Washington D.C. Mar 10, 1891. Frof. Q. C. Marsh, Dear Siv: regarding The following queries? O Should The Niobrara (Loup Fork) group be classified as Miscene or Plicere? De Should The White River group be regarded as Oliacrene? Oligacene? (3) I fail to find who first used the terms "John Day group" (not John Day basin), also "Eguns beds". Carry new cite one the passages when these terms were first used? Yours very uneuty Gilbert D. Flarris.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

New Haven, Conn., March 11, 1891. Gilbert D. Harris. Dear Sir: -In reply to your letter of March 10, I will try to answer your inquiries in the order you give them. 1. The Loup Fork, or Niobrara Group, should be classified as Pliocene, and not Miocene. 2. The White River should be regarded as Miocene, and not Oligocene. 3. I think there is no doubt whatever that I first defined the Equus beds, and gave them that name. In the Am. Jour. Sci. vol. xiv. p. 355, Nov. 1877, in speaking of the Pliocene, I stated " The upper may be distinguished from the lower by the presence of a true Equus." This is from my Nashville address, and in the author's edition of this address, which was issued soon after it was delivered, I used as a frontispiece a geological section with the names of the different horizons attached. Here you will find the name Enaus beds. You will find the same plate in the Am. Jour. Sci. for November, 1878, Plate IV. In defining the John Day Group, I find on referring to the Am. Jour. Sci. vol. ix. p. 52, January, 1875, that I used the term John Day basin. As the basin was a new and distinct one, as I proved by the fostils I found, this is, of course, equivalent to giving the same name to the group. I afterward used the term Michippus beds (see Plate above referred to) for

the same horizon, so as to make it correspond more nearly with the other names I had applied.

I think this will clear the points you mention. If not, let me know, and I will gladly try to help you again.

Yours, very truly,

[OCMOSS)