

by the stockholders and partly by the alumni who purchased the stock not donated. The medical school has for several years held a contractual relationship with the University of Illinois, but that relationship was cancelled last spring. By the present transfer of all the stock, however, the medical school becomes an organic department of the university.

AN administrative committee of the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University has been appointed by the trustees to conduct the affairs of the university until a president is appointed. The chairman is Dr. William H. Welch, and the other members are Professors B. L. Gildersleeve, W. W. Willoughby, W. B. Clark, J. S. Ames, W. H. Howell and E. H. Griffin.

DR. J. W. W. STEPHENS has been appointed to the Sir Alfred Jones Chair of Tropical Medicine at Liverpool University, vacant through the resignation of Sir Ronald Ross, who has gone to live in London.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

UNIVERSITY REGISTRATION STATISTICS

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Unfortunately I was unable to see the proof of my contribution on "University Registration Statistics" to your issue of December 27, 1912, and, as a result, several errors have crept into the compilation which I desire to correct herewith.

Since the detailed figures for the *University of Nebraska* were not available at the time the article went to press, this institution was omitted from the table, consequently the references in the body of the article should be to twenty-eight instead of to twenty-nine institutions. The missing *Nebraska* figures are as follows: college, men, 464; college, women, 617; agriculture, 328; art, 19; forestry, 64; graduate school (non professional), 164; law, 222; medicine, 159; pedagogy, 148; pharmacy, 32; scientific schools, 376. After deducting the double registration of 110, it leaves a total fall registration on November 1, 1912, of 2,483. Of the 486 summer session students, 158 returned in the fall, giving a grand total of 2,811 students for the year.

The fall total at the *University of California* is 4,585, and not 4,741; and that of *Columbia* is 6,148 and not 6,153. The dagger after "extension and similar courses" under the *University of California* should be a plus sign. The grand totals at *Columbia* should read as follows: 1912: 9,002, 1911: 7,938, 1910: 7,411, 1909: 6,132, 1908: 5,677, 1903: 4,557.

The *Indiana* figures should read as follows: College, men, 709; college, women, 438; art, 45; graduate school, 70; journalism, 67; law, 108; medicine, 140; music, 58; pedagogy, 144; deduct double registration, 354; total, 1,423; summer session, 1,197; deduct 280 students who returned for work in fall; grand total, 2,340. Both *Indiana* and *Nebraska* should be omitted on page 889 among those institutions which have more than 1,400 students registered in the college.

The *Johns Hopkins* grand total for November 1, 1912, should read 944, and that for 1911, 1,120.

At the *University of Minnesota* the item of double registration should read 175, instead of 319, thus making the grand total 3,737. This grand total is exclusive of 1,326 students registered in "extension and similar courses," but this latter category of students was included in the figures for 1903 and for 1908-1911.

The grand total enrollment at the *University of Texas* for November 1, 1909, was 2,512, 1908: 2,410, 1903: 1,309.

	1912	1911	1904
Amherst	429	464	412
Brown (incl. graduate school) ..	934	933	988
Bryn Mawr (incl. graduate school)	444	440	441
College of the City of New York	1,109		
Dartmouth (incl. eng., med., grad. stud., and commerce) ..	1,294	1,385	926
Haverford	167	164	146
Lehigh	617	599	609
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1,611	1,610	1,561
Mount Holyoke	748	771	674
Purdue	1,749	1,762	1,359
Smith	1,528	1,508	1,067
Vassar	1,044	1,055	979
Wellesley	1,424	1,433	1,050
Wesleyan	410	395	305
Williams	521	533	443

These changes in the table naturally necessitate certain changes in the body of the article on pages 887 and 889.

The enrollment as of November 1, 1912, of a number of colleges for men and women, and schools of technology is given in the preceding table.

RUDOLF TOMBO, JR.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BUILDING STONES AND CLAY PRODUCTS

IN the issue of SCIENCE for December 27, 1912, there appeared a review by George P. Merrill of "Building Stones and Clay Products" by Heinrich Ries. It seems to me that the criticisms thus set forth in the review are a trifle harsh and I would like to call attention to a few statements which seem inaccurate. The reviewer says:

The portion devoted to stone contains nothing that is not to be found in other easily available works.

The fact that the work contains much information taken from American and foreign publications not even to be obtained in such a library as the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, would indicate that the information is not all *easily* available, while, in truth, a large part of it is practically *unavailable* to many of those who will make use of the book.

The second portion of the book, that devoted to clay products, he states "is little more than an abbreviation of what the author has already included in his well-known work, 'Clays, their Origin, Properties and Uses.'" In his work on clays, Dr. Ries devotes 42 pages to structural clay products, while in the book under criticism, 130 pages are given over to the subject. The new work contains 34 illustrations concerning clay products, only 6 of which were given in the book on clays. The section on clay products, if compared at all with the similar portion of the earlier book, is a decided *amplification* instead of an *abbreviation*.

All works of this character must be largely compilations and their value depends largely on the arrangement and the care in selecting the proper material from the wealth of pub-

lications at hand. Dr. Ries has apparently made good use of the available literature both American and foreign and has condensed it into a volume whose usefulness, for the class of readers for which it is intended, is, I believe, enhanced by such condensation.

HENRY LEIGHTON

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

QUOTATIONS

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT OF
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY AND THE PROFESSOR
OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE¹

My Dear Prof. Fisher:—The press, far and wide, contain articles relative to remarks in reference to the churches of the country, reputed to have been uttered by you in a recent address in Hartford. I desire to know whether or not you have been correctly reported. If you have been incorrectly reported, will you please give me an exact statement of what you did say?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM ARNOLD SHANKLIN

My Dear Dr. Shanklin:—In reply to your letter just received I would say that the report of my remarks before The Get Together Club in Hartford, last Wednesday evening, was substantially misleading. Partly by the omission of qualifying statements which made the setting and shaped the interpretation, partly by ascribing to me words and utterances which were not mine at all, and perhaps partly by the striking headlines which raised brief incidental remarks into the prominence of a principal theme, the original report, upon which apparently many newspaper conclusions and comments have been based was—as I should judge—decidedly unfair. This judgment of mine is confirmed in some degree at least, by the fact that the paper in which the report appeared was constrained by criticism in Hartford to offer me an opportunity to make corrections. There was, however, a large underlying element of truth in the report. I did not say that I would "throw Sunday wide open" or anything else of closely similar meaning. But I did say that I would allow very great freedom of Sunday observance, allowing a man pretty nearly anything that did not disturb the religious or other use of the day by others. I did say that I saw no religious inconsistency in

¹ The letters are all dated from Middletown on January 27.