CHAMPLAIN'S TOMB.

By DR. J. M. HARPER, M.A., F.E.I.S.

In face of that political unrest which is ever and anon bringing into undue prominence the seeming heterogeneity of the confederated provinces of Canada, there are happily to be found in the current history of the Confederation several unmistakeable evidences of a developing national spirit. A nation has generally taken longer to mature than twenty years ; and if, since 1867, all the predictions of those who advocated Confederation have not been realized, there is at least a spirit abroad among the people which turns from the idea of dismemberment as from a disloyalty. If as yet no nation, Canada is at least finding her destiny in a united people from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The country, forsooth, is no longer at its beginning. Its present is assuming stereoscopic proportions on the background of its past, and the contemplation of the blending outlines of the picture is no longer valued by Canadians as a waste of time. Indeed at the present moment, more than at any other perhaps, the history of Canada is of living interest to the Canadian citizen. The illustrious dead and the unselfish activities of their lives are being illumined by the sunshine of Canada's present progressiveness ; and every day we hear of communities vieing with one another in their enthusiastic efforts to do honour to the memory of those who saw the country at its origin and had the courage to labour in its behalf. Thinking no evil of the past and of its slower movements, such communities have not failed

to recognise in the personality of the pioneers who opened up the country and established its towns and their institutions, the foundation back-ground of a common nationality that continues to mature as the years go by.

Perhaps nowhere in the Dominion has this *esprit d'histoire* been more fully developed than in the old town of Quebec. As the oldest city in the country, there is to be found in its history, the material on which such a spirit can most readily nourish itself. In the record of its quaint experiences, there is to the student of history the interest which ever attaches itself to the narrations of that self-conscious compendium of tradition, the oldest inhabitant; and when men turn back to the period when Champlain erected his *Abitation* on the beach at the foot of Cape Diamond, and sought to lay the foundation lines of empire on this side of the Atlantic, there is no tradition of these far away times which they would not have narrated for them, no memorial of energy undismayed, of hopes realized or blasted, of ambition, envy, or united action, which they do not wish to secure as a keepsake worthy of reverence. And what a spirit of romance seizes the historian as he contemplates the new life which men began to live on the St. Lawrence in the seventeenth century! How zealously he gathers up in the hollow of his hand for examination all the petty social and political movements in the little community which for long held in its fevered grasp the destiny of New France! How eagerly he traces the seeds of civilization falling by the wayside of barbarism that were not all to be devoured or trampled under foot by the mutinous spirit born of ignorance, or by the tyranny born of isolation in an unexplored continent! The rivalries of religion are there, that will not be hushed even in face of the necessity for united prayer and enterprise. The overweening greed of monopoly is there, throwing its suicidal talons round the neck of the poor little timorous commonwealth.

The trials of climate and pitiful starvation are there, hovering in the fogs that overhang the river, and in the mysteries of the enclosing forest, while the idleness of despair is to be seen lounging about with haggard face and an evil eye. In a word, famine, pestilence, treason and war seem to have been in league against the place and against the providence that alone had faith in its future. For there *was* a living providence, restlessly working for the good of the place amid all its trouble and insecurity. In face of the treachery of his followers and even of his patrons, never overwhelmed by the dismal experiences of his new life, there was to be seen a hero, in whom providence was working out its plans, walking around in the thickest of the dangers, drawing towards him and circling around him the affection and admiration of those who knew how to put faith in his courage and foresight. Such a hero was Samuel de Champlain in the early days of Quebec. To us of the present time he is a veritable knight errant, one without fear and without reproach. Fixed in his determination to succeed, steadfast in his religious faith, and conscious of the power within him to develop—

> A destiny beyond the seas where realm
> Was wilderness, a kingdom unsubdued,

he possessed that true nobility of character which ever smiles at difficulties. In face of the self-seeking that threatened for long the existence of the little hungry-eyed community at the base of Cape Diamond, he was able to stand bravely by his almost limitless principality in the days of its immaturity; and now to us of the present, he looks out from behind the curtain of the past with the heroic light, not of the seventeenth century, but of the middle ages playing around his features and his character. Armed with the shield of a strong man's faith, he spent his life in warding off the blows which French intrigues and European wars indirectly showered upon the young colony.

'Twas his to organize
The restlessness of man, and even seek
From craft alliance in the cause of peace,
'Twas his with threads of woe to weave a wreath
Of glory for the brow of France. Alas !
'Twas his to see disaster crown his toils
When foreign foe beset his forest home—
The dismal dawning of a fate severe
That since has been the halo of his fame.

And when we, in the third century of Quebec's existence, pass through the narrow thoroughfares of the lower town, seeking some memorial of this hero of New France, the founder of our city, some vestige of the old *Abitation* or traces of the site on which it stood as the nucleus of his little capital, we turn away with regret on finding so little to bear witness to the history of early days. Not that the records have all been destroyed or lost. Enough of them remain to enable us to form a picture full of life and interest. But when after a careful examination of these records, we seem to find the spot where the remains of the founder of Quebec were laid in a tomb all by itself (*un sépulchre particulier*) our regret becomes more and more acute when we discover no memorial in the form of cenotaph or mausoleum raised to his name. This is by no means befitting to a city of Quebec's historical pretensions, hardly becoming to a community so fondly cherished by Champlain in its infancy. Other cities in the Dominion are arousing themselves to the task of raising monuments to their founders and to the men of distinction who had their abode in them. And so ought it to be in the case of the oldest city in Canada. Let us hope that when all the facts of the controversy over the site of this brave man's tomb have been examined by the public, English and French-speaking citizens will join with one another in the enterprise of raising a monument to Champlain worthy of such a hero and worthy of such a life as his was.

