

time and facilities being given, it may be done over wide areas. Again, the iceberg is the child of the glacier, and therefore the agency of the one is indirectly that of the other. Thus, in any view we must plough with both of these geological oxen, and the controversy becomes like that old one of the Neptunists and Plutonists, which has been settled by admitting both water and heat to have been instrumental in the formation of rocks.

In the midst of these controversies a geologist resident in Great Britain or Canada should have some certain doctrine as to the question whether at that period, geologically recent, which we call the Pleistocene period, the land was raised to a great height above the sea, and covered like Greenland with a mantle of perpetual ice, or whether it was, like the strait of Belle-Isle and the banks of Newfoundland, under water, and annually ground over by icebergs, or whether, as now seems more probable, it was in part composed of elevated ridges covered with snow and sending down glaciers, and partly depressed under the level of ice-laden straits and seas.

A great advocate of the glacier theory has said that we cannot properly appreciate his view without exploring thoroughly the present glaciers of Greenland and ascertaining their effects. This I have not had opportunity to do, but I have endeavoured to do the next best thing by passing as rapidly as possible from the icebergs of Belle-Isle to the glaciers of Mont Blanc, and by asking the question whether Canada was in the Pleistocene period like the present Belle-Isle or the present Mont Blanc, or whether it partook of the character of both? and taking advantage of these two most salient points in order to elicit a reply.

Transporting ourselves, then, to the monarch of the Alps, let us suppose we stand upon the Flegere, a spur of the mountains fronting Mont Blanc, and commanding a view of the entire group. From this point the western end of the range presents the rounded summit of Mont Blanc proper, flanked by the