

niliating commerce. Another point of still greater importance was a new subject of discord between the governor-general and the bishop. We have seen the disorders caused among the Christian Indians by the liquor trade; it had within a few years revived,¹ and was producing the same effects that had already cost so many tears to all who took an interest in the salvation of those tribes.

1675.

The liquor trade in Canada revived.

The bishop, the clergy, and the missionaries complained of it; but others had found the secret of persuading the king's council that this trade was absolutely necessary to bind the natives of the country to us; that the abuses of which the ecclesiastics made such loud complaints, were, if not altogether imaginary, at least greatly exaggerated, and that their zeal on this score served for little more than a pretext to persecute those who prevented them from domineering in the country and to induce their recall.

The court prepossessed in favor of this trade.

So far indeed did this prepossession go, that Mr. du Chesneau, having written to Mr. Colbert in very strong language in support of the opinion of the bishop, who had made the liquor trade a reserved case, that minister replied, that in this matter he did not act as an intendant should, and that he ought to know that before prohibiting the settlers from conducting a traffic of that description, it was necessary to be well assured of the reality of the crimes which they pretended that it produced; but the penetration of Colbert did not leave him long in error on this point, and the king's piety did not permit him to remain in indecision on a subject which so many persons, whose virtue and intelligence his majesty could not but esteem, unceasingly continued to bring to the foot of his throne as the most detrimental thing to religion in New France.

¹ Talon on leaving Canada had repealed the acts prohibiting the liquor trade: Faillon, *Histoire de la Colonie Française*, iii., p. 439. The council

followed by a general permission, November 10, 1668, August 4, 1674, and Frontenac by ordinance, February 12, 1674.