

In 1717, when Vaudreuil imposed a *corvée* that aroused serious resentment in the seignery of Longueuil, Zoltvany has his hero go "to reason with" the people, but they became "insolent," and so his guardsmen gave them "rough treatment," after which Vaudreuil jailed ten of them for two months. Zoltvany is explicit that such treatment is not repressive (p. 156-157). I disagree with both the weaselish quality of the description and the substance of the conclusion.

His worst blind spot, however, is the Indian "savage." I have become intolerant of the Parkmanesque rhetoric that makes Indians into screaming animals, and Zoltvany even permits himself to speak of "the halfbreed Montour," which is about the same to my ear as if he had said "that frog Vaudreuil."

The rhetoric is not all. In dealing with the Indians, Zoltvany makes his one visible departure from objective reporting (as distinguished from interpretation). When the Iroquois attack Lachine, there is a "frightful massacre" in which "houses were burnt and men, women and children indiscriminately butchered" (p. 19). But when Vaudreuil destroys the Oneida village by means that could have been described in exactly the same language, Zoltvany quotes without dissent a characterization of the destruction as "gallant deeds" (p. 23). Numbers of casualties are not mentioned in either case, so that Lachine's French victims reverberate as multitudes, which they were not, and the Indian victims become mere vermin not worth numbering, which they were not. As regards Iroquois hostilities in Canada generally, "Statistics convey better than words the devastating results of their attacks. The population fell from 10,725 in 1685 to 10,303 in 1688" (p. 17). From a better source — W.J. Eccles, *The Canadian Frontier, 1534-1760* (1969) — we have it that, "Of a total population of just over 11,000, including the troops, over a thousand died." The statistics rhyme, all right, but Eccles also mentions that "an epidemic of smallpox and measles decimated the colony." With tomahawks, no doubt.

Francis JENNINGS,
Cedar Crest College.

* * *

EDWARD SCHRIVER, ed. — *The French in New England, Acadia and Quebec*. Proceedings of a Conference sponsored by the New England-Atlantic Provinces-Quebec Center, at the University of Maine, Orono. May, 1972.

The papers here published are an attractive mixture reflecting the interests of the politicians, social activists and scholars who were invited to participate in the 1972 conference at the University of Maine. I shall confine my comments to the work of the academics.

The first session brought together a paper on "The Loyalists and the Acadians" by Professor Mason Wade and one on "The Acadians in New England" by Father Clarence d'Entremont. "The Loyalists and the Acadians" is typical of the work which has made the reputation of Professor Wade: its strength is in the amount of intricate detail which has been drawn together from the archives consulted. One might have wished for a broader framework, and a much more detailed consideration of official policy towards the Acadians after 1764. It would have been pleasant if the details about Acadian experience in New Brunswick had been linked to the experiences of their kin during these years in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. But Professor Wade has produced a useful account of particular experiences of certain New Brunswick Acadians at the close of the eighteenth century. Father D'Entremont's paper is a very different matter: if

Professor Wade has given us a detailed pen and ink sketch, d'Entremont's work is a great oil painting envisaging four and a half centuries, 1524-1966. For him there is a marvellous sweep of history, linking St. Croix Island, which he has baptised "The Embryonic Cell of Acadia" with the twentieth century. For him, those who are members of the Acadian Historical Society in New England are living proof that "they are all Acadians, and they want to be Acadians, and [...]: if blood is thicker than water, the Acadian blood is even thicker than all the ingredients of the melting pot." Even reading this paper, rather than hearing it, one gets both a sense of breathless enthusiasm and an overwhelming wish to ask the author to stop and consider his ideas in more detail. His statement that seventeenth-century Acadia was "a part of what is now New England" warrants considerable discussion.

The second session was given to the archivists and those interested in the contents of archives. Father Chiasson presented a description of "The Acadian Archives at Moncton" and Roger Comeau talked of "Acadian Research and the Public Archives at Ottawa." Both these papers live up to their titles; and though neither is a full calendar of material in the particular archive, both give a fair indication of the records available for scholars. The third presentation at this session "Acadian Research in New England Archives and Libraries: Student Viewpoints" by Jean Daigle and Ronald Boucher is a very different affair. Here two young scholars not only comment on what new documents can be discovered by research into Acadian history, but on what sorts of questions historians should ask themselves. Writing about seventeenth-century Acadian history, Jean Daigle sketches the first outlines of an interpretation which would give Acadian-New England relations a different place in the story of Acadian people. In asking for the records of Boston merchants to be more fully explored, so that the complex pattern of commercial relations between New Englander and Acadian may be fully known, Daigle seems to have overlooked the important work of several scholars, chief among whom is A.H. Clark, whose solid analysis of Acadia to 1760 appeared in 1968. For his part Ronald Boucher is more interested in Acadian behaviour in exile than in the famous 1755 deportation itself. The exiled Acadians' capacity for group solidarity was his particular concern. He tentatively identified extraordinary cohesiveness among the Acadians exiled to Massachusetts. Such a conclusion can be matched by a study of Acadians who reached France in 1763, and who withstood efforts to be assimilated into French society, until most left for Louisiana in 1785.¹ He is wrong in thinking that the Massachusetts Acadians returned to Nova Scotia, for most went to Québec.² Even there they displayed a typical independence from the authorities, lay and ecclesiastical, in the 1770s and 1780s.

