is of unquestionable historical value; for it gives us a vivid and not an exaggerated picture of the bitter strife of parties which then raged in Canada, and which was destined to tax to the utmost the vast energy and fortitude of La Salle. At times the Memoir is fully sustained by contemporary evidence; but often, again, it rests on its own unsupported authority," page 102. He might have add ed, "And is in direct contradiction to established facts." Elsewhere he says: "The writer himself had never been in America and was ignor nt of its geography, hence blunders on his part might reasonably be expected. His statements, however, are in some measure intelligible," page 20. Mr. Parkman, using it as he does, and misled into treating a map made by Joliet himself, as one made prior to Joliet's voyage (See Harrisse, notes page 197), candidly says: "That he (La Salle) discovered the Ohio may then be regarded as established. That he descended it to the Mississippi he does not pretend; nor is there reason to believe that he did so," page 23). "La Salle discovered the Ohio and in all probability the Illinois also; but that he discovered the Mississippi, has not been proved, nor in the light of the evidence we have, is it likely," page 25.

The estimate of Mr. Parkman, will be found, we think, by his own actual treatment of the document to be far too high. He really treats it as worthless.

In 1669, the French knew of a river called by the Iroquois, Ohio or Beautiful River, rising south of Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, and running westward. "The hope of beaver, but especially that of finding thereby a passage to the Gulf of California (Mer Vermeille), where Mr. de la Salle be-