

NOTES TO VOL. LIII

(Figures in parentheses, following number of note, refer to pages of English text.)

1 (p. 27).—The Récollet missionaries (vol. ii., *note* 41, and vol. iv.), it will be remembered, were not allowed by Richelieu to return to Canada in 1632; and it was not until 1669 that they obtained permission to resume their missionary labors there. In that year, they sent several priests for this work; but the vessel which carried these men was shipwrecked, and their project had to be given up. In 1670, however, Talon (vol. xlix., *note* 14) took with him to Canada a party of Récollets, headed by Father Germain Allart. Frontenac's instructions, signed by the king and Colbert, advise the new governor to protect both the Sulpitians at Montreal, and the Récollets at Quebec.—"It being necessary to support these two Ecclesiastical Societies in order to counterbalance the authority the Jesuit fathers might assume to the prejudice of that of his Majesty" (*N. Y. Colon. Docs.*, vol. ix., pp. 88, 95). Rochemonteix thinks (*Jésuites*, t. iii., p. 88) that Talon wished to bring the Récollets to Canada to aid him in opposing Laval and the Jesuits. A memorial to the king, dated 1684 (Margry's *Découvertes des Français*, t. i., pp. 18-33), claims that the people of Canada desired and needed the return of the Récollets "for the freedom of their consciences." Faillon (*Colon. Fran.*, t. iii., pp. 198-201) regards the king's action in sending these priests to Canada as an evidence of his zeal for religion, and his desire for the spiritual good of the colony. He granted the Récollets sent thither a pension of 1,200 livres a year, and forbade them to solicit alms.—Cf. Le Clercq's *Establ. of Faith* (Shea's ed.), vol. ii., pp. 67-72; Parkman's *Old Régime*, pp. 335, 353; Sulte's *Canad.-Fran.*, t. iv., pp. 104-107.

2 (p. 49).—Concerning the Ontouaganna, see vol. xlvii., *note* 9.

3 (p. 237).—For a description of these drums, see vol. xx., *note* 3.

4 (p. 247).—Regarding this chief, see vol. xli., *note* 2.

5 (p. 255).—The myths regarding this divinity, and their interpretation, are noticed in vol. viii., *note* 36; and vol. x., *note* 12.