## THING CELOMPINT

# THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

THE POLITICAL HISTORY OF CANADA

e 13 %

Ž

1840 TO 1855.

LECTURE BY SIR FRANCIS HINCKS. (From the Gazette.)

On Wednesday night a large audience assembled in the Mechanics' Hall to listen to the lecture by Sir Francis Hincks, on the political history of Canada from the Union of Upper and Lower Canada to 1855, delivered under the auspices of the St. Patrick's National Association. The chair was occupied by Mr. Mullarky, the President of the Society, and on the platform were His Worship Mayor Beaudry, Messrs. McMaster, President of the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society, John Kerry, President of the Star George's Society, E. McLelan, President of St. Andrew's Society. J. E. McEvenue, President of the Catholic Union, Edward Murphy, M. P. Ryan, M. Donovan, Bafferty, Heffernan, Flannery, P. C. Warren, P. Brennan, the Rev. Father Salmon and Oapt. Kirwan. Sir Francis Hincks, having been introduced by the Chairman, was most warmly received, and delivered his lecture as follows :-

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,-When I was honored with an invitation from the St Patrick's National Association to deliver them a lecture. it occured to me that I might, without impropriety. avail myself of the opportunity to carry into effect a long-cherished purpose, and to place on record what circumstances have enabled me to know of the history of Canadian parties during the struggle for, and the ultimate establishment of Parliamentary government, and, during the succeeding years. up to the disruption of the party which had obtained the victory in that memorable contest, Having been myself actively engaged in the struggle both before and after the publication of the celebrated report of the Earl of Durham, I had peculiarly good opportunities of becoming acquainted with the views of those, who took a prominent part in public affairs, not only at the period of the union of the Provinces, but during the succeeding thirteen years. It would obviously be impossible for me, within the limits of a lecture, to give anything that would even merit the designation of an historical sketch, but venture to hope that it may be in my power to render justice to deceased Canadian statesmen, as well as to give a general idea of the history of the period to which I have referred. It will be my study to speak truthfully and impartially, and to be careful as to the authority on which I make statements which conflict with those of others. It is not my intention to dwell on the events prior to the rebellions in both Provinces in the year 1837. It would be sufficient to remind you that in Lower Canada a large major. ity of the representatives of the people were in con. the execution of the laws of which we have long firmed opposition not only to the Government, but to the Constitution as established by the Imperial Act of 1791. The principal remedial measure advocated by the House of Assembly of Lower Canada was the substitution of an elected for a Metcalfe which prove either that they were wholly nominated legislative council. In Upper Canada parties were more equally divided, and the great I need not dwell further on Lord Durham's recommajority of the Reformers would have been satisfied with the establishment of the existing system of Parliamentary government.

