

lying the Levis at Quebec; and as we now know, at many other places on the south shore of the St. Lawrence.

On the same page (409) my name first appears, and I am represented as being *disposed* to regard the altered rocks lying to the south-east of the *typical* Quebec series as belonging to two older groups. I was not *disposed* to regard, which expresses uncertainty; but after careful personal examination I have distinctly stated that they were older, not than the *typical* but than the *fossiliferous* Quebec group; the only uncertainty being whether they should be considered as one or as two groups. And, apart from supposed reversed dips, Sir William Logan's own descriptions, as I have elsewhere shewn, fully and conclusively demonstrate these relations in age.

On page 410 my results are "shortly" examined, and first in this examination is a remarkable statement of an "inability" on my part; no reasons are given for the inability alluded to; this inability, however, did not only extend as stated "eastward and westward of Quebec," but over the whole extent of the Quebec group. The examination of my results is, however, undoubtedly as stated, short; as the whole of the remaining paragraphs on this and on the following page (411) are devoted not to my results, but to those of Sir William, Dr. Hunt, Mr. Billings and Mr. Richardson, except an admission that the author agrees with me in the very important fact,—indeed all important in relation to the discussion,—namely, that what has been attempted to be done, and is in fact described in the reports, and depicted on the maps, can not be done. Virtually an admission that Lauzon and Sillery have no definite or definable existence apart from Levis, and therefore that I am right, and Sir William and Mr. Richardson are wrong.

On the same page (411) the author says: "Nor is it at all unlikely they *may have* been confounded with the Lauzon and Sillery;" no indication is however given here that this also is one of my results, and that the localities where it has occurred have been pointed out by me. I must also take exception to the statement (pages 410 and 411) as well as to the inferences attempted to be drawn from them, respecting the sandstones and shales, etc., near Metis and Matanne, and to the observations, having a similar import, respecting the series at Point Levis. In these statements the author has omitted two very important facts, namely: that a large and very characteristic graptolitic fauna showing undoubted Levis types is associated with the beds holding the obscure forms named, as Stropolithon, Scolithus, etc., and that the trilobites of primitive type are, as at Point Levis, in the pebbles or *slabs* of the conglomerates. Further I may say that the