

OFFICE OF THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE.

JAMES D. & E. S. DANA, PROPRIETORS.

New Haven, Ct., Feb. 28, 1890

My dear Dr. Dawson

I received your article on the Quebec group two or three days since, and have just now found time to read it. I had thought that the term Quebec group had been rejected by the Geol. Survey of Canada. A year or more ago I wrote Mr. Delwyn about it, being inclined at the time to retain it. But he swept it all away, and I have not since thought it a matter to be considered. I observe that Mr. Ellis

2

New Haven, Ct., 188

Says on page 6 K - "that its
 further use appears not
 only undesirable but to a
 certain extent objectionable"
 Why not then point your
 article at Ellis and the
 Survey ^(Mr Delwyn) rather than Walcott
 who is simply reviewing Mr
 Ellis's Report. I thought
 that Mr Walcott had put
 the point a little harshly,
 as was natural to one who
 had known nothing of the
 older man. But this is
 excusable.

Talking with Prof.
 Seely & Pres. Brainard of
 Vermont about the use of

3

New Haven, Ct., 188

The term Quebec Group,
last December I found
them strongly opposed to
it; and I think this is
the general feeling in the
country on the subject.
I have concluded to
treat it respectfully in my
Geology, but to use
only the terms Calciferous
Chazy + Trenton for the
subdivisions of the Lower
Silurian.

Under the circumstances
and especially the fact
that Walcott is sustained
by the Canada Geological
Survey, I do not think

4

New Haven, Ct., 188

that the *Journ. Sci.* could
rightly publish your paper
as it stands. And I
doubt whether it would
accomplish any good
if Mr Selwyn and the
Survey were controverted
instead of Walcott.

I see you have a
word about *Taconic* as a
closing remark. Why
not bring out clearly the
fact that ^{Emmons'} ~~his~~ Cambrian
Taconic was his Upper
Taconic; and that his
Lower Taconic has been
proved to be Newton to
Calceferous, with only the

of course a mere statement of fact, and may, it is our only evidence to return of your Mass. -
 your views we should not.

OFFICE OF THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE.

JAMES D. & E. S. DANA, PROPRIETORS.

5

New Haven, Ct., 188

quartzite part of the series
Cambrian, I have an
instructive note on Emmons's
work in an article on
Sedgwick & Murchison in
the March no. of the *Jou.
Sci.* (p. 168). It is worth
reading, as it brings out
the difference between
his style and Sedgwick's
or Murchison's, that is
their different methods
of establishing conclusions.

I have your postal
promising me the copies of your
beautiful *Sponges* & thank
you for it. —
Faithfully yours
James W. Dana