island an adult would approach and seize a young on the outskirts of the flock. At other times attacks would be made on young just coming up the beach from the water, while several times those that for some hours had been unmolested near the center of the island were apparently without provocation set upon and left in a dying condition. The main point of attack was the back of the head. To this region a number of severe blows were given with the point of the bill, after which it was grasped between the mandibles of the adult and the bird was pulled about until the skin and flesh were cut through to the skull. Sometimes the young fell on its back with feet convulsively kicking in the air. In this position the carpal joint of the wing and the breast seemed to be the points at which blows were mainly aimed. If the young escaped by running or was left apparently lifeless but subsequently revived and made off during the absence of its persecutor it was at once attacked by any other adult that happened to be near.

I am unable to convince myself that this destruction of their young was due to molestation of the colony, as has been suggested to me, but I have no other explanation to offer, unless it be impatience at the toll of regurgitated fish that the young levy upon the old.

I wish to inquire whether this murderous action on the part of the herring gull or of other birds has been noted in other colonies and whether any plausible explanation of it can be given.

Henry L. Ward.
Public Museum, Milwaukee.

AN UNUSUAL METEOR.

To the Editor of Science: In connection with the sinuous trail left by the meteor described by E. E. Davis in your issue for August 3 and discussed by Professor Abbe in that for September 14, I might remark that a similar phenomenon was seen and sketched in the case of a fine meteor seen in Ontario on July 5, 1898, a full account of which is to be found in the *Transactions* of the Astronomical and Physical Society of Toronto for 1898, page 74.

C. A. Chant.
Toronto, October 16, 1906.

A CORRECTION.

Mr. Bassler, of the U. S. National Museum, has called my attention to a serious error of mine on page 1,209, foot-note, of the Thirtieth Annual Report of the Indiana Department of Geology and Natural Resources. In discussing two species of corals, *Cystelasma rugosum* and *C. quinqueseptatum* Ulrich, figured and named, but without formal descriptions, by Mr. Ulrich in Professional Paper 36 of the United States Geological Survey, the foot-note states: 'These specimens are neither described nor do they have the internal structure shown.' The statement refers to both species instead of *C. rugosum*. It was intended to apply to *C. rugosum* but not to *C. quinqueseptatum*. As it is the statement is untrue, as the internal structure of *C. quinqueseptatum* is clearly and accurately shown in Mr. Ulrich's figures. This is a reflection upon Mr. Ulrich which was not intended and for which I wish to apologize.

The great accuracy with which Mr. Ulrich portrays the characters observed and his unusual powers of discrimination are well known and I would be the last one to question them, especially when I had not examined the specimens figured, as was the case in this instance. Printed slips will be sent to all those receiving copies of the separates of the paper ('Fauna of the Salem Limestone of Southern Indiana') in which the error occurs. Inasmuch as it is impossible to reach all those receiving the bound volumes, it will be a favor if those having them will note the correction in the book.

J. W. Beede.

SPECIAL ARTICLES.

A NEW ARTEMIA AND ITS LIFE CONDITIONS.

The classic observations and experiments of Schmankewitsch thirty years ago on the *Artemias* of certain salt pools near Odessa (Russia) clothe this curious phyllopod genus with a peculiar interest to zoologists and to students of species-forming. This interest has been renewed by the occasional reconsideration of Schmankewitch's data, and more rarely by the actual reexamination of *Artemia*