

tured. Therefore the French Canadians could only buy and sell in France. But in the days of Iroquois invasions there was scarcely anything to sell, for the commerce in furs was nearly destroyed, and by all accounts money was not often handled and rarely ever seen. Later in the history of Canada it was the habit of the officials to deal in all sorts of merchandise, making what in modern language is called 'rings' to keep out the legitimate trade. There was then what always happens in such circumstances, favoured individuals became rich, while the country was impoverished. The people existed.

We are getting, however, entirely beyond the limit of Mr. Sulte's labour, which closes at 1665. With men of education, and with all those acquainted with the epoch of which he treats, he will obtain consideration. Literature, however, has so few rewards in Canada that we question if he will gain any substantial recognition of what he has done. He has the satisfaction, however, of knowing that he has added some pages to Canadian literature, which will not pass away, but be quoted with Charlevoix, Le Mercier, and Mère L'Incarnation, for he has revived the past by the original records. We have only one piece of criticism to make. He introduces the numeral '8' (*huit*) to express the W. For example, Isond8-tannen. It seems some of the Jesuit writers took this course, and Messrs. Laverdier & Casgrain printed the text of the Jesuit journal in this form. These Indian languages have passed away, and hence there is little consideration required for any delicacy of sound regarding them. But were it otherwise, and if there be no W in French, we have *ou* or *gu* to represent it. Surely we do not require a new letter to bring out this nice distinction in Indian, when we can do without it in Paris in the type of the dramas of the Theatre Français or the Sermons of Notre Dame. To our mind,

it is too much like the enthusiasm of the *Fonetik Nuz*: we hope never to meet it again. Even the merits of Mr. Sulte fail to reconcile us to this formidable innovation.

There is one more point before we close, on which we wish to speak. We have said that the time has come when Jacques Cartier should take his true place in history—not metaphorically, but actually, to descend from the pedestal where it is proposed to place him,—for there has been some talk of erecting a statue to him. If there be any statue raised to the founder of Canada it should be to Champlain, and we believe that there is not a voice in Canada which would not accord with this honour to the memory of a great man. If we put ourselves right in this respect, there is another minor point which calls for attention. The late Sir George Cartier always insisted that the word Dominion should be translated by *Puissance*. He appears to have got bewildered in this respect, and that he made it a personal matter. Any contradiction with respect to it, he almost regarded as an insult. His personal qualities led many to accept his opinion. But we never heard anyone justify it. Years have fled since poor Sir George passed away, and it is with no desire to wound his memory that we say the time has come when we should cease to appear ridiculous in the eyes of the French *litterateur* and of all French scholars. The proper translation of the word Dominion is to gallicise the word with a masculine noun *Le Dominion*. If this be objected to there is *la Confédération Canadienne*. But are we a Confederation? Has not the word Dominion the greater significance? We put it to any French Canadian man of letters if this view is not correct, to Mr. Sulte himself, to Arthur Buies, Chauveau, Abbé Cosgrain, Hector Fabre, even to Mr. Pagnuelo, or the distinguished Father Braun, or the author of *La Comedie Infernale*. Mr. Baby and Mr. Masson are both