

give a “warts and all” picture of morals, finances, personality clashes, alcoholism and other problems in the pioneer church.

The turning point in institutional development and in ethnic relations came in the years 1841 to 1856 when new Upper Canadian dioceses were created but usually with francophone bishops in an anglophone province. In those same years the Irish famine migration permanently altered the demographic and even the religious make-up of the church. From this point Choquette concentrates his attention almost exclusively on the unique Bytown/Ottawa diocese which straddled the Quebec-Ontario boundary and both ethnic communities. Unlike most Ontario dioceses, Ottawa enjoyed a large measure of episcopal continuity as the first two episcopates, of Guigues and the “dur” Duhamel, spanned more than 60 years. Both men were dedicated to ultramontane rigorism and to extending francophone Catholicism throughout the greater Ottawa valley, and therein lay the kernel of ethnic conflict.

Given the mutual antipathy of Irish and French Catholics trouble was not long in coming to the diocese of Bytown. Bilingualism imposed on the diocese by Duhamel did not restore harmony and may even have exasperated the culture-clash of the two ethnic groups. Is it an accident of historical selection that complaints of Irish clerical misdoing originated always with French fellow-priests? Eventually the “politique épiscopale”, including the Catholic programme, led Rome to send Conway to Canada on an investigative mission. Ottawa’s problems spilled into other dioceses, especially Toronto where Archbishop Lynch believed his mission was to defend and promote Irish interests, although his archdiocese had only half the churches and people that Ottawa, a Quebec dependency, did. For the Irish-dominated jurisdiction of Upper Canada-Ontario, the Ottawa valley became a sort of “Toronto irridenta” in church politics.

In the second part of his book Choquette turns to examining three major areas of Irish-French conflict — the church-directed aggressive francophone colonization on the Ottawa and westward, the territorial imperialism of Toronto that sought to divide and annex the Ontario part of the Ottawa diocese, and finally the revealing story of linguistic crosscurrents in the public and separate school structures. By 1900 linguistic polarization in the church was intense and public. “Ce qui était auparavant une guerre d’évêques masquée par un écran de fumée religieux est en voie de devenir une guerre ouverte entre deux races, deux nations”. The stage was set for Regulation 17. Which vision of Canada would prevail?

This is obviously an important book for Canadian history, clearly and interestingly written, based on solid, painstaking research into primary source materials that have barely been touched before. It points the way, and the need, for modern scholarly histories of the dioceses and the church, and of the other aspects of the ethno-religious connection such as the rivalry that swirled around the University of Ottawa, and the experiences of smaller francophone communities in Ontario. Once again historians are in happy debt to Robert Choquette.

John S. MOIRE  
*University of Toronto*

\* \* \*

ANN GORMAN CONDON — *The Envy of the American States: The Loyalist Dream for New Brunswick*. Fredericton: New Ireland Press, 1984. pp. xi, 236. Illustrations.

Ann Gorman Condon’s book is based on a Harvard University doctoral dissertation completed in 1975. Since Harvard’s lending policies made the dissertation largely unavailable, the publication of the book is welcome. Nevertheless, a reader cannot help being aware that most of the last decade’s new works in New Brunswick history are cited only in Condon’s bibliography and footnotes. They

have not much influenced her text, which seems little changed since the 1970s, despite the new data and interpretations that have appeared.

Condon estimates that about 15,000 loyalists settled in New Brunswick, but her book concentrates on 20 of them: Edward Winslow, Jonathan Sewell, Ward Chipman and others, "the twenty Loyalist gentlemen who were the first political leaders of the province" (p. 3). The book is a study of political ideology as expressed in the writings of these 20 men. To some extent, it provides a general history of New Brunswick politics and government from 1783 to about 1812, but the loyalist leaders and their opinions and aspirations remain constantly in the foreground.

Condon's 20 leaders (14 were New Englanders, though most New Brunswick loyalists came from the middle colonies) were educated professional men from established and "respectable" families, and most were members of or close to the colonial administration before the American Revolution. Convinced both of their right to govern and of the rightness of their practices, they were inclined to see opposition as malevolent conspiracy rather than honest dissent. Condon shows that, far from shaking their beliefs, the Revolution inspired in these men a lifelong search for vindication. Her book analyzes their plan to prove the rightness of their vision of government by creating in New Brunswick a society that would become, as one of them memorably stated, "the envy of the American states."

Since Condon focuses on the loyalist leaders rather than the British decision-makers, she never entirely dispels the possibility that even without their pressure, Britain might have hived off New Brunswick from Nova Scotia, just as it had (or would) with Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Upper Canada. Still, the loyalist leaders saw the establishing of New Brunswick as their victory and their opportunity to create "an aristocratic form of government... [based on] three institutions: a highly refined propertied class which would hold most of the political power, a series of cultural institutions centering on the Anglican church to inculcate loyalty and respect for the established order, and a supportive empire which would supply the political and economic framework..." (p. x). Condon carefully links this plan for New Brunswick to the 20 leaders' deepest philosophical commitments as well as to their thirst for revenge and their need for suitably respectable places for themselves and their families.

