

P.S. in P 18  
the word "not"  
seems to have  
been omitted  
G.M.

M. Gill College.

Montreal.

Feb 20/82

My dear Mr Gilpin,

I am much obliged  
to you for the communication of your  
valuable paper on the N.S.  
Gold fields. I have read the  
first part on the Geology with  
much interest and return it  
herewith.

The only geological statement  
that seems to me incorrect is  
that on p. 4, to the effect that  
the granites of N.S. resemble the  
Laurentian granites of Canada as  
described by Japan. This is altogether  
a mistake, as any one who has  
compared collectors can see at  
a glance. The Laurentian granites

are mostly humbles, and when  
worn over it is black &  
porritic. They are usually lamin-  
ated and their felspar is  
different in many respects from  
that of the Nova Scotia granites.

If you had said that the  
granites & gneisses of Nova  
Scotia resemble those of the  
White Mountains and the  
Eastern Townships of Canada,  
(Mont-alban series<sup>x</sup> of Hunt)  
this would have been correct.

Hind's evidence of deposition,  
as he explained it to me,

x I suspect that this Mont-alban series which  
is newer than Harwich, may really be Lower Cambrian  
but Hunt thinks it older.

has the occurrence of fragments  
of fossils in the granite, which  
in my judgment tells the  
other way.

As to the intrusion (I do  
not say eruption) - p. 5. line 2d -  
character of the granite, I think  
my observations at Sherbrooke,  
Cochrane's Hill and Victoria,  
are conclusive, <sup>& should be so held, if evidence is worth anything</sup> and I think  
all competent observers who  
have been there have arrived  
at the same conclusion. I  
would show you in my col-  
lections specimens of the

junctions at these places  
and at Victoria and  
Memphramong in Eastern Canada  
which would convince any  
one. It is right however  
to state this view, but I  
would not couple it with  
a remark as to a resemblance  
which does not exist, and also  
with words which would seem to  
imply that those who dissent  
from Bond are "superficial" men.

I may add that in a report  
of a discussion of Bond's paper in the *Free*  
*Press* in 1870 I am made to say that  
I agree with his views. This was a  
mistake or an intentional misstatement.  
I tried as politely as I could to correct  
my dissent, and was rather surprised  
when I found I was made to do the contrary.  
Truly yours  
J. W. Dawson

You do not seem to feel at all sure respecting the limit of age, in our direction, of the auriferous veins. I think my establishment of the age of the Nictaux granite as post-diskany - that is of the same age with the very similar granites of Eastern Quebec, &c.; and my observations at Cochrane's Hill and those of Poole, I think at Muskegon, &c. (See his paper) show that the veins cannot be older in their present form than the close of the Upper Silurian, & that they are "approximately of

Sumner age' as I have  
stated it. Of course I attach  
no value to Huxley's  
witness about the Mitau  
region, which <sup>is</sup> utterly at variance  
with the Stratigraphy of  
Prüß, ~~which~~ <sup>as</sup> I have shown in  
a criticism about his paper did  
not deserve, but for its having been  
given prominence by the U.S. Institute

On page 18 of your paper  
the word "not" seems to have  
been omitted.

Excuse me for these remarks  
but I thought it right to mention  
these points more especially as I  
have little opportunity now to  
re-visit old facts rightly viewed  
against some of the new interpretations  
which I can scarcely agree with,  
Yours  
W. Dawson