

impossible to have him longer in charge.

The leading feature of the Act of 1791, and its greatest mistake, was the separation of Canada into two provinces, thus giving to the French-Canadian element the complete control of Lower Canada; a mistake which, in spite of the solemn warning of history, has been carefully copied into the Confederation Act, and which doubtless before long will lead to trouble in the Province of Quebec. The difficulties those who framed the measure found in the way of legislating otherwise are of course apparent; the French-Canadians were in a very large majority and would have expected an equal large proportion of the representation, and the English from the Upper Provinces would on the other hand probably have preferred even American dominion with English laws, to English dominion with French laws. It might perhaps have been found feasible to introduce the French laws in Lower Canada and the English laws in Upper Canada, giving to both provinces an equal representation, as was afterwards done under the Union Act, but such a step would have dissatisfied the French. The question was certainly not an easy one to settle. Mr. Pitt stated that the population of Upper Canada did not exceed 10,000; the census of 1790 makes the population of Quebec, 224,466. The difference in numbers was very great.

There was, moreover, a strong feeling in favor of conciliatory measures, and means which after times have shown to have been not so wise may have appeared imperative then. The French revolution, following upon the success of the United States, had startled the world not a little, and people were beginning to speak of the advantages of democratic institutions in a way which made kings tremble on their thrones. The powerful notes of warning on the course entered upon by France had the previous year been sounded by Burke in the publication of his cele-

brated "Reflections on the French Revolution." At the same time, Paine's "Rights of Man" had just issued from the press, and had been hailed as the handbook and gospel of the new school in politics and religion. The new French constitution had been completed, and a powerful blow given, not only to the privileges of the Crown, but to the power and authority of the clergy. In England, it was well known, there existed a feverish state of excitement, which at any moment might break out in a flame of rebellion. Jacobin clubs were becoming very numerous, and were believed to be headed in many cases by men of position and wealth. Lord Stanhope had openly presided over a large assemblage, called together at the Crown and Anchor, to commemorate the fall of the Bastille. There was, moreover, good reason to believe that, in Canada, the principles of the revolution had already taken a strong hold upon some of the younger French-Canadians, and though forcibly opposed by the priesthood, through motives of policy, were gaining ground slowly in the country parts. These considerations, joined doubtless to the strong representations of Lord Dorchester, in whom the French interests always found a staunch supporter, induced the Government, harassed by a thousand other questions of more moment, hurriedly to pass the bill.

Another most objectionable feature of the bill was the appointment of hereditary councillors. The folly of such a proceeding was very ably, though ineffectually, pointed out by Mr. Lymburner in his memorial. Mr. Fox, on the other hand, wished the members of the Council to be elected, their property qualifications and that of their electors to be much more considerable than those of the members of the Legislative Assembly. "By this means," Mr. Fox said, "they would have a real aristocracy chosen by persons of property, from among persons of the