ments in the Dry Creek drainage yielded fragments of dinosaur bones and teeth.

While searching for more dinosaur teeth the collectors found a mammal tooth. This impelled an even more careful examination of the sandstone and shale beds in the immediate vicinity because of the rareness of Lance mammal remains.

Several pieces of egg shell, none over an inch in length, were picked from the surface of the shale close to the tooth and also down the slope below it.

That these fragments were at one time parts of the case about a potential or actual dinosaur embryo is considered probable, though no one has reported a whole egg of this type from America and our evidence is appearance, structure and size as judged from the curvature of the preserved pieces. If they were not flattened by crushing, the whole eggs were very likely larger than the Mongolian eggs, for even the most curved portion of the Montana shell is a segment of a circle greater than the circumference of the complete Mongolian eggs. No thorough comparison has been made with those fragments in the American Museum which are labeled as being from the largest dinosaur eggs discovered in Asia, and are known only from pieces.

In external appearance as well as internal structure, the Montana shell scraps resemble some of the Mongolian dinosaur egg shells and share with them common differences from most egg shells of Chelonians, crocodilians and birds. And, true to anticipation, there are notable differences between some of the Mongolian and the Montana specimens. Deep brown, almost black, the Red Lodge shell pieces are perforated by numerous pores and are characterized externally by hillocks and valleys similar to those on some of the Asiatic dinosaur eggs. In section the mamillar zone appears thin and the pyriform zone thick. Nothing approaching a complete shell or cast of one appeared last summer but more search may reveal material that will permit a further comparison with the Mongolian specimens as well as with the eggs from Rognac, supposedly of the dinosaurian *Hypselosaurus priscus,* and change or fortify the present conclusion about the derivation of the Montana fragments.

The fortuitous association of shell fragments, probably of dinosaur eggs, and of mammalian remains has recalled the old hypothesis that dinosaur eggs were eaten by the Upper Cretaceous mammals to the extent of complete extinction of the giant reptiles. But the evidence is feeble and equivocal, and certainly this particular case of chance proximity is not valid testimony pro or con. Environmental compulsion operating upon an unwieldy group seems a more potent lethal factor for the dinosaurs than does a direct organic aggression. But no one knows with certainty why or how or with what speed they drifted out of the picture. Far from inconceivable is the prospect that dinosaur remains may be found well within the Tertiary (above the Lance) as a result of future prospecting.

The Scott Fund Expedition plans to continue the explorations in the Fort Union and Lance strata during part of next summer, concordant with the general program of geological researches which the Princeton department of geology is sponsoring in the Red Lodge area.

GLENN L. JEPSEN

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

CONSULTANTS AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THE resources of our great national library are well-known, particularly in the fields of law, history and economics, but the extent of its collections in the various branches of science are less generally appreciated.

With a view to facilitating the use of the library by scholars and at the same time giving the staff easier access to the advice of specialists whenever needed, a system of chairs and consultants has recently been established. In outlining the plan to the American Library Association in 1928, Dr. Herbert Putnam explained that the function of the occupant of the chair is neither teaching nor research, but interpretation. As members of university staffs, the business of specialists is to teach or to pursue intensive research of their own. In a word, to concentrate. But as members of a library staff and partaking of its spirit, their business would be to diffuse. A chair implies full-time service with some administrative responsibilities and as yet, no such appointments have been made in science. The consultant, on the other hand, is a member of the library staff on a part-time basis with no administrative responsibility, who cooperates with the staff in matters within his field, and in general, aims to make useful contacts with outside scholars, individually or collectively. Such a group of specialists in the service of the national library is a sort of informal faculty, offering to graduate students, in a measure, what is characteristic in the idea of a national university, mainly, convenient access to the principal collection of books and manuscripts in the United States and indirectly to the other extensive resources of the City of Washington.

Funds have been made available up to the present

time for the appointment of seven consultants, three in literature and history, one each in economics, sociology, philosophy and science. The first consultant in science was Dr. Alfred C. Lane, of Tufts College, in the field of geology. The present consultant is Dr. H. W. Tyler, formerly of the department of mathematics in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

No consultant in science will naturally undertake personal responsibility in the field as a whole, but the more modest function of acting as a medium of communication with specialists in the various fields seems within the range of practicability.

The object of this note is to make the plan better known to the readers of SCIENCE with the hope that they may be interested to communicate with the consultant, either in the sense of presenting questions on which information is desired, or offering suggestions for making the service increasingly useful.

H. W. TYLER

REPORTS

THE INTERNATIONAL GEODETIC AND GEOPHYSICAL UNION

THE World War made an unusually wide and enduring breach between scientists belonging to countries arrayed against one another in that conflict. Although geophysics is essentially an international science, strangely enough it has seemed to be precisely in connection with geophysics that the breach was apparently the widest and most enduring. The following translation from the current number of the *Zeitschrift für Geophysik* may be of interest as showing that the breach is now in a fair way to be healed. The London Manifesto, to which reference is made, was a statement drawn up at a meeting that eventually resulted in the organization of the International Research Council. It found its way by implication into the statutes of the Research Council, but all reference to it was removed in 1926.

Extract from the minutes of the general meeting of members of the Deutsche Geophysikalische Gesellschaft held at Potsdam on September 13, 1930, page 503:[1]

Mr. Kohlschütter reported on the negotiations with the International Geodetic and Geophysical Union and on the visit to the meeting of the Union held this year in Stockholm. After a thorough discussion, in which Messrs. Wigand, A. Schmidt, Weickmann, Conrad, Haussmann, Perlewitz and Tams took a chief part, the following resolutions were adopted on motion of Mr. Wigand:

(1) The meeting approves the conduct of the Executive Committee (Vorstand) and of the Stockholm delegates in regard to the International Geodetic and Geophysical Union (unanimously adopted).

(2) The meeting empowers the Executive Committee, in conjunction with the Deutsche Meteorologische Gesellschaft, the Reichsbeirat für das Vermessungswesen, the Conference of Directors of German Hydrological Institutions and the principal German institutions concerned, to prepare the way for the adhesion of Germany to the International Geodetic and Geophysical Union.

In the declaration of adhesion, it shall be stated that adhesion is made on the assumption that the London Manifesto of November 10, 1918, is considered by the Union to be unjustified.

[1] Proceedings of the Deutsche Geophysikalische Gesellschaft, as reported in the *Zeitschrift für Geophysik*. VI. Jahrgang, 1930, Heft 8.

Extract from the annual report of the executive committee of the Deutsche Geophysikalische Gesellschaft for the year 1929–1930 (from October 1, 1929, through September, 1930), page 504:

In April last, the Gesellschaft received through the London Embassy and through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs an invitation from the President of the International Geodetic and Geophysical Union to take part in this year's meeting of the Union at Stockholm. Since Germany is not a member of the International Research Council nor of the Geodetic and Geophysical Union, which is a part of it, German geodesists and geophysicists could participate only as guests. Unfortunately there was attached to this general invitation the condition that the German scientists prepared to take part should address to the President [of the Union] an appropriate request. In our answer, which was decided on at a meeting of the Executive Committee in Berlin on April 28, 1930, we expressed our entire willingness to send to Stockholm several members representing the various branches of geodesy and geophysics, but we felt unable to urge the members in question to make request for an invitation. Although, as we have learned, a number of foreign colleagues urged upon the President [of the Geodetic and Geophysical Union] the desirability of having unconditional invitations sent to the members especially designated by us for the purpose, it was not until the first day of the Stockholm meeting and after being unanimously requested by the delegates present that the President decided to send a telegraphic invitation to the German representatives. This telegraphic invitation, which was warmly seconded by the Swedish local committee, was accepted by Messrs. Angenheister, Hecker, Kohlschütter, Linke and Nippoldt. Though we took part principally in the scientific proceedings, we also took the opportunity to state our views regarding such changes in the organization of the Research Coun-