On the twelfth of November, 1866, an announcement appeared in the Quebec newspapers to the effect that the antiquaries of the city had, after much patient research, found the site of Champlain's place of sepulture. The news caused not a little stir in the town ; and when it came to be known that the Abbés Casgrain and Laverdière were conjointly preparing a *brochure* in proof of the discovery, the conclusion was not far to seek that the reports in the newspapers were well-founded. According to their own statement, these gentlemen had, previous to the discovery, been making a careful study of some of the documents in the archives of Notre-Dame de Québec, thinking to put their hand upon some paper referring to the chapel in which Champlain was said to have been buried. How they came to be engaged on such a special line of research has not transpired. M. Drapeau, a contemporaneous antiquary, has sought to identify himself as having been the means of inducing such research on the part of the two Abbès. The vexed questions of Champlain's tomb had for long been of the greatest interest to him, and there is now no doubt that he had conversed, a few days previous to the announcement in the newspapers, with M. Laverdière concerning the discovery of human bones which had been made years before in Champlain Street, at the foot of Breakneck Steps. The two Abbés confess as much, when they say that, on the fifth of November (*i.e.* seven days before anything had been said of the discovery of the tomb,) M. Drapeau had told M. Laverdière that human bones had been disinterred in a street in lower town, though at the same time they take care to add that, being thoroughly convinced that Champlain's tomb could not have been situated elsewhere than in upper town, M. Laverdière did not think it worth his while to mention the matter to his colleague, M. Casgrain. The minor dispute of precedence is now of very little moment, yet it was the occasion of a

prolonged warfare of words which has gone ever since under the title of the *Quarrel of the Antiquaries.* During the controversy many bitter things were said, not so much by the immediate combatants as by the outsiders who thought fit to take part in the fray. Among those who undertook to defend the Abbès was M. Cauchon, who was looked upon at the time as a kind of literary free lance in Quebec, ready at a moment's notice to take up any one's quarrel and fight it out in the editorial colums of *Le Journal de Québec.* * Nor need it be said that the indignities which the editor of *Le Journal de Québec* sought to heap upon M. Drapeau detracted nothing from the success of the latter's investigations. The distinction of locating the tomb and chapel of Champlain, belongs to him as much as to any one else. Indeed, as the sequel may show, his later theory is the best that has been advanced; and in view of such an assertion, it becomes a matter of little or no consequence to him or to us, whether his conversation with M. Laverdière had or had not the effect of inducing M. Casgrain to examine the archives of *Notre-Dame de Québec,* for the purpose of finding the true site of Champlain's tomb. In the meantime, however, it may add to the interest of the subject if we take note of the manner in which MM. Laverdière and Casgrain conducted their investigations, as well as of the theory which they were led to form and the faith with which the public accepted that theory.

If the two Abbès did not form their theory previous to looking up their facts, it is at least strange that they took for their starting-point a conjecture which others have only reached as their goal after careful examination of the whole subject. That starting-point comes to light in the

* M. Cauchon did not think to spare M. Drapeau, and yet the irascible journalist did not always escape reprisal. On one occasion he wrote.—(*M. Drapeau sent comme un homme de génie, et ressent comme un charretier.* And said M. Drapeau by way of retort, *Savez-vous M. Cauchon, que si je voulais descendre sur ce terrain, j'aurais le droit de dire que vous sentez comme ..... M. Cauchon.*)

query :—Is the Basilica the final resting-place of Champlain's remains ? If it be, we can only trace them there after they had lain in one of two other chapels, or in both, namely, the *Chapelle de Notre-Dame de la Recouvrance* or the *Chapelle du Gouverneur*. It is now established beyond conjecture that the obsequies over the dead body of Champlain were celebrated in the former, and there is as little doubt that the latter was the place in which was to be found the *sepulchre particulier* in which his remains were interred for a time at least. In the fire of 1640, however, both of these buildings were consumed ; and so the two antiquaries found themselves at the very beginning face to face with the proposition :—Was it not likely that Champlain's remains had been deposited, after such a disaster, in the vaults of the parish church for safe-keeping, and if so, was it not possible to find them there still ? The query was a simple one and apparently easy of solution. The diligent antiquaries hastened to the Basilica and made a careful search under the pavement of the church. But all in vain. They found the place beneath filled up even to the pavement, with the exception of a large hollow underneath the chapel of St. Anne. Disappointed but not defeated they returned to re-examine the registers, when all at once a strange conversion came upon them, though how it came upon them must with justice he told in their own words.

" After examining the registers, we noticed what had never struck us before that both M. Gand and Father Raymbault had been buried in the *Chapelle de Champlain* at a date subsequent to the fire of 1640. This discovery was followed by a long discussion between the two of us. In the evening we renewed the discussion, and further examined Sagard, Champlain, the *Catalogues des Bienfaiteurs*, the *Relations*, and and the Registers. And after all this, what was our conclusion ? Nothing else than that the *Chapelle de Champlain*

was not to be found in upper town. Where then was it to be found ? In lower town, and on the morrow we proposed to visit the vaults of the church there. We were soon convinced, however, that the tomb of Champlain was not to be found in such a place, and in the evening we returned to our documents. By and by, we agreed that the *Chapelle de Champlain* was not, as we had at first supposed, a room set apart where they had arranged an altar, but really a building by itself. It must then have been erected outside the *Abitation.* After a long examination, we were finally forced to conclude that it could not have been built on the shore of the river, nor on the north-east side, but on the side of Champlain's garden, in other words at the head of the *Cul-de-Sac,"—i.e.* in the place where, as M. Drapeau had told M. Laverdière four days before, human remains had been found.

From the above narrative it is not difficult to decide how far the theory of the two antiquaries had or had not been established by a process of induction. They are not the first historians who have built for themselves a refuge in a *tour d'esprit.* Yet there is a credit due even to their ingenuity, as well as to their subsequent industry, and it is with increasing interest we trace their labours to a final result. In their *brochure* we find the following statements :—

" Without delay, we waited upon Mr. O'Donnell, one of the engineers who had superintended the laying of the water-pipes of that part of the town. He showed us a plan of the drainage which he had made of Little Champlain Street, on the twenty-seventh of March, 1856 ; and to our great astonishment we observed near the spot where we expected to find the chapel (i.e. the *Chapelle de Champlain*), a section of the remains of an old vault, and the drawing of a coffin which had been found in the middle of the vault. The engineer on being asked what had become of the bones which were said to have been in the coffin, remarked

that they had been examined by several persons and then laid away, he knew not where. 'I took some of them in my hand', he said, 'and measured the *femur* which was very strong and well preserved. It was nineteen inches long, and here is a sketch of it which I was curious enough to make,'" and with this Mr. O'Donnell proceeded to show the astonished Abbés the drawing he had made of all belonging to the tomb.

