

would be about \$15. The furniture, boots and shoes, cotton and woollen goods are nearly all of Canadian manufacture, and of as good value as articles of equally honest make could be imported for if free of duty. If Mr. Boulton's policy of free trade were adopted and direct taxation imposed, how much would the artisan have to pay? Direct taxation is a very attractive and plausible theory. But on what principle is it proposed to be levied, and what means are to be employed for training the people into such habit of saving as will induce them to lay by from week to week the sum which they would be annually required to contribute for the support of Government?

The great fallacy at the bottom of all free-trade arguments is, that Canada being mainly an agricultural country, with the addition of some mines, forests and fisheries, should buy in what is called the cheapest market, say England, and sell in the dearest, say England and the United States, and that these countries from which we buy would take all our surplus products at the same prices which are now realized for them in Canadian cities and towns. Nothing could be more fallacious, as there is almost an endless number of articles of produce which would not pay for transportation to England, and of which there is now an over-supply in the United States. Almost every farmer has some second-class horses, cattle or sheep that would not pay to export; butter good enough for immediate use, but not fit to ship; hay, straw, potatoes, vegetables and fruits, etc., all of which are too bulky or otherwise unfit for export. The extra value of these articles realized in home markets largely exceeds all the additional cost entailed upon him through the tariff on the goods which he has to purchase. The interests of the farmer and the manufacturer run in parallel lines, and not in divergent directions, as the free-trade theorists attempt to establish.

ROBERT H. LAWDER.

Toronto, October 24, 1892.

PROFESSOR STOCKLEY AND FAIRPLAY RADICAL.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—In THE WEEK of October 14th there is a very long letter from Professor Stockley, of the University of New Brunswick, seemingly challenging the authorities quoted by me respecting Ireland. The Professor's letter illustrates the theme discussed of late years, namely, that the art of expressing oneself clearly in English is often neglected for an undue study of the classics. Although he is a clever man in his own sphere, yet he takes up 106 lines of THE WEEK to set forth—in addition to an inferred thesis—five statements, two of which are examples of the inconsequential style of reasoning so continually to be met with in Irish Nationalist writings and speeches. The late Sir Arthur Helps, an able and suggestive writer, stated that what he required in others was: a thesis clearly put and properly proved by evidence. The Professor writes somewhat obscurely, but after carefully reading his paper twice over, I infer that his thesis is, that the main objection of the Irish Protestants to Home-Rule arises from "Protestant religious intolerance." This is a good instance of inconsequential reasoning. All the world over property owners and lawabiding men, whether Protestants, Catholics, or any other religion, object to robbery, outrage and oppression, but no man free from common-sense-phobia, a disease prevalent in some parts of Ireland, calls such objections "religious intolerance." One among a multitude of facts showing that Home-Rule means robbery is the following: Michael Davitt, one of the leaders of the Nationalists, emphatically stated at Rathkeale, that "the cardinal object of Irish Home-Rule is the total uprooting of the 'landlords from the soil.'" Another leading Home-Ruler stated in a public speech that there were 30,000 or 40,000 estates for the people to fight about, and, counting great and small, one-half at least must be owned by Catholics. But where is the Catholic that wishes to have his property confiscated? As to outrages, among other authorities upon the subject, the R. C. Bishop of Cork recently sternly denounced "the village ruffians" who, encouraged by extreme Nationalists, commit the crimes that compel both Protestants and Catholics to rally together to defend all that they hold dear. The Pope formally condemned the plan-of-campaign swindle and the League outrages; and the Bishops as a mass have ultimately taken a step beyond merely tolerating his rescript. The two wings of the Nationalists now charge each other with the authorship and consequent calamities of the Plan-of-Campaign which has ruined so many of their victims, the majority of whom were by the "village ruffians" acting under superior orders, forced to abandon their homes rather than pay rent.

The Professor quotes as on his side of the case a Toronto Protestant who when sailing up the St. Lawrence animadverted upon the huge churches in the French Canadian villages, and whose remarks the Professor, if I understand him aright, appears to think had no solid foundation. This is inconsequential reasoning; what has the fact of the large French Canadian churches got to do with Irish Home-Rule? The homely English Proverb applies "let every tub stand on its own bottom."

Then again the case is reported that some Limerick peasants who had known an Irish gentleman when he was a child, and who, on his return, effusively on their knees thanked heaven that they had lived to see Master G—— return. What has that glamourous fact got to do with the question of Home-Rule? It brings to mind the lines of

the American humorist respecting the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers:—

First of all they fell upon their knees
And then upon the aborigines.

