WAS MACKENZIE ANXIOUS

FOR RESPONSIBLE GOVT.

Author Differs From Grandson in His Views of the Grit Statesman — Deliberate Misrepresentation Averred.

Did Dr. Le Sueur in writing up the life of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie for the "Makers of Canada" series deliberately misuse the material placed at his disposal by Mr. George Lindsey, grandson of the statesman, with the view of showing him, not as a maker, but as a destroyer of Canada?

Was Wm. Lyon Mackenzie as keen on responsible government and as vigorously opposed to the "family compact" as he has hitherto got credit for?

These are the two important questions that enter the mind of the listener in the Non-jury Assize Court where Mr. Justice Britton is hearing evidence in the suit brought by Mr. George Lindsey for an injunction to restrain Dr. Le Sueur, an Ottawa author, from publishing information or opinions he may have derived from the private papers of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie placed at his disposal by Mr. Lindsey.

It was not until after considerable discussion that judge and counsel succeeded in getting the issue defined, and a large portion of the afternoon was spent trying to ascertain how the disputed points could be brought out so that they could be understood, without travelling from one end to the other of Lyon Mackenzie's political career. Ultimately on the suggestion of plaintiff's own counsel, the hearing was adjourned till to-day to allow the latter to pick out a few illustrations of the "objectionable method in which the book is written," which could be used as covering the whole complaint.

THOUGHT HE WAS FRIENDLY

Plaintiff's allegation is that Dr. Le Sueur got access to the papers and newspaper files by deceiving him as to his attitude in relation to the subject whose life he had undertaken to write for Morang's series of "Makers of Canada." Fraud is alleged because Dr. Le Sueur did not tell plaintiff that it was he who had been instrumental in getting Dr. James L. Hughes' "Life of Wm. Lyon Mackenzie" rejected on the ground that it was too favorable to the character of Mackenzie. Had he (Mr. Lindsey) known that was Dr. Le Sueur's attitude, the latter would not have got access to the papers. Misuse of the material is also claimed on the ground that while Dr. Le Sueur used all the references found in Mackenzie's papers which would go to show that Mackenzie, even in his own publications, could not get away from the liberality of the Tories of the time, he (Dr. Le Sueur), the averment is, deliberately left out may references in the same papers which would have put an entirely different complexion on the subject.

LIBERAL TORIES.

"I take you to chapter 3, page 16, of the original manuscript," said Mr. Lindsey. "There Dr. Le Sueur writes:

"The early numbers of the Colonial Advocate (one of Mackenzie's newspapers), give many interesting glimpses of the life of the time in Upper Canada. Mr. Dent and others, including Mackenzie, would have us believe that conditions were shocking, almost beyond expression, and with a superfluity of evil due to the poisonous influence of the family compact. One could read through quite a number of papers without encountering anything to justify this impression. Many indeed point to quite a different state of things.

"There is an account in the second number of the funeral sermon preached by the Rev. Mr. Atterson at the death of Col. Nicol, who was killed by falling over the precipice at Queenston Heights. The preacher spoke of the martyrs of ancient Britain and eulogized the memories of the patriots in the revolution of 1688, who supported civil and religious liberties at the hazard of their lives.

"This surely was not an illiberal discourse for the times, and coming from a member of the privileged class and delivered in presence of the Lieut-Governor and Lady Maitland. Nor do we get an unfavorable impression of the alleged compact."

Continuing the extract referred to the interference in elections Lyon Mackenzie, it states, regretted the influence Mr. Birrell might be able to exercise in an election through his having the farmers in Middlesex in his debt.

"The apprehensions were groundless," Dr. Le Sueur continues, "for Captain Matthews, in whom Mackenzie was interested, gained his election.

ALL POINT ONE WAY.

"The instances cited," the book proceeds, "would lack all significance if culled from a larger number, some of which pointed in the opposite direction. They are all taken from the second number of Mr. Mackenzie's paper, and with one exception they are all the allusions to miscellaneous public affairs found in that issue.

"There are a quantity of articles pointing in an opposite direction," commented Mr. Dindsey. "Dr. Le Sueur tries to make out that that was the line followed by the paper at that time, whereas it was not. He then says 'you may search the file of the Advocate through many numbers and find nothing to controvert the position I put forward here.' He improperly leaves out a great many things. He speaks of the Rev. Mr. Atterson's sermon being very liberal. It turns out that the sermon was on the war of 1688 and the successful landing of William the Protestant King. Dr. Le Sueur thought the minister was referring to the Cromwellian revolution. Further, he says:—

"There is nothing in the paper to indicate or suggest that the general atmosphere is one of general corruption or restriction of popular rights.'

"Less than two months later the paper contains a long article written by Mackenzie which sets out admirably the position of the reformers of the day."

Mr. Lindsey was preparing to read the article when Mr. Justice Britton remarked that it would be sufficient to put it in process.

REFORMERS' GRIEVANCES.

Mr. Lindsey then turned to chapter 2, page 3, of the original manuscript, and read:—

'Mackenzie was not a man under whose feet grass had much chance to grow. Within a few weeks of the general election in July, a petition was published in the Colonial Advocate setting forth the grievances under which the province labored, among which were:—Rejection by the Legislative Council of the most salutary measures passed in the Assembly; extravagant augmentation of official salaries; notoriously unsuitable persons in office; the acceptance of office under the Crown without vacating seats in the House.

'Such were the evils existing in the body politic in Upper Canada in 1828 as seen and judged by Mackenzie and his friends. Not even yet is there any district demand for responsible government.'

MISSED IMPORTANT ONE.

"I will show there was a demand for responsible government and that Dr. Le Sueur distinctly omitted it," said Mr. Lindsey. "In paragraph eight of the same petition, one of the grievances is stated to be the want of carrying into effect that rational, constitutional control over public functions which our fellow subjects enjoy in England."

Mr. Lindsey also objected to a letter written to Dufort in connection with the Rebellion, being used, as that letter was never sent, and Dr. Le Sueur knew that it was not sent.

Mr. Justice Britton—"How could he know that the letter was not sent?"

Mr. Dindsey—"Dr. Le Sueur's note book shows that he knew it was not sent. His notes show that the signature was cut off the letter."

Telegram,
Toronto Nov. 12—12

King, Rt. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie (MG 26 J 7 volume 22) William Lyon Mackenzie - Clippings - LaSuer case 1912

National Archives of Canada
Archives nationales du Canada