

1613. defend the ship, which was at anchor; but neither of them had cannon, while Argall had fourteen. The latter first attacked the intrenchment; and after cannonading it for some time at long range, closed in and poured upon it a volley of musketry, which killed several,—among the rest, Gilbert du Thet, a Jesuit lay-brother, whose valor, real or pretended, excites the spleen of John de Laet.<sup>1</sup>

Villany of  
the English  
captain.

La Saussaye, seeing that a longer resistance would not save his fort, and would entail the loss of the rest of his men, surrendered. La Motte le Vilin was soon compelled to follow his example; but his pilot, Lamets,<sup>2</sup> not deeming it prudent to trust to the English, escaped to the woods, with three others. Argall's first act, on taking possession, was to cut down the cross which the missionaries had erected in the settlement, in order to assemble the faithful at the hours of public prayer until such time as a chapel was erected. He then searched la Saussaye's chests, and finding his commission, took it, unperceived.

The next day, la Saussaye having gone to visit him, Argall demanded his commission. He said that it was in his chest; but on opening it to find the document, was surprised to find it gone. Then Argall, putting on a serious face, called him a pirate, saying that he deserved death, and at once gave up the settlement and ship to pillage.<sup>3</sup> This done, he seemed to relax, at the solicitation of the Jesuits, whom he at first treated very decently. He even offered the French a bark, or a kind of sloop with a

<sup>1</sup> Biard (*Relation de la Nouvelle France*, p. 47) says that du Thet fired a cannon. They had therefore one, at least. Biard says, too, that du Thet was neither "peureux ny couard." See De Laet, *Novus Orbis*, pp. 59, 60. Biard's letter of May 26, 1614 (*Carayon, Documents*, xii., p. 106), mentions Gilbert du Thet's

death, but gives no details of attack. Champlain, *Voyages* (ed. 1632), p. 106. Parkman erroneously supposes du Thet a priest. He was merely a lay brother.

<sup>2</sup> Biard calls him le Bailleux (p. 49).

<sup>3</sup> Biard, *Relation*, p. 48; Champlain, *Voyages* (ed. 1632), p. 106.