

afterwards became a nun, the authorization required on account of her having been married, being signed by the Bishop of Meaux, on the tenth of March, 1648; and that she died on the 20th December, 1654. But how does Mr. Kingsford explain Madame Champlain's having become a Catholic if her husband was a Huguenot? Is not Father Ferland's statement of the case far more probable? He tells us that Champlain, who was a sincere Catholic, instructed his wife in the Catholic creed and had the happiness of converting her.

Now, as I said in the beginning, there are throughout Mr. Kingsford's work certain passages that are inexplicable according to his "theory" on Champlain. Some he tries to smooth over; others he leaves untouched. For instance, Mr. Kingsford in preparing his history, meets with a petition signed by Champlain and others, and in which appear the words, "to seek the means of preserving the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion." This petition is found in Frère Sagard's history (the worthy Father, Mr. Kingsford styles him). About it our historian has this to say: "To my mind, if genuine, three words have been intercalated, which were not in the original. They appear in one place only. In place of *la religion Chrestienne*; the words read *la religion Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine*. They change the whole purport of the document. "*La religion Chrestienne*" is named in a subsequent part of the petition. Was this the original expression used in the first sentence? With this phrase we have a sentiment in accord with the temperate character of Champlain, and no such phrase, as that intercalated here, can be traced in any other of his writings." Would the gentleman be astonished to hear that such phrases as the one he objects to, *can* be found elsewhere in Champlain's writings? The edition of 1632 may be set aside, as it was shown to be unreliable in many respects, long before Mr. Kingsford, with learning borrowed from L'Abbé Laverdiere's notes, attacked it. The edition of 1613 is admitted by the former to be "thoroughly authenticated;" but perhaps he has not read the letter to the Queen Regent with which Champlain prefaces it. In that letter he may find: "*la nouvelle France, ou j'ay toujours en desir d'y faire*

*fleurir le Lys avec l'unique religion catholique, apostolique, et romaine.*" The edition of 1619 is also admitted to be "thoroughly authenticated" yet at page 594 (Laverdiere edition) our friend may read, "*notre foy et religion catholique.*"

Nor does the use of the words "la religion catholique, apostolique, et romaine" instead of "religion chrestienne" change the whole purport of the document. The two expressions were synonymous; and in the letters patent, granted by Louis XIII, on the 20th March, 1615, Mr. Kingsford may read "Les feu rois, nos predecesseurs, ayant acquis le titre et qualite de Tres Chretien en procurant l'exaltation de la Sainte Foi Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine etc." Are not the two expressions here synonymous? Champlain frequently says simply 'notre foy,' but our historian while quoting sentences which contain that phrase, disregards its significance. The words "notre foy et religion catholique" above mentioned, may, however, give him the key to its meaning.

In one place Mr. Kingsford quotes the king's letter of May 1620, enjoining Champlain to have the care required for the Catholic religion. Is it possible that the king would entrust to a Huguenot, the care of the Catholic religion?

Mr. Kingsford relates how Champlain sometime after his return to Canada in 1633, built a Catholic Church in Quebec which was called "Notre Dame de la Recouvrance." Now most historians hold that he did this in fulfilment of a vow he had made some time previously. Mr. Kingsford, however, with his usual disregard for the testimony of others, says: "It has been said that this step was taken on account of a vow made by him in France. There is not the slightest ground for this fanciful statement. It was the first church of Quebec, necessary as immigrants were arriving of whom an additional number was looked for. Its construction was a purely official act." Had but one historian attributed the erection of that church to Champlain's desire to fulfil a vow, there might be some ground for calling the assertion a "fanciful statement," but when almost all historians of any note, who have spoken of this act of Champlain, explain it in the same way, we cannot imagine how Mr. Kingsford