

Table 1

The quantity  $P_1 - P_2$  is the difference in calculated pressure at various temperatures, where

$$P_1 = 2.249[(T/T_0)^{1.528} - 1]$$

and

$$P_2 = 2.2293[(T/T_0)^{1.5351} - 1].$$

| T<br>(°K) | $P_1 - P_2$<br>(bar) |
|-----------|----------------------|
| 100       | 2.5                  |
| 125       | 5.0                  |
| 150       | 5.9                  |
| 175       | 5.1                  |
| 200       | 2.7                  |
| 225       | -1.4                 |
| 250       | -7.0                 |
| 275       | -14.4                |
| 300       | -23.5                |
| 325       | -34.1                |
| 350       | -46.3                |
| 375       | -60.2                |
| 400       | -75.6                |
| 425       | -92.7                |
| 450       | -111.3               |
| 475       | -131.4               |
| 500       | -153.1               |
| 525       | -176.3               |
| 550       | -201.1               |
| 575       | -227.3               |

Since Hardy, Crawford and Daniels' work has shown that the melting curve of mercury and argon cannot *both* be represented by a Simon melting equation, and since neither their fit nor the present one fits the data when extrapolated to

the 20-26 kilobar region (pending more and better data at these pressures), serious doubt has been cast upon the accuracy of the Simon equation's description of argon melting phenomena. Additionally, this raises some question as to the use of a Simon equation fitted to mercury melting data as a secondary pressure standard, a practice which has never been theoretically justified [10].

My thanks are extended to Dr. P. Bolsaitis and Dr. I. L. Spain for their advice; to the Center for Materials Research, University of Maryland, for a research stipend; to the University of Maryland Computer Science Center for the use of their facilities.

#### References

- [1] R. K. Crawford and W. B. Daniels, *J. Chem. Phys.* 50 (1969) 3171.
- [2] J. D. Grace and G. C. Kennedy, *J. Phys. Chem. Solids* 28 (1967) 977.
- [3] W. H. Hardy, R. K. Crawford and W. B. Daniels, *J. Chem. Phys.* 54 (1971) 1005.
- [4] A. van Itterbeek, O. Verbeke and K. Staes, *Physica* 29 (1963) 742.
- [5] P. H. Lahr and W. G. Eversole, *J. Chem. Eng. Data* 7 (1962) 42.
- [6] A. Michels, J. M. Levelt and W. deGraaf, *Physica* 24 (1958) 659.
- [7] A. Michels and C. Prins, *Physica* 28 (1962) 101.
- [8] D. W. Robinson, *Proc. Roy. Soc. A* 225 (1954) 393.
- [9] W. van Witzenburg and J. C. Stryland, *Can. J. Phys.* 46 (1968) 811.
- [10] E. C. Lloyd, C. W. Bockett and F. R. Boyd, *Science* 164 (1969) 860.

\*\*\*\*\*

The role  
is of interest  
lower laser  
faster by ad  
this letter m  
of the lower  
tures are re  
relaxation r  
laser power

A d.c. op  
circuited wit  
the laser tub  
volt. The m  
a few  $\mu$ sec f  
the gas part  
nearly the g  
used here no  
level occurs  
prevents the  
[4]. The up  
cited direct  
relaxation o  
and H<sub>2</sub>O [3]  
can be negle  
through stir  
relaxation c  
rate equatic  
it can be sh  
cumstances  
nential and  
ation time c

The rela  
been measu  
for mixture  
and 1-8.5 to  
laser tube  
length and  
quartz tube  
vapour fro