* * * * * *

As a matter of necessity, the investigation of Abbés Casgrain and Laverdière did not end here. However astonished they were at the results of their labours, so far, they had proved nothing. It is true that they had found a tomb, but the tomb could not have been Champlain's tomb unless there was to be found near it the foundations of a chapel, and unless it could further be proved that such a building had been known as Champlain's Chapel. It is needless to say that all researches in this direction were fruitless. Still the antiquaries did not lose faith in their theory. Through Mr. O'Donnell, they communicated with Mr. Baldwin, of Boston, who had been superintendent of the city water-works in 1854, and were informed by that gentleman that in the month of April, 1854, three human skulls had been found by workmen while they were engaged in digging at the head of Sous-le-Fort Street. The Abbés at once set to work to identify these skulls, and before long they came to the conclusion that they were part of the remains of Brother Duplessis, M. Gand and Father Raymbault, the first of whom Sagard in his history declares to have been buried in 1619, in the *Chapelle de Québec*, while the latter two are known to have been interred in the *Chapelle de Champlain*. The anxious investigators were in a quandary. They had two chapels on hand whereas they only required one. What was to be done? There was only one thing to be done, if the theory they had formed was to be maintained; and thus it was that the

logic of the two antiquaries forced them towards the identification of these two chapels as having been one and the same building—a *reductio ad absurdum*, which, as we shall see, ought to have led them to reconsider the whole question before venturing to give their theory to the public.

To recapitulate, for the sake of clearness, the conclusions which MM. Casgrain and Laverdière had reached were as follows:—*First*, that the *Chapelle de Champlain* was no other than the *Chapelle de Québec* which had been built by Champlain himself in 1615, and which must have been situated at the foot of the stairway that led up the side of the promontory from Champlain street, if it were to be of any service in supporting the identification of these chapels as one and the same. *Second*, that the vault found at the foot of this stairway was no other than the *sepulchre particulier* erected for Champlain's remains, and that the human bones discovered by Messrs. Baldwin and O'Donnell were those of Champlain, Duplessis, Gand, and Father Raymbault. *Third*, that the above statement was corroborated by the tracings of an inscription on the side of the vault which, with elliptical spaces filled in, evidently indicated the name, Samuel de Champlain.

Such were the conclusions which the two archæologists arrived at after a month's investigation, and it only remains for us to see how their labours were appreciated by the public.

"The particular merit of these gentlemen," says one of the newspapers in announcing the so-called discovery, "is that they have found the tomb of Champlain, after diligent search among those historical authorities, which, though well enough known to most of our archæologists and historians, have unfortunately not received at their hands sufficient attention. Knowing that Champlain had been buried in the chapel which bore his own name, they

sought to determine the position of this chapel; and now success has crowned their labours; in a word, they have found for us the tomb of the founder of Quebec." Nor was it easy, in face of such assuring encomiums as the above to convince the public, who so often take things for granted, that the learned Abbés had been led astray in establishing their theory, not only by errors in logic but by errors in history. M. Drapeau ventured to raise his voice against the conclusions of his distinguished contemporaries, only to find himself however all but overwhelmed by the torrent of calumnies and *grosièretés* poured down upon him by the virulent free lance of the *Journal de Québec*, who knew so well how to take advantage of the fact that his opponent had claimed a share of the honour of discovering the tomb in lower town. If the *brochure*, explaining how the discovery had been made, had been of less distinguished parentage, the public might have been tempted to examine its contents with a more critical eye. As it was, the whole thing became for a season a matter of faith. Indeed so difficult is it to overcome the prejudices in favour of the decisions of the learned, that but for the after frankness of M. Casgrain himself, this and succeeding generations might have continued unwittingly to identify the vault at the foot of Breakneck Steps as the original resting-place of the remains of the first Governor of Quebec.

Nine years almost to a day after MM. Casgrain and Laverdière had entered upon their investigations in connection with Champlain's tomb, the former published in *L'Opinion Publique* of Montreal an article which threw a new light upon the whole question.* "The translation into English of Champlain's Works," says Abbé Casgrain with a candour which does him credit, "has attracted the attention of some of the members of the Historical Society of Boston, to the

* In the meantime M. Laverdière had died greatly regretted by all who knew him.

investigations which were made years ago for the purpose of determining the site of Champlain's tomb. These gentlemen have examined and compared the *brochures* which have been published on this question, but the proofs advanced on either side have not appeared to them to be satisfactorily conclusive, and they still express some doubts in regard to the exact spot where the remains of the founder of New France were deposited. Several of them have written to me to know if I was able to furnish further information on the subject, and I think it will be of some service to them if I publish certain documents which have formerly escaped attention. It ought to be said that these authentic records seem to combat the preconceived theory which is now so well known, and to cast a doubt upon certain statements which at one time appeared to be well established. Whatever may be the issue of the whole matter, the materials offered to day afford materials for further consideration. It is no doubt to be regretted that these documents do not tend to strengthen the general tendency of former investigations. Indeed they rather tend to unsettle convictions which had asserted themselves after a conscientious examination of authentic records already well known. However we have not hesitated to publish these new documents in the interest of historic truth. Later on, others may be able to make use of them in definitely solving this question which is perhaps one of the most intricate problems in our city's history."

Along with this statement M. Casgrain published the documents referred to in detail, with the declaration that they had been found among the original papers left by M. Faribault to the Laval University. In one of these documents, which bears the superscription : *Une place située dans la Grande Place de Québec, réservée par M. le Gouverneur*, there is a distinct reference to Champlain's Chapel, while in the other, which bears the title *Contrat de rente foncière*

deûe par Jean Jobin à M. Ls. D'Aillebout, 30 *juin* 1658, there are important references to the properties which were to be found at the time near the Parish Church (now the Basilica), and which thus lay contiguous to the place reserved by Gouvernor D'Aillebout. With these documents in hand, and with the candour of M. Casgrain as a guide, it is the intention of the writer of this paper to follow the footsteps of M. Drapeau and others, in order to see how far it is possible to determine the exact spot where the remains of Samuel de Champlain were originally laid in a tomb all by itself. But first of all, it is necessary to catch some authentic glimpse of Quebec as it was to be seen during the first fifty years or so of its existence, in order that the mind may not become prejudiced by the changes which have removed nearly all the landmarks of olden times.

