

stood him in good stead, for it extorted their instinctive respect. They were his children, and, in their eyes, he was the greatest of all the 'Onontios.' 'There was a sympathetic relation between him and them. He conformed to their ways, borrowed their rhetoric, flattered them on occasion with tenderness, or berated them roundly when they had offended him. 'They admired the proud and fiery soldier who played with their children and gave beads and trinkets to their wives; who read their secret thoughts and never feared them, but smiled on them when their hearts were true, or frowned and threatened them when they did amiss' (p. 70). And see a curious account of Frontenac unbending so far as to brandish a hatchet in the air, sing the war-song, and lead the war dance (p. 254). Moreover, notwithstanding his violent temper, 'there were intervals when he displayed a surprising moderation and patience. By fits he could be magnanimous' (p. 71). Here, as elsewhere, it appears to us that Mr. Parkman unwittingly does an injustice to Frontenac. He was naturally disposed to be good-tempered and conciliatory; and so long as he was not thwarted by clerical or mercantile 'rings,' he never failed to show the better side of his proud nature. There was much to sour even a less arbitrary and self-asserting disposition than his. It might be added that he was a man of fallen fortunes, and expected to repair them in Canada. In St. Simon's Memoirs we read: 'He was a man of excellent parts, living much in society, and completely ruined. He found it hard to bear the imperious temper of his wife; and he was given the government of Canada to deliver him from her, and afford him some means of living.' To sum up in our author's words:—'Frontenac has been called a mere soldier. He was an excellent soldier and more besides. He was a man of vigorous and cultivated mind, penetrating observation, and ample travel and experience. His zeal for the colony, however, was often counteracted by the violence of his prejudices, and by two other influences. First, he was a ruined man, who meant to mend his fortunes; and his wish that Canada should prosper was joined with a determination to reap a goodly part of her prosperity for himself. Again, he could not endure a rival; opposition inaddened him, and, when crossed or thwarted, he forgot everything but his passion. Signs of storm quickly showed themselves between him and the Intendant Talon; but the danger was averted by the departure of that official for France' (p. 21).

Frontenac's first term, so far as its incidents are recorded in history, was a series of quarrels between the Governor on the one side and the Bishop, the Jesuits, and some of the traders, on the other. The quarrel with the Church was of old standing. Some time be-

fore Laval's arrival, the State and the Jesuits had been at dagger's point. Three successive Governors, predecessors of Frontenac, namely, Argenson, D'Avangour, and Mézy, as well as Dumesnil, who was not only Intendant, but also chief agent of the Company of 'One Hundred Associates,'—were all successively involved in conflicts with the Bishop (See Parkman's *French Régime*, ch. v.-ix, inclusive). The Bishop of *Petræa in partibus* was in fact a thorough Ultramontane, as well as an unflinching soldier of the Church militant. He was determined to have no Gallicanism in New France, and all his schemes had but one purpose—the thorough subordination of the State to the Church. When Frontenac arrived, these two inflexible spirits, as a matter of course, came into conflict. The causes, and even the agents, in these quarrels, were exceedingly various to all appearance; but at bottom, the hostility of the Church was the sole cause of all. As our author remarks, 'The key to nearly all these disputes lies in the relations between Frontenac and the Church. The fundamental quarrel was generally covered by superficial issues, and it was rarely that the Governor fell out with anybody who was not in league with the Bishop and the Jesuits' (p. 68). Now this is true, so far as it goes; but it appears to us extremely unjust to Frontenac. Had he been the first Viceroy who had complained of the overbearing attitude of Laval or the evil machinations of the Jesuits and their mercantile protégés, the case would assume a different aspect. But it was far otherwise. As Mr. Parkman himself remarks elsewhere (*French Régime*, p. 107), 'Argenson was Governor when the crozier and the sword began to clash, which is merely another way of saying that he was Governor when Laval arrived.' Hitherto the Jesuits had been busy enough as *intriguants*, but they wanted an astute, bold, and determined leader, and they found one in the new Bishop, whose life was spent in ceaseless efforts to overshadow the State with the ghostly power of the Church. Frontenac, in resisting assumption and intrigue, was merely obeying the orders and instructions repeated a hundred times to divers Governors and Intendants, by Louis himself, and by Colbert. The standing direction to the Colonial rulers was to show all due respect to the Bishop and Clergy, but not to permit them to make the slightest encroachment upon the civil domain; and when Frontenac resisted the Bishop and the Jesuits, and allied himself with the Récollets, a Franciscan fraternity, he was only following his instructions. Duchesneau and Champigny were mere creatures of the clergy, and aided them in thwarting the Governor by every means in their power, and those means were ample. Moreover, Frontenac had been expressly ordered to stop the wild courses of the *coureurs*