measures of relief which show them to be unversed in the subjects on which they essay to give instruction to others.

"As the public conscience becomes aroused by the growth of narcotic menace, the conscience of druggists, as a part of the public, is equally aroused. Indeed, as druggists are in closer touch with the situation they usually are the first to propose action. Associations of druggists were discussing ways and means of curtailing the opium evil a generation or more ago when many of the present-day agitators had not been born and others among them were school children. It amuses these older and inside workers for better conditions to witness the vauntings of those who have just now awakened to the fact that laws to curb the traffic in narcotics are desirable. Still, the agitators may perform a service by calling the attention of a larger proportion of the public to the need for legislation, thereby strengthening a sentiment which upholds the hands of druggists in their efforts for the betterment of conditions among themselves."

It seems unnecessary to speak in these columns of the deep concern of drug trade associations in regulating, not only the sale of narcotic drugs, but of alcoholics; being the first to recognize the evil results, they have invariably been the first to study and propose methods for control. The same spirit has actuated druggists in restricting other sales from which they might derive profit. Accusations and reflections against the drug trade meet the eyes in the public press, in one column or another, and there should be a way of correcting such misrepresentations.

E. G. E.

PROGRESS OF THE PHARMACOPOEIAL REVISION.

BY E. FULLERTON COOK.*

About six months having passed since the Pharmacopoeial Convention in Washington and the election of the Committee of Revision, a brief outline of the work of the Committee during this period is presented, carrying out the idea of publicity, which is a well-defined policy of the work of revision.

The personnel of the Revision Committee was fully reported at the time of the Convention and also the fact that in the personal conferences which immediately followed the election of the Committee, an organization was perfected which permitted the immediate start of the revision.

The Sub-committees with their chairmen differ slightly from those of the last Revision, two new Sub-committees being created and other Sub-committees consolidated.

The Sub-committees on Bio-Assays and on Reagents and Test Solutions, formerly taken care of as the work of other Sub-committees, were considered important enough to be established as new divisions of the work.

The appointment of the Sub-committees,[1] their organization and election of chairmen and the appointment of these chairmen as the members of the Executive Committee during the Washington conferences, were subsequently approved by the

* Chairman of Revision Committee, U. S. P. X.

[1] The Executive Committee is composed of the Chairman of the Revision Committee and the Chairman of the Sub-Committee. The list was printed in June issue, 1920, of THIS JOURNAL, pp. 657–659. The list of members of Sub-committee 9 is incomplete; the names of H. V. Arny and A. H. Clark should be added. General principles to be followed in revision will be found on pp. 740–743, July issue, 1920, THIS JOURNAL.

vote of the Committee of Revision and the Board of Trustees, as required by the By-Laws of the Convention.

Another feature of the Washington conference was the consideration by the Sub-committee on Scope of the articles official in the U. S. P. IX. It was understood that all those articles for which there was no negative vote cast for admission to the U. S. P. X, would be reported at once for inclusion in the new Pharmacopoeia. Material was thus provided for immediate revision. The Sub-committee on Scope within a short time reported about 500 titles for admission and these articles have been before the various Sub-committees for some months.

Scope.—A significant action taken at the Washington conference related to the policy to be followed by the Committee of Revision concerning admissions. There were many of those on the Committee who believed that the final decision on admissions, so far as therapeutically useful substances were concerned, should be left to the medical members of the Committee. Others believed that this decision should be subject to the majority vote of the entire committee and the matter was thoroughly discussed, and the following motions finally approved:

"In questions concerning the inclusion of substances of therapeutic usefulness in the Pharmacopoeia, the entire body of physicians on the Committee of Revision shall have the deciding vote."

"In all questions regarding the inclusion of substances of pharmaceutic necessity, the entire body of pharmacists on the Committee of Revision have the deciding vote."

When the Washington conference had adjourned, several members requested that this action on scope be reconsidered by mail and an opportunity was again given to every member of the committee to present arguments. These were published in full in the committee circulars and a new vote taken. Again the motions were approved by the Committee. The practical operation of this decision resulted in immediately placing before the committee the decisions of the Sub-committee on Scope. This consists of a list of those substances now in the U. S. P. IX, which are approved for admission and also the names of such new articles as may be deemed worthy of recognition. Members of the Committee of Revision are invited to comment upon the reports on scope, and if there is a question raised concerning the decisions of the Sub-committee, the articles under discussion will be reconsidered by all of the physicians of the Revision Committee, their vote to be accepted as final. It should be explained that the Sub-committee on Scope consists of the seventeen representatives nominated by the medical members of the convention and also includes three pharmacists. There are at least six additional physicians on the Revision Committee, and these will have a vote on all substances which must be reconsidered.

The reports of the Sub-committee on Scope will also be published in journals at a suitable time, that physicians and pharmacists may have an opportunity to express their opinion concerning the reported admissions or deletions, and all of these comments will be placed before the Committee before the final vote.

The motions, as will be observed, provide for the original decisions on therapeutically useful substances through the vote of the Sub-committee on Scope, with the final decision, if the original report is questioned, left to the vote of the physicians of the entire committee. In the same manner, the inclusion of those

substances of pharmaceutical necessity are left to the pharmaceutical members of the committee for final decision.

At the personal conferences, the Revision Committee also adopted rules of procedure for the conduct of business in the committee, following very closely the rules in force during the last decade.

