

found no striæ, because the rock has deteriorated and the glacial surface destroyed." If glacial marks could be destroyed in this way on the summit of a mountain 2,400 feet high is it likely they would be preserved on one 2,850 feet high, the rocks being practically the same in both?

*The Canadian Record of Science* for 1900-92,\* also contains a criticism of my work on Mount Orford by Prof. J. A. Dresser, of Richmond, P. Q., in a short paper entitled *Note on the Glaciation of Mount Orford*. In this note, after quoting my statement about the mountain having been glaciated only to a height of 1,800 feet, he says: "From these conclusions it is evident that the observations on which they were based did not include that dome-shaped part of the summit of the mountain which is apparently its highest point." ..... "Here, near the point where a flag-staff has stood for the past few years, a fine-grained and much altered diabase is distinctly striated, and the whole eminence has a generally—smoothed and rounded appearance." Though Prof. Dresser writes so confidently he is not a glacialist, and in his desire to support his friend Prof. Hitchcock, has evidently fallen into the error of supposing that the weathered grooves and ruts in the dome-shaped part of the mountain summit, described by me, are glacial striæ. As regards this, however, he can console himself with the thought that he is not alone in making this mistake, for Prof. Hitchcock, if he ever were there at all, has fallen into the same error. In another paragraph Prof. Dresser says:—"Reasoning from this limit of the height reached by the ice-sheet, viz., 1,800 feet, Mr. Chalmers shows that if it passed over the range of hills along the United States boundary line, some 2,000 feet in height, as was probably the case, that those hills must have stood relatively lower than at present. This hypothesis is then applied to the explanation of certain high-level terraces near the international boundary line, and the deformation of gravel beds around Lake Memphremagog and along the Coaticook and Salmon rivers. But in view of the evidence of ice-action at a much greater altitude than 1,800 feet, the hypothesis may no longer be needed," etc.

This gratuitous comment shows Prof. Dresser to be quite

---

\**Can. Record of Science*, Vol. VIII, 1900-92, pp. 223-25.