

1605. possess of what passed before his eyes, and for a history of French Florida. We there behold an exact and judicious writer, a man with views of his own, and who would have been as capable of founding a colony as of writing its history.¹

Mr. de
Monts' er-
rors and
misfor-
tunes.

While Port Royal gave such flattering hopes, the enemies of Mr. de Monts completed his ruin in France. They succeeded, at last, in having his commission revoked;² and he was unable to obtain any recompense for the advances which he had made, except a sum of six thousand livres, to be raised from the vessels which might embark in the fur-trade. Much stress was laid on this grant, which at bottom amounted to nothing, as the cost of levying this impost would have exceeded the return.³ The thing was, moreover—from the very nature of the trade, the spots where it was carried on, and the slight recourse he could expect to have against his debtors—entirely impracticable. On the whole, this gentleman had committed nearly the same faults as his predecessors. At an outlay of four or five thousand livres, he might (observes Mr. de Champlain) have selected an advantageous post, to lay the foundations of the colony; and nothing subsequent would have prevented its maintenance and increase, without any necessity of a recourse to an unpopular privilege, which he could not long expect to enjoy.⁴

Camceaux seems to be the spot where he should have stopped. It is the head of Acadia, and the best place to receive supplies from France at all seasons. Camceaux is

¹ Lescarbot, *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, p. 545. Mr. Faillon (*Histoire de la Colonie Française*, p. 104, n.) not inaptly observes that Charlevoix did not know the later editions of Lescarbot, or he would certainly have been less eulogistic. For the affairs of the winter, see also Champlain, *Voyages* (1613, ed. Laverdière), p. 115, etc.

² He then ordered Poutrincourt back to France; and that gentleman, with Champlain, left Port Royal, Aug. 11, 1607. Champlain, *Voyages*, p. 154; Laverdière's ed., p. 126; Lescarbot, lib. 4, ch. 18.

³ Champlain (ed. 1632), p. 46.

⁴ It is a matter of regret that there are no papers of de Monts to throw light on his labors.