Interesting as is the autobiographical narrative which Champlain has left behind him, it is next to impossible for us to appreciate fully the spirit which animated him as he proceeded to erect for himself a fortified dwelling place on the narrow shelving beach which lies at the foot of the great rock of Quebec. This was not the first time he had essayed to establish himself in the coasts of New France. The drawing up of plans for his *Abitation* was no new occupation for him. Three years before he had cast anchor in the St. Lawrence, he had superintended the construction of some such a building on the fatal island of St. Croix. His terrible experience there is a matter of history ; and yet such an experience, in a land further to the south where the winters might be expected to be milder than at Quebec, does not seem to have deterred him from again undertaking pioneer work. As he passed hither and thither among the workmen, busy carrying out his orders as architect and builder, no cloud seems to have arisen betwen him and his hope that his new *Abitation* on the St. Lawrence was but the

beginning of greater things. And now what picture is better known to us than the quaint sketch that Champlain has left of the building, which was to be his Canadian home for over a quarter of a century. With its moat and gallery and strong wooden walls, there is something in its *tout ensemble* that tells us of the times when every seigneur had for himself a castle which stood as a protection for him and his vassals. Nor was there wanting in Champlain the feudal spirit of the times, the chivalry and daring of a true knight; and as we pass in imagination, within the enclosure of his moat and wall, examining the awkward-looking buildings within it, climbing the ordnance platforms or peering through the loop-holes of the gallery, we seem to feel not a few of the seventeenth century influences floating around us. The view to be seen by Champlain and his fair bride from the upper window of the square dove-cot tower that stood apart from the three main buildings, is still ours to admire; but the spirit of the times has fled. A new record of liberty,—of a liberty that claims for every man his chance in life—has been a writing by the world since them; and where there once was the attempt to transplant an old and worn out social system there is to be found to-day a social and political liberty that knoweth no lord and master to whom unwillingly men have to pay a serf-like homage.

The site of Champlain's *Abitation* has been very clearly defined. It must have stood at the corner of Sous-le-Fort and Notre-Dame streets, extending as far as Champlain's garden which was laid out on the ground adjacent to the wharf of the St. Lawrence Steamship Company. Near it were probably one or two outside buildings, but, with the exception of the magazine, no attempt was been made to fix their site. Near the main structure and beyond its moat a number of Montagnais had raised their huts, from which the women and children were often allowed to enter the

yard of the *Abitation* and there remain over night. During the first year no attempt was made to mark off the plateau above into the concessions which afterwards became the property of Abraham Martin, after whom the Plains of Abraham were named, of Louis Hébert and Pierre Couillard. Indeed there was hardly time to finish the *Abitation* and to make things comfortable for the approaching winter, which was to witness the death of twenty out of the twenty-eight men whom Pontgravé left with Champlain, when he set sail for France in September.

Let us now turn to the year 1615. During the interval of seven years Quebec had become a trading-station, next to Tadousac, the most important on the St. Lawrence. During the summer months the place must have borne a busy enough aspect, though there could not have been more than a hundred of people who had made it their place of permanent abode. By this time one or two families had built houses for themselves on the plateau above, while there must have been thirty or forty houses at least in lower town. This year, moreover, was memorable on account of the arrival of four Récollets missionaries whose services Champlain had secured for New France, through the direct intervention of the Pope, and it was after their arrival in the ship which brought out Champlain from France in the spring of the year that record has been made of the building of the first church in Quebec. Champlain and Father Dolbeau, we are told, having made selection of a site, a little way outside the *Abitation*, a convent was erected upon it with such expedition, that Mass was celebrated in the part of it set apart for a chapel, a month after the Recollets had arrived. This was none other than the *Chapelle de Québec*, which continued to be the parish church until Quebec was taken by the English in 1629. Where this building stood it is impossible to tell. Some have placed it on the site now occupied by the church of *Notre-Dame des Victoires*, and, as we have seen, the Abbés Cas-

grain and Laverdière of necessity, in their advocacy of the theory which located Champlain's tomb in lower town, fixed its site at the head of the *Cul-de-Sac*. But in conducting the present investigation, we are more interested in ascertaining its fate than in determining its site. In other words, what became of the *Chapelle de Québec ?*

There can be little doubt but that it shared the fate of Champlain's house when Quebec was taken by David Kirke in 1629. At least, indirect testimony in support of this is given in the *Relation* of 1632, in which Father Lejeune, one of the Jesuits who arrived in Canada during that year, says, that on their arrival they saw at the foot of the Fort the poor *Abitation de Québec* burned to the ground, with nothing left standing save the stone foundations. It is not likely that the *Chapelle de Québec*, had it been standing, would have escaped the eye of the Jesuit, and it is much less likely that he would have celebrated Mass in Widow Hébert's house as he did, had there been a chapel in the parish. Were there, however, in face of such evidence any doubt as to the fate of the *Chapelle de Québec*, the *Relation* of 1636 proves conclusively that such a building no longer existed. "The first sacrifices of the Mass which we celebrated in these countries," says Father Lejeune, " were offered up in a wretched little dog-hole, of which we would now be ashamed ; then we made use of a room (in the Fort) and afterwards they caused a chapel to be built," all of which we may safely say, would hardly have been done had the *Chapelle de Québec* been in existence.

But here it may be asked by the curious, how was it that the Abbés Casgrain and Laverdière happened to overlook the above facts in making their investigations ? The answer is, they only overlooked the last statement, and tried to explain away Lejeune's assertion as reported in the *Relation* of 1632. " Why does Father Lejeune," they say, " not speak here of the *Chapelle de Québec*, since it was in lower

town, and since it existed at least up to 1642. It is because its position, so far within the *Cul-de-Sac*, kept it out of sight. The ruins of the *Abitation* alone were in sight, before they had doubled the promontory." Only the after candour of M. Casgrain can protect him from the reply to such logic.

