THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL IDEAS IN THE PROVINCE OF CANADA, 1848-58

Thesis
Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
Doctor of Philosophy

Anthony Walter Rasporich

1970

c Anthony Walter Rasporich 1970

ABSTRACT

The decade following the European revolutions of 1848 was a watershed in Canadian intellectual history. That period has traditionally been described by political historians as one of exciting political ferment, producing the ideological components of modern Canadian liberalism, and after the political realignment of 1854, a conservative political combination that was to dominate Canadian politics for a half-century. This view of the eighteen-fifties has, however, ignored a whole substratum of political assumptions and attitudes held by the politicians and their partisan press. A close examination of these reveals a political culture of decidedly different proportions.

The dynamic thrust of Canadian ideas came more often from social rather than political sources. Ultramontanism, Protestant evangelicalism, nationalism, racism, and anti-Americanism were all emergent forms of social romanticism, which expressed, in radically new terms, Canadian popular aspirations. Their plural and dialectical form of expression, especially in the popular press, effectively changed the role of the politicians. The function of the political system was less and less a forum for the expression and reconciliation of ideological opposites than a sociological safety-valve for social ferment.

After a brief flurry of rejuvenated radicalism with the appearance of rougeism and clear-grittism in the late eighteen-forties and early fifties, Canadian politics settled into an "era of good feelings." The political thought of the next decade was beset by a whiggish complacency and compromise which denied the place of divisive ideology

upon fundamental questions of political and social theory. The politics of consensus dictated that ideological conservatism, such as English Canadian toryism, and ideological liberalism such as French Canadian rougeism had to seek out the no man's land of whiggery. The period was not the cradle of Canadian party democracy, but its whig casket.

The whiggism of the eighteen-fifties presented an open form of eclectic compromise which promised to absorb Canada's pluralism. It had achieved its purpose in the eighteen-forties by opening the constitutional system to popular power through responsible government and legal reform. It now promised to open the entire political process into a free-wheeling contest for power by political coalitions and interest-group politics. Economic action was relieved by whiggery of the moral restraints which early toryism or liberal-democracy had placed upon it. Whiggism also promised to smother Canada's increasing social diversity with its constitutional tolerance and its racial monism. Federalism represented the spirit of the former, and the folk-myths of anglo-saxon and northern racism the latter. The irony of the whig vision was that its open-myth structure was ultimately too restrictive. It deprived the political system of ideological tension, it maintained an undemocratic form of capitalism, and it stood, more often than not, for the ascendancy of English over French Canadians.

VITA

NAME: Anthony Walter Rasporich

BORN: Port Arthur, Ontario
January 9, 1940

EDUCATION: Port Arthur Elementary and Secondary Schools (1946-58)
Queen's University, Hons. B.A., 1962
M.A. 1964

PRIZES AND AWARDS:
Ontario Scholar, 1958
Alexander McLachlan Peace Prize, Queen's, 1962
Ontario Fellowship, 1963-64
Canada Council Pre-Doctoral Fellowship, 1965-66

EMPLOYMENT: Kingston Collegiate and Vocational High, 1962-63
Assistant Professor, University of Calgary, 1966-69

PUBLICATIONS: "Imperial Sentiment in the Province of Canada During the Crimean War, 1854-56," in W. L. Morton, ed., The Shield of Achilles, (Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1967)

"The National Awakening in Canada," in J. M. Bumsted, ed., Documentary Problems in Canadian History, (Georgetown: Dorsey Press, 1969).

Co-Editor with D. P. Gagan, Issues in Canadian History Through the Press, (to be published by Holt-Rinehart & Winston, 1970)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this thesis would like to thank a number of persons and institutions without whose assistance this study would not have been possible. My first debt is to my wife who has not only patiently awaited the completion of this dissertation and listened to my interminable musings on Canadian political ideas, but also contributed considerably to financing a year's research at the Public Archives. My second debt lies with the Canada Council, with the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba, and with the J. S. Ewart Fund for their substantial financial assistance over the four years that it has taken to produce this work. My thanks must also go to the Head of the Department of History of the University of Calgary who has generously offered the secretarial services of the Department for the typing of this lengthy manuscript. Needless to say, the secretaries themselves have been most patient and exacting in their execution of this task.

A number of archivists and librarians must also be thanked for their invaluable assistance in locating manuscript collections, pamphlets, and books: Miss Barbara Wilson of the Public Archives; Mr. Elwood Jones, Mr. Keith Johnson, Walter Neutel, and Carol Lawrie, all formerly with the Public Archives; Miss Sandra Guillaume of the Provincial Archives of Ontario; Miss Edith Firth of the Toronto Public Library; Mr. Charles Beer formerly of Douglas Library, Queen's University; Mr. Bernard Weilbrenner and André Lefort formerly of the Provincial Archives of Quebec.

