

RUSSIA AND ENGLAND.

the first Jesuit mission founded in 1611 was at Port Royal, Acadia, though this was temporary in its character. The next mission was on the St. Lawrence, under the Récollets, a reformed branch of the Franciscan order, who came to the country with Champlain in 1615. The Récollets at once extended their field into the home of the Hurons, and in 1625 called to their aid in their evangelising labours the Jesuits, to whom we are indebted for the long series of interesting *Relations* transmitted annually from the scattered fields of their work to the head of their order at Quebec, and from there forwarded to France for publication. As we have said, these *Relations* have not been translated from the French; the English reader is therefore referred for an account of them to Justin Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History of America*, to the valuable contributions of Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan to the New York Historical Society, and to the writings of Mr. Parkman. In Canadian sources there are also interesting papers on the missions contributed to the *Canadian Monthly* by Dr. W. H. Withrow, and by Mr. Martin J. Griffin, of the Parliamentary Library at Ottawa. The reader will find an account of the Huron Missions by the present writer in *Picturesque Canada*, in the section on the *Georgian Bay and Muskoka Lakes*.

One other important narrative of the religious history of the colonies of France in the New World which remains to be noticed is Father Christian Le Clerq's *Etablissement de la Foi*, published in France in 1691, in two volumes 12mo. This work has been translated, under the title of *Establishment of the Faith*, by Dr. O'Shea, of New York, where it was published with a memoir in two volumes 8vo, in 1881. Le Clerq, who was a Récollet, and antagonistic to the Jesuits, came to Quebec from France in 1675, and found the field of his missionary labours in the Gaspé region. The Jesuits are bitterly satirised by Le Clerq in his work. Another work called forth by the Jesuit missions in Canada is the *Mœurs des Sauvages Américains*, by Father Lafitau, and published in Paris in 1724. The author lived long among the Iroquois and made a close study of that warlike tribe. His book is held in high estimation by collectors, though it is rather overlaid with a theory of the Tartar origin of the red race. Belonging also to this period are the narratives of the discoveries of Father Louis Hennepin, who gives the first account in history of the Falls of Niagara, and who was associated for a time with the Chevalier de la Salle in his explorations in the West. Hennepin's *Canadian Discoveries and Voyages* appeared at Utrecht, in 1697-98, and an earlier work, on the French colony in Louisiana, was issued in Paris, in 1683. An English translation of the latter, by Dr. John Gilmary Shea, an indefatigable student of the early annals of the continent, appeared in New York in 1880. Baron La Hontan's *New Voyages in America*, first published at La Haye in 1703, is another notable, though unreliable, contribution to the literature of discovery and travel in New France. The Baron, a young Gascon, and a favourite of Frontenac, came to Canada in 1683, and was the bearer of the Governor's despatches to Paris, conveying an account of Phipp's failure before Quebec, in 1690. Parkman, in his *Frontenac and His Times*, characterises La Hontan as a mendacious historian; and adds, that he was "a man in advance of his time, for he had the caustic, sceptical, and mocking spirit which, a century later, marked the approach of the great Revolution."

La Salle in his lifetime left no record in literature of his important discoveries in the West; but, though much is shrouded in obscurity, rich materials are extant upon which many interesting volumes have been written. The chief of these are Mr. Parkman's *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, and the *Life of La Salle*, by Dr. Jared Spark, who has also written on the explorations of La Salle's sometime co-labourer, Father Marquette. In the French language, M. Pierre Margry, the present learned Assistant Custodian of the Archives of Marine and Colonies in Paris, has shed the fullest light on La Salle's history; though that writer's claim for La Salle of the honour of discovering the Mississippi, with other statements made in his book, have been actively combated. The chief of M. Margry's collections, which are considered of good authority, is entitled *Memoire envoyé en 1693 sur la découverte du Mississippi et des nations voisines par le Sieur de La Salle, en 1678, et depuis sa mort par le Sieur de Tonti*. The Chevalier Tonti was governor of the Fort of St. Louis, on the Illinois River, during Frontenac's régime, and took an active part in promoting the objects La Salle had in view in his explorations in the Gulf of Mexico, in the vicinity of which La Salle, in 1690, met a woful death.

The latest writer who belongs to this period of Canadian history, in point of ability, industry, and research, ranks admittedly the first. This is the Jesuit Father, Pierre François Xavier de Charlevoix, who came to Canada to inspect the Jesuit missions in the year 1720, and personally travelled through the country from Acadia to the Gulf of Mexico. His narrative, which is in six volumes 12mo, did not appear in France until 1744: it is entitled *Histoire et description Générale de la Nouvelle France, avec le Journal Historique d'un Voyage fait par l'ordre du Roi*. His work, it has been remarked, is commensurate with his opportunities: his faults and errors were those of his order. "Access," says Dr. Shea, "to State papers and the archives of the religious order to which he belonged, experience and skill as a practised writer, a clear head and an ability to analyse, arrange, and describe, well fitted him for his work." Another good authority remarks "that in all the high qualities requisite for a great historian, Charlevoix has no superior: he left no subject relating to the history of the affairs of his wonderful order in America untouched; and as the missions of the Company of Jesus among the Indians were the principal purpose of the Fathers in both of the Americas, the curiosity of Charlevoix permeated every accessible square mile of their surface to learn the habits, the customs, and the secrets of the life of the strange people his brethren sought to subdue to the influence of the Cross."

