

and healthy life, use stone and bone implements, and are without a trace of religion in their customs. Their tents are double, one within the other. The children are totally naked within the inner tent, and were often seen outside, running about on the frozen ground, with the temperature down below 32°. The women wear nothing when within the tents, except a girdle, and the men have shaven heads. A remarkable similarity was noticed between the implements, dresses and customs of these people and those of the Esquimaux and North American Indians. These people are the Tschuktschers. Though armed with bone weapons, and though wild and itinerant, they evidently have a history. They drove off the original inhabitants of the region 200 hundred years ago, the Onkilons, whose houses, places of sacrifice, circles of moss-grown bear skulls and weapons are still to be found almost everywhere on the coast. Lieutenant Nordqvist devoted himself to learning their language. These Indians are on the original highway between the cradle of the human race and the home of the aborigines of the northern part of North America, and it is not thought that the resemblance between them and the Greenlanders is accidental. The arrival of the Vega on the Tschuktscher coast was an event like the landing of Columbus in the New World. It was an unprecedented occurrence, and made a sensation throughout the region.

East of the Lena Professor Nordenskjöld found on shore no scattered blocks of stone, such as are distributed over a continent by glaciers, and such as are found elsewhere in Siberia. This fact was held to point to the absence of land out to sea north of that coast, and it excites anticipations as to the possible discoveries which are to be made by the Jeannette. Not the least of the peculiarities of this strange region is the fact that the coast appears to be rising slowly out of the sea. The inhabitants have to shift their villages at times nearer to the edge of the water, which is gradually receding from them. Professor Nordenskjöld's letter is full of facts like these, and the scientific world will wait with impatience the further publication of the results of his discoveries.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Letters should be brief, and written on one side of the paper only. Those intended for insertion should be addressed to the Editor, 162 St. James Street, Montreal; those on matters of business to the Manager, at the same address.

COLONIAL REPRESENTATION.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR.

SIR,—The Hon. Ed. Blake has lately (and perhaps wisely) raised himself above the mire of Politics. Some mysterious wind seems to have drifted his mantle so as to alight in some measure, on the shoulders of the *Mail*. This conservative, and therefore of course illiberal, organ, is actually advocating the consolidation of the Empire and representation of colonies, with high and noble aim to facilitate settlement of great questions of state Policy, and prevent errors, which, for lack of practical knowledge, will recur with British statesmen, yet might readily be avoided by the presence, speech, and vote, of intelligent colonial parliamentary representatives. With such views most Liberals must heartily sympathize, were it not for a lurking doubt that the cloven foot will soon show itself in a tendency to form this scheme into a means of extending the blessing of our "N. P." to the proposed re-constructed Empire. By the dazzle so produced it is thought to blind Free Traders, and at the same time satiate Protectionists, of whom there are still a few in England, and many in all the Colonies. Lord Beaconsfield, the man of surprises, designs to coin a new phrase,—“Protection with honour.”

Be it remembered, then, in view of the *Mail's* next article, that the extended or limited application of a principle does not in anywise alter the *intrinsic nature* of that principle. Intercolonial trade, or intercolonial reciprocity of tariffs, combined with hostility to all outsiders, only means the giving up Free Trade, and entails commercial antagonism between Great Britain with her Colonies—and all the world. This is a warfare, like every species of warfare, in which there is no gain to either party in the strife. The mantle of the Hon. Ed. Blake has evidently been rent in twain by the hurricane which was needed to waft it to the Conservative organ, and only half will be found to have fallen to its share,—the selfish, mean, and niggardly half, which hungers for monopoly of power in political empire as well as in trade. Canadians, and others, *must* learn that it is impossible to be *mean* and yet prosper. To *give* as well as take is the very primary principle of trade. To restrict the liberty (which is man's inalienable right) of giving and taking, bartering, buying or selling to or from any nation or individual, is a loss of power, a deprivation of liberty, a dwarfing of faculties hindered in their exercise, a *lessening* of empire,—not a *greatening* of it. However much the selfishness of the thing may seem for a time to weld men or nations together by force of self-interest, there lies within the principle (because the principle itself *lies*) elements of separation which must be *felt* ere long, if nothing but experience will teach those who long to commit the folly. No doubt at first, in contemplation of an intercolonial reciprocity tariff, much heated discussion would evolve a tolerably fair adjustment. Yet inevitably, as soon as completed, each integral portion of the Empire would begin to feel, in some direction or other, the necessary restriction of its natural freedom to trade in the commodities of other nationalities. Those portions whose trade interests were the most diverse, highly developed and extensive, would feel it first and most forcibly. Britain's trade interests are already so widespread—nay, universal—that any measure of so-called “protection” is to her so self-evident an absurdity, that any attempt to foist upon British intelligence so rank a folly could but hasten the downfall of that noble Lord Beaconsfield already pronounced upon him by the inexorable law which produces deprivation of power for all who seek, not *truth*, but only

the outward appearance of it. Growth in trade is an impossibility apart from freedom to use the abilities with which man has been endowed to acquire, or distribute and exchange, his possessions or manufactures unhindered by short-sighted legal, but unjust enactments. The path of progress is always in the direction of the extension of liberties—not in restrictions.

