a high-minded man—a much more high-minded man than some of the Reformers with whom he had to contend—no impartial reader of his "Narrative" can doubt; but he was on the losing side. He was a man of great force of character, and he had in fact rallied a large portion of the Province to his views; but the Colonial Office clearly saw that a cause which depended on personal force of character could not be permanently sustained. He was informed that "His Majesty's Government looks to no transient results or temporary triumphs." Finally, as you are aware, he sacrificed his office rather than ohey the instructions he had received to restere a certain person to office whom he had thought it proper to remove.

ARADAD SAVERTA 1946 B.J. MARKES MARKENSSERIES

Same and the second states

I do not know whether the conflict between the two irreconcilable ideas of personal government and popular government can be better studied than in the volume to which I have been referring. It is almost impossible not to sympathize with the champion of the dying cause; and yet the very heroism which he throws into the fight gives foreboding of failure. His opponents did not require to he heroic, nor yet uncommonly straightforward. They only needed to unite on a policy, and pursue it with persistence. What they wanted above all things was control of the patronage; and that they got through the establishment of what was called "responsible government."

At the time that Sir Francis was waging his hopeless contest in this Province the Reform Bill (1832) had already been passed in England. That bill, as it proved, contained in germ the whole democratic system of government; but this was not perceived at the time by its authors, nor even, for the most part, by its opponents. It contained the principle of Democracy in this respect, that it gave substantial representation to the masses of the people; the play of party politics did the rest. So long as there is an untouched reservoir of political power anywhere, so long will it attract the covetous glances of the party most likely to profit by tapping it. It is difficult for the practical politician to pass by a mass of possible votes irretortis oculis. At the same time many were the declarations made that there as no intention, or even thought, of democratizing the Constitution of England. Lord John Russell declared in 1837 that, so far as he was concerned, the settlement of 1832 was final. ""Having," he said, "only five years ago reformed the representation, having placed it on a new basis, it would be a most unwise and unsound experiment now to begin the process again. , . , I say, at least for myself, that I can take no share in such an experiment." As we all know, however, that indefatigable statesman did in later years take part in several such experiments. In 1854, and again in 1859, he made unsuccessful attempts to carry further measures of reform. On the latter occasion he is recorded to have said: "I wish to disclaim entirely any intention to frame a new Constitution. I disclaim such a project for two reasons. One is that I nave no wish to alter the Constitution of this House; the other is that, if any such alteration were sought, I should feel totally unable to propose anything that would stand in the place of