

Meanwhile great excitement prevailed at the French court in regard to the English operations against St. Saviour's and Port Royal; but as at bottom this affair concerned only private individuals, the first excitement soon subsided. Mr. de Poutrincourt was not sufficiently in favor, to flatter himself that his interests would be warmly espoused, and took no steps. Madame de Guercheville contented herself with sending la Saussaye to London, to ask reparation of the injury done her in violation of the right of nations, and restitution of her property; but she obtained only a part of what she claimed, and had to put up with it.¹ She then saw, when too late, her error in not following the advice of Mr. de Champlain, who throws the blame in part on Father Cotton, without whose advice, the marchioness, it is said, did nothing.² But although Champlain guaranteed the good intentions of Mr. de Monts, would it have been very safe to confide to a Calvinist the direction of a colony, the chief object of which was to preach the gospel to the nations of Canada?

In fact they were all in fault;—some from over distrust; others from eagerness to get back at once more than they advanced; some from want of experience; others from not taking time to study the country. Mr. de Monts wished to derive from his monopoly certain and actual funds to meet the expenses of his colony: and without a monopoly he might have had enough by trade, had he begun by settling in a secure place, where he was within reach of succor from France. Mr. de Poutrincourt having acquired the domain of Port Royal, had no better task than to sow ground enough to secure his people from being in want of necessaries; and had he been in his fort

¹ Biard, p. 61; Champlain, Voyages (ed. 1632), p. 112. See characteristic proceedings of English Privy Council (Jan. 2, 23, 1613), in N. Y. Colonial Documents, iii., pp. 1, 2. Biard mentions that her ship, that was taken to England by Turnel, was restored.

² Champlain, Voyages (ed. 1632), p. 112.

