

Nothing could be more satisfactory on this point, and even other evidence is known.¹

II.—THE FORT DUFFERIN SITE.

To this view, Mr. J. W. Lawrence, New Brunswick's venerable historian, and Mr. W. P. Dole, of St. John, have given their adherence. We cannot find that the former has expressed his opinion in print; but the latter has warmly championed the cause in a paper read before the N. B. Historical Society, and published in abstract in the *St. John Daily Sun* of December 5, 1888. The evidence in favour of the view is all expressed in the following summary:—

(1.) Tradition, derived from early settlers, in connection with the fact that fifty years ago traces of old earthworks were there to be seen, and that a well in the vicinity was called the Old French well.

(2.) Denys' description of the harbour, in which, according to Mr. Dole, it is stated that Charnisay's Fort, built after the destruction of Fort La Tour, was farther up the harbour than the latter. As Denys plainly locates Charnisay's Fort, where Fort Frederick afterwards was, Fort La Tour must therefore, according to Mr. Dole, be below, and Fort Dufferin is the natural situation for it.

No documentary, or cartographical or other evidence is offered in support of the view.

That it cannot express the truth appears to be shown by the following facts:—

(1.) Tradition in such a case as this is well nigh worthless. Mr. Dole's tradition does not pretend to go back of the New England immigrants who came to the River in 1762 or 1763. The hundred and seventeen years which had elapsed since Fort La Tour fell had seen many changes about the harbour; forts had been erected and destroyed, and then the rocky shores had been abandoned by inhabitants for many years together. Prior to the coming of the New Englanders, all of the French had been expelled from the lower part of the river. Whence then did the former derive their tradition? Uninterrupted occupation by a single people gives traditions of value, though even then they may err; irregular and intermittent occupation by people of different races can afford no traditions of weight in comparison with documentary evidence. We know nothing of the origin of the earthworks or old well.

(2.) Denys does not say what Mr. Dole attributes to him, but something entirely different, as our readers may judge for themselves from the translation given below, and from the original reproduced in the appendix. That so accomplished a scholar as Mr.

¹ As the letter of Gorges to Gov. Winthrop. (Williamson's "Maine," Vol. I, p. 312, and references here and there in Winthrop's "History of Massachusetts.") It is curious how this view originated. Haliburton does not distinctly state, though he implies it. Perhaps he had it from tradition, and he was followed without question by Gesner, Munro and others. Perley, however, and Rameau are independent investigators upon New Brunswick history and can hardly be supposed to have accepted it without some evidence.

There is yet another argument, quite unanswerable, which I had quite overlooked, and which I owe, with other valuable matter on New Brunswick history, to Mr. J. W. Lawrence, our New Brunswick historian. The first attack on the fort by Charnisay's ships took place in February, and the final attack between the 13th and 16th of April, at both of which seasons the river is frozen to its mouth, and it would have been utterly impossible to reach Jemseg.