

future of 17 members, Catholics and Protestants. The Council was empowered to impose taxes for roads and buildings (1).

The Quebec Act was very gratefully received by the Canadians (2).

Their right to develop according to their national aspirations on the soil of America which they had opened to civilization, was recognized at last (3).

The Protestants were dissatisfied and presented lengthy petitions asking for the repeal of the new constitution (4).

Carleton landed at Quebec, on his return from England on the 8th September, 1774. He formed the new Council, which contained eight Canadians: François Levesque, Charles François de Lanaudière, La Corne de St-Luc, Gaspard Chaussegros de Lery, Pecaudy de Contrecoeur, Picotté de Belestre, des Bergères de Rigauville and Roch de St-Ours.

Carleton could not occupy himself for any length of time with administrative organization, because exceptionally serious matters required his attention to another point.

Two American armies were marching on Canada: one, commanded by Schuyler and Montgomery, was to seize St. Johns and Montreal; the other, under Arnold, was to pass through the Beauce forests and lay siege to Quebec.

Carleton had no army and great was his surprise when he learned that the mass of the country people refused to take up arms and were even disposed to welcome the American rebels as liberators.

While the Philadelphia Congress protested against the Quebec Act and the establishment of a Catholic province in northern America, it sent the Jesuit Carroll to carry on a propaganda in favour of revolution and sent an insidious letter to the Canadians to persuade them that it was in their interest and in that of Catholicism to join the insurgents.

There is no doubt that such hypocritical measures had produced an impression on the naive and credulous population. The example of certain English merchants, James Livingston and Thomas Walker among others, who spoke openly against the Government and headed the insurgents in the Montreal district, was not without influence on the Canadians (5).

(1) Mr. John Boyd, in his *Life of Sir George Etienne Cartier*, rightly observes that if there was no question of the use of the French language in the articles of capitulation or in the Quebec Act, it was because it apparently was not necessary to make any declaration on that subject. It does not depend upon laws or treaties that a people be compelled to speak any special language or be prevented from speaking their mother-tongue, and the French-Canadians' tenacity in preserving their language, clearly proves it. Sir George Etienne Cartier, *Bart.* by John Boyd, p. 31.

(2) Letter from Carleton to Lord Dartmouth, 23rd September, 1774. Const. Doc. (1760-1791), p. 410.

(3) Canada and its provinces, Mr. Duncan McArthur, Vol. 3, pp. 48 and 49.

(4) Const. Doc. (1759-1791), p. 414.

(5) "Some of the King's old Subjects have joined the Rebels, and it were to be wished all of them, inclined to that Cause, had done the same, we should be the safer for it; the Copy of an intercepted letter from one of them is herewith inclosed." (This letter was signed Jas. Livingstone, who came from the State of New York and was a grain merchant on the St. Lawrence.)

Cramahé to Dartmouth, 21st Sept., 1775. Const. Doc., p. 456.

"It requires but little Penetration to Discover that had the System of Government Solicited by the Old Subjects (the English) been adopted in Canada, this Colony would in 1775, have become one on the United States of America. Whoever considers the number of Old Subjects who in that Year, corresponded with and Joined the Rebels, of those who abandoned the defence of Quebec in virtue of Sir Guy Carleton's Proclamation in the fall of the same Year, and of the many others who are now avowed well-wishers of the Revolted Colonies, must feel this Truth however national or Religious Prejudices will not allow him to declare it."

Haldimand to Lord Germain, 25th October, 1780. Const. Doc., p. 488.