these movements seem to be for the best interests of the N. F. The aim constantly in view is to make the book more useful and more popular to both physician and pharmacist. The interests of pharmacists are being maintained and improved rather than being depreciated or lost and the interests of physicians are being increased. The new book will be of great practical value to the pharmacist, and certainly physicians should be interested in standards for all of the items they prescribe.

There remains one final thought. Shall we quietly and simply place the National Formulary in the position of a secondary pharmacopœia and be content therewith? Shall we endeavor to establish a definite and self-evident distinction between the two books and maintain the impression that they are very distinct entities not related to each other? Such a distinction has been suggested of late, in that the U. S. Pharmacopœia should become a book standardizing only chemicals and vegetables or animal drugs, while the National Formulary should have no simples, but should standardize only preparations of these simples. Prof. E. Fullerton Cook has very ably answered these questions in a communication addressed to the National Formulary Committee and printed in the N. F. Bulletin. He says in part: "When Dr. Charles Rice actively promoted the National Formulary he was Chairman of the 1880 Committee of Revision of the United States Pharmacopoeia and it was definitely planned and established as a supplementary book to the Pharmacopœia. In fact, this was the only excuse for its existence. . . . The National Formulary has always frankly taken the place of a secondary book and it has not been particularly discredited because of this, as it occupies a very important position and has legal authority equal to the Pharmacopœia. . . . The definite policy at the present time for including in the Pharmacopœia only those items which are therapeutically acceptable to the physicians elected by the United States Pharmacopœial Convention, and to include in the National Formulary other items extensively used by physicians but not found in the U. S. P., is sound and generally acceptable."

The two books should continue along the same lines that they are now following, for there are splendid fields for each of them. The U. S. Pharmacopœia should be the highest therapeutic authority in the land. It should not only present the best remedy out of a group of remedies, but it should present a suitable remedy, where possible, for every pathogenic condition where a medicine is needed. So far as possible, the National Formulary should provide standards for all non-U. S. P. remedies used by physicians.

There is a great difference in medical practice between a list of remedies of highest therapeutic standing and a list of remedies widely used by physicians. This statement casts no reflection upon the ability of the medical profession. It is characteristic of the human race that some lead and others follow. Certainly this is true in the medical profession where also differences of opinion constantly exist regarding the therapeutic value of medicines. Neither is there any unfavorable reflection cast upon the National Formulary by this statement. The U. S. Pharmacopœia is much the older book and throughout its existence has been without a rival as the leader of therapeutic thought in this country. All of the violins in an orchestra cannot be *first* violins. It is certainly very much more honorable and may indicate a very much higher standing in musical ability to be second violin in a high-class orchestra than a *first* violin in a third- or fourth-rate orchestra.

PHARMACEUTICAL RECIPE BOOK.

The report on the Recipe Book was presented by Chairman J. Leon Lascoff as part of the "Symposium on Practicing Professional Pharmacy." (See page 1196.)

The report of the Committee on Non-Official Standards was presented by Chairman John C. Krantz, Jr.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNOFFICIAL STANDARDS.

BY JOHN C. KRANTZ, JR., CHAIRMAN.

ORGANIZATION.

Since the presentation of the 1932 report, the personnel of the Committee on Unofficial Standards of this ASSOCIATION has remained practically unchanged. The Committee is divided into two sections, a chemical section under the chairmanship of Dr. Hugo H. Schaefer, and a

botanical section under the chairmanship of Professor E. B. Fischer. In addition to the regular members of the Committee there are serving in the capacity of consultants several associate members.

PROGRESS OF WORK.

Last year Doctor Rose submitted a tentative monograph for a preparation containing the glucosides of digitalis suitable for injection. During this year the committee has extensively studied this preparation in collaboration with Dr. James C. Munch, and we feel that a more or less stable and dependable digitalis preparation has been devised. At the Pocono meeting of the Revision Committee of the United States Pharmacopœia, Doctor Scoville spoke of the desirability of including a preparation of this type in the forthcoming revision of the Pharmacopœia. The Committee on Unofficial Standards submitted its work to Doctor Scoville to be studied further for the purpose of including the monograph in the Pharmacopœia.

PLANS FOR FUTURE WORK.

The Committee in planning its future work invites the suggestions from ASSOCIATION members interested in the establishment of standards. It is their purpose during the coming year to project our preparation of monographs and standards to some of the new and more generally used unofficial drugs.

E. N. Gathercoal referred to the importance of the work of this Committee. He thought that he had an opportunity to question standards for items no longer official or that never have been official. He thought Dr. Krantz had a wonderful future in the work of his Committee to prepare a number of monographs.

Chairman Marvin J. Andrews took the chair.

He called on Dr. H. V. Arny to give a report as chairman of the Committee on Glass Standardization.

GLASS STANDARDIZATION.

Chairman Arny asked permission to use his allotted time for (*a*) the report of the Committee on Glass Standardization, (*b*) the report of the Committee on Research.

As to *Glass Standardization*, in 1932 the committee reported that it had secured $2000 for another two-year research on the study of the deterioration of chemicals exposed to light in suitable glass containers. This work is being successfully carried on by R. H. Blythe, B.S., under the personal supervision of Professors Arny and A. Taub at the College of Pharmacy of Columbia University. The 1932–1934 research is being carried on; some 30 chemicals being studied along the same lines followed in the Arny-Taub-Steinberg research of 1929–1931. The present work is incomplete but the findings to date were published in the July number of the *Glass Container*. Any person interested may obtain a reprint of this paper by applying to Dr. Arny.

As to the *Committee on Research*, attention must be paid to the important experiment begun in 1932. Upon the recommendation of the Committee, with the approval of the Council and with final confirmation by the ASSOCIATION, we established a specific research upon the problem of extraction. We formed a sub-committee of five to supervise the research and we then selected Dr. W. J. Husa of the University of Florida to conduct the work; a grant of $1000 from the A. PH. A. Research Fund being voted for the financing of the proposition. Dr. Husa and his associates have performed unusually fine work during the past scholastic year. The work is as yet incomplete, but the results so far obtained are so important, that the Research Committee feels that the work should be continued during the coming year and upon unanimous vote of the Committee and by a mail vote of the Council last July, a second grant of $1000 was awarded to Dr. Husa and his associates for a continuance of the extraction work during the scholastic year, 1933–1934.

Dr. Arny then asked permission to accord the rest of his time to Dr. Husa, who then outlined his work of 1932–1933.

W. J. Husa made the report on the A. PH. A. Drug Extraction Fellowship. It follows: