Price on *Bdellostoma* embryos. From this evidence and his own observations upon Elasmobranch embryos, Burlend assumes that the primitive duct had its origin in a longtiudinal groove of the splanchocoelic mesoderm. By the closure of this groove to form a tube the primitive duct arose. The segmental (pronephric) tubules developed in connection with this duct as it became separated from the coelomic epithelium. The openings of the tubules into the coelom are the places where the original groove remained open when the primitive duct was formed.

The foundations of this hypothesis seem insecure. Price's description of the development of the primitive duct needs confirmation. Granting that Price has correctly described the development of the primitive duct it is surprising that its ontogenesis, if it really is primitive, differs so radically in other Vertebrates. Even in Elasmobranchs the pronephros does not arise as a groove or outpocketing, but as a solid cellular proliferation. If Burlend's hypothesis were the correct one, we should expect the splanchnocoelic epithelium in the region of the mesonephros to make some contribution to the primitive duct. But, as Bates ('14) has stated, the mesoderm posterior to the pronephros makes no contribution whatever to the elongation of the primitive duct. Moreover, the hypothesis affords no clue to the intimate connection of the primitive duct with the skin (ectoderm).

The contrast between the ontogenesis of the pronephros, and of the mesonephros remain unexplained by the hypothesis. Annelids such as *Allolobophora* (Rosa '06) have acquired a collecting duct with relations strikingly similar to those of the primitive duct of Vertebrates, but there is no evidence that this was developed from a longitudinal groove of the mesoderm. Until these difficulties and objections are removed, morphologists will maintain a skeptical attitude towards Burlend's hypothesis.

REPORT OF WORK ON ROTIFERA ON MOUNT DESERT ISLAND—1931

By FRANK J. MYERS, *American Museum of Natural History*

During the season of 1931 I spent the time in collecting and preserving rotifer material in bulk for the purpose of filling up certain gaps in the study collections of the American Museum of Natural History, and of the National Museum; in checking up on certain living rotifers, found only on Mount Desert Island thus far, for a paper on "New Species of Rotifers from Mount Desert Island"; and in working on the rotifer section of Pratt's Manual of the North American Invertebrates now in the course of revision.

(*Editor's note:* See paper by Mr. Myers in *American Museum Novitates*, No. 494, September 28, 1931, on "The Distribution of Rotifera on Mount Desert Island."