

and Chesapeake formations in Maryland. Tertiary fossils were collected for Dr. Dall by Messrs. Harris and Burns in May, 1891, from near Easton, Maryland, and in May and June, 1892, Mr. Burns was sent to the Calvert Cliffs, Maryland, to obtain fossils for Dr. Dall. Mr. Gilbert D. Harris, who accompanied Mr. Burns, made observations on the Tertiary formations in these cliffs, which led to his paper on "The Tertiary Geology of Calvert Cliffs, Maryland."¹

In 1891-92 Messrs. Dall and Harris, in reviewing the literature and knowledge of the Neocene in the United States, in "Correlation Papers, Neocene," wrote a short chapter on the Neocene of Maryland.²

Mr. G. D. Harris collected from some of the Eocene localities in Maryland and Virginia and arrived at conclusions in regard to the position of the deposits, which are set forth in a paper "On the Geological Position of the Eocene Deposits of Maryland and Virginia."³

The marine Cretaceous formations in Maryland received some study from Professor C. A. White, who in May, 1888, made a trip through eastern Maryland northward to examine the deposits. Probably these observations had their influence in the preparation of the chapter on Maryland and the District of Columbia, in Correlation Papers, Cretaceous.⁴

In the latter part of 1891 Mr. T. W. Stanton and Mr. F. E. Willard collected Cretaceous fossils in Prince George's county, Maryland.

In May, 1891, there was a joint scientific expedition into the tide-water region of Maryland with representatives from Johns Hopkins University, the Maryland Agricultural College, and the United States Geological Survey. The survey was represented by Messrs. W J McGee, N. H. Darton, G. D. Harris and David White. The party traveled by boat along the Chesapeake Bay and the Patuxent and Potomac rivers.

HYDROGRAPHIC WORK.

The hydrographic work of the United States Geological Survey in

¹ Am. Jour. Sci., 3d series, vol. 45, pp. 21-31.

² Bull. U. S. Geol. Survey No. 84, 1892, pp. 49-55.

³ Amer. Jour. Sci., 3d series, vol. xlvii, 1894, pp. 301-304.

⁴ Bull. U. S. Geol. Survey No. 32, 1891, pp. 88-90.