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,

1912, I wish to state that to the best of my knowledge and belief no "christening" of the machine has yet taken place; if it has, I am morally certain that the inventor was not invited to the ceremony. As the title "The Coast and Geodetic Survey Tide Predicting Machine" used by Mr. Fischer is not only lengthy but includes the Ferrell Machine used by the office for many years, the title under which I described it is logical in that it differentiates the Harris Machine from its predecessor, at the same time serving as a mark of honor to its inventor.

I wrote three letters to the Coast Survey Office protesting against the injustice done Dr. Harris in Mr. Fischer's article in *Engineering News* of July 20, 1911, and calling attention to the misstatements contained therein, requesting that the office publish suitable corrective notes. My letters were unanswered and I, therefore, laid the facts before the public in my article.

Samuel Tierney, Jr.

QUOTATIONS

Dr. Wiley and the Bureau of Chemistry

On the 9th of April, 1883, I took the oath of office and entered upon the discharge of my duties as chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, in the Department of Agriculture. For the past twenty-nine years I have endeavored to discharge these duties according to the dictates of my conscience, the knowledge at my command and the obligations of my oath. In retiring from this position after so many years of service it seems fitting that I should state briefly the causes which have led me to this step. Without going into detail respecting these causes, I desire to say that the fundamental one is that I believe I can find opportunity for better and more effective service to the work which is nearest my heart, namely, the pure food and drug propaganda, as a private citizen than I could any longer do in my late position.

In this action I do not intend in any way to reflect upon the position which has been taken by my superior officers in regard to the same problems. I accord to them the same right to act in accordance with their convictions which I claim for myself.

After a quarter of a century of constant discussion and effort, the bill regulating interstate and foreign commerce in foods and drugs was enacted into law. Almost from the very beginning of the enforcement of this act I discovered that my point of view in regard to it was fundamentally different from that of any of my superiors in office. For nearly six years there has been a growing feeling in my mind that these differences were irreconcilable, and I have been conscious of an official environment which has been essentially inhospitable.

I saw the fundamental principles of the food and drugs act, as they appeared to me, one by one paralyzed and discredited. It was the plain provision of the act and was fully understood at the time of the enactment, as stated in the law itself, that the Bureau of Chemistry was to examine all samples of suspected foods and drugs to determine whether they were adulterated or misbranded, and that if this examination disclosed such facts the matter was to be referred to the courts for decision.

Interest after interest, engaged in what the Bureau of Chemistry found to be the manufacture of misbranded or adulterated foods and drugs, made an appeal to escape appearing in court to defend their practises. Various methods were employed to secure this, many of which were successful. One by one I found that the activities pertaining to the Bureau of Chemistry were restricted and various forms of manipulated food products were withdrawn from its consideration and referred either to other bodies not contemplated by law or directly relieved from further control.

A few of the instances of this kind are well known. Among these may be mentioned the manufacture of so-called whiskey from alcohol, colors and flavors; the addition to food products of benzoic acid and its salts; of sulphurous acid and its salts; of sulphate of copper; of saccharin and of alum; the manufacture of so-called wines from pomace, chemicals and colors; the floating of oysters often in polluted waters for the purpose of making