TABLE I.

NEUTRONS	BR (1)	BR (2)
Fast (Rn+Be)	$\sigma = 0.9 \times 10^{-27}$ cm^2	$\sigma = 0.6 \times 10^{-27}$ cm^2
Thermal (Cd group)	$\sigma = 1.2 \times 10^{-27}$ cm^2	$\sigma = 0.9 \times 10^{-27}$ cm^2

We believe that the mass number to be attributed to Br (1) is 84. Indeed, according to our experiments it is unlikely that Br (1) and Br (2) are isomers. On the other hand, Snell[4] has found in the bromine fraction separated from rubidium irradiated by fast neutrons (Li+D) two periods of 35 min. and 34 hr. The second period has to be attributed to Br^{82}, resulting from the reaction Rb^{85} (n, α) Br^{82}. The fact that the first of the Snell periods agrees with the period of Br (1) suggests that we have to do with the same body, probably Br^{84} which could result, in Snell's experiments, from the reaction Rb^{87} (n, α) Br^{84}.

We have determined the cross sections for the production of Br (1) and Br (2) by thermal neutrons (cadmium group) and fast (Rn+Be) neutrons. All of the factors entering into this evaluation (yield of the chemical methods, absorption of the radiation, etc.) have been determined experimentally.

These results show that the radioactive bromine isotopes are produced in a very small proportion (at most 1 percent) during uranium fission due to neutrons.

[1] A. Langsdorf, Jr. and E. Segrè, Phys. Rev. 57, 105 (1940).
[2] O. Hahn and F. Strassmann, Naturwiss. 27, 529 (1939).
[3] R. Dodson and R. Fowler, Phys. Rev. 57, 966 (1940).
[4] A. Snell, Phys. Rev. 52, 1007 (1937).

Temperature Dependence of the Periodic Deviations from the Schottky Line

EUGENE GUTH AND CHARLES J. MULLIN
Department of Physics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana
July 12, 1941

IN recent communications[1,2] it was stated that a disagreement exists between the data of Seifert and Phipps[3] and of Turnbull and Phipps[4] on the one hand and those of Nottingham[1] on the other hand regarding the temperature dependence of the amplitudes of the periodic deviations from the Schottky line. The amplitudes were defined as the sum of the ordinate of a maximum and a neighboring minimum with the Schottky line as a reference.

In view of the great importance of the temperature dependence for the theory of the periodic deviations a re-examination of the original data of Nottingham has been made in the light of the theory,[2] which was missing when Nottingham wrote his letter. This re-examination shows that Nottingham's data are not inconsistent with the theory, according to which the amplitudes should be inversely proportional to the absolute temperature; however, these data alone are not sufficient to establish quantitatively the theoretical dependence, because of the superposition of "patch-effects." As pointed out already[2] the data of Phipps and collaborators agree with the theoretical temperature dependence of the amplitudes.

Finally, it seems worth while to point out that the magnitudes of the amplitudes of the deviations obtained by Phipps and collaborators agree closely with those obtained by Nottingham in spite of the considerable difference in the nature of the surfaces of the filaments used. Nottingham's amplitudes are about 10–15 percent higher than those of Phipps and collaborators, thus yielding an even better agreement with theory, which, when the current penetrating the potential barrier at the metal surface is considered,[5] yields amplitudes somewhat larger than those observed by Phipps et al. The remarkably close agreement between the locations of the maxima and minima found by Phipps et al. and those found by Nottingham already has been pointed out by Nottingham.[1]

In order to calculate the positions of the maxima and minima from theory, an assumption about n, the number of free electrons per atom of the emitting metal, must be made. With $n = 1$ for tungsten, the calculated positions were found[2] to differ somewhat from the observed positions. If it is assumed that this difference is due principally to the fact that n is really less than one for tungsten, then the observed positions may be used to estimate the value of n. A calculation based on this assumption indicates an upper limit of $n = 0.35$ for tungsten. From the magnitude of the double layer necessary to yield the observed dependence of the work function of tungsten upon its different crystal faces, Smoluchowski[6] obtained[7] $n = 0.33$ in agreement with the above value.

We are indebted to Dr. Nottingham for putting his original unpublished data at our disposal and for friendly discussions.

