

them on about the same horizon. So with regard to the Quebec group, there is a great diversity of opinion among scientists. They seem to toss and twist the earth's surface in the way that best suits their different views, yet they must criticise the miners, who are at least, quite as consistent as they are, and far more practical?—I am very glad you mentioned that. There was quite a discussion at the meeting of the Royal Society, last spring, about it between, Dr. Selwyn, Dr. Hunt and Mr. Macfarlane. I don't think that Dr. Hunt could have been up there.

Q. Yes; he was, for he stayed a week at my house?—He showed very little knowledge of it, at any rate. After hearing the discussion I came to the conclusion, and nearly all others who heard him, that Dr. Hunt was talking about what he did not clearly understand. Dr. Hunt is an eminent chemist, but he is not eminent as a stratigraphical geologist.

Q. Do you not consider Prof. Chapman an eminent geologist?—He wrote a little book on geology, and if he knew as little about the rocks in the east as in the west, he knew very little about them.

Q. To give a practical turn to the information I have elicited from you, do you not think that the time of the Survey is too much taken up with those matters which are not of interest to others, with the exception of scientists and geologists? A great deal of hair-splitting has taken place with regard to these rocks, such as the Quebec group and the Animikie group, which may be very interesting to scientists, but not the general public, and which has taken up too much of the time of the Survey. Do you not think so?—I agree with you that this hair-splitting among geologists is of no interest to anyone outside of themselves, and if money is spent foolishly, for the settling of these questions, it is of course impractical, but the difficulty is to tell where the hair-splitting comes in, and where it does not.

Q. But still you are of opinion that the whole Survey might have a more practical turn?—I would say that my branch is the real practical one, while the geologist would say that his branch was.

Q. Nobody denies that we receive a good deal of advantage from the Geological Survey, but the question is, might it not be improved?—Certainly.

*By Mr. Baker :*

Q. Do you mean to tell the Committee that Prof. Chapman, who has been teaching geology in Toronto University for a great many years, knows nothing about it?—Only as regards the western rocks. The eastern ones I know little about. He wrote a book and talked about rocks he never saw.

Q. Then the Committee is to understand that your remarks simply refer to the western rocks?—Certainly. It would not be prudent for me to speak about matters of which I profess to know very little.

*(The following circular was sent to several Scientific Institutions and Professors of Science.)*

“ OTTAWA, March , 1884.

“ DEAR SIR,—A Committee has been appointed by the House of Commons of Canada 'to obtain information as to the methods adopted by the Geological Surveys of this and other countries in the prosecution of their work, with a view of ascertaining if additional technical and statistical records of mining and metallurgical development in the Dominion should not be procured and preserved.'

“ The Committee is desirous of procuring information from persons connected with Geological Surveys, Bureaux of Mineral Statistics, &c., in other countries, in reference to recent progress in those departments, with a view of recommending to Parliament such modifications in our own system as will tend to render it more efficient and successful.

“ The Committee will therefore consider it a favour if you will furnish it with a list of works on the above subjects, published by you or under your direction, or the works themselves, if furnished by your Government for general distribution, and will also be much pleased to receive your views upon the subjects mentioned and specially:—