beginning thus: "Such is the language of a recent historian [meaning myself], who further declares belief in any French fort near Prairie du Chien to be 'one of the mock pearls in Wisconsin history.'" Here is raised an entirely new question—an entirely new issue; for every one knows there might have been many such forts built near Prairie du Chien, and not one of them within what are now the limits of Crawford County. No such language is used by me, either in the paper read before the Madison Literary Club or in the History of Crawford County.

Again, on page 57 of this volume of Collections, Dr. Butler says: "Even in the absence of all evidence then, it would appear a bold assertion [one I have never made] that there was never any French military post near the mouth of the Wisconsin, unless 'some official French document can be discovered giving an account of such work, or some traveler mentions it." Here is raised another entirely new question—another entirely new issue; for every one knows there might have been any number of such posts near the mouth of the Wisconsin, and not one of them within the present limits of Crawford County.

If the reader will turn back and read over Prof. Butler's article carefully, he will not fail to find that a very large portion is taken up in arguing these new issues—in answering these new questions; each of which is of his own making—of his own asking.

Dr. Butler proves to his own satisfaction (and certainly to mine): (1) that one Nicholas Perrot, about the year 1685, built a fort on the Mississippi River below the Wisconsin; (2) that it was a French fort—occupied by French soldiers; (3) that it had an advantageous situation as against attacks of an enemy; and (4) that it was named and known as "Fort St. Nicholas." Each and every one of these propositions, I believe to be true. But what have they to do with the question at issue? Surely, if Fort St. Nicholas was below the mouth of the Wisconsin, it was not in what is now the city of Prairie du Chien, nor was it in any part of Crawford County, as now bounded; and its boundaries have not been changed for a number of years. I do not see that, be-