

from the well known place where he died (the monument); whilst it ought to be only about 100 yards from it, when he was mortally wounded in front of the Louisbourg Grenadiers.

5th. Wolfe's line in consequence is also too much advanced; and in placing it on the slope from the eminence of the gaol towards the town, Mr. Doughty is unfortunately mistaken, for it should be the other slope from thence in the direction of the river, where the Louisbourg Grenadiers and the Otway really stood according to all the plans.

6th. The camp, after the battle, was entrenched between the gaol and Sillery and not between the gaol and the town; all the maps agree on this point.

*The Chronicle*, Quebec, Canada, Saturday, August 4, 1900, (see appendix "A"), furnishes further details pointing out more fully these and other notable errors, which cannot be characterized and passed off "*as minor details*," and though they were openly challenged and controverted in the press by the above article herewith produced as an appendix, they have remained unexplained and the objections raised thereto unanswered.

These material mistakes having been so signalized were, of course, corrected by the second plan, but only in part, as can easily be ascertained by comparing both together.

Now the task devolves upon us of challenging the accuracy of this last plan and of proving that it is also subject to further and important corrections, in order to arrive at the true dispositions of both armies, according to the best authorities on the subject, and moreover by means of the very plans we are furnished with in these volumes.

Considering the marked discrepancies between the two final plans presented to us as the joint work of the above named experts and draftsmen; and considering that the latter is, as it purports to be, a new and peculiar one, that is to say, *an average plan* combined from and compiled by careful measurements of all the numerous and different plans submitted to them, we have fair cause for feeling diffident, and find a double reason, in order to dispel our reasonable doubts, for examining very closely the mode of proceeding of these experts; and we are entitled to revise their finding and to ascertain the accuracy of their work. And we shall do so, even at the risk of being taxed too sharp and severe a critic, because we are dealing in this instance more with these experts than with the historians themselves; and also for the