

progress and advancement of Christian faith and religion among the Indians and the establishment of the French colony.*

It was during these destructive wars and endless law-suits that d'Aunay wrote against Latour the series of accusations on which M. Moreau seizes with such avidity. Let us remark the coincidence between the clauses of the condemnation and the accusations of d'Aunay. "After the death of Biencourt, Latour lived in the woods with the Indians, leading a licentious and infamous life, like a brute beast, without any exercise of religion, not even having the care to present for baptism the children born, etc." Again, he imputes to Latour bad treatment of the Capuchin Fathers, and accuses him of having different times attempted "to cause a revolt of the Indians against de Razilly."† Latour is also accused by him of having lived three years, from 1636 to 1639, with the Indians, and of having persuaded them to give trouble.‡

As to the first accusation, Latour, in a letter to the king, dated 1627, giving him an account of his relations with the Indians, says: "I was constrained by reason of the bad treatment (the taking of Port Royal in 1613) we experienced from the English to live and dress like the natives of the country, to hunt and fish in order to gain a living." And again: "The English are commanded and intend to seize this country of New France—to which I am opposed, together with the families and my allies, the natives, and those I generally have with me, my little company of French."

These are the relations of Latour with the Souriquois, which inspired d'Aunay with the odious imputations we have mentioned. But does it become him to speak of the pretended bad treatment inflicted by his enemy on the Capuchins, and at the same time of the attempts at revolt against de Razilly, in conjunction with the Indians?

(To be continued.)

* Second Series, Vol. I., p. 113, *et reg.* † Moreau, p. 133. ‡ Idau, p. 149.