

ship, strongly dissuading the Indians from making peace with the English. In Letter XVI. Pichon states that he has a knowledge fatal (*une fatale connaissance*) to the contention, that the French were not to be blamed for Indian outrages, and that this contention, made by De Raymond to the French Government, was accompanied by a private memorandum, of which the following is part:—

"The minister will easily guess that I have made this statement in such a way that it can be shown to the ambassadors of His Britannic Majesty, and that I have taken good care not to insert in it the barbarous acts of the savages."

The same Pichon, whose mother's name was Tyrrell, was the author of the "Tyrrell Papers," a manuscript volume among the Nova Scotia archives, extracts from which have been printed by Mr. T. B. Akins in his valuable "Selections from the Public Documents of Nova Scotia." As reported in this publication (p. 230), M. Duquesne, Governor-General of New France, wrote on the 15th of October, 1754, to M. Le Loutre: "Your policy of threatening the English by your savages is an excellent one. They will fear them still more when they do strike. The present position of this colony demands that I should cause the negotiations of the English with the savages to be broken up," etc.

Of all the means employed by the French to attach the Indians to their side, says Pichon in the seventh of his Letters, "religion is beyond a doubt the most effective," and "the form of worship which best suits the savages is that of the Roman communion." De Raymond seems to have shared, if he did not inspire, these opinions of his secretary. "Consult your patriarch, who has the feelings (*entrailles*) of a father for you," he said to the Indians in his speech dissuading them from peace, in which address he alludes to the French monarch as having "above him only the true God of whom he has given you a knowledge for the salvation of your souls." On the same occasion, *after* detailing the real or imaginary atrocities of the English, he observed (with a Tartuffian expression of holiness, one may suppose, and perhaps with an invisible smile):—"I do not recall so many atrocious acts, my children, to excite you to a cruel and barbarous war. A true Christian is incapable of inciting you so (*d' une pareille instigation*)."

In the manuscript recommissioning the Indian sachem, Sequidoualouet, "his zeal and affection for the *religion* and for the service of the king," it is to be observed, are the only qualifications recited.

Notwithstanding that his book seems marked by philosophic frankness, notwithstanding that it adopts a Ciceronian motto to the effect that a historian's first duty is not to dare to narrate falsehoods, and his second duty not to dare to suppress truths, notwithstanding that an English translation of the work (London, 1760), has in the title page the added words, "By an Impartial Frenchman," yet Pichon is known to have furnished secret information to the English in Nova Scotia for some years; and, as a traitor, his testimony should of course be accepted with great diffidence and reserve. But his treachery seems only to have begun in 1753, when he had ceased to serve De Raymond, who had brought him out from France as his secretary; and his interesting account of the Indian policy of his countrymen in Nova Scotia is certainly corroborated by the finding of the manuscripts now under our consideration.

There is some reason for suspecting that one object of the governors of Cape Breton in thus formally commissioning an Indian chief was to secure for the savage the furtive aid of the "neutral" Acadians. On the 16th of May, 1753, the peace still nominally existing between France and England, and the Micmacs having lately concluded a treaty with the latter power, Anthony Casteel deposed ("Selections from the Public Documents of Nova Scotia," p. 696) that he and six shipmates and their sloop were treacherously captured not far from Halifax by "Major" Cope, a Micmac chief. After killing and scalping Casteel's comrades, the savages came to a Frenchman's house, where "they demanded provisions, which the Frenchman would have excused himself from giving, *demanding their orders*, on which the Indians produced a paper signed 'Delausett' (a French officer commanding at Fort Gasparo), which he was desired to read." This paper commanded the French inhabitants, as nearly as the deponent could remember the words, "wherever this detachment passes to furnish them with ammunition and provisions and any other necessaries, they being upon the King's duty." After reading this the Frenchman gave the Indians powder and provisions, receiving therefor a certificate, which the deponent was required to draft.