#### EVENTS BEFORE THE UNION OF 1841.

In the year 1938 the Earl of Durham was appointed Governor-General of the North-American Provinces, and High Commissioner to enquire into and to report on their political institutions. The Earl of Durham arrived at Quebec on the 27th of May, and embarked on his return to England on the 1st of November, 1838, having been little over five months in the country. He made an elaborate report, which gave entire satisfaction to the Reform party in Upper Canada and as general dissatis-faction to the party hearing the same designation in Lower Canada. Prior to the rebellion of 1837 the Reform party of Upper Canada had fraternized to some extent with the Lower Canada majority. In a despatch from Sir Francis Head, dated 27th April, ismitted to the Secre art of t 1836 copy of a letter which Mr. Papineau, Speaker of the Assembly of the Lower Province, had addressed to Mr. Bidwell, Speaker of the Assembly of Upper Canada," adding, "I conceive that the traitorous and revolutionary language it contains as well as the terms in which it speaks of your Lordship need no comment." On the 30th August, 1837, Mr. Bidwell had address :d a letter to Dr. O'Callaghan, of Montreal, containing the following passage :-"Retired from public life, probably for ever, I still look with the deepest interest and sympathy on the efforts of those who are actively contending for the great principles of liberty and good government. Your great and powerful exertions in the cause of liberty and justice I have noticed with admiration and respect, and I look with deep interest on the struggle in Lower Canada between an oppressed and injured people and their oppressors. All hope of justice from the authorities in England seems to be extinguished." In November, 1935, Mr. William Lyon Mackenzie and Dr. O'Grady, as is stated in the life of the former, visited Quebec "as a deputation from leading and influential Reformers in Upper Canada, to bring about a closer alliance between the Reformers in the two Provinces." It must be evident, from the facts just stated, that prior to the events of 1837 there was a cordial understanding between those who were designated as Beformers in the two Provinces. LORD DURHAM'S REPORT. In recommending the union of the Provinces the Earl of Durham was chiefly influenced by his conviction that there was an irreconcilable feud between the Canadians of French and British origin, and as he was thoroughly convinced that it was abcolutely necessary that the future government of the country should be conducted in accordance with the will of the majority, he came to the conclusion that the two Provinces must be reunited. I desire to support my statements by unimpeachable authority, and I shall therefore cite Lord Durham's own language :- " Never again will the present generation of French Canadians yield a loyal submission to a British Government; never again will the English population tolerate the authority of a House of Assembly in which the French shall possess or even approximate to a majority." Wholly erroneous as were Lord Durham's opinions on the subject of the national feud, there can be no doubt that he entertained them honestly, and that they were fully shared by Lord Sydenham, as well as by the Imperial Ministers of the Crown, Lord Dur-ham, however, differed in opinion with those Minis-and about the same time the Governor in reply to ters and with Lord Sydenham on a point of considerable importance, viz., the mode of apportioning the representation. A Canadian historian. Mr. Louis P. Turcotte, whose valuable work," Le Canada sous l'Union," I have read with great interest, has fallen into an error on this subject, which I shall venture to correct. Before doing so, permit me to bearmy testimony to the value of the work in question, and to express my conviction that any errors which it may contain have been unintentional. Mr. Tarcotte's work ought to be translated into English and I sincerely hope that author may be encouraged to publish a new edition, and to avail himself of such friendly criticisms as I for one would be ready to submit to him. Referring to Lord Durham's recommendations, Mr. Turcotte observes:----"For the present he recommended the union of the two Canadas under one government, giving to each the Mr. Thomson was in an exceptional position. He | a renagade had brought up his son in extremest | the suburbs, and secured the return of members

himself observes in his report - I am averse to any plan that has been proposed for giving an equal number of representatives, to the two. Provinces in order to attain the temporary and of out numbering the French, because I think the same object will be obtained without any violation of the principles of representation, and without any such appearance of injustice in the scheme as would set public opidion both in England and America strongly against it, and because when emigration shall-have increased the English population in the upper Province, the adoption of such a principle would operate to defeat the very purpose it is intended to serve. It appears to me that any such electoral arrangement founded on the present Pro-vincial divisions would tend to defeat the purposes of union and perpetuate the idea of disunion." The foregoing passage deserves, to be cited as affording evidence of the segacity of the Earl of Durham. There is aboth deterve of Mr. Eurocites. which I think it desirable to correct and I may observe that Mr. Withrow has repeated it. Both historians represent lord Durham having recom-mended a federal union of the British Providees in his celebrated report, whereas he argued strongly In view of the fact that a few years later Lord Durhams views on responsible government were wholly misunderstood by one of his successors, Sir Charles Metcalfe, it seems desirable to prove by quotations from his report that he clearly understood the principle, the adoption of which he so earnestly recommended. I shall therefore use his ownwords : "It needs no change in the principles of government, no invention of a new constitutional theory to supply the remedy which would, in my opinion completely remove the existing political disorders. It needs but to follow out consistently the principles of the British Constitution, and introduce into the government of these great colonies those wise provisions, oy which alone the working of the representative system can in any country be rendered barmonious and efficient. But the Crown must on the other hand submit to the necessary consequences of representative institutions, and if it has to carry on the government in unison with a representative body, it must consent

