

applies also to foot-notes on p. 5, 8, 15, 21, 27.

reference". The page should be given. This remark

are. It is what Whately calls the "fallacy of

is apt to infer that they are more important than they

treated the subject or made reservations, and the reader

merely to show the reader that they have previously

no reference. Such references are made by many authors

in the *Journal of Naturalist*, 1871" is to the reader the same as

note. I would insist on more definite references

The verb is to underline, not to underlay. See also

P. 1. Par. 3. line 6. -- "underlayd" should be: underline.

*Edwin
Smith
Lefroy*

Suggestions on Dawson and Penhallow's paper.

THE GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA,

SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
UNIVERSITY OF CITY OF NEW YORK,
WASHINGTON SQUARE, E.

Feb. 5th. 1890
NEW YORK, 189

Sir William Dawson,

My dear sir,

The committee to which your paper was referred, was more conscientious than most of the pro forma committees have been for its chairman read the paper. He makes two criticisms which you will find on the accompanying paper which is the original sheet.

As to the matter of complete footnotes and references, he is in accord with the Council. Please make a notes of the references mentioned so that when the proof goes to you you may complete them.

If I could get the MS. back which was sent out a month ago for corrections, I should send the proceeding to press next week to be followed promptly by the memoirs; but there will be a delay of nearly two weeks: However all the figures will be drawn and everything made ready so that there will be no delay.

Many thanks for your reference to Mr. Ogilvy.

I am

Sincerely yours,

J. J. Stevenson

Suggestions on Dawson and Penhallow's paper.

P.1. Par.2. line 6.-- "underlaid" should be: underlain.

The verb is to underlie, not to underlay. See also
on p.18

P.3. Foot-note*. I would insist on more definite references

"Canadian Naturalist, 1871" is to the reader the same as
no reference. Such references are made by many authors
merely to show the reader that they have previously
treated the subject or made researches, and the reader
is apt to infer that they are more important than they
are. It is what Whately calls the "fallacy of
reference". The page should be given. This remark
applies also to foot-notes on p.5,8,15,21,27.