

Then the point as to the bad water: as the Bruce map shows, and as old people in Carleton (according to Mr. Hannay) still remember, the low mound of which we speak was cut off from the main shore by a little marsh, through which ran a small creek, which was filled at high tide, making an island of the mound. Under such conditions good water within the fort was an impossibility, and it could be little better than that which flowed outside. This is less probably the case with Portland Point, which is on high ground backed by rocky hills, conditions which should give good water from wells.

So much for the site of Charnisay's fort. But where was La Tour's? In the next passage we are told: "It would have been in my opinion better placed behind the island where vessels anchor, and where it would have been higher, and in consequence not commanded by other neighbouring places, and would have had good water as in that which was built by the said late *Sieur de la Tour*." La Tour's fort, then, stood behind the island where vessels anchor. Is there any ambiguity here? Can it possibly mean anything other than that it stood on the other side of the island (behind it) from Charnisay's, on the shore opposite which vessels anchor? This describes Portland Point to perfection; it describes no other site on the harbour. Vessels cannot lie behind any island out of reach of its guns. It stood on higher ground, Denys said, and not commanded by neighbouring places.<sup>1</sup> Portland Point is much higher than Navy Island and not commanded by it, though it is commanded by Fort Howe Hill. But the conditions of to-day are very different from those of two hundred and more years ago. Then, as we know from records left by the early settlers, the whole present site of the city, and presumably that of the late city of Portland, was covered by a dense growth of trees. Probably through these the small forces of any enemy likely to attack the fort would find it so difficult to drag cannon and mount them that the heights of Fort Howe were considered to be practically useless. There is certainly no hill or height readily accessible from the water which commands the Portland Point site. The case was different with Navy Island, upon which cannon could be landed under shelter and turned against a fort on the Carleton shore. We must admit this discrepancy in Denys' narrative; but in the light of the probability we have mentioned it appears to us to count for very little against the very accurate location implied by his preceding words. It is the only real discrepancy in his narrative. Moreover, there is no other locality about the harbour to which the same objection is not in great measure applicable, and certainly no other to which the full description so well applies.

That there was an old French fort at Portland Point is well known. It stood on what is to-day a grassy knoll, abrupt and commanding, at the south end and east side of Portland street, at the head of Rankine's wharf. Its ruins were found by the New England settlers when they reached the harbour in 1762, and upon its site, one of them, James Simonds, built his house, choosing it because it was already cleared.<sup>2</sup> No other site of an ancient fort is known about the harbour, except the two we have mentioned,

<sup>1</sup> The strategic value of both the Fort Dufferin and the Fort Frederick sites has been pointed out by Mr. Dole and Mr. Hannay. In this respect Portland Point is a most formidable rival to both the former places, and considering the short range of the cannon of the time rather better than either of them.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. M. H. Perley, in his lecture on the "Early History of New Brunswick," printed in *Educational Review*, Vol. IV, No. 9, says: "They [Peabody, Simonds and White] arrived on the 19th of May, 1762 and landed at Portland Point, where there was a small clearing and the traces of an old French fort." Mr. Perley also mentions that skeletons have been found there. Might they be those of the defenders of La Tour's fort, whom Charnisay so