

Now it is absolutely certain that under such conditions lead-poisoning in pottery manufacture will continue to occur. The leading manufacturers, through their counsel, in the course of the arbitration proceedings before Lord James of Hereford in 1903, promised the extirpation of lead-poisoning under the rules then proposed, but that promise has not been kept. On the contrary things are as bad as ever. That more might be done under the rules as they stand would seem to follow from the statistical information furnished by the committee. They examined into the record of the 550 potteries which have been placed under these special rules during the period 1904 to 1908, and they find that during these five years :—

5 potteries have been responsible for 75 cases				
17	”	”	”	119
151	”	”	”	323
<hr/>				
In all 173	”	”	”	517

leaving 377 potteries out of the 550 in which no cases have occurred at all. In other words, 32 per cent. have an average of three cases every five years, while 68 per cent. are entirely free from the disease. In the 173 potteries in which the disease has occurred there are 4,800 workers as against some 2,000 in the other potteries. The conclusion would seem to be obvious. It is in certain relatively large works that the cases of lead-poisoning are most frequent, and this can only be due to bad management, imperfect supervision, or inadequate protective appliances.

During the period 1901-9, 865 cases of lead-poisoning in pottery workers were reported. Of these 788 arose from glaze processes, whereas only 51 were due to decorative processes. Lead glaze is therefore the main cause of the evil.

It cannot be said that the conclusions of the committee now reporting have tended in the slightest degree towards a solution of this grave evil. All the conditions to which lead-poisoning in ceramic manufacture is due are perfectly well known, but the committee was apparently unable or unwilling to make any definite suggestions as to remedies. The committee pleads that it was in a difficult position. The members of the committee representing the manufacturers were entirely opposed to any restriction in the use of raw lead; the representatives of the workers, seeing the comparatively harmless character of low-solubility glazes, would be glad to see them generally introduced, “but have to consider the grave risk of loss of employment which any dislocation of the industry due to their introduction might entail.” *Might*, not would. Taking the question of glazes as a whole, two facts, says the committee, are beyond dispute :—

“In the first place, the danger to the workers of handling raw lead is very real; in the second, it is evident that however unsuitable leadless and low solubility glazes may be for certain classes of ware, there is a considerable quantity made for which they are quite satisfactory.”

But the members of the committee are unable to make up their minds what classes of ware are represented by this “considerable quantity,” although the facts were before them. They think, however,

“that every inducement and encouragement should be given to the manufacturers both to persevere with their experiments in search of satisfactory and low-solubility glazes, and to introduce them whenever possible.”

Also efforts should be made to arouse the interest of purchasers in the question. The members think “it was established that pottery made with leadless and low-solubility glazes can be obtained of excellent quality,” and they “consider that the desirability of insisting on being supplied with such ware should be

NO. 2148, VOL. 85]

brought home to the public at large.” Lastly, they are of opinion that—

“the observance of the special rules has been far from satisfactory. In the past many of the manufacturers do not appear to have regarded it as incumbent on them personally to insist upon it; they have left the initiative to the factory inspectors, and in future they should be made to realise that they are themselves responsible.”

The committee obviously had not the courage of its convictions. It is difficult to imagine any more feeble or inconclusive “conclusions.” No constructive action seemed to be possible to it; its only policy was that of *laissez-faire*. The net upshot of the inquiry is that the whole position is not one whit ameliorated; the operatives apparently are still to remain the victims of lax surveillance or of indifference, and of official non-interference.

The matter, however, cannot be allowed to rest in this position. If the manufacturers’ claim for unrestricted liberty to use such dangerous materials as they please is to be allowed, they must be made to feel the responsibility they thereby incur by far more stringent measures than have hitherto been brought to bear upon them.

#### THE NEW ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF SPORT.<sup>1</sup>

WHETHER by design or by accident, the new edition of this work has appeared at an opportune time, since the success of the Vienna Exhibition has attracted an even more than ordinary amount of attention to sports and pastimes of all sorts during the year now rapidly coming to a close. Those who



Photo.]

[W. S. Berridge.

