

that the departures of the mean minimum were greater in most cases than those of the mean maximum on both the north and south slopes.

*Departures of the mean maximum and the mean minimum from the normal at stations in eastern Utah during January, 1919.*

[The first three stations are north of the divide; the others south.]

| Station.           | Snow on ground at end of month. | Mean maximum.<br>°F. | Mean minimum.<br>°F. |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Laketown.....      | 0.5 in.                         | + 2.1                | + 7.2                |
| Manila.....        | 0                               | + 6.9                | + 7.6                |
| Woodruff.....      | 0                               | +13.2                | + 1.9                |
| Blanding.....      | 7.0                             | - 8.7                | - 9.4                |
| Castle Dale.....   | .....                           | - 7.2                | - 5.9                |
| Duchesne.....      | 4.0                             | - 6.9                | -13.5                |
| Escalante.....     | 12.0                            | - 6.6                | -10.8                |
| Fort Duchesne..... | 2.0                             | - 4.3                | - 7.5                |
| Green River.....   | .....                           | -16.5                | -21.4                |
| Hanksville.....    | 9.0                             | -21.2                | -21.9                |

Possibly a chinook effect, for which the pressure distribution was favorable, was in part responsible for the high temperatures along the northern and eastern slopes of these ridges, though no decided chinook conditions are discernible in the daily temperatures. The idea is strengthened, however, by the fact that the departures were greater here than at some distance from the divide in southwestern Wyoming, which was also generally bare of snow. But this region, like southeastern Utah, is bare with sufficient frequency to have raised the normals, and it is believed that we have in the temperature distribution described above principally an illustration of the importance of snow cover in influencing local temperatures.\*

#### THE EFFECT OF GUNFIRE ON THE RAINFALL OF THE BRITISH ISLES.

[Abstract reprinted from Geographical Review (New York), January, 1919, p. 51.]

A recent statement from Dr. H. R. Mill, director of the British Rainfall Organization, the leading authority on rainfall in the British Isles, gives an answer, as definite as is possible, to the much-discussed question of the effect of the gunfire in Europe upon the amount of precipitation in Great Britain (Symons's Meteorol. Mag., February, 1918). Two districts are selected, southeastern England, which was nearest to, and the northwestern district (comprising stations from Sutherland and the Hebrides to the west coast of Ireland), which was farthest from, the scene of the firing in Flanders. The monthly rainfalls from 1909 to 1917 are summarized in percentages of the average. In the period before the war there were 14 dry or very dry months in southeastern England and 12 wet or very wet months. During the war there were 12 dry or very dry and 13 wet or very wet months. A single month transferred from one category to the other would bring about an equality or even a reversal. In the northwest, in the same two periods, very dry months were equally numerous, and there were no very wet months. Taking dry and very dry months together, there were 7 before and 14 during the war, and of wet months there were 14 before and 15 during the war. Dr. Mill points out that much emphasis has been laid on the relative wetness of the years 1915 and 1916 in southeastern England, but this record should be considered in connection with the fact that the year 1917, when the war was in a very intense phase, had a nearly normal rainfall.—R. DE C. WARD.

\* For other recent discussions of the influence of snow-cover on air temperature, see Mo. Wea. Rev. 1917, 45: 272; and 1918, 46: 570-580.—Ebrton.