"D'après e en ôlant tir, et on hé." a liquid ases pro tid to the at all the vitticism, ent heat. his critis of Mr. long and ark with everance umns of say that int is not y wrong. arennes, self most ntia and vhich he le course nist who e perfect cted any ind heatnund so ted. M. nates of elf with ignorant ier, have lt on the n. ts of the n being rofesseur

de chimie analytique," we in Canada may flatter ourselves with the hope that he will soon make known to the world those brilliant discoveries by which he dispenses with all those tedious operations which we, benighted individuals, have been taught to consider essential.

In another paragraph, M. de Rottermund finds fault with Mr. Hunt's process for converting sulphate into carbonate of baryta, by fusion with carbonate of soda, and supports his argument by a quotation from Berzelius. He very ingeniously stops his quotation with an &c., which unfortunately contains the most important particulars, viz: that the substances are mixed in their atomic proportions! Is the learned professor of analytical chemistry so utterly ignorant of the ordinary processes of analysis, as not to know that an excess of the flux is always employed in such cases? "Que le public juge donc de la valeur de tous les travaux qui sont présentés dans ce rapport." Rather let the public estimate at their true value the ridiculous pretensions of this would-be critic.

In another paragraph he finds fault with Mr. Hunt for not including sulphuretted hydrogen in the list of substances found in a *sulphurous* spring. Is the learned professor unaware that the term sulphurous is only applied to such springs as contain this gas, but that the nature of the salts may vary very considerably? Mr. Hunt omitted the mention of sulphuretted hydrogen, because he had previously employed the term *sulphurous*, which one would imagine ought to be sufficient for any person not endowed with the peculiar obtuseness of M. de Rottermund.

The next attack is upon an analysis of a mineral from the Poisson-Blanc, and here, as might be expected, M. de Rottermund exhibits as much ignorance of mineralogy as he had previously shown with regard to chemistry.

Mr. Hunt gives the quantities of the different substances which he found in the specimen, and M. de R. asks whether this is a scientific analysis. In the name of all that is incomprehensible, what does he want? Mr. Hunt states the nature of the ingredients, and even classifies them in his arrangement, showing which belong to the metallic and which to the silicious or earthy portions of the mineral. It is perfectly evident, on