A few intellectual debts are owing as well. My thanks must go to two of my colleagues of the History Department of the University

of Calgary, Dr. David McGinnis and Mr. Henry Klassen for their assistance either in reading portions of the manuscript or for their helpful suggestions concerning both evidence and argument in the thesis. To Professor Morton must go my special thanks for his patience in reading my lengthy productions and for his helpful criticism in channelling them towards a more unified end-product. Notwithstanding this help, errors and inconsistencies inevitably remain in the typescript and are entirely my own responsibility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

VITA i

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER

I. CANADA VIEWS EUROPE 7

English Canada: Whiggery and Splendid Isolation
French Canada: Liberalism, Catholicism, and Romanticism

II. THE CANADIAN IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES 118

Manifest Destiny and American Expansionism
American Society and Politics
American Constitutions and Institutions

III. ATTITUDES TO EMPIRE: THE LOYALTY CRISES OF 1849 . . . 215

Canada West: The Rise of Imperial Sentiment
French Canada: Loyalty and Nationality

IV. THE DIVIDED EMPIRE - IMPERIAL SENTIMENT AND THE CHALLENGE OF NATIONAL INTEREST, 1850-58 269

The Crimean War, 1854-56
The Indian Mutiny, 1857-58

V. NATIONALITY AND RACE IN MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY CANADA 331

Dualism: The National Political Style
Pluralism: The Social Challenge

VI. POLITICAL AND SOCIETAL IDEALS OF THE CANADIAN POLITICAL ELITE 409

Political and Societal Ethics--Pragmatism, Progress and Patrician Virtue
The Idea of Political Party--Canada West
--Canada East

VII. CONCLUSION 495

BIBLIOGRAPHY 504

INTRODUCTION

Mid-nineteenth century Canadian ideas have had a limited and partisan historiography. On the one hand, the familiar whig view of Canadian political history has stressed, to the exclusion of social and economic development, the constitutional and institutional development of the United Province. On the other, the conservative or tory historian has been preoccupied mainly with the politicians' major triumphs and minor defeats. Anti-historicist by nature, the tory view has forsaken apotheosis for caricature. An entire generation's political activity has been reduced by it to the Rabelaisian revelation of Allan MacNab that his politics were railways.

Both views are by turn fortifying and entertaining, but both are historically limiting. Professor Cornell has been able, for example, to explode one of the caricatures of this period, "the loose-fish," by a careful analysis of legislative voting behaviour.[1] An equally valid question which might be asked of the politicians in this period is what they regarded as their function in the political process, or indeed, how they viewed their total environment. It may be possible to test by an analysis of political and social attitudes the hypothesis that Professor Cornell poses in his conclusion, that "party rivalry did not represent any deep and fundamental division among Canadians."[2]

The clarification of Canadian value systems has been, by and

---

[1] P. Cornell, The Alignment of Political Groups in Canada, 1841-67 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), pp. 83-86.

[2] Ibid., p. 83.

large, confined to contemporary sociology and political studies. For the nineteenth century there are a few oases in a desert of historical scarcity. For the eighteen-fifties in particular there are a number of suggestive but incomplete analyses of political and social attitudes. Both J. M. S. Careless and B. W. Hodgins have demonstrated that Liberals and Conservatives were conservative in their conception of society and politics.[3] But they have, either by the narrowness of the sample or attitude studied left a wealth of mid-century values unturned. What Canadians thought of such momentous world-events as the Revolutions of 1848 or the Crimean War, or conceived of their place in the North American continent and the Empire has gone largely unexamined.[4] While a supposedly insular American historical tradition has had its occasional Daniel Boorstin, Louis Hartz, or Sidney Hook to delineate a peculiar American Weltanschauung,[5] Canadian history has been slow to probe its national psychology.

The nineteenth century newspaper is an excellent, but largely untapped resource of that intellectual heritage. Generally it has been only those newspapers with a direct association with politics that have had much historical stature in Canada. But, as Marshall McLuhan has

---

[3]See B. W. Hodgins, "Attitudes Towards Democracy in the Pre-Confederation Decade," (unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1955); J. M. S. Careless, "Mid-Victorian Liberalism in Central Canadian Newspapers," Can. Hist. Review, XXXI (Sept., 1950), 221-36.

[4]See S. F. Wise, "The Annexation Movement and its Effect on Canadian Opinion," in S. F. Wise and R. C. Brown, Canada Views the United States (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), pp. 44-97.

