

lest he should avail himself of the information and become a rival in the trade. To these maps were attached the true names, the nick-names being understood, and attached to the false maps.

It may be added that even the French Missionaries were a politico-religious race. They operated under the protection and patronage of the French government, and their researches and discoveries were made for the double purpose of extending their religion, and the power and dominion of the French government, and as the English were protestants, and of a rival government, it was *policy* with them not to *publish* correct maps, names, or accounts of the Aborigines, lest advantage should be taken of them.

The discrepancies in *dates* may have occurred from errors in copying, from bad writing or from policy. Under these circumstances, it is not at all surprising that Shea and others should be misled, and that great confusion and uncertainty should occur in the Indian history of the country. But whatever may have been the reason, the dates given by Shea, from the Jesuits, and those given by Carver and others are often very conflicting and uncertain.

In Shea's account of the Indians of Wisconsin referred to above, he gives the names of twenty-six *tribes*, all within the space usually occupied by *one* band of a tribe, and all in the immediate vicinity of Green Bay, and this for what is *now* the *State* of Wisconsin! He does not name the Sioux who were beyond doubt the *original* owners of the soil, nor the Chippewas who are the next largest occupants, nor the Iowas who were sometimes floating through the country. But he includes the *Oneidas* as among the occupants of the country prior to the British conquest of Canada, which occurred in 1759; while it is known that the *Oneidas* came from the State of New York to this country in 1826, and though he has got the *Oneidas* in his list, he has omitted the *Brothertowns* and *Stockbridges*, who came to the (now) State about the same time.