In corroboration of what Father Lejeune says in the *Relation* of 1632, the following extract may be of some interest and perhaps all the more so since it is taken from the collection of manuscripts lately published under the supervision of the Provincial Secretary of the Province of Quebec. At page 104, vol. I, we read: "Le Sieur Emery de Caen had already sent from Tadousac a boat to Quebec, with an extract of the commissions and letters patent from the kings of France and England, according to which the English captain was commanded to give up the Fort in eight days. These they therefore carried to him on the morning after their arrival. The Jesuits, however, celebrated Mass in the oldest house in the country, the house of Widow Hébert who lived not far from the Fort. She has a fine family. Her daughter is married to an honest Frenchman. May God bless them all their days." *

Nor would there have been any excuse for holding the theory that Champlain's tomb and chapel were to be found in lower town, even had these facts and their corroboration been altogether overlooked, since that most careful of Canadian historians, Abbé Faillon, has summed up the whole matter in these terms :—"The first object of Champlain's solicitude for things religious (on his return in 1633) was to procure for the colonists a place where they might unitedly engage in the exercise of public worship. The English, before the return of the French, had burned

* "To them have been given," the record continues, "very beautiful children, their cattle are in very good condition, their lands produce very fine crops. It is the only French family permanently settled in Canada. They had at one time sought the means of returning to France, but on learning that the French were about to return to Quebec, they decided to remain."

or otherwise destroyed the chapel which had formerly been made use of by the Recollets and which had served for a parish church. While waiting for the construction of a new church, they prepared an altar in the Fort, and it was there that the Jesuit Fathers were accustomed to go to administer the sacraments. Champlain, a few days after his arrival, attended holy Mass. But before the end of the year, he executed a pious design which he had long contemplated. After the seizure of the country by the English, he took a vow to build at Quebec a chapel in honour of Mary, should the French ever come into possession of Canada again, and give it the title of *Chapelle de la Recouvrance.*"

With these conclusions set so plainly before us, there now remains nothing for us to do but to turn our attention to upper town in our search for the tomb of the illustrious founder of our city. Quebec was once more in the hands of the French. The buildings in lower town were not restored, since the governor thought it best to take up his quarters in the Fort, which he took pains to repair and and strengthen as far as his means would permit. Houses began to be built upon the plateau, around or near the Fort, within easy reach of the new church which was erected on the site where now stands the Basilica. The question as to the exact position of the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance* was settled by M. Laverdière in 1869. Previous to that time, some had placed it in the neighbourhood of the Place d'Armes, near the present site of the Anglican Cathedral, but M. Laverdière after an industrious search in the court of the Presbytery found the traces of two foundation walls immediately behind the Basilica which could have been none other than the remains of the chapel built by Champlain. The trend of these walls proved that the building had not been in a line with what is now known as Buade street as is the Basilica, but lay more properly in

a line with what is now known as Fabrique street, with its main entrance turned towards the road which led in the direction of the Fort, and looking down the rugged pathway which led up the slope from lower town. The choir of the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance* however must have coincided with the choir of the Basilica, an important point to note, for if the remains of Champlain were laid under the choir of the chapel awaiting the erection of the *sepulchre particulier*, as there is some reason to suppose they were, their first resting-place is easily found, being no other than under the present entrance to the Basilica. To understand matters clearly at this stage it is necessary to turn to a map of the city which is to be found in Abbé Faillon's "Histoire du Canada."

The said map or plan speaks to a large extent for itself and shows, at a glance, how far the arrangement of the streets radiating from the Post Office and the Place d'Armes, and with which we are most familiar, is of more modern date than the times of which we write. The probable sites of the three chapels of which mention has been so frequently made in the above narrative, can readily be distinguished by the reader, though it must be borne in mind that the *Chapelle de Québec* had disappeared with the *Abitation* in 1829, and was never rebuilt. The *Chapelle de Québec* mentioned in subsequent history was that held by the Jesuits and which they had been allowed to occupy by the Recollets.

Let us look for a moment at the streets in order to locate as near as possible the site of the *Chapelle de Champlain*, the central difficulty of our problem, seeing that l'Abbé Laverdière has set at rest all dispute about the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance* by finding its basement walls in the court of the Presbytery, immediately behind the present cathedral. The only pathways in upper town that seem to have borne a name at this time were Fort Street and Côte de la Montagne.

Buade Street probably received its name not earlier than 1672, though it must have existed as a highway in 1649, since it is mentioned in the deed which records the reservation of the piece of land near the parish church, by Governor D'Aillebout as a "roadway which runs south, southwest and north-west between the said land and the parish church." The other three streets or roadways mentioned on the map, coincide or all but coincide with Fabrique Street, St. Anne Street and St. Louis Street of the present time. The roadway leading up the mountain, had on the one side the old cemetery and on the other a vacant lot called the *Grande Place*, and then forked off into Fort Street and the street running parallel with the modern Fabrique Street, the continuation of Côte de la Montagne.

And here it may be said that a good deal has been made of the above deed of Governor D'Aillebout in an endeavour to locate the *Chapelle de Champlain* on the *Grande Place* or the site now occupied by the Post Office. The deed is explicit enough in regard to the exact position of the land reserved, describing it as being bounded by what is now called Buade Street, Fort Street, and the Place d'Armes, and further described as being an enclosure opposite the *Chapelle de Champlain.* Where then was this same chapel? On the *Grande Place*? Look down Buade Street towards the harbour any fine morning and solve the problem for yourself? If not on the *Grande Place* it must have been a little beyond the *Grande Place*, somewhere on the other side of Fort street, the only building in sight in that direction. In a word, if the *Chapelle de Champlain* was not built upon the *Grande Place* it must have been situated in a corner of the old cemetery. And where more likely to find a chapel, having within it the grave or tomb of the founder of Quebec, and built, as it would appear, to protect that grave.

Let us however make haste slowly. The words of the deed describing Fort Street are: "a roadway between the

said reserved land and the said *Chapelle de Champlain.*" There can be nothing plainer than that. Hence the chapel must have been, as one would say, " on the other side of the way," and not in the cemetery after all. Perhaps. But we are not done with the deed yet. The words *Chapelle de Champlain* have been erased by the copyist's pen running through them, and substituted by the words *Grande Place.* And here we are confronted with a new theory.