same number of representatives." Lord Durham

presentative body has confidence. This change might be effected by a single dispatch containing such instructions, or if any legal enactment were requisite, it would only be one that would render it necessary that the official acts of the Governor should be countersigned by some public functionary. This would induce responsibility for every act of the Government, and as a natural consequence it would necessitate the substitution of a system of administration by means of competent heads of department for the present rude machinery of an executive council. I admit that the system which I ٠

to carry it on by means of those in whom that re-

propose would in fact place the internal government of the colony in the hands of the colonists themselves, and that we should thus leave to them entrusted the making solely to them." Nothing can be clearer to my mind than the foregoing passages, and yet I shall have to call your attention later to statements in the despatches of Sir Charles misunderstood or elso deliberately misrepresented. mendalions.

#### LORD SYDENHAM'S GOVERNMENT.

When the Imperial Government decided to carry them into effect, they selected for the office of Gov. ernor-General a Cabinet Minister, Mr. Charles Poulett Thomson, who had represented Manchester, one of the most Liberal English constituencies in the House of Commons. Before adverting to the critical period of the Government of Mr. Thomson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, it seems desirable to consider the state of public opinion in the two Provinces. At that time the Beform party consisted of almost the whole French-Canadian population, an equal proportion of the Irish Roman Catholics, and a British minority equal, if not superior in numbers, to the French-Canadian and Irlsh Catholic Conservatives. The great majority of the British population was included in the Conservative party. I am referring at present to public opinion in Lower Canada. It is stated in Turcotte's history that the French-Canadians of Quebec and Three Rivers, supported by their clergy and a considerable number of influential English, potitioned against the Union, and in favor of the Constitution of 1791. The number of signatures was 40,000 A meeting was likewise held in Montreal, and an address carried against the Union on the proposition of Mr. Lafontaine. The majority of the British population were decidedly favorable to the priniple of the Union Act. In Upper Canada the Reformers warmly approved of the chief recommendations of Lord Durham's report which induced a considerable number of the old opponents of Responsible Government to announce their adhesion to that principle. The bulk of the Conservative party avowed their opposition to Lord Durham's views, and a select committee of the House of Assembly made an elaborate report against them. The opposition of that party was not only directed against Responsible Government, but likewise against the Union, as evidenced by a joint address from the Legislative Council and House of Assembly. Such was the state of public opinion when Mr. Thomson assumed the Government, charged specially to endeavor to procure the assent of the respective Legislatures to the re-union of the Provinces. The Constitution having been suspended in Lower Canada, and the Special Council being composed chiefly of members of the British party, no difficulty was experienced in obtaining the assent of the only Legislature in existence in Lower Canada. In Upper Canada the Reformers supported Mr. Thomson with great cordiality, and as he claimed and obtained the support of the officials, he was enabled to carry his measure by a sufficient majority. The Conservative minority desired to obtain a larger representation for Upper Canada, and other conditions to which the Governor was unable to assent. Although in the discussion which took place in the British House of Commons on Lord Durham's report Lord John Russell had announced that the Government could not concur in the recommendation to establish Responsible Government. His Lordship later in the year wrote a despatch, dated 16th October, 1839, in which he directed that the principal officers of the Crown, particularizing the Secretary, the Receiver-General, the Attorney and Solicitor General, should be informed that hereafter their offices were to be held strictly during pleasure, add that they would be called on to retire whonever public policy might render such a step an address from the Assembly requesting copies of despatches on the subject of Responsible Government, declined furnishing the despatches, but informed them that "he had received Her Majesty's commands to administer the Government in accordance with the well-understood wishes and interests of people, and to pay to their fielings, as expressed by their representatives, the deference that is justly due to them." The despatch of the 16th October and the reply to the Assembly were generally accepted by the Reformers as an assurance that Lord Durham's recommendation would be acted on. It is important, in order to understand the history of the period, to note the chauges in parties consequent on the determination of the Imperial Government. to give effect to Lord Durham's recommendation to reunite the Provinces.

