

this group, in various relations, along its range from the United States frontier to Gaspé; but the complexities in connection with these various points of contact, and the doubts attending the ages of the several formations, have never yet been fully solved in their details. 5. The identification of the members of the Quebec group and associated formations with their geological equivalents in districts where these had assumed different mineral conditions, either from the association of contemporaneous igneous beds and masses, or from subsequent alteration, or both. It is with reference to the results under this head the most difficult of all, that the greater part of the objections to Sir William's views, taken by Hunt, Selwyn and others, have arisen, and that recent discussions and observations have somewhat modified his conclusions."

Into the question of the age or ages of the crystalline rocks identified by Logan with those of the Quebec group, I do not now propose to enter. Facts in my possession with reference to the fossils contained in some of these rocks, cause me to hesitate as to the more pronounced views on the subject. This question is, however, independent of those relating to the position and character of the unaltered fossiliferous sediments, though very interesting in itself.¹

I had intended to refer here to what can scarcely be characterized as other than a very injudicious attempt of a recent writer in the "*American Geologist*," to revive Desor's name "*Laurencian*" for the Pleistocene beds of the St. Lawrence valley, to the exclusion of Logan's name *Laurentian* for the rocks of the old Laurentide hills. This attempt has, however, been so ably and temperately rebuked by Professor Hitchcock, in the last number of the same journal, that any further argument is quite unnecessary, especially in Canada, where it is probable that no one would countenance such a heresy. Hitchcock says:

"It does not concern us now whether it was judicious for

¹ See a paper by Dr. Sterry Hunt, *American Geologist*, April, 1890, p. 212.