

Section on Pharmacopoeias and Formularies

Papers Presented at the Sixtieth Annual Convention

MINUTES OF THE JOINT SESSION OF THE COMMITTEES ON THE U. S. P. AND NATIONAL FORMULARY.*

A joint session of the committees on U. S. Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary, in conjunction with the Scientific section, held as a tentative section-meeting, under authorization of the Council, and presided over by L. D. Havenhill, of Lawrence, Kansas, was held immediately succeeding the third session of the Scientific Section on Thursday afternoon, August 22, 1912. E. Fullerton Cook, of Philadelphia, acted as Secretary.

The Chair made some brief introductory remarks explaining the origin of the movement which had resulted in this joint meeting.

The Chair announced that the first order of business would be the reading of reports of the committees which would logically report to a section of this kind. The first thing on the program, was the report from the Chairman of the U. S. Committee of Revision of the Pharmacopoeia, Prof. J. P. Remington, but as he had not yet arrived, the second report on the program would be taken up, namely, that of the Committee on National Formulary, which would be presented by Prof. W. L. Scoville, in the absence of the Chairman of the committee, Prof. C. Lewis Diehl.

The Chair stated that inasmuch as the report embodied a recommendation, and the next paper on the program, "Points of Contact Between the U. S. P. and N. F." bore directly on that recommendation, he thought it would be well to listen to that paper before taking action, and he would call on the author, E. Fullerton Cook, of Philadelphia, to present it.

The Chair said the papers just read before the Section were open for discussion.

C. E. Vanderkleed moved that the report be accepted, and that the recommendation contained therein be approved by the joint meeting. He added that of course it was understood that this meeting had absolutely no control over the matter, and could only recommend.

H. V. Army, in seconding this motion, called attention to the fact that Prof. Diehl, Chairman of the committee, had made two recommendations, and he supposed Mr. Vanderkleed's motion referred to the one which recommended deferring publication of the National Formulary until after the Pharmacopoeia was published. Mr. Vanderkleed replied in the affirmative, and said this was given preference in the report.

Thereupon, the motion to receive and adopt was put to a vote and carried.

* Now known as the Section on Pharmacopoeias and Formularies. Papers and Reports presented at this session will be printed separately.

The Chair asked if there were any remarks upon Mr. Cook's paper. None were offered, and the paper was referred to take the usual course.

The Chair next called for report of the Committee on Unofficial Standards, as following this line and coming naturally in this connection.

Prof. Army suggested that Prof. Remington was now in the room, and it might be proper here to take up the first order of business, that of report of the Committee on U. S. P. Revision.

The Chair said it seemed to him desirable, as long as the session had the work of the National Formulary Committee under advisement, to finish up that subject and then take up the remainder of the work. However, if there was any objection to that, the report of Prof. Remington might be presented at this time.

Prof. Remington said he was "always one of the innocents," and wanted to know what the authority was for this so-called Section.

The chair replied that this matter had been explained before Prof. Remington came into the room. This Session, he said, was the result of a communication addressed to the Council by Ex-President Oscar Oldberg, of Chicago, requesting that something be done towards creating a Section of this Association which would have to do with matters relating to the Committee on U. S. P. of the American Pharmaceutical Association. This session had been authorized by the Council as a tentative proposition, for the express purpose of ascertaining whether it would be deemed advisable to organize such a permanent Section.

Prof. Remington expressed the conviction that this session could not be properly or legally considered as that of a Section of the Association. It might or might not be desirable to have another Section; that was a matter for thoughtful consideration. As he personally knew, four sessions of as many different branches of the Association were going on at this very time. He himself had just been called upon to appear before two or three meetings at the same time. The practical question was, Where were the members going to find the time to attend a multiplicity of Section sessions?

In answer to a question by Dr. J. M. Francis, as to whether this was not intended to be a joint session of the Committees on U. S. P. and N. F. with the Scientific Section, instead of a meeting of the two committees named as a separate Section, Mr. Eldred stated that he had been informed by the General Secretary that a joint session of the two committees with the Scientific Section had been authorized, to determine the advisability of creating a Section, and the two chairmen had been advised to get together and hold such a joint session this afternoon.