in Upper Cauada. In has in addition to a same space. The worthy and highly estended under, non-residents having been marched to a polling conservative minority, had as his supporters the father of Bobert Baldwin, was an Irishman, a native non-residents having been marched to a polling Reformers of Upper Canada and the British or Cone of the County of Cork, and was never a member of place fixed at a remote corner of the county, at a constitue party of Lower Canada while the opposi- the "Family Compact" nor did he ever hold other distance from the centres of the population. The servative party of Lower Canada, while the opposi-tion to his government, consisted of the French Canadians and their, British contingent sand the majority of the Conservatives of Upper Canada, parties having no sympathy whatever with each other. The tone of the press affords a good indication of the state of feeling. The Montreal Herald declared that Lord Durham's report was "the most luminous, comprehensive and best arranged document on the affairs of the colonies which has ever been submitted to -the British Parliament." The Montreal Gazette styled it "a document of great research, noted impartiality, and fraught with just conclusions with regard to the best interests and the ritimate welfare of these Provinces." I have already referred to the strong opposition of the French Canadians. The Toronto Patriot referred to knot of loafer secretaries and hangers-on, and declared that " the Ministers have made-for themselves a pretty kettle of fish by employing Jacobins and loafers to regulate the affairs of a Conservative and loyal people." This journal was the exponent of the views of the Conservative party of Upper Canada, which had been in the ascendant up to the time of Mr. Thomson's assumption of the Government. The British Colonies and Christian Guardian may fairly be considered as representing the views of the moderate Conservatives, who cordially supported the union policy of Mr. Thomson, and who were not disinclined to accept Responsible Govern ment ; indeed, Mr. Henry John Boulton, Mr. Hamilton Merritt and Mr. Adam Fergueson gave their formal adhesion to that principle after the publication of Lord Durham's report. I was at that time editor of the Toronto Examiner, and had been contending for Responsible Government against almost the entire press of Upper Canada during the whole period of Lord Durham's government. The Examiner gave a cordial support to Lord Durbam's recommendations, and the Union scheme of Mr. Thomson. In February, 1840, alter the close of the session of the Upper Canada Legislature, a vacancy having (ccurred on the Bench, Mr. Attorney-General Hagerman was appointed Judge, Mr. Solicitor-General Draper Attorney-General, and Mr. Robert Baldmin the most convictions member of the Be Baldwin, the most conspicuous member of the Reform party, was invited by Mr. Thomson to fill the office of Solicitor-General.

