

and, no doubt, with some definite plans and specifications for the superstructure and also for the interior decorations and adornments, if any there be.

The next matter requiring careful consideration is the organization which is to carry out the work. In the past, geographical distribution of committee-membership was considered of great importance; it is to some extent, but not in the way of distributing patronage and for the purpose of paying political and personal debts. In the past this has led to a sacrifice of efficiency on the altar of diplomacy. It is an established fact that a committee, as a rule, is no stronger than its chairman. He can make or mar the success of the entire committee. The qualifications for chairmanship should be neither geographical nor political. Ability and willingness to do the work himself and to obtain ready and sympathetic coöperation from his fellow-members on that committee should be the only or, at least, the chief qualifications for chairmanship. The chairman should be a man of convictions yet amenable to reason, and imbued with only one object, that of obtaining the best possible results from the work of his committee. He must be open to conviction, free from personal motives and prejudices and a conciliator of no mean degree. Furthermore, the members of any given sub-committee should be, geographically, as close to each other as can possibly be arranged from the material at hand. Considerations and discussions by correspondence are tedious, time-consuming and most unsatisfactory from many points of view. If the members of a sub-committee are within easy traveling distance of each other they could readily meet and accomplish in one day's discussion more, and with greater satisfaction, than could be done in a month of correspondence.

Another important matter is the selection of the members of the committees and sub-committees. It is essential to pick the right men for each committee. In the past there has been a perpetuation on committees of certain men whose principal qualifications were the ability to talk and write a great deal on subjects with which they had, at best, but a mere "speaking" acquaintance. It is not always the man who reads ten papers, or reads the same paper ten times at ten different meetings, who is really qualified to act on a scientific committee. Much knowledge can be gleaned for parade purposes from thumbing the leaves of a dictionary and cheap renown for erudition may be acquired by glibly quoting the presumable happenings in pharmacy in ancient Babylonia. We have allowed too much freedom and, most important to them, too much advertising publicity to these pseudo-scientists. Let us dig up the men who really are capable to perform this scientific and important work in a real scientific manner; the men who are willing to do this work for the glory and the satisfaction of the deed itself and not for its advertising value and who, moreover, are willing to do this work promptly and without bias. Then we will have a new United States Pharmacopoeia which will surpass anything of its kind and which will be in the hands of the profession within a reasonable time after the Pharmacopoeial Convention.

ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION.

WILBUR L. SCOVILLE: I can endorse the sentiments of Dr. Diner on this proposition; there is one other factor, however, I would like to mention in regard to the saving of time. The saving of time does not mean the hastening of time. The first pharmacopoeia was issued within a year, I think, from the time preparations for its publication were begun; the other editions were not long delayed until the pharmacopoeia was enlarged, and the time for completion increased until on the 8th revision something over five years were required. Then the question of time became an important incident and my understanding is that the committee decided that, if there were a larger number on the work it could be done more promptly because there would be more men to do it. The committee was increased from 25 to 50 and it took six and one-half years to get it out.

The real issue, to my mind, is not so much getting the pharmacopoeia out in a hurry, but letting the pharmaceutical and medical world know when it is coming. There was uncertainty for several years relative to the time when the present edition of the U. S. P. would come out. This information is important for a number of reasons, not the least the one of conservation and prevention of financial loss. However, we can afford to make haste slowly; I do not think six years is any too much time for the revision. I was made to realize the need of time in the revision of the National Formulary. I had to edit that work and thought I was going to get out a book with very few errors. I was very much chagrined when, during the first three or four

months, from 75 to 100 errors were found. I realize the difficulties incident to the getting out of the pharmacopoeia wherein we have a thousand articles for which there must be provided nomenclature, descriptions, tests, assays, etc. When the Pharmacopoeia got into print errors were found that needed correction throughout the book, and since then other errors have been discovered, which might have been avoided by giving more time to the work of revision.

My suggestion is that the Pharmacopoeial Convention should *fix* the time when the new Pharmacopoeia shall go into effect. There is a great difference between hurrying time and saving time. It is wise not to hurry the work too much, but the time should be fixed as to when the Pharmacopoeia is coming out, and when it will go into effect, then we know what we have to look forward to.

WILLIS G. GREGORY: I think it was Mark Twain who said, it was difference of opinion that made horse races. There is always a difference of opinion in discussing questions of great interest.

When my friend Diner was reading his paper he said that the appointments on the Revision Committee ought not to be controlled by geographical considerations and then, afterward, he said he believed the sub-committees should be appointed within a limited area so they could readily have conferences. I really do not know which proposition he believes in.

Talking about saving time: I agree with Professor Scoville that hurrying does not always mean saving time. I believe to save time we should preserve our present committee; namely, a large committee, a committee of 50. It will be recognized that a committee of 50 is more democratic. This body is big enough to have within its limits representatives of all the various interests concerned with the materia medica. Physicians have representation; the government is represented; chemists are represented; pharmacists and pharmaceutical manufacturers are represented, etc. Therein is the strength of our Pharmacopoeia—it is representative. I think we should preserve our original committee, and not bring the question of a smaller committee up for a discussion at all. We should have an Executive Committee of, perhaps, 15 members, composed of the sub-chairmen and the chairman and, perhaps, the general officers. I believe that the Executive Committee should be given greater power. I think there should be certain things, within their scope, that they may determine without reference to the general committee.

Here is another time-saving proposition: Nearly every member of the Revision Committee is sure to have some fads, some one pet scheme that he thinks will save the world, if he can only get it presented to the committee. I do not think members ought to be privileged to bring up any half-baked fancies and have the committee thrash them out, at the expense of time as well as money. I would like to see the rule established that no motion should be presented to the Revision Committee unless it has four seconds. If not 10 percent of the committee is willing to assume responsibility for presenting the subject for consideration, why should it be presented at all? Another preliminary rule should be, that a motion before the Executive Committee requires, at least, two seconds, that would be three sponsors out of fifteen; that is only 20 percent of the Executive Committee; these men are supposed to know what they are about. Those who are on the Committee know that much time will be saved by the adoption of the suggested rules.

Something has been said about the expenditure of money to facilitate the revision of the Pharmacopoeia. Money can be wisely spent in saving time, and I am quite in accord with the views that have been presented for meetings of the sub-committees, when necessary, and the discretion for that necessity I would place in the Executive Committee. I think it is highly desirable to have annual conferences of the sub-committees during the meetings of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

I do not think it is in the spirit of recompense that the work of revision is done by members of the committee, but in the spirit of loyalty to the profession and service to humanity. However, the workers should receive something in the way of financial recompense. The criticism of Dr. Caspari is well founded, that men, naturally, take care of the duties first for which they are paid. The members of this committee are busy men and are entitled to some financial compensation for the work they do, and authority should be vested in the chairman for necessary expenditures, without the delay occasioned by too much "red tape."
