

the contrary. I share the opinion of Bancroft and other historians who have written on this subject.

For the rest I am convinced that if Nicolet had reached this river in 1639,<sup>1</sup> the sensation would have been as great as it was when Joliette and Marquette discovered it in 1673, and that the memory of it would not have been lost at the latter epoch. I do not hesitate either to believe that the two celebrated travelers would never have been willing to have allowed honors to be attributed to them which were not legitimately due them.

Mr. Ferland is then wrong in blushing for having been anticipated in the tardy homage that should be given Nicolet, to whom there always remains the honor of having contributed largely to the extension of our discoveries; but it is known that for want of a nail the horse was lost, and in the present case the point is capital.

F. X. GARNEAU.<sup>2</sup>

QUEBEC, 18 April, 1854.

---

[From the *Journal de Quebec*, 22d April, 1854.]

SIR—In the little corner that I occupy with my *feuilleton* in your *Journal*, I have often felicitated myself at being sheltered from the political tempests that I hear rage above my head. Thus it is with a certain hesitation that I leave the humble earth-surface to mount for an instant to the highest, and I promise to descend from it as soon as possible.

Your number of the 20th inst. contains some observations by M. Garneau, *à propos* of the encomium rendered to Jean Nicolet by Mr. John Gilmary Shea in his work entitled: *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley*. The disapprobation of M. Garneau seems to relate chiefly to the two following passages: "It is certain that to Nicolet

---

<sup>1</sup> See my *Mélanges* pp. 435, 436, 439. Garneau speaks constantly without taking into account the difference of the times. Between 1634 and 1673 there is a whole world! (*tout un monde*).—B. SULTE.

<sup>2</sup> Garneau wrote a very good history of Canada, but seldom touches any point in detail.—B. SULTE.