

hension being completely refuted by means of a recourse to official documentary evidence. At the siege of Quebec, in 1759, an officer named Montgomery was concerned in certain proceedings held to be, even in time of war, inexcusable, on account of their atrocity. As a consequence, his name and the memory of the man became odious. During a long period of time subsequently, it was generally supposed that Richard Montgomery, who fell, as has been stated already, at the assault of the city on the morning of January 1st, 1776, was that same officer. Nevertheless, that was not the universal conviction. A gentleman, resident in Upper Canada, addressed an application to the War-office in England, in order to ascertain, if possible, what regiments were serving in America in 1759, their stations, and whether a Capt. Richard Montgomery had been one of the officers among those on duty at Quebec. The result was a search among the Archives of the War-office, and, in due time, an official reply to the application that had been sent from Canada. This shewed that there were, in that year, two officers named Montgomery serving with their regiments in America, of whom the one named Richard Montgomery belonged to a regiment *then with General Amherst's forces at Lake Champlain*. The other Montgomery—whether or not a brother of Richard, as some have supposed, is uncertain—was at the same time serving in one of the regiments under Wolfe, at Quebec. It was further stated, in the official reply, the said Richard Montgomery, some years afterwards, while his regiment was still in America, but before the commencement of the revolutionary war in 1775, sold his commission and retired from the service. In short, the Richard Montgomery who thus retired from the British army, and who settled down in America, transferring his allegiance to the United States, and who afterwards perished at Quebec, in 1776, was not the man whose name and memory merited those odious imputations; but under a misapprehension of the real facts, he had been mistaken for another officer whose surname was the same as his. It may be right to mention that a copy of the letter intimating these facts was communicated to the writer by one of the vice-presidents of the Quebec Literary and Historical society, Mr. LeMoine, who had himself been mainly instrumental in thus rescuing the character of an innocent man from the odium so long resting upon his memory.

A complete collection of Canadian Archives would embrace an enormous quantity of records now scattered in localities very distant from each other, and of which many, perhaps the most valuable, are not the property of the dominion. To obtain access to them, it would be necessary to go to the capitals of several of the neighbouring States, especially to Albany, Boston, Philadelphia, and Washington. We should be obliged to go to the British Museum and depositories of Archives at London, and to Paris.

To the methods of dealing with the public records in some of those places, we shall have occasion to refer. As regards the documents themselves, however, their nature and contents, our observations will be confined as much as possible to Archives actually held in Canada and belonging to it. But, in truth, owing to various causes, and amongst