Dowling in 1902, and now in the Geological Survey of Canada. It was described by the writer in the fourth and last part of the third volume of "Palæozoic Fossils," recently published by the Survey, but it was not illustrated, as the type and only known specimen was unfortunately mislaid.

This missing and previously unfigured type has since been found, and it is now practicable to give two illustrations of this interesting specimen, and to slightly amend the original description of the species.

In regard to the two foregoing text figures of *C. cuneatum*, the explanations given below them may be supplemented by the following remarks. The specimen is a cast of the interior of part of the septate portion of the shell, with sixteen of the chambers preserved, and of a small piece apparently at the commencement of the body chamber. Figure A shows both the arcuate contour of the fossil, and the widely and shallowly concave lobe of each of the sutures, as viewed laterally. Figure B, on the other hand, shows the lateral compression, the ovate cuneate transverse section, as seen in an end view of the smaller end of the specimen, the narrow venter, and the apparently eccentric position of the siphuncle.

The original description of the species may be slightly and briefly amended, so as to read as follows:

"Shell widely arcuate, strongly but rather obliquely compressed, very narrow on the periphery or venter, much wider but narrowly rounded on the dorsum, the outline of the transverse section being ovate cuneate, and the lateral diameter to the dorsoventral about as three to five.

"Septa averaging about six millimetres apart laterally, the sutural lines being shallowly concave on both sides and produced into a narrow pointed saddle on the venter." Test unknown. Shape and position of the siphuncle not very clearly defined in the only specimen collected, though at the smaller end thereof there are indications that it was eccentric and placed a little on the ventral side of the centre, as represented in figure B.

The shell is "evidently not a true Cyrtoceras, but a probably new generic type, which there is not yet sufficient material to define satisfactorily."