

SAYS MACKENZIE WAS NOT A PILLAR BUT A PULLER-DOWN

Such Is the Way Dr. Le Sueur Summed Up the Life of the Statesman,
Which G. C. S. Lindsey, His Grandson, Takes Exception To—
Interesting Evidence Produced in Action in Civil Assizes.

MAINTAINS DR. LE SUEUR DID NOT WRITE TRUTH

"There were qualities in Mackenzie which in happier combination might have made him an admirable, not merely a notable character, a pillar, not a puller-down of the State."

This is the summing up of the character of William Lyon Mackenzie in Dr. W. D. Le Sueur's biography of him, which indicates the attitude of mind which led to the suit to enjoin him from publishing the book, which is being heard in the CIVIL ASSIZES to-day. Mr. George Lindsey, grandson of the reformer and rebel of '37, from whom Dr. Le Sueur obtained much of the material of his book, is the plaintiff in the suit.

Yesterday afternoon's sitting opened with the reading of correspondence between Mr. Lindsey and Dr. Le Sueur in 1908. Dr. Le Sueur wrote early in May:

"No man ever revealed himself as Mackenzie did. No man ever revealed himself so completely, and threw caution and reticence to the winds so utterly. I know things about Mackenzie that Kingsford never knew, that his own family never knew."

"As to suggestion about my passing over points in Mackenzie's favor, I am not capable of such a line of action. I have been making a political study of Mackenzie, one which can be of service to the present generation. I am no partisan, but I think it may be of service to awaken people to the hereditary nightmare of partisanship in which they are wallowing."

Asked for Return of Papers.

When this was read Mr. Lindsey asked to be allowed to make a few comments.

"When he said that he was the man responsible for the rejection of the Hughes manuscript, I found that he had previously deceived. He had not mentioned that fact before. What he says about having promptly declined to found out from examination of his correspondence with Morang's that this was untrue."

Mr. Lindsey's reply to this letter, dated May 26, was read. It asked for the return of the papers.

Mr. Morang tells me that he has declined your book for the 'Mackenzie of Canada' series. With you, therefore, please let me have all copies of documents and papers obtained for the purpose of writing that book. The original papers of Mackenzie and the material written on the 'Mackenzie of Canada' biographies having fallen into your hands, I am sure that you will please abstain from making any use of such documents for any purpose."

To this letter Dr. Le Sueur replied that he was sending the documents by express.

"I regret very much," ran his letter, "that you should forbid me to make any use of the material on the ground of Morang's refusal. It seems a pity, that because that gentleman was not acceded to, the labor of Morang should be wasted. I wrote the book for the public, and it is not I but Mr. Morang who has defaulted to the Canadian public. If I could make any changes without destroying the coherence of the book, which would make it acceptable to you, I would be glad to do so."

Mr. Hellmuth then asked the witness to point out the sections of the manuscript in which he thought Dr. Le Sueur had misused his materials. "Before I can do so," said Mr. Lindsey, "I must have the text of the manuscript which Dr. Le Sueur has put out."

"I believe it is inadvisable your words," said Mr. Hellmuth, "you want to show that Dr. Le Sueur did not attempt to write the life as he said he would."

The extract, summing up Dr. Le Sueur's view of Mackenzie was accordingly read.

"There were qualities there which in happier combination might have made him an admirable, not merely a notable character, a pillar, not a puller-down of the State."

Says Truth Was Not Told.

Another reference from Chapter 16 says: "Mr. Dent and other historians of the period, including Mackenzie himself, would have us believe that conditions at that time were shocking because of the poisonous influence of the Family Compact. One may go through many numbers of the 'Colonist' Advocate without encountering anything to justify that impression. In one place 'The Advocate' says: 'That fine old gentleman, Dr. Kerr, has just taken up the broad seat of the Supreme Court. We are glad to see that our law is being administered by Hamilton instead of him. Even in our piping time it is not always the case that a worthy public servant is succeeded by one equally estimable.' In another place the Advocate referred favorably to the appointment of the commissioners for the construction of the Burlington Canal."

"Such," comments Dr. Le Sueur, "are examples of the state of affairs at that time. There is no suspicion that public works administration would be a factor in summing up the Government's record. Such suspicion became rife in later times. What do you say as to these?" asked Mr. Hellmuth.

To this letter Dr. Le Sueur replied that he was sending the documents by express.

*At Law,
Michael May 13-12.*

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

001432