#### THE LATE ROBERT BALDWIN.

All the circumstances of Mr. Baldwin's acceptance of a seat in the Executive Council under Sir Francis Head four years previously, and his subsequent resignation being well known, the offer of office was a virtual declaration to the country that the Government under the Union would be conducted in accordance with the wishes of the majority. Mr. Baldwin's political friends were at the time supporters of the Government, and he did not feel justified in refusing the offer of office. His opinion, concurred in by his political friends, was that until after the elections under the Union Act it could not be expected that the Governor-General could form an efficient administration for the United Province. The Governor had encountered warm opposition from the French-Canadians, and there can be no doubt that his belief was that, by the Union of the British party in Lower Canada with the moderate Conservatives and Reformers in Upper Canada, a working majority would be obtained in the new House of Assembly. Mr. Baldwin and his friends were of opinion that the natural combination of parties would be the Reformers of Upper and Lower Canada, the latter consisting chiefly of French Canadians, with whom the Irish Catholics were at that time allied. I cannot introduce the name of Mr. Baldwin without expressing my deep sense of his great merits as a statesman and a patriot. Many of his cotemporaries have passed away, but there are still some survivors of those who fought the great battle for Constitutional Government under the leadership of Robert Baldwin. I cannot forbear referring here to a letter which I received a few months ago from an old and valued friend who had been reading an historical lecture which was delivered about that time by the Hon. Mr. Laurier. He wrote as follows :- "If he (Mr. Laurier) knew as much as you and I do about the establishment of Constitutional Government, I think he would at least have montioned the name of Robert Baldwin in his lecture. Whilst many of the advanced liberals of that day were seeking to rid the country of the irresponsible mode of conducting the Government, which had become intolcrable, by advocating elective institutions, Robert Baldwin from the first contended that the English Constitutional system of responsibility afforded the true solution of our difficulties. How zealously and disinterestedly he labored to save his country from the crushing effects of a rash and unsuccessful resort to physical force-with what contempt and indifference he treated the slanders of his political opponents-how perseveringly he pursued the wise and prudent course he had marked out for himself until the complete establishment of responsible government was triumphantly attained, no one knows better than you, and you, as his colleague, also know the enormous amount of labor which he bestowed on the establishment and perfecting of the municipal system and other kindred legislative measures which he considered necessary to solidify and make more perfect the government of the country under that system which he had so long labored to establish. It seems to me that justice has not been done to the memory of Robert Baldwin, and there is no man now living whoknew him as you did, who can testify in his favor as you can. I hope you will be able to do something to keep alive the memory of our old friend and leader, for it seems to me he is almost forgotten by the new men who now fill the seats of power and occupy positions of prominence." It no doubt appears strange that any one acquainted with Canadian history could lecture thercon without bearing testimony to the labors ci Robert Baldwin, but Mr. Laurier, although professing to review the history of the Liberal party in this country, seems to have been of the opinion that he could do so satisfactorily by ignoring the existance of the Upper Canada section of that party, and by keeping in abeyance the political questions which led to the disruption of that party, although several of them were deeply interesting to the peoplo of Lower Canada. It is to be regretted that no doubt that his memory has been, and will continue to be, held in high esteem by his countrymen. Unfortunatly, owing to his having had to place himself in opposition to Sir Francis Head, to Lord Sydenham and to Lord Metcalf, his character has been aspersed in books that are to be found in most English libraries. The most offensive of the attacks on Mr. Baldwin's character is to be found in the life of Lord Metcalf by the late Sir John William Kaye, one of the worst class of biographies, the author apparently considering it his duty to cast the vilest imputations on all who differed in opinion. with his hero, of whom he writes in terms of the most fulsome adulation. Sir John Kaye was never in Canada, and never seen Mr. Baldwin, and must have derived his information either from Lord Metcalf himself or from his immediate dependents. He commences the discription of his character by alleging that he was "the son of a gentleman of Toronto, of American descent, who had formerly been a member of what was called the "Family Compact." The elder Baldwin had quarrelled with his party, and with the characteristic bitterness of