So if Home-Rule was achieved

First of all they'd fall upon their knees
And then upon the property-owners.

The Professor states that "Protestant anti-Home-Rule clergymen have told him that the intolerance there would be reduced to a minimum were it not for the Orangemen." There are 990 Nonconformist ministers in Ireland, and it is admitted that six of them are Home-Rulers, but the others emphatically stated in their published address—see *Liberal-Unionist* for April—that under Home-Rule "the struggle between Catholics and Protestants would be intensified and the eventual result would be the all-but certainty of civil war." Surely these 984 educated gentlemen, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists—scattered all over Ireland—know where the shoe pinches. If a strong objection to the horrors of civil war is "intolerance" then all right-minded men must be classed as bigots. Consider the object-lessons since the Nationalists split into two factions, and the desperate fights between such recent friends. If they ill-treat friends thus, what would they do to foes when they had them in their power? It would take up too much space to quote the charges brought by the leaders of the two factions against each other in their leading journals and on the platform. Thieves, liars, inciters of crime, and murderers, are among the epithets hurled at each other. Can we wonder at common-sense and lawabiding men objecting to be ruled by such people? Professor Stockley is evidently unaware that at the lowest estimate the Catholic Unionists are half as numerous as the Protestants. In 1885, when nearly all the constituencies were contested, the Unionists numbered 32½ per cent. of those who voted, although the Protestants then comprised only 22 per cent. of the population. In the recent general election—see *Liberal-Unionist* for August—the combined Nationalist strength in 64 Irish seats, which were contested in 1885 and also in 1892, fell from 271,543 to 231,992—a decrease of 15 per cent., while the Unionist vote increased. In the Dublin district—city and county—the Home-Rule vote diminished by 8,145, while that of the Unionists increased by 6,187. Dublin city has about the population of Toronto and suburbs.

The Professor erroneously states that one-half or perhaps more of the Ulster M.P.'s are Nationalists; the numbers are, 19 Unionists and 14 Home-Rulers. The Nationalist vote in Ulster fell from 86,608 in 1885 to 61,560 in 1892—a decrease of thirty per cent., while on the other hand the Unionists increased.

A common mistake made by outsiders is this, that they are unaware of how much imagination has to do with Nationalist so-called facts. The way to meet Home-Rulers is by following the advice of the old Yankee farmer "always hark back to the solid facts and you'll knock the bottom out of Irish grievances." The converse is shown by the tale of the two Irish disputants. Mike to Pat—"But the facts is agin you." Pat's reply—"To h—wid the facts."

FAIRPLAY RADICAL.

Toronto, October 24.

DR. BOURINOT'S CAPE BRETON.*

THE island of Cape Breton, now so little visited and so little talked about, which to most Canadians even is a *terra incognita*, has for a long time waited for some one to point out that, during a period of fifty years, it, more than any other part of America, occupied the attention of the statesmen and fired the imagination of the people of the English and French nations. Its annals, now so monotonous, then blazed up with lurid light while the great duel between the two leading races of the world for the possession of America filled its lonely harbours with warships and enlivened its sombre shores with the brilliant uniforms of the soldiery of France and England. There too the embattled farmers of New England first measured their strength with the regular troops of Europe, under all the conditions of civilized war, and the success these homespun-clad warriors there achieved laid the foundation of the confidence with which twenty five years later they resisted the armed forces of their mother land. Many romantic stories cluster round those precipitous cliffs and haunt the forests overhanging the deep lochs which reach their arms far through the hills. It is right that a son of the island, born and bred there, and thus familiar with all its localities, should have taken pen in hand to recall its past glories and narrate for us, who were forgetting, the many deeds of heroism which illuminate its annals.

In this exhaustive monograph Dr. Bourinot has recounted the whole history of Cape Breton from the misty times of the Norse voyages to the present day. In doing this he has necessarily treated at greater length the more stirring episodes. The first siege and capture of Louisbourg occupies two chapters and is illustrated by fac-simile plans of the city and of the siege operations—one of them from the drawings of Richard Gridley, who commanded the New England artillery. This remarkable achievement is narrated with much detail, and Dr. Bourinot portrays the characters of Shirley, Pepperell, War-

ren, and other leading characters with much skill and discrimination. The more this enterprise is discussed the more surprising seems its success. Such an aggregation of fortunate circumstances has very seldom occurred to aid the efforts of inexperienced even though brave men.