Prof. Remington said if the session was to be treated as a part of the work of the Scientific Section—a sort of symposium of the Pharmacopoeia—it was all right; but he doubted the propriety of creating a separate Section.

The Chair concluded the discussion by stating that the Council, at its sixth session last night, had authorized the chairmen of the A. Ph. A. Committee on U. S. Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary to hold a special session—to determine whether it would be advisable to create the proposed Section on the U. S. P. and N. F. The specific purpose in view was to consider the question of forming a new Section to deal specifically with these matters, thus relieving the Section on Scientific Papers of their discussion.

The Chair stated that, without objection, the session would now proceed to finish up the subject of National Formulary work, before taking up the question of the Pharmacopoeia, and called on Mr. Cook to present the report of the Committee on Unofficial Standards, of which Mr. Geo. M. Beringer was chairman.

Mr. Cook said that he would not read the entire report, as it was very voluminous, but would give the substance of its leading features. The report, he said, was followed by a monograph on each of the forty-five substances treated of.

Dr. Francis suggested that Mr. Cook merely read the titles of the articles upon which the report was rendered, and the Chair stated that as the titles were being read, if anyone present had any particular interest in the monograph on a given subject, he could ask to have it read.

Philip Asher moved to receive the report as read, and this motion was seconded by Mr. Scoville.

Dr. J. M. Francis moved to amend by adding that the recommendation of the Chairman of this particular committee be referred to the Council for action, as it was absolutely necessary for the Council to act before the adjournment of the Association. This recommendation, he said, involved the appropriation of a certain amount of money, and also appointment to vacancies on this committee.

Prof. Asher indicated his acceptance of this amendment.

The Chair thereupon put the vote that the report be received and referred to the Council for its action, and the motion prevailed.

The Chair said this disposed of the subject matter in hand—the report of the Committee on National Formulary and matters related thereto. Referring to Mr. Cook's paper, he said there had been appointed a harmonizing committee on U. S. P. and N. F., which he had no doubt would remove dissension as far as possible.

The Chair then stated that this brought the work of the session up to the point where U. S. Pharmacopoeia matters could be taken up, and in the absence of Mr. Remington from the room at the moment he would ask Mr. Eldred to take the chair, while he read his own report as Chairman of the A. Ph. A. committee.

Prof. Scoville moved to receive the report just read and refer it for publication, and this motion was seconded by Dr. Francis.

Prof. Remington, who had returned to the room, said he was sorry that Prof. Havenhill did not make this report to the Pharmacopœial Convention, as that was the place for it. The work of revision was now perhaps two-thirds completed, and he asked if it was proposed that the Committee of Revision should be abolished and another Convention assembled, to carry out the radical changes he advocated. The American Pharmaceutical Association did not make the United States Pharmacopoeia. It was a delegate convention that did that, and its members represented various bodies throughout the country. There was no sound reason, he thought, for most of the criticism offered, and the proposition to publish the Pharmacopoeia in three volumes was an unheard-of thing in the history of Pharmacopœias. The doctors would certainly object to a book giving the properties of various remedies—a book on therapeutics, in short. The Committee of Revision had begun its work two years ago, on the lines laid down by the Pharmacopœial Convention, at which the doctors of the country were fully represented. He could see no justification in this proposition to bring about a totally

new plan of procedure at this time—a plan which was perfectly impossible of accomplishment, and one which could serve no good purpose. If it was intended merely to receive the report and publish it as an individual expression of view, he had no objection; but he strongly opposed the idea that it should carry with it any endorsement by the American Pharmaceutical Association as touching the U. S. Pharmacopoeia.

Mr. Scoville said he thought Mr. Remington was speaking under a misapprehension. This was a report of the Committee of the A. Ph. A. on U. S. Pharmacopoeia, of which Mr. Havenhill was chairman—a report to the Association. His own motion was simply to receive the report and refer it for publication.

Mr. Francis thought that, while it was entirely proper to receive the report and refer it in the usual way to the Publication Committee, this action did not commit the Society to the recommendations made by the author.