If the *Mail* belies my prophecy and refrains from its second article, it will only be because it has already been answered. But it will refrain. I have no belief in the marvellous or the impossible.

“*Liberal.*”

Toronto, 17th October, 1879.

PRIZE QUESTIONS IN CANADIAN HISTORY.

N.B.—We have received from A.B. a photograph copy of a plan of Montreal as it existed in 1758, showing the fortifications and the site of the present Place D'Armes marked but not so named; but A.B. writes that “*it is a copy made from the original plan of 1879,*” thus showing by a simple clerical error how soon mistakes in history may be made.

With reference to Question No. 37, we have to cancel reply No. 3, as we have learned on the best authority that the circumstances as stated are incorrect, and hence it can in nowise be accepted as an answer to the question; we are sorry we have been misled in the matter.

39. Which is the oldest Protestant Church in Canada?

Ans.—If accepted as including the present Dominion of Canada, St. Paul's Church, Halifax, N.S., is undoubtedly the oldest. It was opened in 1750 under Rev. Mr. Tutty, who came out with the first Protestant settlers in the autumn of 1749.

If the old Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada are taken, then the Church of St. Andrew's at Berthier-en-haut, L.C., built by the first English Seigneur, Hon. James Cuthbert, in 1786. A Lutheran Church at Williamsburg, U.C., built in 1789, consecrated in 1790 and called Zion Church; the first pastor was Rev. Samuel Schwerdfeger.

The oldest at present in use is the St. Gabriel Street Church, in Montreal, which was erected in 1792, Rev. John Young, from Schenectady, N.Y., being the first pastor.

[NOTE.—The Church of England Mission at Sorel was commenced in 1784, and the church was built soon after that date; it does not now exist, but the present church is built upon the same spot. A church built under the auspices of Brant, the Indian Chief, on the Grand River, is stated by some competitors to have been in existence in 1789; but in Stone's “Life of Brant” it appears that he visited Montreal and Quebec in that year, with a view of obtaining aid for the establishment of a permanent mission there, with the services of a resident minister, but was not successful, as the Governor was absent.]

40. Who first owned St. Helen Island (opposite Montreal); from what did it derive its name; by whom was it occupied after the battle of St. Foye, and what event took place there which prevented the French standards falling into the hands of the English at the capitulation of Montreal?

Ans.—(1) The Island was first owned by the Company of the Hundred Associates. A son of Lauzon, President of the Company, received a grant of all the islands in the St. Lawrence, excepting those of Montreal and Orleans. It was granted to Charles Lemoine November 3rd, 1672. Ferland, vol. iii., p. 350.

(2) Champlain named it after his wife, Helen Bouillé. Miles' French Regime, p. 43; Miles' School History of Canada, p. 25.

(3) After the battle of St. Foye—April 28th, 1760—the French troops under De Levis retreated to Montreal and were quartered in the town and on the Island. Miles' French Regime, pp. 460–510.

(4) On September 7th, 1760, Bougainville and Marquis de Vaudreuil capitulated, but General Amherst refused them the honours of war. De Levis determined to resist to the last and retired to the Island. Amherst sent Col. Haldimand to demand the French colours, but the French declared they had none to give up, as all had been destroyed. De Vaudreuil and De Levis certified the fact of their destruction by giving their *parole d'honneur*. The reason alleged for their destruction was that they were too cumbersome for the woody country, but it was probably to prevent their falling into the hands of the English. The colours had been seen as late as the battle of St. Foye.

41. When did the Acadians arrive in Canada, and how were they treated?

Ans.—In 1748 many of them were induced to cross over into Canada, and received grants along the frontier. De la Galissoniere afforded them everything required for their maintenance.—Bigot: Memoire, 1763, pp. 56–67.

The Acadians arrived in Canada (when turned out of Acadia) in 1755. They were favourably received by the people, but they were ill-treated by the Intendant Bigot, Varin, Cadet and others in authority, who kept back the provisions sent out from France for them, and gave them horse-flesh to eat. The bad treatment they received caused the death of several hundreds of the unhappy Acadians from want and misery. Those who were willing to take land on certain seigniories were, however, better treated. Some of them founded the parishes of Nicolet and Beaucour.—Writings of Dr. Anderson, Quebec; Miles's “French Regime,” p. 301, and Appendix; “Memoires sur Le Canada,” 1749 to 1760, p. 69.

[NOTE.—In the treaty signed by Lord Amherst, the Acadians were not granted the same privileges as the Canadians.]

42. Who first suggested a Railway Bridge across the St. Lawrence and took steps to test its possibility?

Ans.—The late Hon. John Young, in 1847, at public meetings, and also by writings in the newspapers. He also advanced the necessary funds to Mr. T. C. Keefer for a survey and plan of the work, and urged its importance on every occasion. The site now occupied by the Victoria Bridge is the one originally selected by Mr. Keefer. Mr. Martin, C.E., of the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Railroad, also made surveys; his plans were somewhat altered, and a different site chosen. The final surveys were made in 1852.