This time it is Dr. Dionne who enters the lists. He evidently has made up his mind that the chapel was on the *Grande Place* and nowhere else, and explains the erasure in this way. As the chapel occupied only a limited part of the *Grande Place*, he says in substance, the clerk who drew out the deeds, no doubt thinking that the ground occupied by the chapel was not sufficient in itself to indicate the boundary line of such a large lot erased the words " the said *Chapelle de Champlain*" and subsituted the more comprehensive term the *Grande Place.* The explanation is ingenious, and had there ever been found the remains of a *sepulchre particulier* or foundation wall on or near the site of the Post Office, it would have been almost as valid as fact. But though search has been made, no such remains have ever been found, nor is there any record to prove that this part of the *Grande Place* was built upon until later on. Besides, the erasure may have been only after all a clerical error corrected in the usual way. But, if Dr. Dionne wishes to adhere to his explanation of the erasure, let him take both of the deeds unearthed by Abbé Casgrain, and observe that the buildings adjoining the piece of land reserved are made special mention of—namely, the parish church, the fort of the savages, the houses or properties of Jacques Boissel, Louis Côté and Abraham Martin. The buildings were the landmarks, which enabled the notary or clerk, who drew out the deeds, to indicate the streets bounding the reserved land. And hence, while remembering that the *Chapelle de Champlain* was the only

prominent object that stood in sight at the time on the river side of the reserved land, Dr. Dionne will see that the fact of its being mentioned in the deed does not determine its nearness to Fort Street as being "right on the other side of the way." The deed says "we have reserved a place situated in the said enclosure *opposite* the *Chapelle de Champlain*," but the word "opposite" in itself does not mean very near, no more than the word "near" means right on the other side of the way. For example the Jesuit chronicles in speaking of the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance*,, says that it was near the Fort, whereas the distance must have been very much more than the distance between the reserved land and the graveyard. Father Lejeune, in speaking of Madame Hébert's house, says it was near the Fort whereas it was even farther away from the Fort than the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance* ; and so it was in other instances which might be cited. The word opposite does not necessarily mean "right on the other side." And thus it is that Dr. Dionne is even worse off than the Abbés Casgrain and Laverdière, all honour to them ; they really found a tomb and in theory built a chapel over it—an example which it is possible we may have to follow ; but Dr. Dionne has found neither a tomb nor a chapel : he has merely found a theory.

And now having waded through nearly all the dry-as-dust pathways, let us turn to the theory which seems to be the most reasonable of anything advanced, since the appearance of the deeds found by Abbé Casgrain which, as we now know, prove conclusively that the tomb at the foot of Breakneck Steps is not Champlain's tomb. Let us lay all the documents before us, and with M. Stanislas Drapeau to guide us, let us try to answer the following queries :

(1.) Where did Champlain die ?
(2.) Where were his obsequies celebrated ?
(3.) Where was he buried ?
(4.) Who built the *Chapelle de Champlain ?*
(5.) Where and when was the *sepulchre particulier* built ?

(6.) What was the fate of the chapel ?

(7.) Was the tomb ever found ?

The categorical answers to these queries are :—

(1.) Champlain died in a room in Fort Saint-Louis.

(2.) His obsequies were celebrated in the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance.*

(3.) He was buried in the *Cimetière de la Montagne.*

(4.) The *Chapelle de Champlain* was built by Governor Montmagny, to commemorate the death of his predecessor.

(5.) It was within the chapel, and is first mentioned in the *Relation* of 1643.

(6.) It was destroyed by fire in 1640 ; was rebuilt, and finally fell into decay or was burned a second time.

(7.) A tomb has been found in the place where the chapel probably stood, and can be circumstantially identified as the *sepulchre particulier.*

And (1.) *Where did Champlain die ?* The Abitation was never rebuilt after its destruction by Sir David Kirke in 1629. The colony was restored to France by the Treaty of St. Germain in 1632 ; but Champlain, detained in Europe from various causes, did not return until the spring of the year 1633. * In the month of October 1635, while daily busied with the affairs of the colony, he was suddenly struck down with a stroke of paralysis. At first it was thought, as is usual in such cases, that he would recover, but he never rose from his bed after. On Christmas Day of the same year he passed away, with no fear for the future, with no regret for the past. Wise and noble in his thought and conduct, he was more, he was a good man, a man in whom the religious instinct was fully developed. It is said that he shed tears on his death bed, when he spoke of the colony he had founded, and prayed for the men and women and little ones whom he had brought from Europe to be " his own people in the West." " They must be pro-

* Madame Champlain, who left for France in 1624, did not return with her husband.

tected, they must be assisted," we think we hear him say, "they must be encouraged to remain, just as they would have been had I continued among them." During his two months' sickness he was tenderly cared for by Father Lalemant, the warm-hearted Jesuit who was among the first of his order to open a school in the colony; and on the day of his death there stood by his couch his friend De Chateaufort, who had come from his post at Three Rivers to be with the Governor in his last moments, and to receive from his hands the keeping of the affairs of New France until such time as another governor should be appointed by the Crown.

(2.) *Where were Champlain's obsequies celebrated?* They were celebrated in the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance*, as is clearly indicated by the *Relation* of 1636. Father Lejeune, who as we have seen was the first to celebrate Mass after the arrival of Champlain in 1632, in Madame Hébert's house, preached the funeral oration. Two years before Champlain's death this pioneer priest had thus written of him: "It often occurs to me to reflect how this great man, who, by his admirable sagacity and unequalled prudence in the conduct of business, has gained so much worldly renown, yet prepares for himself a very bright crown of glory in heaven by the concern he testifies in behalf of the conversion of so many, whose souls are in danger of perishing through unbelief in these wild countries. I pray earnestly for him every day, and our Company having, by his means, occasion to glorify God in such a noble enterprise, will owe him an eternal obligation." The funeral was attended by a very honorable gathering of people, including the priests, officers, soldiers and traders who had their usual quarters at Quebec. The mainstay of the colony had been cut down in the midst of his usefulness; and so father Lejeune speaks to them words of hope: "We can truly say that his death is the death of the blessed. I believe that God has bestowed his favour upon him in con-

sideration of the wealth he has been able to procure for New France, by means of which we hope that some day God will be loved and served by our French compatriots and known and adored by the uncivilized around us. It is true that he has lived a life of justice and honour, faithful to his king and the company; but in his death he has perfected his virtues, with a piety so remarkable that we cannot but be astonished." In the spirit of these words was preached the funeral oration of Samuel de Champlain in the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance*, which, as we know, was for the time being the parish church of Quebec.