Mr. Havenhill disclaimed any purpose of criticizing the present Pharmacopoeial Revision Committee. He realized that the Convention had met and decided on the method of procedure for the present revision. He believed, however, the movement should be begun along the lines pointed out in his paper.

Mr. Vanderkleed asked if all the members of the committee had signed this report. Mr. Havenhill replied that it was entitled the report of the Chairman, and not the report of the Committee.

Mr. Vanderkleed, said that, as it appeared that this was in reality a paper by the Chairman of the Committee, and not really a report of the Committee on U. S. P. to the Association, it was perfectly proper to receive it just as any other paper was received. It was not signed by the committee, and was not a report from the committee.

Mr. Arny said he was glad Mr. Vanderkleed had made this point clear. The report of the Committee on National Formulary, he said, had been signed by Chairman Diehl only, but the report had been gone over by the members of the committee and approved. The paper under discussion should be considered simply as a paper contributed by the Chairman of the Committee on U. S. P.

After some further discussion of the subject, participated in by Messrs. Scoville, Gordon, Eldred, Francis and Remington, a suggestion by Mr. Francis, approved by Mr. Remington, that the author insert a statement by way of introduction to his paper that, in the absence of a report from the committee as a whole, the Chairman offered this as embodying his individual views on this subject, was accepted by Mr. Havenhill, who promised to correct the paper accordingly.

Thereupon, Acting-Chairman Eldred put the question on the motion to receive this paper and refer it to the Publication Committee, with the modification suggested by Mr. Francis, and it was carried.

Chairman Havenhill resumed the chair, and called on Mr. Remington to make report as Chairman of the Committee of Revision of the U. S. P. He expressed regret that this session could not have been opened by the presentation of this report by Mr. Remington, because of his absence from the hall at the time. (See October, 1912, Journal, p. 1124.)

Mr. Remington, discussing his report, said he thought that the most far-reaching question the Committee on Revision had to deal with was the question of

patents. The doctors in the Convention did not understand why such a thing as "aspirin," for instance, should not be in the Pharmacopoeia. The doctor didn't know anything about the conditions—why such a thing as he used every day was not in the Pharmacopoeia; and he wanted to throw out the whole book because the thing he used every day was not in there. But how was that to be helped? Where a patent had expired on a synthetic or controlled product, or would expire within the year, there was no trouble about putting it in the Pharmacopoeia. Indeed, the manufacturer who knew that his patent would soon run out was willing enough that his product should be put in. But it would be impracticable to have an official test for such a thing as aspirin, for the manufacturers would not allow the use of the name; and if the doctor prescribed it under some other name, the manufacturer would at once say that there was only one true and genuine aspirin, which was yellow in color, or pink, or some other color—something not found in the Pharmacopoeia. And in doing that he would claim that he was simply defending his rights.

Mr. Becker said he would like to see the Pharmacopoeia give the solubility in oil or oil base of many chemicals used. A good example was biniodide of mercury in oil. The Pharmacopoeia gave no information as to that.

Mr. Remington said that the committee having that subject in charge fully recognized the importance of this. The doctor, however, did not care to know whether it was 783.5 or 780 or 800, as long as he could get some idea in making his preparation. He said a table would be prepared by Atherton Seidel, which would go into the back of the book and contain the exact solubilities, as near as it was possible to determine them from the best available sources. The idea was to give information suitable for the doctor.

Mr. Asher moved that the report be received, and that this Section express its appreciation to Mr. Remington for the able manner in which he had presented his report.

This motion was seconded by Messrs. Scoville and Johnson and carried unanimously.

The Chair stated that the next thing in order was a paper contributed by J. U. Lloyd. It would be remembered, the Chairman stated, that one of the functions of the Committee on U. S. P. was to collect statistics regarding the frequency of use of official and non-official drugs by the medical profession in various parts of the United States. Prof. Lloyd had gone into this question on his own responsibility, with a remarkable amount of energy, as was his custom in investigating any subject. (See elsewhere in this issue for Prof. Lloyd's paper.) He asked Secretary Cook to give a summary of the paper.

Prof. Remington moved to receive the paper and refer to the Publication Committee, which motion was seconded by Mr. Vanderkleed and carried.