[5]See, for example, D. J. Boorstin, The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964); L. Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America (New York: Harcourt & Brace, 1955); S. Hook, American Philosophers at Work (New York: Criterion, 1956).

pointed out, the nineteenth century newspaper was the equivalent of the electronic media of the twentieth century. Its message, as he notes, was not individualist at all, but "a collective form of press mosaic, with its magical power to impose its own assumptions."[6] The newspaper was at once the purveyor of nationalism and social realism. Nor was it any accident that the rapid expansion of the daily press coincided with not only the aspiration to national status, but also with its rapid realization.

As Professor Waite has pointed out, Confederation in 1867 would have been impossible without the political newspaper.[7] While the Founding Fathers of the American Republic were most often wealthy patricians, the Canadian founders were either small-town lawyers or journalists.[8] Social as well as political reality was expressed through the press. The bourgeois commercial ethic ran throughout the advertisements of merchandise, property, and patent medicines. Realism was also reflected in the literary tastes of the period. News dispatches from Europe, the debates of the Provincial House, Dickens' novels, and Napoleon's Memoirs were all the vehicles of social and political realism, however romantic or heroic the form of the latter two might have been.

Newspapers were in short the highly charged carriers of

---

[6]Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man (New York: Signet Books, 1964), p. 192.

[7]P. B. Waite, The Life and Times of Confederation, 1864-67: Politics, Newspapers, and the Union of British North America (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), p. 17.

[8]See W. H. Kesterton, A History of Journalism in Canada (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1967), p. 37.

bourgeois reality, aspiration, and conscience. The peculiarity of the Canadian media was that there was little of the "sober second thought" in the form of literary journals.[9] There were virtually no monthly or quarterly periodicals to counteract the impact of the mid-century press, which reached some two hundred in number by 1860. The Canadian political élite which controlled the daily newspapers were then injecting the narcosis of their values and assumptions directly into the blood-stream of the reading public.

By mid-century political attitudes were no longer the private judgment of a few literate politicians who had read and comprehended Blackstone, Burke, Maistre, Fox, or Jefferson. Rationality and logic, whether to conservative or to liberal ends, was not the form of newspaper persuasion. Hegel, Fourier, and Comte were not in their original form fit items for popular consumption. Rather it was the popularizers like Lamartine, Carlyle, and Bagehot, who persuaded empirically and historically that held newspaper audiences. By mid-century, ideology as a form of rational disquisition had given way to social didacticism and social romanticism. Marx, Carlyle, and Spencer were the purveyors of a new romanticism which was social rather than political in content, empirical rather than logical or rational in form.

Without raising too forcefully at this time the labyrinthine question of romanticism, it seems that a singular aspect of that complex movement may be applied to the mid-century climate of ideas in the North

---

[9] An exception was the short-lived Anglo-American Magazine. See F. Armstrong and Neil C. Hultin, "The Anglo-American Magazine Looks at Urban Upper Canada on the Eve of the Railway Era," in Profiles of a Province (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1967), pp. 43-59.

Atlantic world. Because of its preference for the concrete over the universal, the complex over the simple, romanticism manifested itself in what one historian has called the atomization of European society:

> The nineteenth century was to be eclectic in its architecture, pillaging the past for borrowed styles; it was to offer a "generous confusion" of modes in art and ideas; it divided into separate national cultures. It was a much more pluralistic civilization. Man was parcelled out in men, as the poet Rossetti put it.[10]

The mosaic pattern of thought which emerged out of this socially and culturally plural romanticism reinforced heavily the historical and empirical mode of thought which emerged from the popular press in the mid-nineteenth century.

The impact of all of these several forces in European intellectual development was profound for Canada. Unlike political liberalism or philosophic conservatism, social conservatism and romanticism allowed that European ideologies need no longer be applied dogmatically to a different context. Canadians were allowed to define themselves in a diverse social sense, as a single nation, as two nations or even more, should such a definition be empirically and historically warranted. Negative social definition was by the same empirical process as important now as the positive affirmation of classic conservative or liberal ideology had been in the early nineteenth century. To define oneself as a voluntaryist was not so often a positive faith in the rational beauties of a separated church and state, but a negative faith derived from anti-Popery. In order to define oneself as an English Canadian by 1850, it was less important

---

[10] R. Stromberg, European Intellectual History Since 1789 (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1968), p. 41.

to extol the virtues of a superior constitution, than to say that one was not a French Canadian or an American. Similarly Canadian nationality as reflected in the Confederation Debates was an essay in empirical-social dialectics, not a rational discourse in political economy as were the Federalist Papers.[11]

The uneven and eclectic character of mid-century Canadian thought fit well into the complex mosaic of European ideas after 1848. Canadians were neither "feudal" nor "enlightenment" remnants of European thought as Louis Hartz has suggested in his ambitious treatise on the Founding of New Societies.[12] Although Canadians rejected much in European societies and politics in a search after their own individual and collective identity, they still remained part of a European psychology. It is for this reason that this study begins with the European revolutions of 1848 as its starting point. It terminates a decade later in 1858 because of the increasingly inward cast of Canadian attitudes on Europe and the Empire, and the increasing preoccupation of Canadians with the internal problems of sectional and federalism. The chronological limits of this study are not intended, however, to apply restrictive limits to intellectual trends that extend back into the eighteen-forties or forward into the eighteen-sixties and beyond. Rather, the intention of this work is to identify a major watershed in Canadian ideas that was apparent after eighteen forty-eight and forty-nine.

