

casual care. For therein we specifically stated that notwithstanding the fact that we could find no comprehensive treatise on this phenomenon in the sources at our command, still we had the impression that very thorough observations have long since been made and recorded, but felt justified in recording our observations in order to *recall* attention to the phenomenon. So, notwithstanding Dr. Auer's conviction to the contrary, I still hold that the material contained in our communication is not original.

Finally, had Dr. Auer made careful observations upon the frog's pupil he would have found that excision of the eye or stoppage of the frog's circulation, as by removing or tying off the heart, are alone followed by very marked asphyxial constriction of the pupil, and therefore the employment of additional asphyxial procedures is entirely superfluous. His conclusion might then well have been *that asphyxial changes in a frog's pupil differ from those in mammals in that there is not such a well-marked period of asphyxial pupillary dilatation*. It should be observed that we pointed out in our note that the post-mortem condition of the pupil in different mammals varies: in cats it is chiefly dilatation; in common gray rabbits constriction (as compared with the size of the normal pupil in diffuse daylight). From this it is obvious that the asphyxial changes in the frog's pupil as compared with those of the rabbit are in general similar, the chief difference being a well-marked but short period of dilatation in the rabbit.

C. C. GUTHRIE

PHYSIOLOGICAL LABORATORY,  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

---

#### QUOTATIONS

##### "MEDICAL FREEDOM"

MAKERS of patent medicines, adulterators of drugs, and practitioners of the cults of mental and osteopathic healing are up in arms. They have persuaded a few well-intentioned but misled individuals to join them, and have formed the "National League for Medical Freedom" to oppose the efforts of practically

all the reputable physicians in the country to consolidate the agencies of public health at Washington into one efficient department or bureau.

These efforts have been waxing stronger. The men of the American Medical Association and of the Committee of One Hundred on National Health, sanctioned by the Association for the Advancement of Science and headed by Professor Irving Fisher, of Yale, have won the approval of the entire press of the United States in urging the passage of their bill. In the various departments and bureaus of the federal government are lodged powers that can not be wielded effectively until they shall be coordinated under one head. Once united, they can be used in a great propaganda for educating the people against the habit of self-dosage and a resort to quack medicines for their ailments. By a campaign of prevention the bureau would break the prevalence of epidemics and infections between the states. It would work for the passage of laws that would guard the channels of inter-state commerce against the admission of adulterated drugs, and for the establishment of standards of purity and strength that would be copied by the states and cities of the nation.

The self-styled "League for Medical Freedom" quotes Professor Fisher accusingly as having said that the government might soon be appropriating millions yearly for the conduct of this bureau. If it should appropriate a million for every hundred thousand it now appropriates for the protection of the health of hogs and cattle in the United States, Professor Fisher's prophecy would be fulfilled, and no one would have cause for complaint but these friends of "freedom." Their cry is an old one and well understood.

License they mean, when liberty they cry.—  
The N. Y. Times.

---

#### SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

*Ants. Their Structure, Development and Behavior.* By WILLIAM MORTON WHEELER. New York, Columbia University Press, Macmillan Co., publishers. 1910.