(3.) *Where was Champlain buried?* There can be little doubt that he was buried in the cemetery near at hand to the parish church, the *Cimetière de la Montagne*, which was laid off on the slope of the hill near the site where till lately stood the Parliament Buildings. This cemetery is marked on all the plans and views of the city as it was to be seen between 1660 and 1695. An effort has been made to strengthen the conjecture that the remains were at first deposited in the vaults of the chapel, by urging, first, the necessity there was for such a burial, it being the depth of winter, and second, the desire there would be to do honour to the remains of one so distinguished. But the second argument is as insufficient as the first in face of the fact that subsequently Governor Mesy was buried in the public cemetery, as were the governors of other places afterwards, and that many of the more distinguished of the residents of Quebec about this period are reported as having made the request that after death their bodies were to be deposited in the graveyard common to all. Dr. Dionne has endeavoured to identify the humain remains found in 1877 in the vaults of the Basilica, in order to show that others beside Champlain, had been buried in the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance*. But he has not been very successful in connecting his investigation in this direction with the issue

at question. He has not weakened the idea that Champlain was buried in the only burial ground near at hand, the *Cimetière de la Montagne*. If the register of burials had not been burned in the fire of 1640, with the other archives of the parish church, there would have been no difficulty in solving this point ; but the very fact that Father Lejeune in chronicling the event of Champlain's obsequies does not make mention of his remains being deposited in an unusual place, is all but conclusive that he was buried in the cemetery common to all.

(4.) *Who built the Chapelle de Champlain ?* There is now no difference of opinion over this part of the controversy. It was built in the summer of 1636, by Governor de Montmagny, as a mark of respect to his predecessor, whose grave would in time disappear were it not protected in some such way as this. This is borne out by the fact that the chapel is more than once to be found on record as the *Chapelle de Monsieur le Gouverneur*.

(5.) *Where and when was the sepulchre particulier built ?* It is impossible to say whether the tomb of Champlain was built before or after the chapel. We think Dr. Miles is not far wrong when he says : " Since the funeral took place in the dead of winter, it seems probable that the sepulchre or at least the exterior of the tomb was not completed until some time afterwards." The first mention that is made of either tomb or chapel in the *Relations* is not for six or seven years after the death of the first governor. In the record of 1641, it is distinctly stated that Commissary-General Gand was buried in the *Chapelle de Champlain*. In that of 1642, it is stated in the registers that Father Raymbault was buried in the same chapel on the 22nd of October ; while the *Relations* of 1643, in referring to the event of the priest's death, state that at the special request of the governor his remains were " interred near the body of the late M. de Champlain, which is in a tomb all by itself,

built expressly to honour the memory of that distinguished man who has done so much for New France."

(6.) *What was the fate of this Chapelle de Champlain?* Like the other chapels mentioned in this controversy it was destroyed by fire. In the fire of 1640, which had its origin in the Presbytery of the Jesuits, these prominent buildings were destroyed—the Presbytery itself, the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance*, and the *Chapelle de Champlain.* And here we may remark, in the spirit of Victor Hugo, in describing the Battle of Waterloo, that if it could have been known in what direction the wind blew in Quebec, on the 14th of June, 1640, there would have been none of this controversy. The *Chapelle de la Recouvrance* took fire from the Presbytery, and the *Chapelle de Champlain* from the combined conflagration. "The wind so violent, the extreme heat, the oily wood of the pitch pine with which these buildings were constructed lit up a fire so quick and so violent that we could hardly save anything." So says the *Relation* describing the fire. Why didn't it go further and say in what direction the wind was blowing at the time. Had it done so we would have known almost to a certainty where the *Chapelle de Champlain* was situated.

(7.) *Has Champlain's Tomb ever been found?* There is the record of a tomb having been found in the north-western corner of the old cemetery, which from its appearance seems to have been none other than the *sepulchre particulier* mentioned in the *Relations.* The history of its discovery is not far to seek but may be found in the Quebec newspapers of the 18th of December, 1850. By looking at the plan of the city of 1660, it may be observed that there is indicated a space of ground above and adjoining the old graveyard. In 1688, this plot of ground was in the hands of Town Major Provost, at least we are told that it was purchased from him by Bishop St. Vallier, who built a residence for himself on it in 1694. In 1831, the government feued this

property from Bishop Panet, and proceeded to erect on it the first of the parliament buildings erected in Quebec. These buildings, now known as the first old parliament buildings, to distinguish them from those consumed by fire a few years ago, consisted as those who have seen them remember, of a central block with a wing on the north side, and what was left of the old bishop's palace on the south side. Thus the edifice remained until I850, when the government decided to pull down the remains of the palace, and to give the parliament building a more complete appearance by erecting on the site of the old palace a second wing to correspond with the other.

While the workmen were engaged in removing the outer foundation wall of the old palace, they came upon a tomb which had evidently been, at the time of its construction, carefully built with solid masonry, and which at the time the workmen exposed it contained some human remains. This tomb, in my opinion, was none other than the *sepulchre particulier* in which the remains of Samuel de Champlain were deposited in 1635. The exact position of the tomb can easily he ascertained, as it lay near the south-western corner of the present enclosed ground, within the wall, which is a little further down than the original boundary-line of the graveyard, right under the foundation wall of the old palace. The graveyard seems to have been closed, within thirty years after Champlain's death, with no record of a tomb such as this having been built in it by any one, before or after that event. There can hardly be any doubt that Champlain was buried in the *Cimetière de la Montagne*, (1) because, then as now, it was not customary to inter the bodies of even the most illustrious of the laity within the church, more especially in these early times when the colony was but a stage in advance from the roughness of camp life, and when the chapels were constructed of unenduring material, and (2) because if in a new building (such

as the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance* was at the time of its founder's death, it being only two years built,) Champlain had been the first to be buried, some mention would almost to a certainty have been made by Father Lejeune, of the unusual occurrence—the first governor, the first to be buried in the first chapel built after the recovery of the country—the founder of the chapel buried under its altar. The conjecture that Champlain was buried in 1635, in the *Grande Place* can hardly be entertained. Nor really has it, for those who maintain that the tomb was ever to be found there have to premise that the chapel was built before the tomb. The premise is only tenable on the suppostion that Champlain was first buried in the *Chapelle de la Recouvrance*, and yet if the deceased governor's grave was thus protected, if he was thus honoured with a resting-place in the chapel which he himself had built, what need was there for Governor Montmagny to be in such haste to protect the remains of his predecessor or even, if you will, to do honour to the memory of one on whom had been conferred the very highest honour the church can bestow short of saintship. In a word the internal evidence is against the conjecture that the chapel was built to receive the tomb. The tomb was built in whole or in part to receive the body on the 27th or 28th of December. There were masons enough about the fort to prepare the place roughly at first for the reception of the body. Governor Montmagny probably saw the *sepulchre particulier* complete or incomplete as it was, as he climbed the steep pathway and saluted the cross in the cemetery which he had to pass on his way to Mass, on the day of his arrival ; and, no doubt, hearing from those near him of the good deeds of the man whom he had succeeded in office, he took a vow to build a chapel to protect the sacred spot, just as Champlain himself had taken a vow to build a chapel should be ever return to Canada. There can be no doubt that this is the tomb we have been in search of.

