Grand Central Palace, New York, has been announced. The chairman will be Irving E. Moultrop. Other members are: Homer Addams, past president, American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers; N. A. Carle, manager, Puget Sound Bridge and Dredging Company; Paul Doty, president, The American Society of Mechanical Engineers; Fred Felderman, past-national president, National Association of Power Engineers; Charles V. Haynes, president, American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers; C. F. Hirshfeld, chief, research department, Detroit Edison Company; O. P. Hood, chief mechanical engineer, U. S. Bureau of Mines; John H. Lawrence, Thomas E. Murray Company; Fred R. Low, past president, The American Society of Mechanical Engineers; David Moffat Myers, consulting engineer, and Fred W. Payne and Charles F. Roth, co-managers, of the exposition.

DISCUSSION

THE USE OF PERMANENT PAPER IN SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING

ONE of the major problems which confront librarians and the publishers of scholarly works is that of the deterioration of the paper upon which the publications are printed.

At the University of California Press we believe we have solved this problem by printing a special edition of 25 copies of our scientific works on a permanent, 100 per cent. rag paper, and distributing these copies to a selected list of depositories throughout the world.

Much of the material published by this press is in serial form. It is extremely technical and, we think, important within its field. Some 30 series are more or less regularly issued, relating to many fields of human knowledge from agricultural sciences and anatomy to Semitic philology and zoology. How much of this material possesses lasting value no one can say, but certainly some part of it will be of signal importance to future scholars.

Publishers have a duty to posterity; particularly those who, like ourselves, are engaged in preserving the results of original research. Consciousness of this ought to compel us to print our publications on material that will last. But much intervenes between duty and practise, and, as a result, important discoveries are being published so shoddily that within the century their record will be lost.

Late in 1933 the University of California Press, recognizing its obligation to future scholars, initiated the new method of publishing which has been described. Long study and careful preparation were necessary before the project could be successful. Paper technicians, chemists and other experts were consulted in an endeavor to prepare specifications for a paper which would be as permanent as possible without being excessive in cost. After much work on this problem, we found that in all probability our wisest course would be to adopt the specifications used by the United States Government Printing Office in the purchase of paper for the Federal Government's permanent printed records. These specifications are a matter of public record, and the paper mills are familiar with them; therefore no difficulty was encountered in having a shipment made up for our use. The comparatively heavy cost of this paper made its use impossible for entire editions, but its use in twenty-five copies made little difference. The bulk of the edition is printed on a paper of good quality but much less costly.

Once the technical problem of production had been solved, it was necessary to select a group of depositories for receiving the special copies. Consultation with scholars and librarians resulted in the compilation of a list of institutions throughout the world. In making the list, consideration was given to geographical distribution, to the scholarly nature of the libraries and to their willingness to bind and house the material which they would receive. Nothing was asked in return except their custodianship. If exchanges were forthcoming, so much the better, but they were not requested. (Should any reader wish a list of these libraries, it will be gladly furnished on application to the author of this note.)

Letters were sent by the Division of Serials and Exchanges of the University of California Library to the designated depositories, and without exception this plan received commendation. The librarian of one of the largest libraries in the eastern part of the United States wrote as follows:

> Your decision to print your serial publications on rag paper will, I hope, be imitated by other institutions publishing important serials and books. I know I need not tell you that those which have been printed on wood-pulp paper will have disappeared or become unusable within the next fifty years. So we applaud your decision and thank you most heartily for including us among the institutions to receive these rag paper editions.

This brief note of a project which should be of interest to all scholars and librarians must necessarily omit many details which might be of interest. But room is lacking for a detailed explanation.

It is unfortunate that we are not endowed with a Methuselah's term of life so that we may know whether our judgment is sound, but we are building

for posterity and hope that the record will be intact a thousand years from now.

