

a curve round Toula, and by way of Riazan and Tambow, descends to the district of Bobrowsk in the Government of Voronega, thence across the Governments of Tambow, Penza, Saratow, Simbirsk, Samara and Orenbourg, extends to the Oural, cutting the river about the 51° of north latitude. In Russia this pine forms compact masses in many places, particularly on healthy lands and gravels, called Bór, or pine lands; but also grows freely intermixed with birch, or spruce, or larch, or poplar, and other species.

This pine is chiefly used for building purposes, as beams, planks and boards. A large trade in these materials is carried on between Germany, France, and England. The pine for these markets come from the Governments of Olonets, St. Petersburg, Tver, Novgoud, Orel, Smolensk, and the Northern Governments; and is known by the name of Riga pine. Large dimension pine is used for the masts of vessels and in the construction of ships for sea and river navigation, and very considerably for railway ties. Its use in the manufacture of casks is also of some importance. All the rosin dispatched from the northern Governments abroad, as well as that sold in the markets of the interior of the Empire, is carried in barrels made of this wood. It is also used in the manufacture of small wares and in carpentry, but in this respect it gives way to harder species of wood, as the oak, the ash, the maple, the birch and other broad leaved kinds. In the peasants' houses of the North countries this pine, cut into thin boards and re-split, is used in the manufacture of matches. Inferior qualities are used for firewood. The stumps, roots and knots make tar, pitch, and turpentine, commercial articles for home use and export. For construction purposes this pine is exploited by cuttings from 100 to 150 years old, and by cuttings of about 60 years for fuel.

### Letters to the Editor.

IN REPLY TO G. T. B.

SIR,—You will pardon me in saying in reply to G. T. B. that all reasonably well informed men in Canada understand sufficiently the right of Roman Catholics in Manitoba to have their grievances removed, but do not admit that the bill of the Government is the right way to do it.

It was first decided by the Privy Council that the Manitoba School Act was legal, then the same authority decided that in the working of the Act there was a grievance to the Roman Catholics who constituted a minority of the inhabitants of Manitoba. At the same time it decided that the Church of England had a similar grievance, they forming however a portion of the majority in the Province. On coming to Manitoba the Mennonites had been assured by the Canadian Government that they would enjoy equal rights with any of Her Majesty's subjects. Here, then, we have three bodies equally entitled to a Remedial Act. To pass separating bills for each would be ludicrous and therefore the remedy the Government proposes would be unworkable and is unjust in giving special privileges to one body and refusing it to others.

The honour of every Roman Catholic is bound as much as that of every Protestant to give equal privileges to the Mennonites. Consequently I am driven to the conviction that the only mode of remedying the grievance is to give to the local trustees of every school the right to prescribe (subject to an appeal in case of dispute) the religious instruction to be given in it.

G. M. R.

### WRONG CRITICISMS.

SIR,—In the American Historical Review for April, 1896, there is a *critique* on Vol. VIII of Kingsford's History of Canada which demands notice. It is written and signed by Prof. Wrong, Professor of History at the University of Toronto. That University is a Canadian one and Professor Wrong is appointed to teach history there to Canadians. His utterances, therefore, have an importance which otherwise they might or might not possess. The views of history he inculcates more or less affect the tone of thought of our young men. It has been a great pleasure to myself, in common with the majority of Canadians, to see the manly and stalwart line THE WEEK has taken with regard to Canadian interests and problems, and the *critique* of Professor Wrong's is a corresponding disappointment.

With his opinion of Dr. Kingsford as an author or his depreciatory opinion of that author's manner of writing contained in the sentence, "Mr. Kingsford is not a stylist"—whatever that means—I have nothing to do. Professor Wrong is entitled to his opinion, and it is his duty to say what he thinks. Nor am I concerned with his microscopic corrections. On this head it may justly be said "physician heal thyself." In the article complaining of misprints in the book there are no less than three mistakes, the very name of the contributor being misprinted. Nor do I care to argue with Professor Wrong that it is he who is mistaken in the meaning he attributes to sentences he quotes as not saying what they mean. All of these points are a matter between Dr. Kingsford and his critic. But what I do complain of, and feel it my duty to remonstrate against is the false impression of the history of the war conveyed by Professor Wrong. These two paragraphs are what a Canadian Professor of History has to say of that war. They are Professor Wrong's own words without alteration:

"The year 1812 saw the Americans checked on land, and England, to her amazement, had been beaten upon the sea by her own children. Book XXIX. relates the incidents of the war in 1813. Mr. Kingsford devotes especial attention to statistics, and has been at great pain to determine the numbers engaged in the land and sea contests. The feeling of exasperation on both sides was intensifying. The British general Proctor left some prisoners insufficiently guarded, and forty of them were brutally massacred by his Indian allies. American officers were accused by the British of violating their parole, and some of them, including Winfield Scott, were plainly threatened with execution if they fell into British hands. The Americans burned the public buildings of York (Toronto), the capital of Upper Canada, and destroyed the pretty village of Newark (Niagara), leaving four hundred people homeless. The British retaliated. The American side of the Niagara frontier was devastated, and it was in continuation of this policy of reprisal for injuries in Canada that the public buildings at Washington were burned later.

"Book XXX. brings the story of the war to a close, and is on the whole a record of disaster to the British army, owing largely to the incompetence of Prevost, the Governor-General of Canada. The destruction of property at Washington and the huge British losses at New Orleans make melancholy reading. 'The events of the war have not been forgotten in England,' says Mr. Kingsford, 'for they have never been known there.' They are certainly neither unknown nor forgotten on this side of the Atlantic. Mr. Kingsford complains of the partisan accounts of the war which American writers have given. He should discriminate. Second-rate writers in all countries are too blindly patriotic. Surely Mr. Adams and Mr. McMaster aim to be fair enough."

I claim that these paragraphs are grossly unfair and improper. They are not a true version of the result of these campaigns. The very first sentence conveys a wrong impression. The Americans were a great deal more than "checked" in 1812. They were thoroughly well beaten. The English were not "beaten on the sea." The Americans called men-of-war frigates, and they captured in three cases—no more—British frigates of much lighter build and equipment, and then claimed that they had "beaten the British Navy." Professor Wrong commits an improper, unpatriotic and unworthy act when he, a Professor of History in a Canadian University, subscribes his name to such a falsification of history. Nobody wants him to misrepresent history in the interest even of his native country. We all can fairly object to his misrepresenting history in the interest of his country's enemies.

Next, "American officers were accused by the British of violating their parole." They did violate their parole. They admitted it themselves and justified it by saying they had done so because their Secretary of War told them not to mind their parole but to continue to serve. The American General Wilkinson shewed his opinion of such conduct in the order issued by him, quoted by Dr. Kingsford. Why does not Professor Wrong state the fact and not seek to disguise it?

Next, "Book XXX. brings the story of the war to a close, and is, on the whole, a record of disaster to the British army, owing largely to the incompetence of Prevost, the