

We may grant this so far as very common species are concerned, and for most specimens taken from below the present rock surface. There are two fields, however, in which the loss is not only real but at the same time serious. I refer here to weathered surface material and to rarer species whose structure is not fully known.

Well weathered material may in a single specimen reveal many minute details, both of outer surface and interior. If the nearly complete form is preserved, such a specimen may be saved, and finally yield new truths to some paleobiologist. On the other hand any great loss of surface or of other portions of the whole may make the specimen one of little or no value to a collector of the second type, yet the fragment might show details of inestimable value to the collector of the third type. We must elaborate these statements somewhat in order to get a clearer idea of their import.

A complete specimen may do no more than add a new species to our ever growing lists, while a well weathered fragment may add largely to our knowledge of the structure and function of a whole order. For example, the type of *Blastoidocrinus carcharidens* Billings, shows less than half of a complete specimen, but it reveals the character of its food-grooves; cover-plates; floor-plates; the drainage tubes situated between the outer ends of the latter and leading into the hydrospires; the outer surfaces of the hydrospire folds; the exceeding thinness of the latter, fitting the organ to perform the function of respiration; the fine corrugations on their inner surfaces, giving strength with extreme lightness; the external openings or discharge pores, showing the direction of flow to be downward (cataspores), and not upward (anaspores) as in the blastoidea; and the true basals. (See N. Y. State Museum Bulletin 149, plates I-IV.) Not one of these things was to be seen in the well-nigh perfect specimen collected by E. M. Hudson on Valcour Island, until it was sectioned, and even then the details shown were neither so numerous nor so complete as in the holotype, and in other still smaller fragments. (N.Y. State Museum Bulletin 107, plates 1-4). The holotype also demonstrates the absence of a lancet plate, and is itself clearly an example of a new order of Echinoderms, the *Parablastoidea* (last reference, page 119).

Let me refer to another specimen less than "half there." This is the type of *Protopalaeaster narraayi*, papers on which appeared in THE OTTAWA NATURALIST in May, June, July and December, 1912, and October, 1913. In addition to these papers the species was figured in N.Y. State Museum Bulletin 164; by W. K. Spencer, in part I of his "Monograph of the Paleozoic Asteroidea," 1914; and further shown by a