The wording of Sequidoualouet's commission, without constituting a decided breach of the peace, was admirably calculated to make ignorant Micmacs and "neutrals" suppose that war existed, virtually if not officially, between the rival powers. It forms another illustration of the unscrupulous policy of the French in Acadia, another proof that they never meant

to keep the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, and another argument for the expediency of expatriating the Acadians—for the wisdom of the plan, but not for the mode of its execution.

F. BLAKE CROFTON.

THE SCHOOL READERS.

THE School Readers question, since the advent of the new Minister of Education, has assumed another and a perplexing aspect. The Hon. Mr. Ross, if we may trust the quasi-official editorial in the *Globe* of Thursday last, has evidently no idea of being hampered by the legacies of his office. He must find it embarrassing, however, to act with independence if he is forced to have regard to the responsibilities of his colleagues for their share in producing the muddle into which educational matters—particularly concerning the authorization of the School Readers—have of late fallen. Against just such folly as the new Minister would seem to be conscious of were the Education Office and the Provincial Administration again and again warned by writers in one at least of the Educational journals, as well as by non-political friends in the teaching profession, and by the zealots of a competent and pure administration of the Education Department. The most urgent appeals were repeatedly made to the Government and to the acting-Minister of Education on behalf of a *single set* of readers for the schools of the Province; but though the counsellings of manifest wisdom, these appeals were disregarded, and the Executive made itself responsible for the hasty and impolitic authorization of two series of rival Readers and the rejection of a third—the latter of which, all things considered, being the one most worthy of authorization, and the set of Readers that fully three-fourths of the teachers of the Province are now insisting shall be the *one* series authorized for exclusive use in the schools. It is little to the credit of the Central Committee that the series which was rejected or rather jockeyed out of consideration, when the three sets were submitted for its report to guide the Government in its decision, is now seen to be the one almost universally called for by the teaching profession of the Province, as the Reading Books best adapted both for literature and for teaching purposes, of the several series offered to the Department. It is the authorization of this series, which the Government cannot now ignore or longer shut out from competition, that the new Minister finds himself necessitated to deal with. Unfortunately, as the public are aware, two series have already been authorized, and the din of their assaults on the school-doors of the Province has for months back been a scandal and disgrace. To let loose the forces of a third publishing-house, in the rude rivalry for place in the schools, the Minister no doubt feels would be little short of a public calamity. The injury to Education and the demoralization of the profession which have followed the sanctioning of the two sets of Readers, would be intensified by the authorization of a third, however just and politic the act would be in itself. To meet the difficulty, the Minister would seem to wish to undo the acts of his colleagues, to be disposed to withdraw the authorizations that have been already given, and to submit the whole matter anew for consideration. The impelling motive, according to the *Globe*, is the desire to have but *one* series of Readers, the choice of the three submitted, or a composite one, formed of the best volumes of the various competing issues—as may be found practicable in the Minister's negotiations with the publishers. To be free to take this line, the Minister of Education must first, however, arrange a delicate bit of business. To withdraw the authorizations that have been granted, in view of the expenditure on the manufacture of the books and the outlay incurred in securing their introduction into the schools, cannot be legally or morally set about without compensating the publishers interested. To ask the Legislature for an appropriation for any such purpose would obviously be fatal just now to the Government, which has sins enough to answer for in connection with many years mal-administration of education, and which, moreover, is primarily responsible for the scandal arising out of the advertising and canvassing operations of the rival publishing firms. If the appropriation cannot be asked for, what must be done? An apparent solution of the problem is hinted at in an anticipated compromise with the publishing-houses, which would enable the Education Department to select a series of Reading Books from the three separate ones in the market, and in return the Department would secure to each surrendering firm of publishers the benefits arising from the exclusive manufacture of the volume or volumes selected to form part of the finally authorized series. The obstacles in the way of effecting this arrangement, not to speak of the doubtful results of accepting and placing in the schools a patch-work series of Readers, are many, and we fear, insurmountable. The wholesale expenditures and portentous rivalries of the publishing-houses interested are not likely to be appeased with a sop; nor will public interest and public morals be protected by allowing