

1641-2. them.¹ They promised to do all that depended on them, but apparently failed to bring together the remnants of this dispersed nation,² which may perhaps be the Iroquets mentioned in my journal.³

¹ Relation de la Nouvelle France, 1642, p. 38.

² Creuxius (*Historia Canadensis*, p. 374) speaks of traces of the ancient town as still remaining in his time, and the Algonquins called it Minitik *sten entag8giban*—“island where there was a town (Relation, 1642, p. 36).

³ Journal, pp. 110, 111. They were undoubtedly the Iroquet. See Relation, 1640, p. 34. Charlevoix supposes them to have been Hurons; but they were Algonquins, and were called by the Hurons *Onontchataronons*: Relation, 1633, p. 29; 1643, p. 61. It is not necessary to suppose them the inhabitants of Hochelaga. A Huron town generally had Algonquins camping near, and the account of the origin of the war between the Iroquois and Algonquins shows this to have been the case in early

times. The statement, however, here given clashes with that of Perrault (*Mœurs, Coutumes, etc., des Sauvages*, pp. 9, 165), followed by de la Potherie (*Histoire de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, i., p. 288); unless we are to suppose Hurons in early times to have expelled the Iroquet, and that then the Iroquois and Algonquins settled there till their war came off, when Hochelaga was destroyed, and the Iroquois fell back to New York and the Algonquins to the Ottawa. It is more likely, however, that in this incidental mention of an Indian's remarks, the words Huron and Iroquois have been transposed. If the chief said his ancestors were driven out by the Iroquois, and that some took refuge with the Hurons, the account will agree with all others that have been handed down. See Journal, p. 109.