scattered as formerly, though its volume remains large. During the last convocation week the American Association for the Advancement of Science was spared somewhat by the fact that most of the geneticists met in a city apart. Thus we venture the hope that in due time the segregation may become so complete that scientists may be free to peruse their favorite journals without risk of that offense to the finer sensibilities which results from seeing familiar words or characters abused.

Carl S. Scofield

Lanham, Md.,
February 18, 1912

UNIVERSITY REGISTRATION

To the Editor of Science: Information received from the registrar of the University of Nebraska after the university registration statistics printed in the issue of Science for January 5, 1912, had gone to press, increase the enrollment of that institution as of November 1, 1911, from 2,733 to 3,459, as against 3,661 on November 1, 1910. The decrease is due to the fact that the affiliation relations of the university with the conservatory of music, which had existed for a number of years, were severed during the summer of 1911. The gain in attendance on the other departments was not large enough to offset the loss in music students.

In the net total registration of 4,889 students at Cornell University (excluding the summer session) there were included 477 students in the 1911 short-course in agriculture. These students are not in attendance at the university this academic year, although approximately that number of students are enrolled in the 1912 winter course. If these students are excluded from the Cornell registration, the winter attendance would be 4,412, instead of 4,889.

As for the figures of the University of Minnesota, in connection with which an explanation was given in a footnote, the situation is as follows: It has been customary for a long time to include in the total registration of the university the registration of the *School* of agriculture, which is to be distinguished sharply from the *College* of agriculture, the latter being of collegiate grade, while the school has a three-year course of secondary grade. The students in attendance on the school, therefore, while not technically preparatory students in the sense that they are being fitted for college work, should really be classed as preparatory students—in any event they can not logically be regarded as college students. Subtracting from 4,307 students recorded as being in attendance at the university on November 1, 1911 (including the summer session), the 775 students in the school of agriculture, leaves a balance of 3,532 students of collegiate and university grade.

The figures for the Harvard School (787) included only the students in the summer courses in arts and sciences. There are, in addition, 278 students in science in the summer school of dental medicine. The total summer attendance thus becomes 1,065. Of these 115 students returned for work in the fall, the net total attendance at Harvard, inclusive of the summer session, thus being 5,674 instead of 5,426.

The University of Cincinnati submitted a table showing that its enrollment in all faculties on November 1, 1911, was 1,324 students, as against 1,416 on November 1, 1910, 1,364 on November 1, 1908, and 1,068 on November 1, 1903.

Taking account of these revisions, the net total attendance of 28 American universities as of November 1, 1911, including the summer session, but making due allowance for the summer session students who returned in the fall, is given in the following list.

1.	Columbia	7,938
2.	California	5,724
3.	Harvard	5,674
4.	Cornell	5,609
5.	Michigan	5,452
6.	Chicago	5,390
7.	Pennsylvania	5,220
8.	Wisconsin	5,015
9.	Illinois	4,929
10.	New York	4,055
11.	Minnesota	3,773
12.	Ohio State	3,567

13. Nebraska	3,459
14. Northwestern	3,438
15. Syracuse	3,307
16. Yale	3,224
17. Missouri	2,596
18. Texas	2,539
19. Kansas	2,265
20. Indiana	2,154
22. Iowa	1,967
21. Tulane	2,040
23. Stanford	1,648
24. Princeton	1,543
25. Western Reserve	1,331
26. Cincinnati	1,324
27. Johns Hopkins	1,057
28. Virginia	804

RUDOLF TOMBO, JR.

CONVOCATION WEEK MEETINGS

I HAVE read with interest two recent communications[1] in SCIENCE relative to the meeting place of the different scientific societies, with which I am heartily in accord. To me the only valid objection to holding these meetings at the time and place of the American Association is the tendency of the different meetings to conflict with one another. This difficulty should be to a great extent obviated if the executive committees of related societies (for example, zoologists, naturalists, anatomists) were to jointly arrange the program for their societies, allowing this program if necessary to include the day preceding or following those on which the general association meets. Certainly this difficulty was not obviated last year when the three societies above named met at Princeton, the meetings of zoologists and anatomists distinctly conflicting with each other. On the other hand, the great objections, as it seems to me, of holding these meetings at different places and at the same time is the entire loss of the benefits of the general association by those who wish to attend the sectional meetings. Speaking personally, I was much disappointed to miss the Sigma Xi convention at Washington last year in order to attend the zoologists' meeting at Princeton. To one living at some distance from the heart of things a trip to the annual meetings involves a considerable sacrifice of time and money, and he feels like getting the largest return possible for such sacrifice, which was not possible for all of us with the meetings arranged as they were last year.

If the present policy of aloofness on the part of certain societies be deemed desirable in future, might it not at least be possible to arrange the sectional meetings so as not to conflict with those of the general association?

In the case of a society with eastern and central branches (viz., zoologists), where the majority of the members belong to the former branch, I believe it would be fair to all to hold two eastern meetings to each one in the central district, such meetings to be joint meetings of the two branches. Separate meetings by each branch seem to me undesirable, at least if such meetings are held at the same time, as was the case with the zoologists in 1910.

R. T. YOUNG

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA

[1] Morse, Max, SCIENCE, December 22, 1911. Reese, A. M., SCIENCE, January 12, 1912.

THE TIDAL MACHINE

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The undersigned desires to say that the machine described in the issue of this journal of February 23, 1912, under the name of "The Harris Tidal Machine" is the product of one of the bureaus of this government, the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The officials of that bureau, who are well acquainted with all the details of its development, from first inception to final completion, named it "The Coast and Geodetic Survey Tide Predicting Machine." Under that name it was described briefly in the *Journal* of the Washington Academy of Sciences, July 19, 1911, and more fully, with illustrations, in *Engineering News* of July 20, 1911.

E. G. FISCHER

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
February 26, 1912

REPLYING to Mr. Fischer's note concerning my article on "The Harris Tidal Machine" published in this journal on February 23,