we find these requirements of secondary moment or they are lost sight of entirely. This seems to me not only a great fault in our educational system, but also a very serious hindrance to the progress of American chemical science.

I am aware that some will fail to see the relation between teaching and research in chemistry and will maintain that the teacher should be only teaching and the investigator only occupied with investigation.

We may regard this matter from the standpoint of the student, from the standpoint of pure science, and finally from the standpoint of the teacher bimself.

The student has a right to expect instruction in chemistry either as part of a liberal education or as a preparation for a professional career. In either case it is or should be taught, not as a dead and completed science, but as a constantly advancing vital, living science. It is or should be taught as a science of investigation. The only one who can teach it as such must be himself an investigator. No one would maintain that the discoveries of Woehler or Hoffman did in any way detract from their effectiveness as teachers. On the contrary, it is apparent that in their characters as investigators they transmitted an inspiration to their pupils which has given to modern chemistry an incaculable impetus.

Again, science looks mainly to teachers for its advancement, since, as a rule, they alone have or should have at command the necessary funds, materials, and equipments for the persecution of researches. Moreovor, they alone have or should nave the leisure and unbaised mind so essential in the search for truth.

Lastly, the teacher himself has no right to content himself with the single aim of the p_{∞} lagogue. If he would not stagnate, he must advance. He must be himselt a student, standing as interpreter between the unknown and his pupils. The true attitude of the teacher of chemistry toward research is one of interest and active participation in precisely the same degree as he manifests interest in and sympathy with his pupils.

-Read at the World's Congress of Chemists.

AN IMPORTANT PEPSIN DECISION.

In last week's issue of the *Reporter* we published the decision of the court in the suit instituted several years ago by the Carl L. Jensen Company against the New York manager for Parke, Davis & Co., for alleged infringement Reporter, Feb. 12th, 1894.

of the plaintiff's patent for the manufacture of pepsin. The progress of the litigation was watched with interest by the trade, and as the final adjudication of the questions at issue is of general importance a brief review of the leading facts in the case will be opportune at this time.

: 7

The legal controversy originated in 1889, in the United States Circuit Court of New Jersey, the plaintiff relying mainly upon the second claim of his patent in which his product is described as "having a digestive power of one to seven hundred." The defense was that the pepsin complained of had a digestive energy equalling one to two thousand, and that while it possessed some of the physical characteristics of the Jensen product it was an entirely different article. The defendants insisted that their pepsin could not be made by the methods described in the patent, and they further assailed the validity of the Jensen patent, but the latter point the court did not consider it necessary to pass on.

The gist of the patent appears to be that the process of manufacture includes converting the stomach tissue into peptone by the action of its contained pepsin under favorable conditions, and the retention of all the peptone, with its contained pepsin so found An expert called on behalf of the complainant seemed to take this view of the patent, and stated that in his opinion a pepsin which is made by a process which aims at a partial elimination of the peptone is not the pepsin of the Jensen patent.

Another expert testifying for the defense, said that the pepsin sold by the defendants could not be produced under Jensen's patented method of manufacture, and that the pepsin of Parke, Davis & Co., is practically three times as strong as any that can be made by the Jen-He further deposed that the sen process. pepsin of defendants differed both physically and chemically from that of the complainants. It appeared on the trial of the case that the defendants' pepsin was made in accordance with a process which secured the removal of a portion of the peptone and a considerable part of the soluble salts contained in the peptone, by dialysis.

After hearing the evidence and carefully examining the various issues presented, the iudge came to the conclusion that the great

stive power of the pepsin made by defendan indicated that it was not, and could not be, made b. the Jensen process. As these facts fully supported the position taken by the defendants, the court did not decide upon the validity of the patent upon which the plaintiffs based their action -Oil. Paint and Drug Reporter, Feb. 12th, 1894.