

The Editor OTTAWA NATURALIST.

SIR,—My attention has just been drawn to an article in the last number of *THE NATURALIST* by R. Chalmers, LL.D., on "The Glaciation of Mount Orford." This article is in the form of a reply to our recent paper by Professor C. H. Hitchcock, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., on "The Glaciation of the Green Mountain Range" (Report of the State Geologist of Vermont, 1903-4, Burlington, Vt.), and to a brief note on the subject of Mount Orford by the present writer (*Canadian Record of Science*, July, 1900). Unfortunately, it is the writers, rather than the subject, that receive the greater share of attention in this article. Yet a few words of explanation may help to remove any misapprehension regarding the latter.

In the annual report of the Geological Survey of Canada Dr. Chalmers advanced the view that Mount Orford and other hills in south-eastern Quebec were not glaciated above an altitude of eighteen hundred feet. In 1898 Professor Hitchcock reported to the American Association for the Advancement of Science that glacial markings and drift were found by him at the summit of Mount Orford in the previous season.

On the appearance of Dr. Chalmers' report, early in 1900, the writer, quite unaware of Professor Hitchcock's investigation, wrote the short paper above referred to, expressing the opinion that the mountain had been glaciated to the top, and that, consequently, the extreme height reached by the ice in south-eastern Quebec is not yet known. When in manuscript, this note was sent to the late Dr. G. M. Dawson, then Director of the Geological Survey, with the request that it should be also submitted to Dr. Chalmers. Dr. Dawson's reply was to the effect that, the writer's view being probably the correct one, there was no objection to its publication. Accordingly, after again visiting the summit of the mountain, the article was published in July, 1900. It is, therefore, only after five years that Dr. Chalmers first expresses his dissent, and that, apparently, without having in the meantime re-visited the field. It is still more inexplicable that his criticism should now be so largely a personal one.

Dr. Chalmers' ground for discrediting the evidences of the