

NOTE.

THE manuscript of the annexed narrative was circulated for half a century in Quebec by the late Deputy-Commissary-General Thompson, with a note to the effect that it was transcribed by him "from rough memoranda." From the high position which both he and his father had held in public estimation, for nearly a century, it was generally known as the "Thompson Manuscript." A short time before the removal of the Royal Engineers from Quebec, Mr. C. Walkem, an *employé* of the Department, in assorting the office-papers, discovered a manuscript, and, not being aware of the existence of the "Thompson Narrative," believed that it was an original document. Under this impression he shewed it to me, when I at once pronounced it a nearly *verbatim-et-literalim* copy of Thompson, and produced to him the original, which I left for some time in his possession. Mr. Walkem dissented from my view of the case, and in December last the manuscript found by him appeared in the *Canadian Illustrated News* as an original paper never before published, and being the production of a Major Moncrief, an Engineer of the Expedition. I at once took exception to this, which led to a lengthy correspondence, in the course of which it came out that the manuscript had been published among the Royal Engineer Corps papers in 1848, having been furnished by the late General Lewis, and that the copy found by Mr. Walkem was not, as he had alleged, a copy of the original of Major Moncrief, but had been transcribed by Mr. Pilkington, in 1857, by direction of Colonel Gallwey, from the Engineer Corps papers, for the information of Sir Wm. Eyre. Mr. Tregellas has since laid claim to the authorship for Major McKellar, the Engineer-in-Chief of the Expedition, but admits that they are not in possession of the original manuscript, which they have hitherto failed to discover. In the course of the controversy, among other statements it was alleged that the Moncrief manuscript was written in "the old style of the English of the year 1759, whereas the Thompson journal is written in the modern style." Mr. Charles Walkem has also written: "Strictly speaking, there is nothing clear or well-defined about this document, which was kindly lent me by the President of the Society. I compared both manuscripts carefully at my leisure, and find that the Moncrief manuscript is by no means a literal copy. There are in the Thompson manuscript over twelve hundred (1200!) words additional, omitted, or changed." I underlined in the Thompson manuscript all the passages differing from the Moncrief, and placed it in the hands of the printer, with the request that he would put all the underlined portion into Italics, which he has done. I have counted the words in the "Thompson Journal," and find that as nearly as possible they amount to 11,983. The Moncrief contains somewhat less; but both contain 10,783 exactly alike. The chief difference arises where whole and sometimes long sentences, which are not found in Moncrief, are found in Thompson; but all of them, it will be seen, add to the clearness and