

### RECENT DEATHS AND MEMORIALS

DR. DAVID MURRAY COWIE, professor of pediatrics and infectious diseases and chairman of the department of pediatrics of the Medical School of the University of Michigan, died on January 27 in his sixty-ninth year.

EMBERT H. SPRAGUE, professor of sanitary engineering and head of the department of engineering at the University of Maine, died on March 9 in his sixty-sixth year.

DR. LEON E. JENKS, of Sauquoit, N. Y., who was research chemist for the General Chemical Company in New York from 1927 until his retirement in 1935, died on March 8 at the age of sixty-three years.

DR. S. J. HICKSON, from 1894 until his retirement with the title emeritus in 1926 professor of zoology in the University of Manchester, died on February 6 at the age of eighty years.

FORMER students and friends of the late Dr. Henry Van Peters Wilson, who was Kenan professor of zoology at the University of North Carolina, are endeavoring to raise funds to establish a suitable memorial in the form of a summer scholarship for studies of marine biology at the seashore or a small library endowment. The chairman of the committee receiving funds is K. P. Battle, of Rocky Mount, North Carolina, and the treasurer, R. E. Coker, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

## SCIENTIFIC EVENTS

### THE BRITISH ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENT

At the first meeting in London of the British Advisory Council on Scientific Research and Technical Development, Colonel J. J. Llewellyn, who opened the meeting in the absence through illness of Mr. Burgin, the Minister of Supply, as reported in the *London Times*, said that the ministry already had an extensive Directorate of Scientific Research which served all three defence departments. The ministry had also been able to supplement the resources of the directorate with extensive assistance from research laboratories in universities and in industry.

The Advisory Council, of which Lord Cadman is chairman, is the senior advisory body of the ministry upon all matters of pure and applied science. He stated that "the ministry looked upon the council not only to help to make weapons superior to those of the enemy and to indicate efficient antidotes to any 'secret' war weapons we may have to meet but also to assist if possible in the development of new processes of rapid production. It was hoped, too, that the council might be able to assist in the appropriate utilization and conservation of raw materials and the discovery of substitutes for materials wherever that might be desirable."

According to the *Times*, Lord Cadman said that "the council had an extensive research program before it which included more than 1,000 items for investigation. The range of subjects was striking, covering on the one hand the most exacting chemical work in the explosives section to the most refined physical research in the communications section. Because of the variety of subjects to be dealt with it was essential to have a council membership of not less than twenty-five and to have many committees of the council on which outside scientists also would serve.

"With the impetus which it was hoped the council would give to military research they would, no doubt, have some proposals of a major character. It was expected that the committees would recommend changes in existing researches, both in nature and the financial provision needed for them.

"The Ministry of Supply, Directorate of Scientific Research, had a personnel of about 900, but even so there was plenty of ability outside the permanent staff capable of helping and willing to do so. The directorate was so constituted that advantage could be taken at any time of outside facilities and outside personnel could be engaged for investigatory work. Such services would be paid for."

### THE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE AND THE SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW<sup>1</sup>

THE United States Court of Appeals on March 4 reversed a district court decision by Justice Proctor that medicine was a "learned profession" and therefore not within the scope of the Sherman anti-trust act. As part of its decision, the Court of Appeals said, "The fact that defendants are physicians and medical organizations is of no significance." At the heart of the litigation is the question whether the law against restraint of trade applies to the medical profession. The court said, "We think enough has been said to demonstrate that the common law governing restraint of trade has not been confined, as defendants insist, to the field of commercial activity, ordinarily defined as 'trade,' but embraces as well the field of the medical profession." Again the court said, "It can not be admitted that the medical profession may through its great medical societies, either by rule or disciplinary proceedings, legally effectuate restraints as far reaching as those now charged." In addition the Court of Appeals held that, while the charge against the American Medical Association may be wholly unwarranted,

<sup>1</sup> From the *Journal* of the American Medical Association.