

times a sailing vessel is liable, for many causes, to be carried many, even some hundred miles out of her course in crossing the Atlantic.

Mr. Howley has a closely reasoned argument concerning the exact course taken by Cabot. He first gives the different statements made by various writers, and shows where, according to each one, Cabot ought to have struck land. "Herrera gives latitude 68° as the landfall; Eden, 58° ; Hackluyt, 56° ; Galvano, 45° . As to the courses taken, Fabian says northwest; Galvano, west; others, west by north." The point 68° north is rejected "because to reach that point he would require to sail around Cape Farewell, in Greenland, then alter his course to something east of north, so as to reach Davis' straits," which, being so unlikely, is declared inadmissible. But according to a principle laid down by Mr. Howley in another part of his article, we must not reject contemporary testimony unless we have some more authentic and undoubted fact to replace it. Now, we have the direct contemporary testimony of Ramusio, who says he has a letter from Cabot, in which he (Cabot) says he sailed as far north as $67\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$. We cannot reject this testimony, and if it appears inadmissible it is simply because we have not rightly understood it. According to the explanation given by me above, it not only can be admitted, but chimes in most harmoniously with the whole account. This statement of 68° refers to the *second* voyage only, and *not* to the landfall, but the turning point of the voyage northwestward, after having left the landfall. With regard to the courses, Mr. Howley says: "Northwest, the course given by Fabian would strike the land just midway between the two points [55° and 58°], or at about 57° on the coast of Labrador, allowing, of course, for variation. The course north-northwest would strike Nova Scotia at 45° north. A west-by-north course would strike the coast of America at about South Carolina, and a west course would take him to the island of Cuba." These latter courses are consequently rejected as out of the question.

This is only another example of trying to adjust facts to fit a preconceived theory. Raimondo tells us that Cabot sailed towards the west (or the *east*, as he calls it). Now he is a contemporary writer. He relates what he heard from Cabot's own mouth, and he is the *only* writer who mentions the course of the first voyage. Now, although, as I said, we must not pin our faith to him for a point or so of the compass, yet, on the principle mentioned, we cannot reject his authority. I will soon show that there is no occasion to do so. Mr. Howley, though reasoning well, sets out from a wrong starting point. He takes his courses from Bristol or Cape Clear, $51\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ north. We know that the starting point should be at St. Kilda's or Rockall, 58° to 60° north. Taking our courses from this point,