

"I have already referred to Wm. Smith's oration, in which is the date, December 31, 1775, and which was published at least twice, separately. I have never seen either of the original editions, but it is given in full in Peter Force, IV, pp. 1675-1684. The monument erected in New York, at the rear of St. Paul's Chapel, gives the date of his death as December 31, 1775. The inscription upon it is given in Lorrington's 'Field-Book,' Vol. I, p. 201, and blunders in regard to his age, which it says is '37.' As he was born December 3, 1736, he had just completed his 39th year."

Such are some of the authorities in support of the generally accepted date of the attack on Quebec in December, 1775, by the troops of Congress—the date put forth by the eminent historian, George Bancroft, in his "History of the United States of America," Vol. VII, p. 131.

Let us see the documents on which Dr. W. Kingsford rests his theory in Volume VI, page 33, of his "History of Canada." Quoting Finlay's "Journal," the doctor wrote:

"31st December.—Wind N.E., very stormy and dark. As Captain Malcolm Fraser, of the Emigrants, who that night commanded the main guard," etc.

"Caldwell writes: 'They (the Congress troops) remained until the 31st December. About five o'clock in the morning we were alarmed at our picket by Captain Fraser, who was captain of the main guard,' etc.

"Mr. James Thompson, who, as engineer, carried on the work of increasing the fortifications, and lived to be 98, dying on the 30th August, 1830, describes two assaults on the night of the 31st December, 1775, or rather the morning of the 1st January, as the time when Arnold approached Palace Gate" (p. 113).

"Badeaux (Verrault, p. 182) gives the same date. 'Enfin, ne trouvant aucun moyen pour entrer dans la ville, il forma l'escalade le premier jour de l'année 1776, à quatre heures du matin.'"

"The error," Dr. Kingsford adds, "apparently has arisen from Sanguinet having described the event as taking place '*le trente et un de decembre, 1775, a cinq heures du matin.*' Sanguinet was, however, at the time at Montreal, and whatever the expression may mean, he cannot be accepted as an authority for what took place during the siege."

Let us now sift the foregoing evidence adduced by Dr. Kingsford.

Finlay's testimony seems to us anything but conclusive as favouring Dr. Kingsford's assumption, especially when read in conjunction with the statement of Colonel Cardwell, which immediately follows it, and