

M. Gill College.
Montreal.

Copy of
Oyler's
Dec 31, 1890

Dear Mr Oyler,

I beg to thank
you for your kind letter
of the 15th, and take
the first opportunity to
reply.

I am in no way de-
termined to make a new
order for *Microsauria*. In fact
I never trouble myself about
matters of formal classifica-
tion. My only wish is to
have the actual differences
recognized.

As to *Oyleria*, I

think of you will look
at some photos of
H. Zelli which I propose
to send with this and
at the bones figured in
my chebenthes plate V.
You will see that they
belong to a creature con-
siderably in advance of

Hypopleurion of *Dutch & Hesperian*
*of very different from any ordinary *Lodgwood* birds,*
Gemtszi of *Cecluer*. The
trouble about the specimens
in the crest trees is that
when the parts of the skeleton
are together they are not on
one surface but mixed in
with what was a map of

debris now hardened into
stone, in such a way that
it is very difficult to
extract the bones. When
on flat surfaces the bones
are usually scattered, still
the paper I send you will
give the proportions of the
parts

As to the honey scales
of you will see ^{with other} in my Report
Sweet paper pages 647, 648
you will see a full account
of these parts their microscope
structure these compare we
that you may understand
the matter fully I shall
enclose in this a rough
sketch of the scale based
on the measurements of the
lines and with the

Scaly armorature of the upper
parts in place, also a
series showing the junction of
the upper wing & lower
by scales. I think you
may rely on this estimate
as approximate at least

I may say further
that *Stenochelys* also
had many scales above
and cuplets at the
sides or on the throat
but wanted the ornament
spaullets etc.

Except in the case
of these creatures I never
in trees we know nothing
of the habits of *Carolinianus*
Portuclians but I have
no doubt the rule was
to have by pavement bears
very scales above in *Mes.*
smaller *Salpustrius*?