

was willing to tell about himself. He does not complete the elaborate portrait of which the first volume gave promise. The hero of the first volume ceases to be heroic in the second: when the author found that he had pitched the opening eulogy in too high a key, he was fully justified in beginning a descent towards the region of sober reality. But the undertone of adulation, once adopted, is never abandoned. Rolph, if less seraphic, never ceases in Mr. Dent's hands to be great and noble; nor Mackenzie to be vile and despicable. If Mr. Dent has left unfinished the portrait of Dr. Rolph, of which he drew the outlines in the first volume, he has at least furnished the material out of which a picture can be made; not a full-length portrait, but sufficient to give us a tolerable view of the public side of the man. More than this is not desirable; but should the necessity for more arise, the materials are not likely to be wanting. Rolph, it is admitted, joined the insurgents; but in excuse we are told that the strong man was led astray by Mackenzie, the weak man. Rolph was to take no active part; and yet, it is admitted that he "advised"—Mackenzie says ordered—the change in the day of the rising. Rolph was to await in calm expectancy the hour of triumph, while Mackenzie and others did the fighting; and in the moment of success Rolph was to hasten to claim the chief prize of victory. Mr. Dent, with a frankness which does him great credit, divulges the fact that Dr. Rolph so arranged matters that Mackenzie, once success had been obtained, was to be thrust aside, on the pretext that he was dangerous, and even placed under arrest to ensure the elevation of Dr. Rolph to the presidency of the provisional government. In all the charges made against Dr. Rolph, from first to last, there is nothing that will prove to be so lasting a stain upon his memory as this statement, the accuracy of which there is no reason to doubt. But, while Mr. Dent is entitled to credit for bringing this damning fact to light, his failure to condemn the intrigue shows the extent of his devotion to the offender.

In the matter of the flag of truce, Mr. Dent fights valiantly for a desperate cause. But we cannot for the life of us see what the quarrel is about. Mr. Dent admits that Dr. Rolph, sent by the Government with a flag of truce to the insurgents, took advantage of his contact with them, so gained, to urge them to come into the city at once to overthrow the Government in whose service he had been a minute before. By no process of moral bisection could the ambassador be, at the same moment, true to the Crown and to the insurgents; and in playing a double part he imperilled the success of the venture on which so many lives were staked. If the advice or order was not given on the first visit of the flag, so much the greater would be the peril of discouragement in the ranks of the insurgents when they saw in the service of the Government, without any explanation, one to whom they had looked as a leader and a friend; but if, as Mackenzie, Lount, and others alleged, the advice or order was given on the first visit, then was Dr. Rolph unfaithful to the Government by whom he had been entrusted with the flag. There is really no choice of alternatives; and it is puerile to attempt to find justification in either.

Mr. Dent has laboured under the difficulty of having to deal with evidence got up, under peculiar circumstances, for the purposes of exculpation and recrimination. The evidence of a design to get up this evidence takes us back to the first half of 1838. Dr. Rolph conceived the plan, and Dr. Morrison aided him in its execution. The latter, in a letter which Mr. Dent has printed, was, in May, 1838, employed in getting up evidence "for future use," and by no means for present publication when all the witnesses were living, and any misstatement made could be readily corrected. Another letter, with which Mr. Dent has made us acquainted, shows that Dr. Rolph, as late as 1854, was still opposed to the immediate publication of anything respecting which counter evidence could be brought. Nothing beyond a general denial of Mackenzie's version of the rebellion was to be ventured upon. In the meantime, evidence was to continue to be got up for future use. We cannot here go into the evidence, the fruit of these labours, which Mr. Dent has, in this volume, given to the public; but a word as to the methods employed in collecting it is necessary. The business of evidence-making thrived best when Dr. Rolph was Commissioner of Crown Lands. On three of the witnesses, if not four, Dr. Rolph, in the disposal of the patronage of his Department, conferred office. One witness, and the most important of all, who had been among the first to echo Mayor Powell's charge that Dr. Rolph was a double traitor—a traitor to his fellow-insurgents, as well as to his Sovereign—now found no difficulty in giving him a clean bill of health; another, from being an intense admirer of Mackenzie, became his severest censor. One witness lays himself open, to the suspicion of having fabricated evidence. "General" McLeod, of the Patriot Army, on whom Dr. Rolph, when Commissioner of Crown Lands, bestowed an office, contributes a military order which purports to have been signed at Lewiston in 1838, its avowed object being to prevent

