

uary and also the *Chemist and Druggist* of February 10th commenting upon it.

The Montreal correspondent seems to have been asleep, his latest news is that it is suggested that the American Pharmaceutical Association be invited to hold its convention of 1895 in Montreal. It is evident that a perusal of the minutes of the last convention in Chicago, or an interview with the Montreal members of the A. P. A. who were in attendance, or with any of the Montreal druggists whose opinions were asked on the subject and who were in favor of inviting the Association here for 1894, would convince this correspondent of the fact that he is almost seven months behind the times. The invitation could not be accepted for next year, but all the indications are that we will have the convention in 1895. Our western friend should stir up his correspondents, especially his Montreal representative.

THE IMPERIAL PHARMACOPŒIA.

In this issue we publish Prof. Attfield's paper "On an Imperial British Pharmacopœia," a copy of which we have received from the author. This document is of the greatest interest to colonial pharmacists, and is published in the hope of causing a discussion upon the important subjects therein touched upon, especially as regards suggestions extending the usefulness of the work in the colonies.

Paragraphs 11 and 12 are at present the most interesting to us. The willingness to accept recommendations and suggestions as regards improvements should act as a stimulus to Canadian pharmacists to aid in the work, both individually and collectively, and it is to be hoped that we will not allow this opportunity of showing our capacity as scientific druggists to pass unnoticed, and it would be a grave reflection on Canadian pharmacy if we do not show ourselves worthy of the occasion. Every druggist can aid by suggestions in the way of improved processes for galenicals now official, suggestions for the introduction of new drugs, preparations and processes. Prof. Attfield promises that all these will receive consideration, and the columns of this journal will always be open for the publication of such and for discussion thereon, and we hope that good use

will be made of them. We have already commented upon this subject, but no action has been taken on the matter by any of our associations as no official notice has been received from the General Medical Council, but the publication of this paper should we think be sufficient to cause the matter to be earnestly taken up at once and pushed forward by every possible means.

Outside of its bearings on colonial pharmacy the paper is of great interest to pharmacists generally, as anything in this line from the pen of Prof. Attfield is the result of ripe experience and wide knowledge of the subject. But as pointed out by our London correspondent, in another column, some of the author's suggestions will hardly meet with universal approval. As regards nomenclature, the proposition to retain such titles as black oxide of manganese instead of manganese dioxide is retrogressive, if this principle is carried out, our Pharmacopœia would still recognize white vitriol, glauher's salts, and all the other antiquated names, which long since have passed into "innocuous desuetude." The Pharmacopœia should be abreast of the times, even if there be "a sacrifice of the advantages of translation and of literary elegance to mere 'up to date' chemistry and its will-o'-the-wisp nomenclature," it should be representative of the most advanced thought and knowledge of the subject. The chemical nomenclature of the U. S. P. comes in for some hard knocks, but it's all a difference of opinion. If magnesii sulphas should be literally translated then sulphate of magnesium would certainly be the proper translation, but we do not think it to be necessary that any but the correct English synonym should be given, and in our opinion magnesium sulphate as adopted by the U. S. P. Revision Committee is correct. Furthermore, the adoption of Prof. Attfield's suggestion would only complicate matters for the unfortunate student who would be compelled to learn one set of chemical names in Attfield's chemistry and an entirely different and more ancient set in the British Pharmacopœia, the editorship of which we hope will be filled for many years by its present able occupant. We certainly think that as regards chemical nomenclature the Pharmacopœia should keep up with the advance of chemistry