

the first part of the letter, which is marked private, referring to the recent appointment of Mr. Gale to the Bench, which had created a great deal of excitement among what Lord Aylmer calls the disaffected party. His Lordship explains in reference to the charge of injustice towards the French Canadians in the appointments to the Bench, that out of four of these, three were French Canadians, all of whom belonged to the Canadian party and were opposed to his administration, so that he could not be accused of partiality in the exercise of such powers of patronage as he possessed. He then proceeds :—

I am really ashamed of being obliged to justify myself thus beforehand regarding this appointment, but the virulence with which my public character and my administration are assailed by the public prints of the Province, of all parties and denominations, renders it necessary that I should omit no opportunity of guarding His Majesty's Government against their misrepresentations. My situation in this Province has this peculiar difficulty attending it; that having rejected the alliance of the Public Press and having traced out a line of policy of my own wholly independent of all parties, I am considered as an object against which they may all level their principles. Such has been my position hitherto in Lower Canada with this further disadvantage in the early stage of my administration not only of being unsupported but openly censured by the authorities at home.

To have maintained my ground up to this time under those circumstances must be considered by all those who are acquainted with the politics of this distracted Province as a sort of miracle. (Series Q., vol. 217-2, p. 325.)

The position of hostility assumed by the House of Assembly as above indicated, Lord Aylmer attributed to his having inherited certain nice and difficult questions which had long agitated the Assembly at which time he found himself in the same position as Mr. Spring Rice had done when the latter assumed the office of Colonial Secretary. But, he continued, he felt he had no cause to be dissatisfied with his position, in so far as it regarded himself individually, and he was content to be judged by the result of the policy he had adopted. (Series Q., vol. 217-2, page 532.)

Partly, as it would appear, to conciliate Mr. Papineau and Mr. Neilson, partly to satisfy the Assembly as to the method of conducting the business of the Council, they were both offered appointments in the Executive Council, but both declined, Mr. Papineau on the ground that the rules of the House of Assembly would stand in the way of his acceptance, Mr. Neilson because of engagements he had contracted with his constituents at the time of his election. (Series Q., vol. 201-1, page 140.)

The conciliatory course followed by Lord Aylmer was not considered by Sir John Colborne as an example to be followed in the case of Mr. Mackenzie, his words describing him being "A more unprincipled demagogue could not have sprung up to disturb a colony." (Series Q., vol. 374-2, page 260.)

The political letters of Messrs. Papineau, Viger and Mackenzie are so full and detailed that it seems unnecessary to do more than refer to them. The correspondence on the political state of affairs in Upper and Lower Canada will be found in the volumes relating to the two provinces. The opinion of Lord Aylmer with respect to the people of Lower Canada and the Assembly may, however, be quoted. "The former," he says, "are loyal, peaceable and well disposed, and I do not think that (with few exceptions) there exists among the latter any systematic opposition to the views of His Majesty's Government." (Series Q., vol. 206-1, page 67.)