

the northern fringe of this continent from the rest and attach it forever to Europe, shutting your ears against the unwelcome, and as you fancy disloyal, voices which would tell you the honest truth. The Canadian jingo stimulated by your Imperialism and thinking himself safe under your shield, does all that he can by offensive demonstrations to provoke the enmity of our mighty neighbour."

A more cunning and malicious attack you never penned. If you cannot persuade Englishmen by one method to adopt your opinions you try another. You now appeal to their pocket and say: "See how if Canada were annexed she would make the Americans retain the gold standard and thereby your investments would not be endangered." You know it is not true. You know that if Canada were annexed her influence is not sufficient to turn the scale, and yet you try to mislead your countrymen by saying that it would. Your sordid appeal to cupidity will be as futile as have been your previous attempts to arouse fear by dwelling on the dangers from United States ambition. But what shall be said of the man who, like you, abases the rights of a sojourner? Speak out plainly. What demonstrations do you allude to? Who are the jingoes you refer to? Name them and let Canadians know who it is you are attacking. Catinline sought to plunge his country into the horrors of civil war for his own selfish advancement. You are doing the same thing to gratify an idea of your own. Read your Cicero again and refresh your memory as to the history of the man whom the orator denounced.

Reminiscence  
of 1870.

M. Emile Ollivier was, it will be remembered, the French Prime Minister at the time when France declared war against Germany in 1870. It was to him that Bismarck wrote the famous letter in which this passage occurred:

"If I had been unfortunate enough to draw down upon my country one half of the ills which you have drawn upon yours, I would pass the rest of my life in asking pardon of God and men."

M. Ollivier was lately interviewed in Paris on the occasion of the twenty-sixth anniversary of his fall, and he made the following statement which students of the campaign will say is not without truth. The explanation of the scattered disposition of the French army corps at the outbreak of hostilities is new and interesting. If true, it explains what most students of tactics have always considered to have been a grievous blunder.

"France," M. Ollivier said, "was assured of the alliance of Austria and Italy, and this alliance we should have had except for the disaster and the unpardonable mistake of Sedan. Yes, we had their support even after Reichshofen."

So certain were these alliances that the plan of campaign for which the Emperor has been so much blamed, the parcelling out that is of the army corps along the frontier, was imposed upon us by the Austrian military staff. Our troops were even disposed according to the plans of the Archduke Albert that we might the more easily support him when he should arrive at the head of the army. But there was something better than this, for even if the alliances failed us, even if we were abandoned by all, we were to be victorious, for the first victory would have sufficed to decide the final hesitations of Austria and Italy, then intimidated by the support that Russia gave to Germany. We had every chance of beating Prussia. The German mobilization could not be completed until August 9. But we were ready on July 30. We had 280,000 soldiers at Metz ready to march. The first mistake was not marching, and this was the Emperor's fault. Leboeuf desired it—he who has been calumniated. Our infantry was superior to that of Germany at this moment; we had only to cross the Sarre and we should have found opposing us only the Eighth Corps still in formation. We might have come down upon it like a torrent and crushed the first Prussian corps issuing from the defiles of Kaiserstein. The Emperor did not wish it. At Saarbrücken

he had not been able to stay on his horse and had fallen fainting into the arms of his aide-de-camp. He suffered from an internal disease. He was unable to command and would not allow another to command in his stead." According to M. Ollivier, the second blunder, an heroic one, was committed by MacMahon on August 6 in accepting battle at Worth without assenting himself of the movements of Faily and Douay. Although MacMahon killed or wounded as many Germans as composed his own army corps, France began the campaign by a defeat. Still it was not too late to repair the evil. But a third blunder was committed, and the person guilty of this, according to M. Ollivier, was Froissard, who became frightened at Forbach and retired, while Bazaine said to himself as he hesitated whether to go to his rescue: "The *maitre d'école* is in the thick of it; leave him to extricate himself alone." The fourth blunder which M. Ollivier describes as a crime, was the action of Bazaine at Metz on the 14th, 16th, and 18th, at Borny, Gravelotte, and Saint Privat. Finally, the fifth blunder was the Cabinet Council presided over by the Empress, and the responsibility for this M. Ollivier ascribes to the Comte de Palikao and his colleagues. He accuses the Empress of having inflexibly refused, even against the wish of the Emperor, MacMahon, and the young Prince, to give her consent to an act which was the most obvious of all duties at the moment—namely, to recall the army of Chalons to Paris, and to organize under its protection the arming of the nation. By this mistaken notion of dynastic interest the *débauche* of Sedan became possible, and M. Ollivier quotes the Emperor as saying to MacMahon: "Puis qu'il en est ainsi, allons nous faire casser la tête!"

The Landing  
of Cabot.

We have been favoured by Father Dawson with a copy of his monograph on the discovery of America by John Cabot in 1497.

This monograph is extracted from the Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada relative to a Cabot celebration in 1897. The point brought out by this paper is that it seems to prove that John Cabot was the true discoverer of the continent of America. Columbus reached the mainland at Venezuela in 1498. He had, of course, discovered the West India Islands in 1492. Cabot leading as he did in 1497 an English expedition, laid the foundation for the English claims to the American continent, not specially of Newfoundland, but of Nova Scotia and of the American colonies as far south as Florida, as well. The landfall that Cabot made is doubtful. Three localities have been suggested: (1) Some point on the Labrador Coast, and specially Cape Chidley; (2) Bona Vista on the coast of Newfoundland; (3) Cape North, or Cape Breton on Cape Breton Island. Father Dawson strongly, and it seems to us conclusively, argues in favour of the last. In our criticism of Gresham's History of Canada we noticed the fact that the author of that work had gone totally astray on the point of Cabot's landing. We recommend to the authorities of Toronto University the study of Father Dawson's monograph; as they have been relying on false guides it is time they were set right. Our readers may not all be aware that next year at Halifax the Royal Society of Canada will celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of Cabot's discovery. They will proceed to Sydney to unveil a monument there commemorating John Cabot's memory.

Professional  
Cricket.

The other day we had occasion to notice a tempest in a teapot over the conduct of the Cambridge captain in the Oxford and Cambridge match. Now it is the professionals who are at it. The Spectator of the 15th instant thus describes the matter:

But now it is the conduct of certain professionals which has given rise to excitement of the keenest kind, and to lamentations upon the supposed evidences of decadence in the national game. What did those professionals do? Five