Himalayan Tahr. From “The Encyclopædia of Sport.”

possess the first volume of the original edition will find, on comparing it with its successor, a great change in regard to much of the subject-matter, aviation having been practically created since the date of the appearance of the first edition, while during the same period motors have come to the front as a means of communication, and everything in connection

<sup>1</sup> “The Encyclopædia of Sport and Games.” Edited by the Earl of Suffolk and Berkshire. New and enlarged edition. Vol. i., A to Cricket. Pp. viii+496. (London; W. Heinemann, 1910.) Price, 10s. 6d. net at home; 12s. 6d. net abroad.

with automobiles has been revolutionised. So far as I am capable of judging, these articles, as well as those devoted to archery, athletics, cricket, &c., are thoroughly up to date, and, like the rest of the volume, admirably illustrated.

On turning, however, to the articles on big game and big game shooting, I notice that there is a considerable amount of repetition and overlapping, while, worse still, one and the same species of animal is in several instances mentioned in different places under different names. In the case of the reindeer or caribou, for example, the scientific name of the species is given on p. 264 as *Rangifer tarandus*, on p. 399 as *C. (=Cervus) tarandus*, and on p. 401 as *Tarandus rangifer*. Take again the case of the Indian gazelle (*Gazella bennetti*), which is figured, quite unnecessarily, in three different places. The first figure, p. 75, bears the legend "Ravine Deer"—a common sportsman's name—while it is alluded to in the text as the "Chinkara"; on p. 256 the illustration is lettered "Indian Gazelle," while on p. 412 the same figure reappears under the designation "Chickara." Again, the West African dwarf buffalo is designated *Bos caffer nanus* on p. 248, and *Bos pumilus* on p. 319.

These eccentricities in nomenclature are, however, by no means all the defects in the articles under consideration. The chita, or hunting leopard, for example, in addition to being styled *Cynaelurus jubatus* on p. 408, and *Felis jubata* two pages later, is stated on the former to be nearly related to the leopard; and on p. 410, the Indian spotted deer, or chital, is asserted to be a near ally of the fallow deer, despite the fact that the one wears its spotted livery all the year round and the other only in summer. Worse than all, we find on p. 250 a photograph described as that of the western tur (*Capra caucasica*), whereas it is really of the same individual as that depicted on p. 252, under its proper title of tahr (*Hemitragus jemlaicus*).

An error of another kind appears in the first article under the heading bison, which is devoted solely to the American representative of the group, whereas it should have commenced with the European species, which is the bison *par excellence*, the American animal having only a kind of courtesy right to the title.

These and others errors are due, in the first place, to what I regard as the pernicious principle of putting men of different opinions, and in many cases of very different degrees of knowledge, to write on the same subject or branches thereof, and in the second place to the lack of a competent editor to revise and correlate the zoological articles, and thus prevent useless and irritating repetition.

While fully appreciating the value of the work as a whole—which is really a wonderful enterprise—the above and other errors in the big game portion are much to be deplored, more especially as the articles are intended for the use of those who are not professed naturalists.

### WESTERN CHINA.<sup>1</sup>

MR. ARCHIBALD LITTLE'S work, the result of fifty years spent in western China, forms a valuable contribution to our knowledge of that vast region. The volume before us is invested with special interest, as it is the remnant of the labour to which he devoted the greater part of his life. He was at heart an explorer, although in business as a merchant in Chung-keng, much of his time



FIG. 1.—The Hua-Hua Lo at Wuchang, opposite Hankow: one of the most beautiful pavilions in China, unfortunately destroyed by fire. From "Gleanings from Fifty Years in China."

was spent in difficult and dangerous expeditions, which he carried out so successfully as to establish his fame, not only as an intrepid traveller, but as an authority on the western provinces of the empire. He was an exception to the majority of the foreign merchants one meets in China in his having acquired a

<sup>1</sup> "Gleanings from Fifty Years in China." By the late A. Little. Revised by Mrs. A. Little. Pp. xvii + 330. (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co., Ltd., 1910.) Price 7s. 6d. net.

R. L.