THE SMALLEY FOUNDATION COMMITTEE:

This committee recommends the rejection of any reports which are received after the time designated in the announcement which will initiate the next series of samples. The Uniform Methods and Planning Committee approve this recommendation and move its adoption. The motion was seconded and approved by the Society.

The Uniform Methods and Planning Committee are of the opinion that there should be a place in our methods for the publication of methods on which collaborative work has been done, but which are not yet considered sufficiently satisfactory to be labeled "Tentative" as the latter designation carries some approval by the Society. Also that no methods be placed in the section without first being submitted to and approved by the Uniform Methods and Planning Committee. The Uniform Methods and Planning Committee move the adoption of such a plan. The motion was seconded and carried by the Society.

We wish to take this opportunity of thanking the various chairmen and members of the committees who have devoted their time during the past year to the work of the Society.

H. P. TREVITHICK
E. B. FREYER
R. C. HATTER
M. L. SHEELY
J. J. VOLLERTSEN, *Chairman*

CORRECTION

OIL & SOAP 13, p. 178 (July, 1936), *Report of Committee on Soap in Refined Oils.* Tables and language were improperly allocated in the above report, giving rise to some confusion. The closing portions of this report are herewith repeated, to replace the material appearing after page 178, column 2, line 2.

Following is the procedure of analysis as outlined for the second method:

Weigh 100 grams of oil in a 200 ml. extraction cylinder. Extract three times with 50 ml. of hot alcohol (formula 30), allow to settle, and syphon off the alcohol into a 250 ml. beaker. If emulsion is encountered, place cylinder in hot water to facilitate separation of alcohol and oil.

Evaporate the alcohol from the three extractions to about 20-30 ml. and transfer to a platinum crucible, carefully washing the beaker with alcohol and transferring to crucible. Slowly burn off the alcohol and then ignite the crucible until no carbon remains.

Cool the crucible and place into a 250 ml. beaker. Wash the crucible with about 50 ml. hot distilled water and titrate with N/50 HCl, using methyl orange as an indicator.

1 cc N/50 HCl = .00607% sodium oleate

The results obtained are shown in Table 2.

Laboratories No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 all find a lower amount of sodium oleate than that actually incorporated. It appears that three extractions with alcohol were not sufficient to dissolve all the sodium oleate.

There was not sufficient time left for all the laboratories to reanalyze all samples using a greater number of extractions. However, laboratory No. 1 carried through same procedure and using five alcohol extractions instead of three.

Following are comparative results:

TABLE 3.

	Sample A	Sample B	Sample C	Sample D
Per cent sodium oleate incorporated.....	0.0040	0.0100	0.0050	0.0500
Laboratory No. 1—3 alcohol extractions.....	0.0030	0.0067	0.0036	0.0380
Laboratory No. 1—5 alcohol extractions.....	0.0038	0.0094	0.0042	0.0406

The above figures are very encouraging and indicate that more than three alcohol extractions were necessary to extract all the sodium oleate.

Laboratory No. 4 shows high results and states the following:

"The boiled distilled water used for taking up the alkaline ash showed slight alkalinity. The samples were reanalyzed and the distilled water was neutralized with N/50 acid employing methyl orange as indicator. The results are as follows:

TABLE 4.

	Sample A	Sample B	Sample C	Sample D
Per cent sodium oleate actually incorporated	0.0040	0.0100	0.0050	0.050
Laboratory No. 4 (reanalyzed).....	0.0061	0.0109	0.0043	0.0425

These results are much more accurate than those shown in the original analysis.

Your committee agrees that of the two methods outlined above, the alcohol extraction is the more correct in principle, but insufficient work was done to definitely outline a correct procedure. It is, therefore, suggested that this committee be allowed to function another year, and it is believed that the work will be carried to a satisfactory conclusion.

L. A. SPIELMAN,
Chairman.

N. T. JOYNER,

J. J. LAPPEN,

R. C. STILLMAN.

TABLE 2.

Kind of Oil	Sample A Cottonseed	Sample B Cottonseed	Sample C Cocoanut	Sample D Cottonseed
Per cent sodium oleate actually incorporated	0.0040	0.0100	0.0050	0.0500
Laboratory No. 1.....	0.0030	0.0067	0.0036	0.0380
Laboratory No. 2.....	0.0038	0.0033	0.0030	0.0035
Laboratory No. 3.....	0.0030	0.0070	0.0030	0.0400
Laboratory No. 4.....	0.0103	0.0161	0.0099	0.0367
Average of all laboratories.....	0.0050	0.0083	0.0049	0.0295