

present a *prima facie* apparently clear case and satisfactory as such even to many learned readers; until a closer examination revealed the total fallacy of the whole fabric and mode of exposition.

In the meantime it was headlong asserted in the press by a correspondent, more bombastic in tone than perspicuous in discernment, that "he (Mr. Doughty), is absolutely satisfied that his conclusions are buttressed by truth and cannot be assailed."<sup>1</sup>

Certainly there is much that is plausible in the argumentation of the writer, and though we disagree with his solution on both points adverted to, his paper is singularly interesting to study, and deserved a better result, instead of being now discarded by him and meeting a disastrous failure as to the position of both armies, compared to which the small blunders he found in Hawkins are insignificant.

The connection of this paper with the more complete work which is its legitimate and grown up offspring, is so close and direct that, for the sake of argument and comparison, they must be reviewed together and placed in juxtaposition.

It would be more satisfactory to us not to refer, in any way, to that paper, if we could pass over several material errors we see in it, and specially in the plan A, as mere oversights or inadvertences, had not Mr. Doughty since reaffirmed in a deliberate manner their perfect truth and accuracy, being confirmed, as he alleges, by the further plans he had since received from Europe.

And were it not also that the insertion of the same paper in the transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, was hastily put in before having been examined and discussed by the section; as explained by the Editor, who at first sight judged it "a paper of special value and must assist the student in coming to a correct conclusion." There it remains unchallenged, though admitted now to be erroneous.

We are sorry to say we cannot fully commend the second version and plan, as being also correct, because the same course of reasoning has been partly followed; and they must also come to grief in part, but not to the same extent as the former, which caused us to stagger at first sight.

We shall therefore take issue on the findings of Mr. Doughty on the two above mentioned points; and to avoid all misunderstandings, we shall quote his statements in his own words.

He says in his paper, p. 410; note :

1st. "Towards the close of my paper I mentioned that two important documents relating to the battle were in Europe and that at the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Quebec Morning Chronicle*, April 2, 1900. *North American Notes and Queries*, June, 1900, p. 15, and August, 1900, p. 93.