

ed to solicit subscriptions from the citizens. That they will meet with encouragement, we do not doubt. A Society which has done so much to beget and encourage a taste for nature; which assists so much in the investigation of this widely extended science, and which, from the very nature of things is necessarily so far in advance of our national state, will not, we are confident, be allowed to suffer from want of proper support.

---

TO OUR REVIEWERS.

The Editors of this Journal are always thankful for the notices with which they may be favoured by the newspaper-press, and are willing to profit by the hints whether of friendly or hostile critics. They may, however, be allowed to say that they have sometimes been distressed by statements which convey to the public—unintentionally no doubt—very imperfect or incorrect ideas of their meaning. A remarkable instance of this has occurred with reference to an article in our June number on the Bowmanville Coal question. In that article we endeavoured to vindicate Prof. Chapman and Sir W. E. Logan from the charges which had been urged against them; and by a careful investigation of all the possibilities that remain of the occurrence of coal in Canada, to show that none of these applied to the current statements respecting Bowmanville, and consequently that the pretended discovery must be rejected. Our explanations may have been less clear than we had supposed, but it certainly was with some surprise that we found one of our contemporaries stating that the possibilities referred to were urged in defence of the supposed discovery; and that we had blamed Sir W. E. Logan for excess of caution when we said that he is “too cautious to hazard any conjecture as to the occurrence of fossil fuel in a country where facts palpable to the Geologist have inscribed everywhere a negation of its presence.” With still greater astonishment we found that only a few weeks ago we were accused of attacking our Provincial Geologist as guilty of rashness, an opposite and we are sure still more undeserved charge. Personally we feel that we have good reason to complain, that after fully committing ourselves against the so-called discovery, at a time when it was very generally credited, we should now be blamed as if we had taken an opposite course. But as Canadians we feel more deeply aggrieved, that through what we must regard as the culpable carelessness of our reviewers, an impression should be spread abroad that there was any controversy between scientific men here on the subject. In the interest of truth, therefore, and of our common country, we ask the gentlemen who have thus misrepresented us, to re-examine the position taken by this Journal, and to do justice to its statements.