

Report of the Referee Board of the Season 1926-1927

AT the New Orleans meeting, 1926, certain recommendations were made by the Board for the improvement of the rules governing the appointment of Referee Chemists. It seemed to the members of the Board that a man doing control work for mills or refineries under contract, held practically the same position as a regularly employed chemist on the premises and his analysis in referee cases should therefore carry no added weight unless agreed to by consent of buyer and seller.

The recommendation was strenuously opposed by some of the commercial chemists present, and it was voted down. In view of the fact that various regulations have come up from time to time, it was decided wise by the Referee Board to codify rules and regulations, and recommend such improvements as seemed obvious.

Considerable correspondence was involved, and a proposed code of rules governing referee chemists was drawn up and submitted to Counsel General Benet, of the Interstate Cottonseed Crushers Association for advice and also for action by that Association. This was done as it has been the opinion of your Board for some time that many of the questions involved from time to time are intimately connected with the trading matters of the Interstate Association, and that the Referee Examining Board should be governed only by passing on the professional attainments of referees, leaving such questions as were of direct interest to the members of the Interstate to be passed

upon by the Rules Committee of that Association.

In the absence of advices from Counsel General Benet, the Committee is receiving applications in the same manner as heretofore, and will consider them and other pending applications at the New Orleans meeting.

A list of Referee Chemists certified for the season 1926-1927 is given below:

REFEREE LABORATORIES AND CHEMISTS 1926-1927

- Barrow-Agee Laboratories, Memphis, Tenn.; Jackson, Miss.; Shreveport, La.; Little Rock, Ark.
- The Battle Laboratory, Montgomery, Ala.
- Bureau of Chemistry, New York Produce Exchange, New York.
- Curtis & Tompkins, San Francisco.
- Forth Worth Laboratories, Fort Worth, Texas.
- L. B. Forbes, Memphis, Tenn.
- Geo. W. Gooch Laboratory, Los Angeles, Cal.
- John C. P. Helm Laboratory, New Orleans.
- Houston Laboratories, Houston, Tex.
- Indiana Laboratories, Hammond, Ind.
- Lehman Johnson Laboratory, Memphis, Tenn.
- N. E. Katz, Meridian, Miss.
- Law & Co., Atlanta, Ga.; Wilmington, N. C.
- I. F. Laucks, Inc., Seattle, Wash.
- Sebastian Lomanitz, Oklahoma City, Okla.
- Landon C. Moore, Dallas, Tex.
- Norfolk Testing Laboratories, Norfolk, Va.
- Felix Paquin Laboratory, Houston, Tex.
- Picard Laboratories, Birmingham, Ala.
- Chas. W. Rice & Co., Columbia, S. C.
- Wiley & Co., Baltimore.
- Edward S. Williams Laboratory, New Orleans.
- David Wesson, *Chairman*.

Report of Ammonia Committee

(Continued from page 186)

all results which have been received up to Wednesday morning of each week before the final proof copy is sent to the printer; have been accepted. These last results, however, have not been included in calculating the accepted average, and on one or two occasions had these results been included in the accepted average, the latter might have been changed as much as .01 per cent. This explains why some collaborators have found on one or two occasions that the accepted average as reported differed from their calculations.

This year's report of the Smalley Foundation shows much progress. More collaborators were enrolled than in any previous year while the

efficiency of the analysts is improving. The value of this work is unquestionable and is being more fully appreciated each year.

The Ammonia Committee has requested no additional work from the collaborators this past year, and the foregoing summarizes the year's activity.

In concluding, the Chairman again wishes to thank the collaborators and the members of the Ammonia Committee for their cooperation.

H. C. MOORE, *Chairman*
C. A. BUTT
L. B. FORBES
H. B. BATTLE
E. H. TENENT

* * *

Report of Detergents Committee

(Continued from page 196)

and those present believed that all should be tried in an effort to find the best method. Soiling by means of an emulsion of lanolin, white mineral oil and deflocculated graphite with water as the continuous phase was considered especially worthy of trial.

(d) Washing Procedure. Modification of the present method of washing was urged as regards concentration, number and duration of rinses, and elimination of heat in final preparation of the washed cloth for inspection.

V—CONCLUSION

It was clearly the consensus of opinion at the Washington meeting

on April 9, 1927 that the work to date had shown the present method of evaluating detergents to be of little value. There was at the same time optimism that modification of the technique of this method along the lines outlined above might be expected to produce a workable method.

The Chairman wishes to express his sincere appreciation of the time and thought devoted to the work by members of the Detergents Committee and recommends that the work of the committee be continued along the lines indicated at the recent Washington meeting of the committee.

L. F. HOYT, *Chairman*