Circumstantial evidence is said to be the best of evidence, but when it is supported by one substantial fact in its favour it is all but absolutely conclusive. No such substantial fact has been advanced in favour of the *Grande Place* theory. No tomb has ever been found there, no vestige of a chapel. We have found no remains of a chapel it is true in the cemetery, but a tomb has been found corresponding to the *sepulchre particulier* in nearly every respect,—in position, for it stood directly opposite the piece of land reserved by Governor D'Aillebout,—in site, for it was found as a *sepulchre particulier*, in a remote corner of the cemetery, a tomb all by itself; and in construction, since it was carefully built of solid masonary. If we have found no chapel, nor even the record of the foundation of a chapel, yet the erection and re-erection of walls and buildings can account for the complete disappearance of the foundation walls of a building that never seems to have been intended as a regular place of worship, and whose foundations on this account were probably not placed very deep in the ground. As has been said, it was built to protect and mark more prominently the *sepulchre particulier*,—built in haste as an act of piety, to disappear, most probably for the second time by fire. It disappeared, but the *sepulchre particulier* remained, and as it seems to me, we have been with those who have guided us to the interesting spot, where it was erected.

And now a word in conclusion. The work of this discovery has not been the work of one man, as its history indicates. For a man to be wrong in his conclusions does not necessarily exclude him from being thanked for his arguments. Such, as M. Cauchon, whose only argument is denunciation, can not be classed as anything but self seekers, men in whom there is no true work. In a controversy of this kind we leave such men out of count. The man to whose candour and industry in the first place is

due the inception of such an investigation as the above, is Abbé Casgrain, perhaps the most industrious antiquary of our city,—not to mention Mr. Drapeau who had to endure the *grossièretés* of an effulgent editor while uttering the truth, and Mr. J. M. LeMoine who was the first to draw my attention to this interesting subject. And for a moment we may pause to ask what good can come of such controversies as this, for the practical is ever immanent in men's minds nowadays. The answer is in the growing feeling that the founder of our city should have within its borders a monument to commemorate his life work, not an ordinary monument, for his was no ordinary life merely magnified now for us by distance effects. Let us raise to his memory something that shall really show that the enterprise which was born to us through him continues to live; something that men shall know of everywhere, and something that shall commemorate the realization of his great life dream, the pathway past Quebec that leads to China. A proposition has already been made by the wealthiest corporation in the country to build such a monument for us in part at least. The most of you have seen the character of the edifice proposed in the architect's plans. What city would not be proud to have such a monument raised on the sacred spot of its founder's grave? Is there anything in us or around us to hinder such a scheme? Is there ought to prevent us from making a public effort in behalf of the scheme? In a word, is there anything to keep the citizens of Quebec, individually and collectively, from joining with those who would largely assist us in raising a *Maison de Champlain* on the ground where the stalwart frame of our first governor had resting place?

DOCUMENTS DISCOVERED BY ABBÉ CASGRAIN.

Une place située dans la grande place de Québec réservée par M. le gouverneur.

Louis Daillebout lieutenant-général du roi et gouverneur dans toute l'étendue du Grand Fleuve Saint-Laurent en la Nouvelle-France rivière et lacs y descendants et lieux qui en dépendent. En vertu du pouvoir à nous donné par Messieurs de la Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France et sous le bon plaisir d'icelle, en faisant la distribution d'une place située dans l'enclos de Québec. Nous nous sommes réservé une place située dans le dit enclos contre la *Chapelle Champlain* contenant un arpent de terre ou environ tenant du côté du nord-est à un chemin qui court sud sud-est et nord-ouest qui est entre la dite terre et les terres de l'Eglise paroissiale de ce lieu, d'autre côté au sud-ouest aux terres non concédées d'un bout au nord-ouest à un chemin piésente qui est entre la dite terre et la Grand place pour en jouir par nous du dit arpent de terre ou environ nos successeurs ou ayant cause à toujours pleinement et paisiblement aux charges qu'il plaira à Messieurs de la dite Compagnie nous ordonner, faite au fort Saint-Louis de Québec ce dixième jour de février mil six cent quarante-neuf.

DAILLEBOUT.

Contrat de rente foncière due par Jean Jobin à M. Ls. D'Aillebout—30 *juin* 1658.

Par devant Jean Baptiste Peuvret Notaire de la Nouvelle-France et témoins soussignés fut présent en sa personne messire Louis D'Aillebout chevalier seigneur de Coulonges gouverneur et lieutenant-général pour le Roi en ce pays étendu du fleuve Saint-Laurent, Lequel a reconnu et confessé avoir baillé, cédé, et transporté à titre de rente foncière de bail d'héritage annuelle et perpétuelle non rachetable du tout à toujours et promet garantir de tous troubles et empêchements généralement quelconques à Jean Jobin Mtre tailleur d'habits habitant de ce pays à ce présent preneur et acquéreur au dit titre pour lui, ses hoirs et ayants cause, une place sise en cette ville de Québec, contenant demi arpent de terre ou environ faisant moitié d'un arpent de terre au dit seigneur bailleur appartenant, Joignant d'un côté à la rue qui passe entre l'église paroissiale et la dite terre, d'autre côté à Jacques Boissel en partie et à Louis Côté, d'un bout à une rue qui passe entre le fort des sauvages et la dite terre, Et d'autre bout à la place d'Abraham Martin en partie et aux terres non concédées, au dit seigneur bailleur appartenant par concession qu'il en a prise le dixième jour de février mil six cent quarante-neuf, ratifiée et signée par Monsieur de Lauzon ci-devant gouverneur de ce pays le vingt deuxième jour d'avril mil six cent cinquante deux.