Considerable criticism has been received concerning the use of "mils" in the Pharmacopoeia, and as the term has not been adopted among chemists, and the Bureau of Standards had recommended the use of the abbreviation "Cc." as the standard abbreviation for cubic centimeters, the committee has voted to use "Cc." in the new Pharmacopoeia. The French spelling of the word "gramme" was also criticized and the committee decided to adopt the American standard spelling of "gram." The theoretical argument that it might be mistaken for "grain" in prescription writing was considered unworthy of serious consideration, as no physician writes the word "gram" on a prescription.

Organization of the Chairman's Office.—Soon after the convention, the Chairman's office was organized in Philadelphia. The necessary supplies, consisting of stationery, envelopes, binders and general equipment, were provided, and in August 1920 the Board of Trustees authorized a rental of an office for the work. Here are concentrated all phases of revision activity, and in this office are being mimeographed and issued, the "Circulars" of the General Committee, the "Letters" of the Executive Committee, and the "Bulletins" of practically all of the Sub-committees. There have already been placed before the various committees over 600 pages of circular material.

Sub-committees.—Every Sub-committee is organized and at work. First reports on texts have appeared in some of the Sub-committees and others are about ready to send in their first revised texts.

Special Sub-committees.—The Convention authorized the establishment of two special Sub-committees, one on Drug Markets and the other to study and establish standards for permissible quantities of gruffs and tailings, resulting from the grinding of drugs. These two special Sub-committees have been made subsidiary committees to the Sub-committee on Botany and Pharmacognosy, and Dr. Carl L. Alsberg has accepted the chairmanship of the work on Drug Markets, and Professor E. L. Newcomb, of the special Committee on Gruffs and Tailings.

Auxiliary Workers.—As the number of the members of the Committee of Revision is limited, it was not possible for all of those interested in the revision to be elected to the committee, but their assistance and coöperation in the revision of the Pharmacopoeia was considered of great importance. Therefore, the committee voted to invite the coöperation of auxiliary members to the several sub-committees. This action having been approved by the Board of Trustees, a number of auxiliary members have been nominated by Sub-committee chairmen and approved by the Revision Committee and Board of Trustees. These associate members will take part in Sub-committee activities but without vote or honoraria. Those on the first list are given below, and others have since been nominated:

Biological Products and Diagnostical Tests.		*Inorganic Chemicals.*	
Wm. H. Park	New York City	Lyman F. Kebler	Washington, D. C.
James P. Leake	Washington, D. C.	Wm. G. Crockett	Richmond, Va.
John N. Force	Berkeley, California	Jeannot Hostmann	New York City

Hugo H. Schaefer.....New York City
Gaston DuBois.....St. Louis, Mo.
Virgil Coblentz.....New York City
S. P. Sadtler.....Philadelphia, Pa.
J. P. Snyder.....Norwich, N. Y.
Joseph L. Mayer.....New York City
W. F. Hillebrand.....Washington, D. C.

Organic Chemicals.

Joseph Rosin.....Philadelphia, Pa.

Reagents and Test Solutions.

W. D. Collins.....Washington, D. C.
Joseph W. Ehman.....Philadelphia, Pa.
Ralph R. Foran.....Philadelphia, Pa.

Cerates, Ointments and Miscellaneous Galenicals.

William A. Hall.....Detroit, Michigan
Gustave Horstman.....New York City
Otto Canis.....New York City
J. L. Lascoff.....New York City
Curt P. Wimmer.....New York City
Wm. C. Anderson.....Brooklyn, N. Y.
Edwin C. Hutman.....Albany, N. Y.

Nomenclature.

E. J. Crane, Editor of *Chemical Abstracts*.. .....Columbus, Ohio
Dr. Arno Viehoever, Bureau of Chemistry.. .....Washington, D. C.
Oliver A. Farwell, of Parke, Davis Co..... .....Detroit, Michigan

Botany and Pharmacognosy.

Chas. M. Sterling.....Lawrence, Kansas
Chas. H. Butters.....Minneapolis, Minn.
Anton Hogstad, Jr.....Brookings, S. D.
Philip F. Fackenthall.....Richmond, Va.

Gruffs and Tailings (Sub-group under Botany and Pharmacognosy).

E. L. Newcomb (Chairman)..... .....Minneapolis, Minnesota
C. L. Alsberg.....Washington, D. C.
George E. Ewe.....Philadelphia, Pa.
John Moser.....Baltimore, Md.
G. A. N. King.....Minneapolis, Minn.
Henry Kraemer (ex-officio)..... .....Mt. Clemens, Michigan

Comments and Suggestions.—All of the comments or criticisms of the U. S. P. IX, which were available, either through the Digest of Comments of the Public Health Service, or as submitted to the convention or the committee within recent months, have been tabulated and placed before the Committee of Revision and the Sub-committee chairmen. A letter has recently been sent to many of those interested in the Pharmacopoeia, either as manufacturers of pharmaceuticals or chemicals or dealers in pharmacopoeial products, again inviting suggestions, and anyone who is in position to offer an improvement for any pharmacopoeial drug, chemical or preparation, or for other requirements of the Pharmacopoeia, is invited to send this at once to the chairman, who will see that it is properly considered.

Publicity.—From time to time, important decisions of the committee and a report of the progress of the revision will be made public through the chairman's office, so that all may follow the work of revision. When revised texts have followed their regular course of Sub-committee consideration, Executive Committee study, and are finally before the General Committee, an abstract of the proposed changes will also be published, giving everyone who is interested an opportunity to know the new standards before they are actually printed. This plan was found of much value in the last revision and is fully in keeping with the policy of the present Committee of Revision.