

Further, Sebastian Cabot, in a map made by him in 1544, while giving no name to this cape, refers to it as the "first land seen". He must have had his information from his father, or he may have known it himself, as it is very likely that he was one of the "Matthews" company. On the same day an island was found close to this "first land seen," which was named St. John, because it was John the Baptist's day. Now, Cabot did not know of the Gut of Canso, which was not discovered until 1525, and he thought that Cape Breton was part of the mainland. Even had he known of this passage, by no possibility could he, in the slow-sailing craft of his day, which could only make four or five knots an hour, have got through and seen the coast of Prince Edward Island the same day. It would not be possible with our present-day craft. Not knowing of the Gut of Canso's existence, he could scarcely have reached this Island in a week.

But Cabot, on this first voyage, when he had found the land, had accomplished his mission. He had found land to the west, which he thought to be and reported to be

the land of the Great Khan, the land for which he was seeking. Then, skirting the coast of Newfoundland, he returned to Bristol, where he arrived in September, having been absent on this voyage about four months. It seems beyond doubt that Cabot never saw Prince Edward Island. The island named by him St. John, found the same day that he made the land, was almost certainly Skatari, off the Cape where he made his landfall. There is no other island off that coast that complies with Cabot's description. By no possibility could it have been Prince Edward Island.\*

Verrazauto, a Florentine navigator in the employ of Francis I of France, made a voyage in 1524, and it has been alleged that the credit of discovering this Island may belong to him, but that idea may be dismissed. He made the land to the south, near the Carolinas. He sailed along the coast of the present United States and the shores of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and it was largely upon his discoveries that the French founded their claim to New France. He also coasted along Cape Breton, but there

\*The late Archbishop O'Brien, in a very erudite paper on Cabot's Landfall and Chart, published in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, for 1899, disputes the view adopted in the text, which is the one advanced by Doctor Dawson. Some of the crew, he argues, landed at Cape North, "on the very Cape," and then sailed four leagues west to St. Lawrence Bay, within the Gulf, where they again landed for water. Entertaining, as he does, a profound respect for the late distinguished prelate's erudition, the writer yet feels that his distinguished fellow Prince Edward Islander's patriotic love for the land of his birth, has misled him in this matter. The facts as mentioned in his article, would seem to be fatal to his contention. Cabot made his landfall about 5 a. m. True, this was on one of the longest days in the year. He had been storm-tossed for six to eight weeks, without seeing land. The crew, before landing "on the very Cape," had to make some preparations, getting boats ready, etc., and would spend some time going to and returning from the shore, and would also spend some time on the land, when they got there. Men, who had been so long at sea, in bad weather, would be apt to linger on shore. Then they returned on board, got the ship under weigh, and sailed four leagues to St. Lawrence Bay, where they again went on shore for water. The accounts are, that they saw no inhabitants, but that they saw traces of them, which they reported. This shows they took time to look around. It is almost safe to say that Cabot himself landed. Besides the time taken in getting their water, which they had to find, dip up and put into their casks, they remained on shore long enough to form an estimate of the quality of the soil, and of the products they deemed it

adapted for raising. They evidently looked about them, seemingly without hurrying. Now, if they made Cape North in the early morning, landed and spent any time there, then sailed four leagues, in a vessel whose rate of sailing would be little, if at all, over a league an hour, landed again, procured water for the ship, had a look at the land, returned with their casks to the ship, and got them on board again the same day, even though a long one, would have been pretty well spent. It seems to the writer quite impossible, that, in the slow-sailing Matthew, they could have reached Prince Edward Island the same day. Moreover, if he had made Prince Edward Island, he would not have known whether it was an island, or part of the mainland, as subsequent explorers believed. No doubt, His Grace was right in his description of the headland of Cape Breton as not agreeing with Cabot's description, but it was not necessary for the Navigator to step on shore at the Cape itself. There are landing places near the Cape. It seems possible that the Cape, made by Cabot, may have been one of the headlands, or points, in the same neighbourhood, but, even if that were the case, it would not destroy the force of Doctor Dawson's contention, which the writer has adopted in the text, and which seems to him to be conclusive. Another point which the Archbishop does not seem to have considered, but seems to the writer to be of weight against his contention, is the fact that, when Cabot, sailing to the West, made his landfall, he had accomplished the purpose of his expedition, and had no occasion to continue on his voyage. In fact, having, as he believed, attained his object, and being short of provisions, he did turn back.