THE CLAIMS OF THE MICHIGAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCE.

The State Academy of Science was organized in June, 1894. At a meeting of the advisory board, it was unanimously agreed that it have for its principal object the study of agriculture, archeology, botany, geography, geology, mineral resources, zoology of the State of Michigan, and the diffusion of the knowledge thus gained amongst men. You observe that provision was made at the first meeting for investigations in agriculture, and at the first meeting for the presentation of papers, one paper was read by Manly Miles, M. D., entitled "Futile Experiments for the Improvement of Agriculture." At the next annual meeting A. A. Crozier spoke on "Recent Advances in Agricultural Botany," and Prof. Walter B. Barrows spoke on "Food Habits of Michigan Birds." At a field meeting of the academy held at the Michigan Agricultural College, June 13th, 1896, formal permission was given for the organization of a section of agriculture with Prof. Clinton D. Smith as chairman. The agricultural section of the academy was organized at the request of some twelve persons connected with the teaching force and experiment station of the Agricultural College, with several objects in view; one of which was to furnish opportunity to professors of the State University, colleges and normal schools to become interested and instructed in the relation of science to agriculture.

At the seventh annual meeting of the Academy held in Ann Arbor with Prof. J. A. Jeffery in the chair of the agricultural section, in the opinion of those present, an excellent program was furnished, consisting of "Some of the Relations of Botany to Agriculture," Dr. W. J. Beal; "Some New Demands upon Agricultural Education," Kenyon L. Butterfield. Three persons were present, including the chairman and the two who read papers, and they incidentally began to cite the statement of John Hopkins and the log. It needed no argument to show that the program did not draw.

At the eighth annual meeting held in Ann Arbor, Prof. Jeffery in the chair of the agricultural section, there were four papers read; one by J. J. Ferguson, instructor in agriculture; one by a student, George Severance, a senior of the Agricultural College; one by Dr. W. J. Beal, and one by Kenyon L. Butterfield.

There was a single visitor present, C. A. Davis, then instructor in forestry at the University, who came to listen to the paper by Dr. Beal on "What Shall the Michigan Farmer Grow for Fence Posts and Telegraph Poles."

A strenuous effort was made to make the ninth annual meeting attractive to outsiders, with just a little improvement over the other meetings by way of attendance.

The officers of the academy had claimed all along that the section of sanitary science could not be successful unless the section met at Ann Arbor, where the meeting would receive support from the faculty and students of the medical college. It began to dawn on some of the agriculturists, why should some ten of the members of the agricultural college faculty go to Ann Arbor with papers to read solely to their own number? To be brief, permission was granted to hold the agricultural section at the Agricultural College, thus securing more easily a better program and larger attendance,

besides saving time and expense of busy men at the college. With meetings held at East Lansing the attendance has been good, though by no means equal to that of a local circus. What is a good attendance at meetings of scientific students, either local, state or national? Depending on where the meeting is held, and more or less on the advertised program, it ranges from ten, twenty, not to exceed fifty persons, except rarely when it reaches a hundred or more. Meetings of the National Academy of Science for presenting papers meet twice a year. At one session a certain mathematician, Professor Pierce, of Harvard, was prepared with a paper. When called on he glanced over those in attendance, remarked that there was only one member of the academy who could understand his paper, and as he was not present he thought it not worth while to read the paper, and it was not read.

W. J. Beal.