Prof. Remington here stated that there was so much inquiry at the present time about the progress of the Pharmacopoeia, that he would like to have the recommendation of this session that permission be given to send the paper he had read to the pharmaceutical journals throughout the country. He did not wish to forestall any thing that should properly appear in the Journal of the Association, but it would be some time, he supposed, before that came out, and if the members here believed that the public interest would be served by giving out this in-

formation, he did not suppose it would do any great harm for an exception to be made in this case.

Mr. Asher, in reply to Mr. Remington, stated that this question had come up in the Council a few days ago, about the giving of the President's Address and certain reports to the public press, and the publication of papers was left entirely to the Journal. So the only recommendation that this session could make would be to the Council.

Thereupon, Mr. Army moved that this session request the Council of the Association to permit the release of this report of the Committee on Revision of the Pharmacopoeia to the journals other than the Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association. This motion was seconded by C. E. Mollet and carried.

R. H. Needham, of Texas, presented his paper on "Some Practical Suggestions for Pharmacopoeial Revision."

The paper was discussed by Messrs. Remington, Asher, Army, Clark and Mollet, after which it was on motion, received and referred to the Publication Committee.

The Chair stated that there were three or four papers on the program. As it was now 20 minutes after 6 o'clock, he would be glad to have the ideas of the members as to whether an adjourned session was desirable.

Mr. Needham thought favorably of the suggestion of having an adjourned session, but Mr. Sayre and Mr. Frazier suggested that their papers might be read by title, to save time.

Mr. Remington said he thought Mr. Sayre's paper should be read, because it was vital to this session. Mr. Sayre then presented his paper entitled, "A Plea for another Section in the A. Ph. A." (See October Journal, p. 1123.)

Mr. Mollet moved that this paper be received to take the usual course, but Mr. Clark suggested that as any proposition to create a new Section must be referred to the Council of the Association, this paper should be so referred.

Mr. Vanderkleed thought the only objection to carrying out most of the suggestions set forth in this paper was the fact that the Association did not have a meeting which lasted two weeks, instead of one. The work of the Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary was exceedingly important, but he thought it might be possible to arrange a symposium on the subject in the Section on Scientific Papers. He saw no necessity of making a separate Section.

Mr. Sayre said he was aware of the difficulties that existed. He felt, however, that a paper of this kind should be before the Association for the things he wanted to convey; and he would be glad to have it referred to the Council. In his report last year on Drug Reform, the one point he made was that the American Pharmaceutical Association should be made a clearing-house for drug chemists, and he believed here was the opportunity.

Mr. Mollet thereupon amended his motion to the effect that the paper be accepted and referred to the Council.

Mr. Cook said he wished to call attention to the fact that the purpose that Mr. Oldberg had in mind in suggesting the formation of a new Section was to relieve the Scientific Section, by gathering together each year all the papers on the subject of U. S. P. and N. F.

Mr. F. T. Gordon said that one idea in the creation of the new Section was

that the Scientific Section now had as much work as it could handle—in fact, more; and if a new Section were created, it would have a certain *prestige*. The members would contribute papers to the Section, and if only a few members were present, still, it would be a Section of the American Pharmaceutical Association, and the papers presented before it would be printed in the Proceedings and the Journal of the Association.

Mr. Remington said there was much to be said on both sides of the question, but he thought with the Chairman it was the duty of this meeting to express itself on the proposition as to whether this should be a part of the work of the Section on Scientific Papers, or whether an independent Section should be created. Personally, he preferred that it should be a Section—particularly since he had noted the interest shown by the members, heard the papers read and seen the results of this session. Papers on the Pharmacopoeia had been submitted of a character which had never been seen before. He thought it time that everyone should be heard on matters so vital as the Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary. The only objection was the one which had already been mentioned, that of having too many Sections, and having so many simultaneous sessions. This could not be helped, unfortunately, and the point was to arrange the Section sessions in such a way as not to interfere with each other. The proper thing, of course, would be to extend the meeting to ten days, instead of a week, but this would not be popular with the rank and file. This question of extension of time, however, was one that the Association must face in the near future.

