

S. McDevon

Rideau Club.

Ottawa.

18 April 89

My dear Father,

I received your

note regarding that I might
be in western town, Good
Friday, but think I had better
attend to business here. I shall
never take an early opportunity of
paying you another visit. I had a
letter from Dr White, of Washington,
the other day in which he asked a
number of questions respecting the
Cretaceous. In looking up facts bearing
on these I came to the conclusion that
it might be worth while to write a
short note to the Am. Journ. Sci., on
the Earliest Cretaceous especially which
being ascertained facts are of some
interest in extending much the

Employment of his
bits for purposes
of comparison

Jan
S. M.

Known area. In looking into this
 I find some discrepancy between the
 age of the Kortumie & Queen Charlotte
 Island formations as depicted by
 yourself & Mr. Whittens by Hants
 & marine fossils respectively. Series
 C. in I.C.I. section Mr. W. Corrodes
 with the Savell, & further states that
 the lower series (E) holds the same or
 bears the same set of species. The
 fossils got by Mr. Corrodes in 86 in Rocky
 Mts, were studied by Mr. W., he
 says turn out to be equivalent to the
 fossiliferous I.C.I. beds, particularly
 Series C. These fossils come from
 beds below the Kortumie plants,
 though in the same series. The plants
 you correlated in a general way
 with those of Series C. in I.C.I.
 The Kortumie & I.C.I. are there-
 fore regarded as respectively the same
 stage both of plants & molluscan
 fossils, but the plants I find you at-

Queen Charlotte Islands

first was inclined to call
 Jurassic-Cretaceous, & in your
 paper in Trans R. Soc., has called
Lower Cretaceous, while her writings
 refer to the beds as Gault would
 make them Middle Cretaceous
 according to some classifications or
 I think here of the Upper Cretaceous
 following Gaskie. The question I
 wish to ask is whether you should
 suppose this apparent discrepancy of
 evidence as to age to be an
 actual one, or whether you
 would suppose it possible that
 the plants too might be referred to
 the Gault. The warm plants of
 the DC Is. & Kootenai too would
 I am, doubtless, been classed
 by the U.S. geologists as Jurassic,
 but the W. Is. specimens found
 near the valley that the

Wells containing a similar (partly identical) fauna in the Western States, are very Oribacians, & though white carboniferous, I would not permit myself, who saw him lately, that he is now practically prepared to accept it.

The practical question which occurs here is whether in the early white I have spoken I should refer to this divergence of opinion as to actual age & name, pass it over without notice. If you would kindly give me anything on this which may occur to you I should be obliged.

You will observe in a late number of Am. Jour. Sci., that word of words so-called Saramine plants, there is no name to which name is from Saramine but from early tertiary has nothing unambiguously in the Saramine at Golden in Colorado. I forgot the name of the author of the paper to which I refer, but the fact has evidently an important bearing on the