was virtually an autocrat (in Lower Canada, and, batted of his old opponents and had instilled into pledged to support his Government. Some of the owing to the position of parties, almost as powerful him the most libral opinions.". It would be diffi-ound be diffi-in Upper Canada. He had divided the Conserva-cult be orowd a greater number of errors into the Latontaine, the Lower Canadian leader, was a can-tive party in that Province, and in Addition to a same space. The worthy and highly esteemed didate, were carried by violence, armed bads of father of Robert Baldwin, was an Irishman, a native non-residents baving been marched to a policy the "Family Dompact, nor did ne ever mois Head, consequence of this policy, was the increased hos. than the most liberal opinions. Sir Francis Head, consequence of this policy, was the increased hos. certainly not a partial judge, describes him as tilling of the French Canadians to the Government. rather more ultra in his theory of reform than his son, a gentleman of very large property, who is ie spected for his moral character, and who had been spected for his moral character, and also recomended by my predecessor for a seat in the Legislative Council" Neither the doctor nor his son entertained bitter feelings against their opponents, and although firm in their adherance to cherished political opinions they were both highly and universally respected. Sir John Kaye asserts that Robert Baldwin "seemed to delight in strife." A very brief reference to his public career will be the most satisfactory refutation of his statement. At the early age of 24 he was elected in 1828 mem- ther the Beformers of the the two sections were Ber for the town of New York, now the city of satisfied with the composition of the Government, French Canadians. The Toronto Patriot referred to ber for the town of New Fork, now the only of and there was almost an unabimous declaration of "the conduct of the froward nobleman and his Toronto. Withrow in his History of Canada, says and there was almost an unabimous declaration of that of losfer secretaries and thangers on," and "During the entire course of his public life to have want of confidence. Mr. Baldwin thereupon re-"During the entire course of his public his out a bar on the Governor a reconstruction of commanded the esteem of both political parties. commended to the Governor a reconstruction of His personal integrity, his legal ability and his singular moderation enabled him, as has been admirably said, to lead his country through a great constitutional crises into an era of larger and more matured liberty." In 1830, two years after his election, there was a sudden dissolution of the Liberal House of Assembly on the ground of the demise of King George the Fourth. The Reformers were defeated, and Mr. Balwin with. drew entirely from politics for about six years. In 1836 he was invited by Sir Francis Head to become a member of the Executive Council Sir Francis Head's own despatch, dated February, 1836, is a complete refutation of Kay's unfounded accusation. He writes to Lord Glenelg :-" After making every enquiry in my power, I became of opinion that Mr. Bobert Baldwin, advocate, a gentleman already recommended to Your Lordship by Sir John Colborne for a feat in the Legislative Council was the first individual I should select, being highly respected for his moral character, being moderate in his politics, and possessing the esteem and confidence of all partles." The foregoing character was obtained by Sir Francis Head, not from Mr. Baldwin's political friends, but from his opponents, one of whom -Chief Justice Robinson-is specially referred to. Mr. Balwin held the office of Executive Councillor in 1836 for about three weeks, he and his colleagues having resigned, as he did nearly eight years afterwards, when he found that the Governor was determined to conduct public affairs without the advice of his known and responsible Councillors. A dissolution of the Assembly having taken place owing to its rupture with Sir Francis Head, cousequent on the resignation of Mr. Baldwin and his colleagues, and the Government having been successful, Mr. Balwin accepted the verdict of the country and again withdrew entirely from public life, declining to attend meetings or to be a party to the agitation which culminated in the rebellion of 1837. He continued in retirement until he was again invited by Lord Sydenham to accept the office of Solicitor-General at the time when the union of the two Provinces was about to be consummated. This is the man who was pronounced by Lord Metcalfe's biographer to have been possessof "unbounded arrogance and self conceit;" to have been "serving his own ends by the promotion of his ambition, the gratification of his vanity or his spite." It is to be regretted that Canada's most illustrious statesmen is chiefly known to English readers by the character given to them by Sir Francis Head and by the authors of the lives of Lords Sydenham and Metcalfe. I have digressed from my subject in order to pay a merited tribute to the character of one for whom from the period of my first acquaintance, about 45 years ago, I entertained the most profound veneration, which was not in the least abated, during the period in 1841 and 1842, when I was temporarily estranged from him under circumstances to which I shall have occasion to advert.

