EDITORIAL NOTES

The New York Times of April 15th, in commenting on the congratulations of Lord Rutherford to Drs. Urey, Brickwedde and Murphy on the discovery of double-weight-hydrogen, expresses appreciation also because of the conspicuous part that Americans have played in physical research during the last two decades.

The editorial concludes: "In an era when the United States is looked upon abroad as the land of materialism, the place where only the profit-making motive counts, it is good to read Lord Rutherford's words and to realize that not only the spirit of scientific research, but the ability to carry on the work of the great, lies within our laboratories."

Some of the processes of pharmacy may become subjects of research in connection with the important discovery.

QUALITY OR QUANTITY?

The Oil, Paint and Drug Reporter of April 9th, comments on a recent decision that "Many men will be of many minds with respect to a dictum of a United States Circuit Court of Appeals judge in a recent decision having to do with the regulation of business; for the opinion expressed clashes with many theories and with many views developed beyond the theoretical stage. In fact, the judge's utterance is at variance with certain economic delineations set forth in the statutes of the United States and of a number of the States. There are those who will find in the dictum disagreement with certain points of the popular conception of constitutional grants of individual rights."

Here is what the appellate jurist said:

Surely, it is a mild assumption that the more vital interest in the end may demand that there be less goods sold at higher prices rather than that all existing manufacturers should remain in business. He would be a hardy exponent of noninterference who should assert the opposite to-day, if for instance, the rise in cost was due to improvement in working conditions, or in the hygienic quality of the product.

"DRUGGED FOODS."

The Journal of the American Medical Association states that "Medicating common food articles with drugs—such as the addition of phenolphthalein to chewing gum, acetylsalicylic acid to candy, and senna to bread—is becoming a growing menace, and must be viewed with apprehension and concern as a danger to public health. The general appearance of these drugged foods does not distinguish them from the respective non-drugged forms; label declaration of the added drugs cannot be expected to prevent their fortuitous misuse or their consumption by the uninformed, the unobservant or those unable to recognize the significance of label statements. There is, therefore, the ever-present likelihood that children, and even adults, may unsuspectingly or ignorantly consume such drugged foods with results that may be disastrous."

DEFINITION OF POISON.

Dr. John J. Abel, retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in his recent Boston address, said "there is no definition of a poison in medical law of the United States or England. No one has ever been able to give a concise and accurate definition of a poison that would apply to every one of the many thousands of known poisons." Dr. Abel made this statement to emphasize how obscure is man's knowledge of poisons and how meaningless is the term in a basic sense. "Nature," he said, "has not affixed a poison label to any particular substance or class of substance. The pharmacist does that." Whether a drug is poisonous or not depends on its use or the amount taken.

REVISION OF BRITISH PHARMACEUTICAL CODEX.

Under the direction of the Council of the Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, reports are being issued preliminary to revising sections of the British Pharmaceutical Codex. The report of the pharmacy sub-committee presents a summary of the principal new or revised formulas recommended by it for inclusion in the British Pharmaceutical Codex of 1934. The sub-committee recommends the inclusion of formulas for a number of preparations from earlier pharmacopœias which are not included in the British Pharmacopœia of 1932 but are still in more or less frequent demand. Useful comments on the proposed formulas will be appreciated by the editor, C. E. Corfield, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London, W. C. 1, England.