

which he has used, some words of primary importance which are fatal to his view have been omitted. This misreading of passages in Denys' work, which are in such plain French that it seems utterly impossible that anyone could ever misunderstand them, is the strangest fact in all of our local literature. As a matter of fact, as the reader can see for himself below, Denys, after speaking of what Mr. Hannay must admit to be Partridge Island, goes on to add: "On the same side as the island there are great marshes or flats." These words, "on the same side as the island," are totally omitted from Mr. Hannay's translation as given in his paper, and thus is destroyed the sense of a passage which in its truth and entirety is quite fatal to the theory he seeks to establish. But this matter will come up again in a moment.

(2.) A bare statement of this sort can have very little weight when not backed by reliable evidence of some sort. We have no reason for believing that M. Massé de St. Maurice, writing in 1769, had any reliable information as to the site of Fort La Tour. But, on the other hand, maps of 1755 (presently to be referred to) are known, which place Fort La Tour on the west side, and it was very probably from one of these that he had his information.

(3.) Mr. Hannay's whole reasoning is based, as he himself tells us, upon the supposition that Fort La Tour stood on the Fort Frederick site. Taking this for granted at the start, he proceeds to show that all we know of the subsequent history of both forts is consistent with his assumption, and hence a strong degree of probability is attached to the latter. But aside from the fact that Mr. Hannay by no means succeeds in proving all of his points in the line of the argument, owing to our very scanty knowledge of their subsequent history,¹ there is the additional difficulty that if the assumption to start with be just the reverse, i.e., that Fort La Tour was at Portland Point, everything is just as consistent with the assumption as in the former case.

The entire absence of cartographical evidence is a serious drawback to Mr. Hannay's argument. The only maps he mentions, two in number, he admits to be against his view. In a question of exact geography, the evidence of maps cannot be neglected.

¹ For instance, to take but a single point, Mr. Hannay argues from passages in Church's history of his eastern expedition that Villebon's fort, built in 1696, was on the east side. But this is directly opposed by a statement of Brouillon, who was personally on the ground in 1701. His description of the fort (in "Collection des Manuscrits," Quebec, 1884, Vol. II, p. 390) calls the land "low, wet and unhealthy, which makes both garrison and stores suffer," which applies perfectly to the Old Fort Point site, but not to Portland Point. Then he says: "The water is very bad and very scarce"—almost the identical words of Denys, who applied them to Charnisay's Fort at Carleton (see below p. 67); and then he adds: "The place is very contracted, and all that M. Villebon has been able to do has been to arrange what little earth there is in bastions very little elevated and with a slope very easy to surmount." And again (Murdoch, I, p. 249), he calls it "extremely small, and commanded on one side by an island, at the distance of a pistol shot, and on the other by a height which commanded it entirely, at the distance of only a hundred and odd fathoms, with the disadvantage of having no water to drink without going to seek it beyond the torrent of the River St. John." Brouillon thus clearly indicates that Villebon's Fort was in Carleton, and not on the east side, as Mr. Hannay's chain of reasoning requires.

As this paper is passing through the press, I have received from Paris a copy of a map in the French Archives, entitled "Plan du Fort de la Rivière de St. Jean, par le Sr. de Villieu, 20 Avr 1700." This is Villebon's fort, and shows it surrounded by water on the west, north and east sides, and connected with the land to the south by a marshy neck. This settles finally the situation of Villebon's fort, as Mr. Hannay, who has seen the map, admits. It was in Carleton at "Old Fort." Hence Mr. Hannay's chain of reasoning must fall to the ground.

Just to the south-west on this map is marked a hill, with the inscription, "hauteur d'où le fort peut estre incommode." This is of course the height mentioned by Brouillon, and is the very abrupt hill, higher than "Old Fort," on Water street between Market and Ludlow, in Carleton.