

could make them all out as indulging in a play of fancy. After all, we know the facts of history only through the authority of others. And does Mr. Kingsford imagine that we are to set aside as a "fanciful statement" what others have said on this matter, simply because he tells us to do so? Official or not, this act of Champlain in building a Catholic Church speaks poorly for his Huguenotic convictions. But Mr. Kingsford praises l'Abbé Laverdière's "honesty, fidelity, and ability." Let him read this author more carefully and he will find in him words confirmatory of the opinion that Champlain's action was the fulfilment of a vow. Let him read Ferland's history, a work commended as an authority on the early history of Canada. There too he will find a corroboration of that opinion. I transcribe Ferland's words which are almost exactly those of Laverdière: "[D]ans le temps que Champlain était forcément retenu en France par suite de l'expédition des Kertk, il avait promis que, s'il rentrait à Québec, il érigerait une chapelle sous le vocable de *Notre Dame de Recouvrance*; il accomplit son vœu, l'année même de son retour."

Frequent mention is made of Champlain attending mass and religious services with the Recollets. Mr. Kingsford saw the difficulty and tried to explain it away in a quiet manner. Once he says: "He (Champlain) attended the religious services of the Recollets, *the only religious services he could attend.*" But when the Recollet Frère Sagard (always called Père by Mr. Kingsford) arrived at Quebec the historian says: "He at once entered the chapel *as his feelings suggested.*" Why assign such different motives to the two

men for entering the Catholic places of worship? Elsewhere Mr. Kingsford records that Champlain took Father Lalemant as the director of his conscience; that Father Le Jeune preached his funeral sermon; and that six years afterwards Father Raymbault was buried beside him. Strange facts these, if Champlain were a Protestant.

Many other instances might be adduced of assertions made by Mr. Kingsford in his history, which do not quite chime in with the idea that the founder of Quebec was a Huguenot. But sufficient have been pointed out for our purpose. Before closing however, let us hear what Mr. Windsor, a Protestant and librarian in Harvard, has to say on the matter under discussion: "Whatever," he says, "the religion which rocked his cradle, Champlain as an historical character, undubitably stands as the champion of the Roman Church."

And now we leave it to the good judgment of our readers to decide the question, to what religion did Champlain belong? Mr. Kingsford, we imagine, has not done much to establish the great Frenchman's Protestantism. We cannot understand how to any intelligent reader he should seem to do so, for, we take it, most people will admit with us that his arguments are rather ingenious than convincing. The attempt of Canada's latest historian may prompt others to pursue a similar course; but in the end truth will prevail and men, looking through the spectacles of impartiality, will believe the earliest and more universal testimony, and wonder how anyone could have been led astray by the caprice of sectarian selfishness.

J. J. QUILTY '97.