SAMUEL T. FARQUHAR
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES VS. "LABORATORY INDUSTRY"

THE object of this communication is to arouse all professional men, and especially scientists, to the dangers involved in the proposed "Code for Commercial Testing Laboratories," the title of which was changed to "Code for Commercial Research and Testing Laboratories." This change was the response of the code makers when it was pointed out that the wording of the proposed code was broad enough to include all professional men—chemists, engineers, physicists, psychologists, doctors, dentists, etc.—providing only that they maintain or operate any kind of a "laboratory" for the establishment of facts incidental to the practise of their respective professions.

Professional service is essentially a personal service and responsibility, generally demanding a confidential relationship to the client. It is against public policy to permit the professional man to hide his personal responsibilities behind the screen of incorporation. On the contrary, he personally is held to strict account not only by the law, but also by the code of ethics of his profession. He should be encouraged to establish his practise on the basis of his personal integrity and ability rather than to become an employee in some "professional" corporation, where the stockholders of to-morrow, if not those of to-day, may have interests opposed to those of the "clients" for whom work is done. All this is of the highest importance, for, once the individual professional man is under a "code," the Code Authority will have the right and duty under the enforcement rules to pry into his confidential records and thus often find items interesting to themselves or the corporations controlling their business. This destroys the chief protection the public has against possible deception by corporations.

In its broad sense, this proposed code appears to me to be an attempt on the part of industry to dominate the professions. Lawyers maintain libraries. Should they be included in a "library industry code"? Surgeons when operating may use a knife or a saw. Are they therefore to be included under the codes covering butchers and carpenters? A physician does not become a "Commercial Research and Testing Laboratory" when he makes blood, urine or other tests incidental to his practise. Neither does the professional chemist, when he makes the tests needed to guide him in forming his opinions and giving his advice to clients, or in giving his testimony in court.

The article printed on pages 341 and 342 of the issue of SCIENCE for April 13, entitled "A Code for Chemists?", fails to point out this major issue, although it lists six other reasons why professional scientific men oppose codification under NRA. So far as I can see, the four methods mentioned by the author (H. H. Bunzell, chairman, Code Committee "Organized Food Laboratories") as "ready to be put into operation" under the code proposed by his group, and which "may be unorthodox as codes go," are all forms of advertising, even though the suggested "bi-weekly news letters," with material of interest to manufacturers, are to serve "as a clearing house for new methods and improvements of old ones." Perhaps this is to give the publication the odor of scientific sanctity, for it appears otherwise useless. SCIENCE for February 16 states that last year 64,190 abstracts, covering the literature of the world, were published in *Chemical Abstracts* by the American Chemical Society. This enormous organization, with its 17,000 members making it the largest organization of all kinds of chemists in the world, has come out strongly against codification.

Dr. Bunzell states that in his group there are 75 or more independent food laboratories, most of them small, many with only a porter or office boy. He further states: "There is overwhelming evidence at hand that the food industries, still prosperous, in general consider laboratory work a luxury." The overwhelming evidence is precisely the opposite. Every important food industry maintains many laboratories, employs many competent chemists and runs its plants on the basis of ceaseless laboratory work. That is why comparatively little work is passed over to the outside "laboratory industry," which deals mainly with specialties and service to firms too small to have laboratories of their own. When the food industry was affected by the general business decline, there was naturally less work for outside laboratories.

Dr. Bunzell laments the fact that "the chemist is not rendered the same degree of recognition or business courtesy as his professional brothers, the legal adviser or the advertising counselor." Depending on their behavior and competence, the professional chemists I know are accorded the same recognition as members of any other ethical profession. Chemists employed in an industry come under the codes of their respective industries. There is no reason why a man trained professionally may not conduct or work for an industry. Professional chemists refuse to be thrust into the "laboratory industry" or any other industry.

So far as I can make out, the main sponsors of the proposed "Code for Commercial Research and Testing Laboratories" are certain corporations whose animus could very well be "more tests, higher prices and larger profits," instead of their ostensible slogan,