"All waters which, though natural in the beginning have anything added to them or abstracted from them after they come from source, should either be labeled as 'artificial' or should be so labeled as to indicate that certain constituents have been added to or extracted from them. It is suggested that the word 'artificial' be used in this instance, the case may be, should appear in as large type as the name of the water in question and on a uniform background."

One wonders whether the contempt which the label of Pluto Concentrated Spring Water shows for "Food Inspection Decision 94" bears any relation to the fact that the French Lick Springs Hotel Company has for its president—Thomas Taggart—a politician whose influence at Washington is such as to make it unnecessary for the company to worry about such trivial things as mislabeling.

**ECKMAN'S ALTERNATIVE**

**What One "Lunger" Thinks of It**

A consumptive in Virginia wrote to The Journal within the last week or two ordering one of our pamphlets on "Consumption Care Fakes." Part of his letter is so interesting that we give it:

"I might add that I am a 'lunger' and have been taking treatment in some regular sanatorium for tuberculosis for the past fifteen months with excellent results, but my well-wishing friends beseege me with advice on 'patent medicines,' furnish the dope for me to take and then consider me ungrateful because I strictly adhere to my physician's advice, and do not try every fake that comes on the market; in fact, one acquaint-ance dying of tuberculosis beseeched me three bottles of Eckman's Alternative, which had done him so much good."

**Correspondence**

**Progress in Medical Education**

To the Editor:—In "Progress in Medical Education" (The Journal, March 8, 1913, p. 743) President Pritchett of the Carnegie Foundation mentions the University of Tennessee as "a university lending the shelter of its name and its charter to a medical school which it neither controls nor supports, and whose ideals of teaching are on an entirely different plane from those maintained in the other departments of its work." Inasmuch as this statement does a great injustice to our institution, I beg that you will allow me to say that the college of medicine of the University of Tennessee is an integral part of the state university and is absolutely and completely under the control of its president and board of trustees, and that no member of its faculty has any pecuniary interest in the school other than the salary which he is allowed for his services by the board of trustees. President Pritchett was evidently mis-informed in regard to the status of our college of medicine; otherwise he would not, of course, have included it in the list of schools having connection with the parent institution which he deprecates.

Brown Ayres, Knoxville, Tenn.

President, University of Tennessee.

President Ayres' letter was referred to President Pritchett, who writes:

To the Editor:—In reply to President Ayres' letter I venture to say that it would be a genuine source of regret to me to do "a great injustice" to the University of Tennessee. I do not feel, however, that the report to which he refers can be so con-strued. If the college of medicine at Memphis is now an integral part of the University of Tennessee, it is nevertheless true that the history of the university in medicine up to a very recent date is correctly described in this paper. Certainly the University of Tennessee would not accept either its Nashville school or the Memphis school, as it was taken over, as representing the ideals of instruction in the university itself.

For the improvement in the Memphis school I tried to give full credit, and if it still continues to bring forth the fruits of medical righteousness no one will be more ready than I to rejoice over it. The university cannot, however, expect to live down its medical past in a single year.

Henry S. Pritchett, New York

**The Menace of Irrational Legal Processes**

To the Editor:—We have all recently passed through a distressing experience here in Baltimore on account of an outrageous and unjust decision of the courts in a "malpractice" suit against Dr. Guy L. Hunner. My own utter disgust with the methods of the legal profession is such that if I were to act on the impulse of the moment I would abandon my surgical work, and retire to some distant field to escape as far as possible from the nauseating associations with courts and their wearing delays and postponements and their processes of flagrant injustice.

The case was this: Dr. Hunner operated on a woman with a large mass of phthisic tuberculosis abscesses. The lower pole of the kidney was calcareous and tuberculous; he did a remarkable conservative operation, resecting the diseased portion and saving a good organ which has healed perfectly and given no further trouble. The surrounding tuberculous abscess cavity naturally demanded prolonged drainage until it healed, in about seven months. During this period there was a trifling fecal drainage for a short time. Dr. Hunner in three days removed the substantial drain inserted by him at the operation, but his resident later left in the suppurating wound a tiny sliver of gauze just large enough to fill half an ordinary thimble. This appeared and was pulled out some weeks later by the physician at the patient's home in the country. A trap was then set for Dr. Hunner in the form of a letter complaining of carelessness and hoping that no axes, saws, etc., were still concealed in the wound. He replied indulgently, "I am sorry we were so careless," expressed the hope that there were no axes and saws, etc., still to be extracted and advised her as to further conduct. The patient gradually in the intervening months developed a pulmonary tuberculosis from which she now suffers to a marked degree.

Dr. Hunner gave his previous time and his faithful services over a period of more than half a year. It was alleged at the trial, and an "expert"—a doctor-laywer—was produced to prove it, that the tiny drain caused both the fecal fistula and the pulmonary tuberculosis. It was also alleged that Dr. Hunner was responsible for leaving "the drain" in; and, finally, that he ought, therefore, to be mulcted for damages. The "expert" lawyer-doctor qualified by alleging that he had had one kidney operation within the past year—a suspension of the kidney last August—"a simple operation," as he stated with becoming modesty.

All the expert witnesses testified for the defendant; namely, that the wound needed prolonged drainage and that the tiny sliver of gauze did no harm at all.

Dr. J. T. M. Finney said that its presence was beneficial as the wound needed the stimulus of a drain to hasten contraction and closure.

Dr. Thomas S. Cullen appeared with the identical piece of kidney which had been removed and showed that it was extensively tuberculous, demonstrating that inasmuch as the operation was done on a tuberculous kidney, the operation could in no way be said to have produced a condition which was ante-cedent to it.

I testified as to the general excellent care given the patient throughout, not only equal to the average as demanded by the court, but far exceeding it. I also showed how ridiculous was the suggestion that the pin of gauze in a wound which must suppurate until it closed could hurt the patient and induce any grave sequela.

There were manifestly three things to be considered by the jury: