

ness of the Records in the *Registres Civils* is known. It is a portion of French national life for the name of every Roman Catholic child to be inscribed in their pages. Champlain's name does not appear. The inference is plain that he was baptized a Huguenot." By the way is this argument logical? If Champlain's name does not appear in the parish register is there but one conclusion to be drawn, viz that he was baptized a Huguenot? Are we not equally at liberty to infer that he was not baptized at all? But apart from this we would like to know whence Mr. Kingsford derived such information. Where is the register from which Champlain's name is missing? Would our historian be surprised to learn that no register has been found of the parish of Brouage where Champlain was born, of a date earlier than 1590, or about twenty years after the latter's birth? Has he ever read Delayant's 'Notice sur Samuel Champlain.'

Further on in the same history we find the words: "Champlain is careful to tell us that he was engaged for some years in the army of Henry IV. under Marshal d'Aumont and other leaders of that side D'Aumont was a Huguenot and played a distinguished part in the battle of Ivry fought in 1590." Mr. Kingsford apparently would have us infer that Champlain was a Protestant because he served in the army of Henry IV. If so, how does he explain Champlain's remaining in the same service after Henry had made a public abjuration of Protestantism? Could he blame us if we should set up the latter circumstance as a proof that Champlain was not a Protestant? But in regard to that battle of Ivry, perhaps Mr. Kingsford does not know that it was not won by Huguenots alone. Were there not Catholics and Protestants on both sides in that encounter; owing to the fact that there was at stake, not merely a question of religion, but also one of succession?

The next statement to be remarked is relative to Champlain's marriage. It is generally believed that Helene Boullé was a Huguenot before her marriage with Champlain. When the contract was made she was but twelve years of age, and on account of her youth was to wait two years longer before marrying. But the writer in question adds, "No record of

his marriage has been found in the *Registres Civils*." The *Registres Civils* apparently have great force with Mr. Kingsford. We have shown that his argument derived from this quarter with regard to Champlain's baptism is not tenable. Here again his argument is weak. If Mr. Kingsford will take the trouble to look up marriage records of Champlain's time, he will find that in most cases the marriage contract was preserved in place of any formal registration of the names of the married couple, as is now customary. So that as we have Champlain's marriage contract, it is reasonable to infer that his case was that of the majority. But once for all let us inform Mr. Kingsford that even did the *Registres Civils* exist at the time of Champlain's birth, and were it the custom to record marriages in the same, his argument would still be weak, for we find to-day as well as centuries back, a goodly number of Catholics, of whose baptism or marriage there is no record.

Continuing, the historian says: "Those were not the days of civil marriages. Champlain was himself a man of severe piety and must have felt that the religious ceremony, according to his faith, was a necessity; so that when the marriage took place, a Protestant minister must have officiated." These sentences, we hardly think, were meant as an argument to prove Champlain's Protestantism, for the words, "according to his faith," suppose that he was already a Protestant. If, however, they were designed as such an argument, their author falls into that most dangerous of fallacies—the *circulus vitiosus*. But if on the other hand Mr. Kingsford is satisfied of his having already proved his point, we refer him to the contract, since he has mentioned it. Let him read that document and give us his explanation of some words contained therein. How does he explain the expression, "*si Dieu et notre mere l'Eglise s'y accordent*." What did Champlain mean by "our mother the Church?" It remains a fact at any rate that this is a very common Catholic phrase.

We have said that Madame Champlain was a Huguenot before her marriage. But what of her afterwards? Mr. Kingsford averts a serious difficulty, when, later on in his work he declares that she is lost to history after her return to France in 1624. He might have added that she