The final session was a mixed bag which saw Father Landry speak of "The French migration from Quebec to New England;" Jean-Louis Roy of "Quebec Society and the American Proximity in the Twentieth Century" and Luc Lacour-

¹ The archives for these experiences are mostly those of France, in particular the Departmental Archives of Ille-et-Vilaine, Morbihan, Loire-Atlantique, La Vendée, Charente-Maritime and the Gironde. A good number of the documents have been copied for the University of Moncton. However, the deposits in the Spanish archives, especially those in the *Archivos de los Indias* in Seville are not yet fully available in Canada.

² The legend of the long walk from Massachusetts to Nova Scotia has yet to be adequately studied. Though it is not impossible that a handful of families made their way along this trek it is clear, from a study of the archives in the Boston State House and of the *Quebec Gazette* that nearly 900 Acadians were shipped directly from Boston to Quebec in 1766: *Quebec Gazette*, Sept. 1st, 15th.

ciere of "Oral Tradition: New England and French Canada." Of the three, that of Luc Lacourciere is the most significant, being a comparison of folksong and folk literature in the two societies and pointing out not only a common heritage of fantastic tales but of songs made up to describe the lives of those who left Quebec for American lumber camps.

This conference did not equal the scholarly attainments of the *Colloque sur l'État des Recherches sur le Canada français* at Laval in 1963. One regrets that a number of scholars who could have made a major contribution were not invited, that the occasion was not used to prepare up-to-date scholarly bibliographies, and that new models of interpretation failed to emerge. Yet it is pleasant to read of a conference seriously attempting to bridge the gap between the layman and the professional.

N.E.S. GRIFITHS,
Carleton University.

* * *

ROBERT GOURLAY. — *Statistical Account of Upper Canada*. Edited and introduced by S.R. Mealing. The Carleton Library. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1974.

In 1822 Robert Gourlay's *Statistical Account of Upper Canada* appeared. Any reader willing to brave the 1,995 pages associated with the work stumbled across a rather chaotic jumble of matter — relations of Gourlay's schemes for the alleviation of rural poverty in England, material connected with the Gourlay agitation in Upper Canada, extensive descriptions of the history, the statutes, and the state of that colony, vitriolic attacks on those whom Gourlay imagined had wronged him, and so on. Much of this could only have been of peripheral interest to any contemporary reader, though some of it would indeed have been of concern to would-be emigrants to Upper Canada.

Professor Mealing has assumed, quite rightly, that students of Upper Canadian history might find much of value and interest in a severely abridged edition of Gourlay's work. Though his publication is but one-quarter as long as the original, the deletion of repetitious material, of most of the lengthy, and often tedious, footnotes prepared by Gourlay, and of the bulk of the extensive documents found in the volumes published in 1822 account for much of the editing.

Gourlay was driven in the first instance into his stance as a "gad-fly," and thus ultimately into his mad career in Upper Canada, by his desire to find a solution for the rural poverty and distress he saw about him in Britain. In his rather brief introduction, Mealing places Gourlay in the context of British agrarian radicalism, and in his selection of material allows Gourlay himself to present some of his more lucid explanations for the solutions he envisioned for the ills of English society — solutions such as the redistribution of land, the abolition of the poor laws, the establishment of limitations on child labour, the adoption of a single tax on land, the implementation of a general debt reduction, and so forth. Certainly, one can see in all Gourlay's proposals evidence of genuine humanitarian concern, just as one can see in Gourlay's career at large, as Professor Mealing does (pages 2, 11), evidence of a compulsive desire to attract attention. More to the point, it is clear, as the readings suggest, that the realities of an increasingly industrial and urbanized Britain were not within Gourlay's range of vision, as he concentrated almost exclusively on the ills of the countryside.