#### FIR LOUIS LAFONTAINE AND DR. TRACY.

This is a convenient opportunity to do justice to another highly valued friend, the late Sir Louis Lafontaine. The great French Canadian statesman his colleagues, and his advice was that the govern-Baldwin, and many are living in our midst, both old supporters and old opponents. I can hardly believe that there is a single individual in the ranks of either party who would admit that Kaye was correct in attributing to Sir Louis Lafontaine "indecision and infirmity of purpose." I can declare for my own part that I never met a map less open to such an imputation. It is true that Kave acknowledges that "his better qualities were natural to him; his worse were the growth of circumstances" . . . Ite was a just and honorable man; his motives were above all suspicion."-Strange, however, that Kaye cou'd believe that such a man could be elevated to the leadership of "an important and united party" without any par-ticular fitness, and "by the force rather of his moral than his intellectual qualities." When lec-turing under the auspices of St. Patrick's National Association I can't omit paying a just tribute to the memory of one who took an active part in the great struggle for Constitutional Government at the most gloomy period of the contest, but who did not live to share in the rewards of victory. I allude to our distinguished countryman Dr. Tracy, who was cut off in the prime of life, and in the full vigor of his faculties. I had not the wivantage of Dr. Tracy's personal acquaintance, but from the period of my first residence in Montreal in 1844, 1 and my family were privileged to enjoy the friendship of his sister, Mrs. Charles Wilson, who still survives, honored and beloved by the whole Irish population for her intellectual, as well as her many amiable qualities. When in better health than she has of late years enjoyed, she was the most active supporter of every project suggested for the benefit of the Irish population. Those who visit the cemetery are reminded by the beautiful monument erected to the memory of Dr. Tracy, of his

On the meeting of the Legislaturo it was found that the Reformers of Lower Canada, instead of having a majority, as had been fully anticipated, of about iwenty, were only about equal to the number of their opponents. In Upper Canada the Con. or their opposed who acknowledged Sir Allan servative members, who acknowledged Sir Allan MacNab as their leader were few in number, while the Reformers had a very decided majority. On the meeting of Parliament Mr. Baldwin summoned a meeting of the members of the Liberal party from both sections of the now United Province. The chief object of the meeting was to ascertain whether the Beformers of the the two sections were the administration, and on his advice being rejected resigned. Mr. Baldwin was severely censured by his late colleagues and their friends for the course of proceeding which he adopted, a course which no one would have more readily condemned than Mr. Baldwin himself, if the administration had been formed in the usual way. The union of the two Provinces, the members of which were not even personally acquainted, caused an abnormal condition of affairs. Mr. Baldwin had been invited by the Governor to accept a seat in the Executive Council in February, 1811, in the following terms: -" I am called upon to name an Executive Council for this Province without delay, which at present will be composed exclusively of the chief officars of the Government, and I have therefore in-cluded your name in the list." Mr. Baldwin wrote to Lord Sydenham in reply, regarding the com-position of the Council :--- "With respect to those gentlemen Mr. Baldwin has himself an entire want ot political confidence in all of them except Mr. Dunn, Mr. Harrison and Mr. Daly." • He deems it a duty which he owes to the Governor-General at once to communicate his opinion that such ar. rangement of the administration will not command the support of Parliament," Such language could admit of but one construction, Mr. Baldwin plainly indicated his intention when the proper time came to require a reconstruction of the Cabinet, but pending the meeting of the Legislature was unwilling to create embarrassment to the Governor by any premature action. He, however, did not concent from his collegues his want of political confidence in them. If the Governor or his colleagues had been of opinion that Mr. Baldwin's retention of his seat in the Council under the circumstances was objectionable they could have required his immediate resignation. His own opinion was that the assembling together of the newly elected repre. sentatives of the people of the reunited Provinces on the occasion of the meeting of Parliament was the proper time for action, and that had be taken any more energetic steps than what he did, he would have laid himselt open to the charge of caus. ing unnecessary embarrassment to the Governor. General. He had shortly after his appointment to the office of Solicitor-General, February, 1840 written a letter, which was published at the time, in which he stated :- "I distinctly avow that in accepling office I consider myself to have given a public pledge that I have a reasonably well grounded confidence that the government of my country is to be carried on in accordance with the principles of responsible government which I have ever held. My position politically is certainly peculiar, but its resultarity has arisen out of the position in which the present Parliament placed the Governor General, themselves and the country by the course they chose to adopt during the last session, and it is therefore right that it should be distinctly understood that I have not come into office by means of any coalition with the Attorney-General or with any others now in the public service, but have done so under the Governor-General and expressly from

OCT. 24, 1877.

