

Dana
New Haven, Mar. 6. 1890

My dear Dr Dawson

I have received your
Geological Handbook, and
thank you much for it.

I should think it would
be a convenient work for
Canadian Students; and
it is so for me also as it
gives some points in
Canadian Geology that
I might have overlooked.

I see your use of the
word Lutes Group. The
point I have to decide for
my Geology is whether it
is best to ~~make~~ it the
name of a period ~~of~~

the Lower Silurian, to include the Calciferous and Chazy, or whether Calif. & Chazy should be kept separate. It was the latter that Prof. Seely favored. And I should think that this on the whole is the best way.

You make ~~too~~ much of U.S. opposition to the Huronian. Irving's papers have been unobjectionable in style + method, and merit respectful treatment even if his conclusions are ~~rejected~~ — which I am inclined to do.

A. Winchell + Mr. H.
Winchell's style & methods
I do not care to defend.
But I know of no others ^{in the same category}
The Harmonian is still
a good subject for
investigation; but it is
a difficult subject,
which hasty work and
hasty words will not
put at rest. — Walcott
is a man of excellent
purposes; and if open to
reprimand he can get
behind some of your
disloyal Canadians. I
always had & still have
the highest opinion of Logan
as a geologist and great

esteem for him as a man.

Faithfully yours
James D. Dana

You see in my paper on
Sedgwick & Murchison, ^(March No. Am. J. Sci.) my reply
to the statement made at Toronto
after the reading of my paper
on the views of Murchison.