

Dear Sir I have glanced over the  
paper relating with this with some  
interest. It is my suggestion to say the  
least, and I think would be  
my first allude to the R.S.

Notes on paper  
May note 1  
As to comments the part I would  
make is that as you have seen really  
to all the later works it would have  
been well to have you credit to Spill  
Myself in the report of stating the value  
of the land. At. When we had the  
matter up they were in great confusion  
the work done called civil means the  
Upper Camb & Gp for New Red sandstone

Note 2. At Pamborn & Thuis Chyrest  
Work done is pretty well depicted

Note 3. Great creasques I should think  
Lithon must include the Upper shales  
passing into civil means. See my  
Report on Canada for 1847, p. 10  
U.S. Geol. Surv.

Note 4. Evidence of the not quite column  
The shales are naturally more folded than  
The structure is somewhat

5, 6 See my Report on Little River 26 Apr 1847

7 In further Colchester also

8 My latest view is that the cross  
flayer crystal is nearly equal to  
Muller's part see paper of May 1844 See p. 210

9 See my Report of 1847 also occur of 28 p. in  
Upper Cambal Waller & Cape etc  
See the field



10 I doubt this there may be some  
overlap up to local inclusion but  
not overlapping - see Gyp's list and  
Pike's list is part of 1874

11 must be later than local & earlier than  
Huron

12 Upper line from 450 at W. Flax  
marked at Cape W. W.  
You regard the Upper Red Sand  
as early Permian

13 In some places soft <sup>has</sup> layers <sup>at</sup>  
depth of 500 - see it's feet

14 I do not remember any Permian rocks  
comparable to looking anywhere  
in the W. of Huron & East Canada

15 You do not seem to mention the  
great inequality of <sup>depth</sup> inclusion in  
the line from <sup>see</sup> as well  
Gyp's & W. W. & Gyp's  
W. W. & what I have  
referred and a whole ~~to~~  
~~get a note~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~text~~  
see