

the non-existence of Sillery and Lauzon apart from Levis, and having eliminated from the Quebec Group the metamorphic older series, and also considerable areas of Trenton, Utica and Hudson Rivers hitherto included in it, the course deprecated seems less open to objection than to retain the name Quebec group. However, names are, as is justly remarked, of very little importance in themselves, and I cordially agree in the necessity of not "misapplying them or needlessly changing them," especially in the direction of inventing new ones.

I can not agree in the statement (page 218) of the "main point in dispute between Sir W. Logan and his later critics," indeed not only is it not the main point in dispute, but it has absolutely nothing whatever to do with it.

The main points—there are more than one—at issue between my predecessor and myself simply and fairly stated, are: 1st. Is the Quebec group as defined by Logan entirely palaeozoic or not. 2nd. Are the crystalline Levis, Lauzon and Sillery the same formations as the fossiliferous Levis, Lauzon and Sillery as they are shewn to be on the maps and in the reports. 3rd. Does the Quebec Group represent Calceiferous and Chazy only as is clearly indicated on the maps and stated in the reports,* or does it include as I have pointed out it does since 1876, large areas of pre-Cambrian rocks and portions of all the formations of the New York system, perhaps from Potsdam, and even Primordial, up to Utica and Hudson River.

If I am right then Sir William was wrong, and if so it is useless to vindicate his accuracy, when further and more detailed investigation and the most distinct evidence shows he was mistaken. If I am wrong no one will be better pleased than I shall be to have my error demonstrated and to acknowledge it; but I must be excused if I am not willing to accept as evidence every kind of theory, possibility, probability and supposition of what might be, mixed with much excellent advice to students, on geological observation and induction, but scarcely required in the present discussion, unless as serving to obscure the real issues in the case under consideration.

In conclusion I would say that I much regret having been obliged to make the foregoing remarks, because some will think them—and perhaps represent them—as an attack on my predecessor, which they are not. The work of my predecessor requires no defender, but like other mortals he was not infallible. No one can appreciate more fully than I can the great value of his work. I have myself been actively

* Page 20, Geol. of Canada, 1863.