Equally full is Dr. Bourinot's treatment of the second and better known siege by Amherst and Boscawen. The officer commanding for the French king was made of different stuff from him who surrendered to Pepperell and Warren. He defended the fortress to the last with great tenacity and bravery, but the fates were against France and the little fishing hamlet and the ruined casemates shown on plate 2 at the end of the volume are the only remaining vestiges of the aspiring hopes of the French kings. From that period the historic interest of Cape Breton ceases. The English garrison was soon withdrawn from the neighbouring port of Sydney, and after a period of neglect and petty intrigue the island was annexed to the Province of Nova Scotia.

Besides the historical disquisitions this volume includes chapters on many other interesting points. There are discussions on the Acadian population and on the geography of the island. There is an account illustrated by two views of the present condition of Louisbourg. There are notes upon the Micmac Indians, on Norumbegue and on the early cartography of the coast. Among so many interesting matters one is glad to meet a recognition of the merits of Nicholas Denys, an estimable and enterprising Frenchman who, in the early part of the seventeenth century, had trading posts in Cape Breton and at Guysborough and Miscou. Though more practical than either Jolliet or LaSalle he led the same struggling life; his settlements were ruined by men who were fitted only to destroy and not to build; and, after a life of unavailing effort, he retired, a ruined man to die somewhere in France. In that small particular he was happier than the others. Jolliet died unheeded and alone somewhere on the coast of Labrador, and LaSalle was buried in an unknown grave on the lower Mississippi. These and a few such-like men gave America to France and she threw her opportunity away. Her history abounds in details, not of their doings, but of the gallantries of the dandies who surrounded the court. The light amours of the Duc de Richelieu and many other inconsequent personages may be followed in numerous historical memoirs, but it was left to Francis Parkman, to an alien pen and a hostile race to do full justice to the memories of those silent heroes of France in the New World. Denys published an account of Acadia in 1672, and the map which he printed with it has been reproduced in fac-simile in this volume. It is very scarce and the reproduction is a great boon to students.

In introducing his subject Dr. Bourinot gives a short notice of the early Icelandic voyages; but, as none of them can be shown to refer to Cape Breton, the scope of his work did not call for any long discussion on that interesting subject, although in the notes there is an excursus on the Norsemen. Vague as are the descriptions of localities in the Sagas there is an irresistible attraction about them. One seems always just upon the verge of a discovery—always the mist seems about to clear. But Vinland the Good, to a Rhode Islander, will always be in Rhode Island, and, to a Massachusetts man, it must be near Boston. Markland every loyal Nova Scotian believes to be that part of Nova Scotia between Shelburne and Yarmouth, although to one born at Sydney like Bourinot, it may well be in Cape Breton. Doubtless the Northmen visited the Dominion about the year 1000 of our era, but where they landed is like the conundrum propounded to Alice in Wonderland; there is no answer to it. Such at least seems to be at bottom the opinion of our author.

Not so dubious however is his decision upon the vexed question of the Mappé-Monde of A. D. 1544 attributed to Sebastian Cabot. It is in truth plainly enough stated upon that map that Cape North was the first landfall of Cabot, the *prima terra vista*. A fac-simile of the map is given in the text, and there, in fact, are the words upon it; but, in reading the narrative with a Mercator's map, it is difficult to imagine how a vessel sailing from Bristol could have made such a landfall. For Cabot was not seeking the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The whole continent was undiscovered at the time of his voyage (1497), and if he had lit upon Cape North by any accident, he could not have failed to remark upon the bold outline of Cape Ray which would be clearly visible on the right as he sailed through the strait to the island supposed, on this theory, to be Prince Edward Island. There is a mystery about the map. It bears date 47 years after the voyage and was published at Nuremberg; but one copy exists and that was found at Paris only fifty years ago. All the literature extant down to the discovery of this map, pointed to Newfoundland or Labrador as the *prima terra vista*, and that opinion was supposed to be founded on information given by Cabot himself. Harris discusses the subject very learnedly in his recent valuable work on the discovery of America, and thinks that Cabot, who was then intriguing with England, cooked the map to curry favour at the English court which was then putting forward some new claims to America. The theory seems wild, and, although Cabot's character for truthfulness and integrity is not good among geographers, it is difficult to accept it. Upon consideration of the whole case one is inclined to side with the Reverend Doctor Howley and place the landfall at Bonavista in Newfoundland. A very competent writer in the *New York Nation* has pointed out that the legend which identifies the map with

* "Historical and Descriptive Account of the Island of Cape Breton (once Isle Royal) and of its Memorials of the French Régime, with Bibliographical, Historical and Critical Notes," by J. G. Bourinot, C.M.G., LL.D., etc., etc. Montreal: W. Foster Brown and Company; Toronto: The Williamson Company, Ltd.