my confidence in him." It is to be borne in mind

#### patriotic services to the country of his adoption. POLITICAL COMBINATIONS AFTER THE UNION.

I must revert to the period of our history when a political alliance was formed between Mr. Lafontaine and Mr. Baldwin, which was only dissolved when they retired from public life, about the same time in the year 1851. During the year 1840, in the carly part of which Mr. Baldwin accepted office, there were no political events of any importance. There were some communications be-tween the leaders of the Reform party in Upper Canada and the principal French-Canadians, the object being to ascertain how far it would be possible for the Reformers of the two Provinces to act in concert. The Lower Canadian Liberals were unable to accept the Union Act and were consequently in direct opposition to the Government in which the Upper Canada Reformers very generally professed confidence. Unfortunately for the reputation of Lord Sydenham, there was not a fair representation of Lower Canada in the first Union Parliament, and for this, to some extent at least, he must be held personally responsible. In the Union bill, as originally introduced by Lord John Rus-sell, it was provided that "the incorporated cities of Quebec and Montreal" should be represented, but in the Act, as finally passed, a clause was in-troduced empowering the Governor to define the boundaries of the several cities and towns named in the Act. Under this authority Lord Sydenham, by a stroke of his pen, disfranchised two-thirds of the inhabitants of Montreal and Quebec, inhabiting

ment should be reconstructed very much as was done about a year later under the government of Sir Charles Bagot.

### POSITION OF PARTIES IN 1841.

The effect of Mr. Baldwin's resignation was to p'ace him in opposition to his old colleagues, all of whom, Reformers as well as Conservatives, retained office, and although frequently defeated, owing to combination of parties having little sympathy with each other, the government succeeded in getting through the session without serious difficulty. There were at least five if not six parties in the House, three from each Province. In Upper Canada there was first, the old Conservative party led by Sir Allan MacNab; 2nd, the Ministerial party composed chiefly of Reformers, with a few Moderate Conservatives under the leadership of Mr. Attorney-General Draper and Mr. Secretary Harrison; 3rd, the Reformers who followed the lead of Mr. Baldwin, numbering six to eight. In Lower Canada there was-1st, the Reformers of French and Irish origin with their allies of the British party, led by Mr. Morin, Mr. Neilson and Mr. Aylwin; 2nd, The British party including the Conservativo French Canadians and Irish elected to support Lord Sydenham's policy, and almost uniformly doing so that session, although several of them had a decided bias in favor of a liberal policy while others were as decidedly conservative. I may mention the names of two representative mon, both deservedly respected, and both at the time members for the city of Montreal, the Hon. Geo. Moffat and Benjamin Holmes. A year later those gentlemen were completely separated as to party connection, the former being as decidedly on the Conservative as the latter was on the Liberal side. At the period to which I am referring, both wore supporters of the Administration. The division lists of the session of 1841 cannot fail to strike any one acquainted with the state of parties as extraordinary. Mr. Baldwin on several occasions voted with considerable majorities in opposition to the Government, while as frequently he wis in insignificant minorities. There was a decided tendency towards a coalition with the reformers of French origin on the part of Sir Allan MacNab and the Upper Canada Cosservation The Ministerial s rength lay in the support which it received from tue British party of Lower Canada, and from the majority of the Upper Canada Reformers. On more than one occasion, especially the election bill. the lafter followed Mr. Baldwin's lead, at d the bill was carried against the Government in the Commons but was thrown out by the Legislative Courcil. There was a great contest over the Municipal Bill, which was the most important measure of the session, and it was on one occasion saved from defeat by the casting vote of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Sir Allan MacNab and his Conservative friends, and Mr. Neilson and many Lower Canadians were wholly opposed to municipal institutions; while Mr. Baldwin was desirous of amending, the Government bill so as to make it more liberal. The Government announced its determination on what I thought at the time, and still think justifiable grounds, to withdraw the bill, if any important amendment were carried, and on this as on several other occasions as the session. advanced. I considered it my duty to support the

CONTINUED ON SIXTH PAGE.