

& examination of figures, so the parcel of fossils has not only given great pleasure - but instruction. There are a few I would like to specially mention - When I saw you in London, I mentioned that what you named Cordaites simplex appeared to me from your description to be C. principalis Sereno - The specimens of C. simplex which you have sent me, show a plant I have never met with in Britain (as yet) & are different from the species I believe to be C. principalis.

Also I was under the impression that your L. corrugatum was L. Veltheimianum Sternb, but from the fine series of this plant which was among the specimens, I am most undoubtedly by wrong in my views - Your L. corrugatum is a true species & altogether very distinct from L. Veltheimianum, but many of your figures of this species, really do not shew well the character of the plant - Are you aware that you have sent me the specimen figured on Pl. II. fig. 444, in the Report of the For. Plants of the Lower Carbon. & Millstone bed Formations? Is this a mistake & do you wish it returned? You will see I have compared the specimens pretty closely!!! - In regard to Psilophyton robustum it seems undoubted that this is the Psilophyton

which is so plentiful in certain
parts of the Old Red Sandstone of
Scotland & of which some small
fragments have been figured
by Salter in the Trans. Geol.
Geol. Soc. & by Heist. Muller
in some of his works. &
further, I have been led to
believe that P. robustus is the
same plant as Goppert's
Halesites Declenianus, figured
in his Joss. Flora d. Ubergangsgewächse
Pl. II. (1832). I have seen a
printing specimen from Peck-
shui, (which is figured in Dr.
Geikie's Text Bk of Geology) which
appears entirely with your specimens.
& whatever may be said of
Goppert's plant, I do not think
any doubt can remain as
to the Canadian & Scotch
plants being ^{the same} ~~similar~~ —

You will notice in the front
Journal Geol. Soc. Vol. XLI. pt.
3. proceedings p. 98, that my
paper on Ulodendron etc. has been
with drawn by permission of the
Council. The explanation is
- that ~~they~~ ^{the Council} would give me
an abstract & I at once re-
fused to allow them to pub-
lish it in that form as it
"would merely suppress the evidence
wherein I had shown certain
writers to have been misled &
neither so the subject nor my
self justice" Perhaps you will
remember that a member of
the Geol. Soc. once wrote a
paper of Ulodendron & that is
where I believe the shoe
pinches - of course I have
no positive evidence that this
is so, but when this is coupled
with the possession of certain

Knowledge (what of course I have no right to know) that the
report sent in a favourable report - the case looks worse -
- However it is published in full in the "Annals", & I hope
soon to be able to send you a copy - This Autumn
I spent about four weeks examining the fossil flora
of some of the English coal fields & hope in a
month or two to begin a series of papers dealing
with the vertical & horizontal distribution of the
British Coal Plants - I have got a good deal of
information on this subject collected - Will your
paper not be published in full? That is, the one
at the British Association - I am very glad to hear
you will be in this country next year - when I
hope we may meet - in fact, I would very much
like to show you some specimens I have, what I
think would interest you -

Again allow me to thank you for the fossil
plants, which have given me so much pleasure
& instruction - With kindest regards

Yours truly
Whistler

Sir. Wm Dawson - }
Montreal

Gen. Plank
Kudstru
Carl 1887