For the sake of bringing the question to a vote, he would move “that this Section session recommend to the Council the creation of a Section upon U. S. Pharmacopoeia and National Formulary.”

Prof. Sayre said he was somewhat particular as to the choice of a name for the proposed Section. He suggested “Formulary and Drug Standards,” as that would include the U. S. P. and N. F. He was in favor of a broad policy, that would popularize the work and make it helpful to the physicians and the community at large.

Mr. Remington feared that if the question was complicated it would not be so likely to pass before the Council. He doubted the wisdom of complicating it by introducing all formulas. These were now taken care of by the Practical Pharmacy and Dispensing Section. He was in favor of limiting it to a Section on U. S. P. and National Formulary.

Mr. Eldred favored Mr. Remington's view of the matter. He thought if it was made a general Section the members would never know where papers were to go. He had changed his mind two or three times on this proposition, but it seemed to him now that it would be best to have a separate Section, provided it was understood that the Section on Scientific Papers and the Section on U. S. P. and N. F. should not hold simultaneous sessions.

Mr. Clark said he had overlooked the fact that the present session was just tentative, and that the members would be called upon to make a recommendation. He heartily favored the formation of this separate Section. He asked how it would do for this session to recommend to the Council the formation of a Section on U. S. P. and N. F., referring Mr. Sayre's paper to the Council at the same time.

Mr. Sayre said this was satisfactory, so far as he was concerned. But the words "United States" did not include the Homoeopathic or other Pharmacopoeias.

Mr. Gordin suggested the title "Section on Pharmacopoeias and Formularies," and Mr. Sayre agreed.

Mr. Remington suggested that Mr. Gordon make his motion as simple and as plain as possible.

Thereupon, Mr. Gordon put his motion in this form: That this session accept Mr. Sayre's paper and refer it to the Council, with the recommendation that a new Section on Pharmacopoeias and Formularies be established in the American Pharmaceutical Association.

The motion as stated was then put to a vote and carried.

The Chair said there was one other question to bring up, namely, that of officers for the new Section in the event of favorable action by the Council. He asked if it was the sense of the members that they should elect a chairman, vice-chairman and secretary, or whether they considered that it was better to leave such appointments to the Council.

Mr. Needham was of the opinion that the members now present, who had taken such an interest in the proposed Section, were the ones to elect its officers.

Mr. Gordon, on the other hand, thought the Council should be empowered to appoint the officers of the proposed Section for the next year, in case it acted favorably on the recommendation.

Mr. Remington said inasmuch as this was not yet a Section, he could not see how it could elect officers; therefore, it seemed plain to him that the Council should be asked to designate the first officers of the Section. He therefore moved that the Council be requested to designate the officers of the Section for the ensuing year, if it approved of the formation of such Section.

This motion was seconded by Messrs. Gordon and Sayre and carried.

The Chair stated he still had in his hands some papers which had not been presented, and he would entertain a motion that these be read by title and referred to the Publication Committee. On motion of Mr. Frazier, it was so ordered.

The Chair stated that the first of these papers was entitled, "Does the Medical Profession Read the United State Pharmacopoeia?—by H. L. Chambers, M. D. This was a paper submitted by a practicing physician, and contained some valuable information. Doctor Chambers, however, was not a member of this Association, and some special action would probably be necessary in regard to his paper.

Mr. Remington suggested that this paper might be included with the rest, and let the Publication Committee settle the question of its acceptance for publication, and the Chair stated that, without objection, this would be done.

The Chair then read by their titles the following: "To What Extent Shall Powdered Drugs be Recognized in the Ninth Revision of the U. S. P?" by C. M. Sterling. "Getting Ready for the 1920 Pharmacopoeia," by Wm. Mittlebach. "The U. S. P. as a Stepping Stone to Higher Ideals," by W. J. Frazier. "Suggestions Relative to Standards and Methods of Analysis," by L. F. Kebler. "The U. S. P. in a Retail Pharmacy," by W. H. Varnum.

This concluded the session of the tentative Section on Pharmacopoeias and Formularies, and on motion of Mr. Needham the session adjourned.