Having established the leaders' aims, Condon goes on to describe the wreckage of most of their plans. Support from Britain was either too slight or else hostile to the leaders' intentions. Most of the colonial institutions proved inadequate for the role intended for them, and the political system actually gave rise to a chorus of opposition to the leaders' plans and pretensions. Almost as galling to the 20 was the success of the United States in avoiding the anarchy that they saw as the inevitable consequence of independence and republicanism. At the end of the book, Condon presents the loyalist leaders as out of step with their times, outmoded and "'more imperial' than the empire."

In recent years, most loyalist historiography has been at pains to demolish the wealthy-autocratic-Bostonian stereotype of Loyalism, by presenting poor loyalists, rural loyalists, ethnic loyalists and politically radical loyalists. Condon restores some balance with her portrait of these 20 leaders and their families. Too genteel to call a male chicken a cock, they conform perfectly to the traditional image — no doubt because it was originally modelled on them.

Condon's history is traditional in method as well as subject. As political history focusing on a small elite and based on a close reading of their written statements, it deals with the issues and problems defined by the loyalist elite and does not reach out for a broad comparative perspective. Condon does not measure the New Brunswick experience against parallels or contrasts in other Canadian loyalist communities. We learn the leaders' attitudes to the USA and Britain, but no comparative study of their ideology is attempted. The material culture of the loyalist elite is considered in a set of beautifully arranged and captioned illustrations, but not in the text.

More important, the politics and ideology of early New Brunswick are studied with scant attention to social and economic context. Intellectual historians are doubtless justified in refusing

to have their field made into a sub-species of social history, but the key subject of Condon's book is aristocracy, and aristocracy is not just a political concept. The politics that the loyalist leaders ordained for New Brunswick required the elite to achieve social and economic ascendancy as a prerequisite to their political control. Their political failure cannot be separated from their inability to realize their ideal: a landed gentry supported by revenue from prosperous rural estates. In this respect, the leaders' plan may have been doomed as soon as it was decided that all loyalists would be land-owners, but Edward Winslow's *cri de cœur* — "Our gentlemen have all become potato farmers — & our Shoemakers are preparing to legislate" — cries out for further investigation. How much money was needed to shore up aristocratic pretension in New Brunswick, and how far short did the leaders fall? What were the investment needs and revenue potentials of their country estates? Who did benefit from agricultural production? Condon's assertion that New Brunswick was quickly organized into a stable rural society (p. 144) still needs to be tested against a study of rural communities along the Saint John River.

The attention Condon gives to the approximately 14,980 other loyalists of New Brunswick is disappointingly brief, particularly since recent work has undermined her contention that evidence on rank-and-file loyalists is fragmentary. Condon at times suggests that the loyalist leaders "acted, and were recognized, as spokesmen for the larger whole" (p. 97). She tentatively reads previous estimates that relatively few loyalists left New Brunswick (p. 2) as evidence of satisfaction. (Other scholars have taken this emigration as proof of disaffection, but surely the whole issue of transience needs to be studied as something more than an ideological litmus test.)

Condon eventually concludes that "the rank and file rejected the deferential hierarchical colonial pattern" (p. 169) favoured by the elite, but the full implications for New Brunswick — and beyond — are not faced. Condon asserts in her preface that Loyalism made great contributions to the Canadian body politic. "Canadian federalism is stamped with Loyalist visions," she writes, but these points are never seriously addressed. If Loyalism was the ideology Condon describes in this book, one could as fairly conclude from her evidence that most loyalists were not Loyalist at all.

Condon is not an uncritical advocate of the 20 leaders she studies. She exposes their failures to meet their own high standards, recognizes that much of their abuse of officials such as John Parr was unfair and unfounded, and even calls them greedy for seeking patronage jobs they probably badly needed. Yet the organization of the book and the occasional use of phrases in which the leaders become "the Loyalists" (e.g., "The Loyalists' primary goal, then, was not land, but posts — jobs, appointments, places," p. 43) ultimately seem to accept the leaders' claim that they were entitled to define reality for all the New Brunswick loyalists. Even if we accept that the leaders' highly conscious plans should be labelled a dream, the book's subtitle misleads by proclaiming the leaders' vision to be *the* Loyalist dream for New Brunswick, rather than one of several.

Christopher MOORE  
Toronto, Ontario

\* \* \*

GERALD FRIESEN, — *The Canadian Prairies — A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984. pp. XV, 524.

Canada's prairie region has been well served by a wide variety of writers. Creative writers — novelists like Stead, Ostenso, Roy, Salverson, Laurence, Ross, Mitchell, Gordon, Kroetsch, Wiebe and McClung — have produced a large body of fine work that is recognizably prairie in focus, content and feeling. Amateur historians have been almost unbelievably assiduous, producing during the past generation some 5,000 histories of prairie locales. Historical and record societies have been