

cost areas that Congress might now set aside for that purpose for nothing?

Nothing could be more satisfactory to those wishing to exploit for their own benefit the resources of the public lands than to have the public imagine that the development of our national park system has almost reached its desirable or practicable limits. That is very far from being true, but unfortunately the Forest Service, which does not wish to give up lands to the parks, and the National Park Service, which desires not the enlargement of the park system but the development of the road and hotel systems of the present parks to improve them as business propositions, are doing their best to encourage such a belief.

At a recent hearing before a Congressional committee the representative of a well-known organization who appeared in opposition to adding a certain area to the park system proved to have no information as to what was on the area in question and could give no reason for opposing its addition other than that certain government officials did not wish it included.

It is a matter of record, which any one so disposed may verify, that the same bureaus and organizations that are now so exercised over the possible lowering of the standard of the parks by making a few small additions to them are the ones who initiated and promoted the legislation in 1921-1923 to lower the standard of the Sequoia Park by eliminating half the park (containing at least two thirds of the sequoia trees the park was established to protect) and opening the area up to commercial use. They have never protested at, or given publicity to, the lowering of the standard of the Yosemite Park, which has been going on for years through the logging and railroad building operations of a big lumber company that have wiped out practically all the finest parts of its forests and ruined from a scenic standpoint two of its three sequoia groves. Publicity would have ended that vandalism. In 1925 and 1926 they initiated legislation to lower the standard of the Rocky Mountain Park by excluding most of the best timbered parts of it. Can they now venture to deny that trimming Crater Lake Park for the elimination of the splendid forests in its southern part is on the program of the government bureaus?

It is not the addition of attractive, even if not extraordinary, areas to the park system that lowers its standard. It is logging, railroad and reservoir building and other commercial developments and also "boundary adjustments" to legislate out timber or other resources desired for exploitation that are lowering the standard of the parks, and doing it in a way that no future regrets or efforts can remedy.

WILLARD G. VAN NAME

NEW YORK

## DICTION IN SCIENTIFIC WRITINGS

Now that the pronunciation of "research" is cleared up, perhaps some one can illuminate an obscurity occurring in the writings of even the best scientists. I read that something is "1,000 times larger" than something else. Does he really mean that, or does he mean "1,000 times as large?" The difference in this case is not particularly significant, but becomes so if, for example, the thing compared is "three times larger." I would be inclined to take his statement at its face value until I see that something else is "100 times smaller" than the thing with which it is compared. Now how can anything be more than once smaller than anything else? Would it be any harder to say "one hundredth as large" if that is what is meant?

R. L. EDWARDS

MIAMI UNIVERSITY

## A SUBSTITUTE FOR "BELIEVE"

DR. MILLER has suggested that there is an ambiguity in the use of the word "believe" in scientific articles and called for a substitute. Perhaps the word "opine" might do. This word is defined as follows in Webster's New International dictionary:

opine:—to have, express, form, or hold, an opinion; to give out formally as one's opinion, or to give a formal opinion; to judge; think; suppose.

ELLIS I. FULMER

IOWA STATE COLLEGE

## QUOTATIONS

### THE USE OF LEAD TETRA-ETHYL

ETHYL has stood her trial, and the jury have returned a Scottish verdict of *Not Proven*. That is the sum and substance of the unanimous report of the Departmental Committee appointed last April to inquire into

the possible dangers to health resulting from the use of motor spirit containing lead tetra-ethyl or similar lead-containing compounds, and to report what precautions, if any, are desirable for the protection of the public or of individuals in connection with the use or handling of such motor spirit.

The appointment of the committee was the result of a good deal of discussion, both in the press and in Parliament, following the announcement that the Anglo-American Oil Company had produced Pratt's ethyl petrol for ordinary motorists' use with the