G. MERCER ADAM.

A DISTINGUISHED writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* proposes to contradict, in a series of articles, some of the facts and theories set forth by Sir Charles Dilke in his treatment of the position of European politics. Having abridged the latter, it seems only impartial to give the reverse of the picture as shown by the present writer, who opens his subject by a somewhat lengthy prologue, in which he states that "holding with the *Fortnightly* reviewer, Sir James Stephen's Commission, and the Adjutant-General, that it is of vital consequence for us to determine in military matters what we want and whether we can afford to pay for it, we intend in a series of articles to discuss the military relations of the Great Powers of the Continent at the present moment, and how they affect England's military power. We propose in this course to take up those precise aspects of the question which have been altogether ignored by the reviewer, and we purpose not only to study the armed forces of the Continent as they exist on paper, as well as our own, but we intend further to take account of the medium in which those forces have necessarily to interact. We are convinced that the whole tendency of the articles which have dealt with the 'Position of Modern Politics' has been to put these matters in a false light. In particular, as regards Russia, the author has, as we believe, put her strength for her weakness and her weakness for her strength. He has not taken account of the effect upon the position in Europe of the rise of the new power of Italy, whose army and whose politics he has in many respects most admirably described. He has in many most important respects misjudged the strength of Austria, of Germany, and of France. In almost every instance, not from an inaccurate statement of bare facts so far as he has given them, but from assumptions radically false, he has tended to lead our statesmen astray. We therefore look upon it as a duty, for the sake of our national future, to endeavour, whilst yet there is time, to remove the false impressions which have been produced on the minds of men by these brilliant papers."

LET us now in regard to Russia and to England, and to the question generally of English power, draw together the points on which we desire to insist in these corrections of historical inaccuracies. Beyond all doubt our point of vantage consists in the facilities of our sea transport. We possessed at the time of the Egyptian revolt in 1882 the means, thanks to our vast mercantile marine and to the efficiency of the *personnel* of our navy in such matters, of transporting at short notice the number of men and the stores required for them in a desert march more easily than any other European Power. Compare now the case of Russia. To any point at which she desires to strike she must, by an inexorable necessity, when we are opposed to her, convey her troops over enormous distances by land. The one advantage we enjoy, that of transporting to the very point where we want to strike the force we can embark in England, is a power the nature of which those know best who best understand the real conditions of war. To Sir Charles Dilke it seems enough to show what forces Russia can collect at her depôts. He does not understand how those terrible miles of road over which the loyal Russian soldiery, whose heroic bravery and readiness to die, and whose patriotic and religious enthusiasm he has so truly and so well described, will stretch their limits, present themselves to the minds of any soldier who does understand what war is. He does not see that an army wanting altogether alike in an officer and in a non-commissioned officer class, with habits of peculation engrained in those who cater for it, and suffering always from that disease of "Too much Archduke," which proved so fatal to it in 1877, enters upon any distant campaign under disadvantages which no numbers at the depôts can compensate.

We cordially and heartily agree with Sir Charles Dilke that it is needful for us, for the defence of the Empire, to be able to strike blows far from the shores of England. It is only an application to our time of that which, in the grandest of the Duke of Wellington's despatches, was for ever insisted on, that the true principle for an English patriot is not to make preparation for fighting an army at home—though in its measure that too is needful—but to strike blows abroad which shall keep the shores of England sacred from invasion. In all reason, then, where is the weakness of our enemy, at which we ought to strike? Where is the special strength which we ought to develop? Not all the militia, not all the guns, not all the officers with which Sir Charles would supply us, will serve our need, for the precise purpose which he has well shown we need. Of the ultimate and essential power of England, if only time be granted her to develop it, no one, as Sir Charles Dilke himself asserts, has any doubt. What is doubtful is what she can do in the first few weeks and months of a modern war; and, as he has well shown, that is the time on which now the fatal issues hang. But no mercantile marine, not even our own, can in the first few weeks of war transport to a hostile shore an army reckoned by the hundred thousand, even if we possessed such a force. Perhaps in a month or two the transport of 200,000 Armed Men, if all our vast mercantile resources were strained to the utmost, and everything sacrificed to it, might be possible. But 200,000 men are not an army. If we have afoot a force of something like 70,000 men, complete in all its arms, and actually ready to take the field, that represents pretty nearly the limit of the power with which we could, under any circumstances, strike a blow.

Now England can we think be made ready to meet the special needs of her position by four simple means: First, by having her fleet actually able to perform the duties of guarding by effective offensive strokes the vast commerce, *more than double, as it is, of the whole carrying trade of the world outside of Great Britain*, the guardianship of which entails upon that fleet such duties as fall to the lot of no other navies, not of all the combined navies in the world beside. Secondly, by completing the armament and garrisoning of her home fortresses and foreign coaling stations, so that, possessed as we are of the most important points of vantage for a