

have more or less responsibility resting upon them for whatever may be properly criticized in the governmental scientific corps. Efforts the corps itself may make for betterment are liable to the charge of self interest. The "outsiders" can help, if they will, to promote the ideal service. For such help no one will be more grateful than the members of the corps concerned.

A long dissertation illustrative of the statements above made might easily be written, but space requirements forbid it here.

In conclusion the writer is confident that neither in this country nor elsewhere is to be found a body of men of science more devoted to their work, more self-sacrificing in their devotion to it, and with a more honorable record, than the scientific corps of the government service, however, in the human way, it may fall short of the ideal.

WASHINGTONIAN

"BIOLOGY"

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The publication in SCIENCE, of September 8, 1911, of a request that you "refuse to print any communication in which the adjective 'due' appears in any way except as agreeing . . . with some noun or pronoun" leads me to refer to the advertisement on page 1, of the same number, which gives, under six heads, a list of educational books for sale, one of the heads, "Biology," listing texts on "Laboratory Zoology," "Mammalian Anatomy" and "Zoology"; another head is "Botany," listing a "Guide to Laboratory and Field Studies," "Plant Anatomy" and "Vegetable Physiology."

After we have decided what the difference is between water-vapor and steam, and why the ether can not be made of electrons, will you please allow space for replies to the following question: What is there more "biological" about laboratory zoology than about laboratory and field studies in botany, about mammalian anatomy than about plant anatomy, or about a text-book on zoology than one on vegetable physiology?

Will not SCIENCE hereafter please refuse to

publish any communication or advertisement in which the word biology is used as synonymous with zoology? Zoological journals please copy!

C. STUART GAGER

BROOKLYN BOTANIC GARDEN,

September 11, 1911

HOUSE AIR

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Before the last echoes of the discussion as to indoor and outdoor air, humidity and so on die away I should like to add a word as to the general neglect on the part of doctors and nurses to look carefully into the nature of the air supply. There is an increasing tendency to prescribe life out of doors, even in bad weather, as almost a specific for many pathological conditions, from incipient tuberculosis to weak heart action. But after all, most sick people are indoors during the greater part of the twenty-four hours, at most seasons of the year. And yet it is rare indeed to find even an exceptionally intelligent physician who knows in detail at what rate the air of the patient's room is being changed, what is its origin, or its relative humidity. Physicians rather commonly and nurses almost always ignore the difference in ventilating effect between furnace or indirect steam heating and hot water or steam pipes in the rooms of the house. I have heard an unusually intelligent nurse, a woman with years of thorough training in her calling, argue for a half hour that no change of air could be accomplished by an open furnace register—she doubted whether any air came into the room from that source at any time.

As a matter of fact the ventilation from a register of ordinary size (say $9\frac{1}{2} \times 15\frac{1}{2}$ inches) in freezing weather, with a reasonable fire in the furnace, is much better than can ever be obtained in summer by opening a single window to its full height. There is no other simple way of securing cold weather ventilation in ordinary houses so certain to act efficiently as heating with a furnace provided with a capacious cold air duct. Still