pharmacist will approve of it. I have not the least doubt that the honest, conscientious pharmacist will always dispense the particular drug which the physician has in mind, the drug which has a standard either in the present or former editions of the U. S. P. or N. F.

I am fully aware that there is a set of men who hold the opinion that as soon as a drug is deleted it is no longer official, it has no more standards, it is an outcast

---

\* Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Cleveland meeting, 1922.