the destruction of public monuments and private property. But the real object is revealed by the private circular, which is made to appear as if it had accompanied the order, and in which Mackenzie is charged with having carried a keg of powder on his back to be used in blowing up "a public work on the Welland Canal." All the facts about the blowing up of the work on the Welland Canal are known to the minutest particulars. Mackenzie was not within three days' travel of the scene when the explosion took place. An officer, who served under McLeod—for all the witnesses are not dead—writes to a friend who has handed his letter to me: "I never heard of such a circular; certainly it was not sent to the officers or read in their presence." And he adds: "I know, as far as it is possible for any man to know a negative fact, that no such circular was issued." The date, "Lewiston, 1838," no month being given, creates suspicion, which the signature "Ashley, Adjutant-general," the given name being omitted, will not lessen. His official signature, of which specimens are in existence, was "R. W. Ashley, jr., Adjutant-General, R.S.R.U.C." "I think," says the correspondent, "that when McLeod was procured to sign the order and circular, he had forgotten Ashley's mode of signature," and signed it in the form presented. Whether these facts amount to positive proof of fabrication the reader can judge. The "evidence" which it contains against Mackenzie, of his carrying a keg of powder on the Welland Canal, when he was at Rochester, is certainly false. This general glance at Dr. Rolph's mode of getting up evidence for future use, when all who could contradict it might be dead, shows the necessity of subjecting the product to a searching criticism. Mr. Dent is not to be held responsible for these very peculiar methods of getting up "evidence for future use," but he often looks upon the result with too friendly an eye, and seeks to invest it with an importance which it does not possess. And in dealing with the evidence he does not always hold evenly the scales as between Rolph and Mackenzie. Take an instance: when he has barely turned the hundredth page, the author has repeated no less than five times that Mackenzie drew up, for signature by another person, a statement bearing on the controverted facts, as if it were a rule of evidence that the person who is to make an affidavit or declaration must draw it up himself; but, while he invokes this fictitious rule against Mackenzie, he excuses, or at least fails to condemn, its violation by Rolph in a case in which the witness who, under prospect of official reward which he did actually receive, flatly contradicted a statement which he had voluntarily made many years before.

It would be affectation to pretend not to see that Mr. Dent is frequently unjust to Mackenzie. The payment by the Government to Mackenzie, after his return from exile, "of a considerable sum by way of recompense for services rendered in connection with the Welland Canal," and another sum by the county of York as "back wages," now called "indemnity," as a member of the Legislature, Mr. Dent characterizes as "benefactions." The former amount was one which no Government could have refused to pay; this debt, due for services as Commissioner in the Welland Canal investigation, was not paid at the time it became due because the supplies were withheld, principally at Mackenzie's own instigation. For the same reason Mr. Papineau, when he went into exile, left behind his unpaid salary as Speaker of the Lower Canada House of Assembly. When he returned, the arrears were paid by a Tory Government. Mackenzie's claim stood on precisely the same footing. His claim for unpaid indemnity was one which, in the opinion of an eminent counsel who was soon after appointed judge, could have been collected through the Court of Chancery. Is it fair to represent these just debts as "benefactions"? These statements are only samples of many others that might be quoted.

In the final sifting there is, in the new evidence, much that will be rejected; but there will still remain a valuable addition to the materials necessary to form a conclusive judgment on the public character and career of Dr. Rolph. Of these, whatever tells against him may be accepted without question; the witnesses for the plaintiff will probably undergo cross-examination and have to face rebutting evidence which may sometimes come from no less authority than themselves.

"The Other Side of the Story," a pamphlet of one hundred and fifty pages, by Mr. John King, barrister, of Berlin, contains a number of criticisms which Mr. Dent's first volume provoked. This *brochure*, being devoted almost exclusively to criticism, is not, in a literal sense, "the other side of the story"; but it shows very distinctly that there is another side. On the whole, it is a favourable specimen of pamphleteering—lively, incisive, sparkling, dealing hard blows without being merciless—but it does not pretend to furnish a complete reply to the "Story of the Upper Canada Rebellion." Still, in the two books we have the bane and the antidote, and whoever reads one will not do himself justice if he does not read