

1634. had been supposed at first, but had been murdered by his Huron guides for his effects, and that they had thrown his body into the river to conceal their crime.¹ The Indians themselves said openly, that to prevent such crimes, which in their results would be fatal alike to them and the French, they should not be left unpunished.

Cause of this refusal. But these Indians, after having thus spoken in public with all the equity to be expected from the most reasonable men in the world, quite often change their tone when it comes to execute the judgment dictated by themselves, and you must not always expect them to cover with a plausible pretext their inconsistent conduct. The Hurons on this occasion did, however. The day of their departure being fixed upon, one of their chiefs declared bluntly that he could not take any missionary or even any Frenchman in his canoes, unless the governor first set at liberty the Algonquin who was in irons. He was told that he had himself judged him deserving of death. "I agree," he replied, "that it is right to punish an assassin; but the relatives, friends, all the youth of this man's village, have demanded him back from us, and they await us at the passage, in the hope that we will restore him to their hands. If their expectation is defeated and they perceive any Frenchmen among us, they will without fail fall upon us, and we cannot withdraw them from the fury of the tribe without being involved in a combat which will turn our allies into enemies. We cannot even answer for the result; and what grief we shall feel if we see those confided to our care slaughtered before our eyes and in our very arms!"²

Defects and virtues of the Hurons. The French tried in vain to banish the real or pretended fears of this man: they effected nothing. In vain even other chiefs said that they assumed the whole affair: he had adopted his course, and he declared that he would allow no Frenchman to embark. The governor no longer doubted but that he acted in concert with the Algonquins,

¹ Le Jeune, Relation (1634), p. 92.

² Ib. (1633), p. 40.