[1] W. B. Nottingam, Phys. Rev. 57, 935 (1940).
[2] E. Guth and C. J. Mullin, Phys. Rev. 59, 575 (1941).
[3] R. L. E. Seifert and T. E. Phipps, Phys. Rev. 56, 652 (1939).
[4] D. Turnbull and T. E. Phipps, Phys. Rev. 56, 663 (1939).
[5] E. Guth and C. J. Mullin, to be submitted for publication in Phys. Rev.
[6] R. Smoluchowski, Phys. Rev. 59, 944A (1941).
[7] R. Smoluchowski, personal communication.

Positive Excess in Mesotron Spectrum

G. BERNARDINI, University of Bologna
and
G. C. WICK, M. CONVERSI, AND E. PANCINI, University of Rome, Rome, Italy
July 19, 1941

SEVERAL years ago Rossi[1] and Mott-Smith[2] tried to observe the deflection of cosmic particles in a magnetic field by a system of two coincident counters with magnetized iron plates interposed. The effects observed, if at all real, were small and pointed to the existence of positive particles.

Later this method was superseded by the more powerful technique of the Wilson chamber, and it became clear that

TABLE I. Counting rates for various magnetic fields. (Coinc./hr.)

INDUCTION IN GAUSS	AT ROME (50 m.s.l.)		AT CERVINIA (3460 m.s.l.)	
	ARRANG. I	ARRANG. II	ARRANG. I	ARRANG. II
2400	81.1 ±1.2	77.7 ±1.2	162 ±2.1	160 ±2.1
5000	83.1 ±1.2	77.2 ±1.1	165 ±2.5	157 ±2.5
10,400	88.5 ±0.9	80.5 ±0.8	175 ±2.1	159.5 ±2.0
15,500	97.5 ±1.0	84.7 ±0.9	206 ±1.8	176 ±2.0
17,000	103.3 ±1.5	91.2 ±1.3	217 ±2.7	184.8 ±2.9

the smallness of the effects previously observed was due to the fact that positive and negative particles are present in approximately equal numbers. More recently, however, Jones,[3] Leprince-Ringuet,[4] and Hughes[5] found a positive excess of about 20 percent.

It seemed to us worth while, therefore, to repeat the experiment of Rossi with a somewhat improved triple coincidence arrangement (Fig. 1). The iron plates A, B, C, D, are magnetized by means of coils, A and B parallel to each other and antiparallel to B and D. The field can be so directed as to concentrate the positive particles (arrangement I, as in the figure) or alternatively so as to concentrate the negative particles (arrangement II). We found the results given in Table I.

The experiment affords conclusive evidence in favor of the existence of a positive excess, in accordance with the finding of Jones, Leprince-Ringuet, and Hughes.

An elaborated evaluation has been made of the "allowed

FIG. 2. Coincident counting rates for various field strengths.

cone" of incident directions for many points in the horizontal symmetry plane of the first counter and it has thus become possible to interpret the above results quantitatively to a certain extent. Assuming that the positive excess is evenly distributed over the whole spectrum, we find that the difference I−II must increase almost linearly with the magnetic field, which is seen to be the case (Fig. 2).

If the ratio of positives to negatives is $(1+\epsilon)/(1-\epsilon)$ the "experimental excess" expected is

$$\frac{\mathrm{I-II}}{\mathrm{I+II}} = \epsilon \frac{B}{25,000}.$$

From this we find $\epsilon = 0.11$ at Rome and $\epsilon = 0.12$ at Cervinia.

The method, owing to its simplicity, seems well-suited for an investigation of the positive excess under conditions when the elaborate Wilson chamber technique is impossible. For stratosphere work permanent magnets could be used. Experiments at great elevation are now in preparation.

FIG. 1. Arrangement of counters and magnetized iron plates.

[1] B. Rossi, Nature 128, 300 (1931).
[2] L. M. Mott-Smith, Phys. Rev. 39, 403 (1932).
[3] H. Jones, Rev. Mod. Phys. 11, 235 (1939).
[4] L. Leprince-Ringuet and J. Cussard, J. de phys. 8, 207 (1937).
[5] D. J. Hughes, Phys. Rev. 57, 592 (1940).