

of business men. The head of the Division of Forestry, for example, with \$187,520 at his disposal, receives a salary of \$2,500. If a thoroughly competent man has been secured for this important position at this ridiculously low figure the Government is, indeed, to be congratulated. As soon, however, as he shall have established a reputation he will very probably be 'lifted' by some more generous Government. This actually happened last year in the case of an officer of the Department of Agriculture who received \$1,800 a year. He now holds a like position in Japan at a salary of \$7,000.

If in spite of this Congressional niggardliness many very capable men be now engaged in governmental scientific work, this result has been brought about more by good luck than by good management, and the broad truth is not thereby affected that in every business, whether private or public, the higher salary appeals to the higher order of talent, with its consequence of greater efficiency in the work done. At the late session of Congress an unsuccessful effort was made to rectify this mistaken policy. It is to be hoped that another session of Congress will not pass without a further and a successful effort to readjust the salaries of all government scientists, and to fix them at figures which will at least bear a comparison with those paid for similar work by many private firms and corporations.—*Philadelphia Record*.

Two important government positions at Washington are going begging because there are no applicants for them. The reason is simple:—they can be filled only by men of technical skill and scientific training, and the salaries attached to them are \$1,200 and \$1,400 a year, respectively. The politicians who fixed these low salaries for high-class work knew that the incumbents would be worthless for political manœuvring, and hence did not care to 'waste' much money on them. It is a rule that holds good all through the scientific side of government work.—*Philadelphia Ledger*.

THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY PROJECT.

THE action taken at Detroit by the National Educational Association on the subject of the

projected national university leaves that matter in a peculiar but not a necessarily disappointing status. A committee of the Association had investigated the general project of utilizing, for higher university education, the facilities afforded by the governmental establishment and appurtenances at this capital. It reported in favor of the plan recently proposed by the George Washington Memorial Association and the Washington Academy of Sciences for the creation of an establishment to be known as the Washington Memorial Institution, to direct the energies of students desiring to avail themselves of the educational facilities here, without endowing a specific educational organization. The association declined to adopt this view and passed resolutions declaring its unwillingness to abandon its favorite project of establishing a distinct national university in this city.

Thus it appears that the issue at Detroit is between two plans to accomplish the same purpose. There is no division on the score of the desirability of utilizing the exceptional educational advantages of the capital city. All the educators agree that here lie chances for higher education which are not to be found elsewhere and which could not be duplicated with any expenditure. The majority of the delegates to the convention believe, as have many leaders of pedagogic thought in the past, and as did George Washington in the beginning, that the best way to make use of this plant is by direct means to create a university which shall stand for the national progress and prestige. Others contend that this is impracticable, and that the most promising method is to respect the existing educational establishments as sufficient in themselves and to create a supplement for the special use of those who desire a post-graduate course afforded only by the governmental facilities here.

The capital desires nothing more than that the fullest possible use be made of its exceptional opportunities for education. It hopes to see George Washington's ideal realized in some form as early as possible. It will aid to the extent of its ability any promising project to this end. It will safeguard the interests of any educational creation here, whatever its form or name. It

hopes that the discussion of the particular method whereby his object is to be attained will arouse the interest of every educator in America, and will create a determined purpose to accomplish something definite without further delay.—The Boston Transcript.

A NEW MAMMALIAN GENUS.

PROFESSOR E. RAY LANKESTER writes from the Natural History Museum, under the date of June 17, to the London Times, as follows:

I have this afternoon received and unpacked the case shipped at Mombasa on April 19, containing the skin and two skulls of the remarkable new giraffe-like animal obtained from the Semliki forest by Sir Harry Johnston, and sent by him to me for preservation in the Natural History Department of the British Museum. I write without loss of time to say that the specimens have arrived in perfect safety and they fully and completely bear out Sir Harry Johnston's statements and inferences.

The animal is a giraffe-like creature devoid of horns, with relatively short neck and with color stripes on the limbs, but nowhere showing spots or areolæ like those of the giraffe. Sir Harry Johnston was amply justified in assimilating the animal to the extinct *Helladotherium*, but after an examination of the skulls I am of opinion that the 'Okapi' (the native name by which the new animal is known) cannot be referred to the genus of the *Helladotherium*, but must be placed in a new genus.

I must say that, although the horny hoofs are not present, yet the double bony supports of the hoofs are preserved with the skin, and leave no doubt, even without reference to the accompanying skulls, that the animal which bore the skin was not a horse-like creature, but one with cloven hoofs.

P. S.—The 'five-horned giraffe' recently reported as having been discovered by Sir Harry Johnston is (I am told by Dr. Forsyth Major) due to a misunderstanding of a French translation of Sir Harry Johnston's description of the Okapi as 'une girafe sans cornes' (grafe à cinq cornes).

In connection with the above letter, Sir

Harry Johnston has written as follows: Perhaps I may be allowed to correct a slight misapprehension that has arisen owing to a postscript attached to my friend Professor Ray Lankester's letter in *The Times* of June 18. It has been thought by the authorities of the British Museum that the telegram of a press agency from east Africa announcing that my expedition had recently discovered a giraffe with five horns was a misleading variant of the account sent some months ago as to the other discovery made by us in the summer of 1900 of the existence in the forests bordering the Semliki River of a giraffe-like animal, without horns, which has just been named 'Ocapia' by Professor Ray Lankester. Quite independently of this interesting discovery, the credit of which, it must not be forgotten, has to be shared by Mr. Karl Ericsson, of the Congo Free State, who furnished me with a complete specimen, my expedition has been the means of discovering a species or variety of giraffe, which, in the male, possesses five horn cores, instead of the two or three found in other known species of giraffe. Specimens of the five-horned giraffe were shot by Mr. Doggett and myself about five weeks ago in the country lying to the east of Mount Elgon in the northeastern part of the Uganda Protectorate. Of these specimens, two are males and two females. The female has only three horns, while both the male specimens exhibit five horn cores.

In coloration it is my opinion that this species of giraffe differs from those already known. I have in my possession now drawings and photographs confirming these statements, and the four specimens (bones of the head and neck and skins) are on their way to England for presentation to the Natural History Museum.

Until these specimens are in the hands of competent authorities it is rather premature to discuss the worth of the discovery, or the question of its substantiating the existence of a hitherto unknown giraffe.

Perhaps I may be allowed to add that the fact that a month ago my expedition was still travelling through a very wild part of the Uganda Protectorate, and was passing through enormous herds of wild game, recalling the