---

[11] This idea is suggested in W. L. Morton, "The Conservative Principle in Confederation," LXXI, Queen's Quarterly (Winter, 1964), 528-47.

[12] L. Hartz, et al., The Founding of New Societies (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1964), pp. 3-122.

CHAPTER I

CANADA VIEWS EUROPE (1848-58)

Both English and French Canadians were generally convinced of the environmental uniqueness of North America and the societies it bred. European societies were always too despotic or too democratic, too priest-ridden or too agnostic, too wealthy or too poor. English Canadians may have prided themselves on their imperial attachments, and French Canadians may have taken an increasing pride in their cultural debt to France but they did not consciously ape the internal cultural norms of their parent cultures. As much as Americans took pride in their distinction from the corrupted European family after their revolution, so Canadians had come to regard themselves, albeit somewhat more quietly, as chosen peoples.

As Louis Hartz has observed in his classic work upon the American Liberal Tradition, the ideological spectrum in colonial and former colonial societies is a narrow one.[1] Mid-nineteenth century Canada generally conforms to the Hartzian model. When the revolutions of 1848 burst upon their limited intellectual horizons, Canadians did not fragment into an equal number of political factions such as roamed the streets of Paris or even those contained in the Provisional Government of Lamartine. Instead, a rapid consensus emerged from both English and French Canada that was unique and roughly homogenous in each section. If single adjectives could be used to describe the journalistic response

---

[1] L. Hartz, The American Liberal Tradition (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1955).

of each section, it would be "whiggish" in the case of English Canada, and "liberal-Catholic" in French Canada. Both views of revolution were considerably to the left of legitimist reaction in Eastern Europe and considerably to the right of Parisian socialism.

Unlike the first French Revolution of 1789 which was greeted with a uniform conservative reaction in the fledgling British colonies of Upper and Lower Canada, the revolutions of 1848 fell upon more fertile soil.[2] Conservative assumptions on revolution had eroded to such an extent by mid-century that those which remained had become self-conscious recitations of eighteenth century European reaction. Simcoe, Inglis, and Hubert had been capable of glosses upon Burke, or even later, Maistre, in remote isolation. But the old tories and the ultramontanes of the mid-nineteenth century were not. The vital, instinctual element in Canadian political thought had moved to many of the whiggish premises that Hartz has described so well in American political culture of the nineteenth century. The elite of the Canadian provinces were no longer frightened backwoods aristocracy or churchmen but outward-looking and prosperous bourgeois prepared to emerge as confidently from the cocoon of Empire as had the American colonials of 1776.

Violence was generally eschewed in Canada of 1848 because the

---

[2]For the reaction to the earlier revolution, see M. Wade, "Quebec and the French Revolution," C.H.R., XXXI (Dec., 1950), 345-68; M. Brunet, "La Revolution Francais sur les rives du St. Laurent," R.H.A.F., XI (Sept., 1957), 155-62; B. Sulte, "Les Projets de 1793-1810," T.R.S.C., (Third Series), V (1911), 19-67; Journal and Proc. of Legis. Assemb. and Council of Upper Canada, 1793, 1794, cited in A. Fraser (ed.), Seventh Report of the Bureau of Archives for the Province of Ontario (Toronto, 1909-11), pp. 15-37; E. A. Cruikshank (ed.), The Correspondence of J. G. Simcoe (Toronto: Ont. Hist. Society, 1925), III, 101, 187-89; IV, 16, 17, 158, 187, 311; S. F. Wise, "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History," United Church Bulletin, XVIII (1965), 3-18.

Canadian reformers felt that they had collectively shaken the tree in 1837, and were confidently waiting for the fruit to fall. When therefore the European revolutions reached this elite, they found one which by and large accepted the futuristic promise of revolution, but not its practical reality. Proudhon's agents, if they had existed, would have been as unwelcome as the earlier agent David McLane, who, in 1796, was hung and quartered in the town of Quebec. But, as a categorical abstraction "revolution" found considerably more sympathy in 1848 than either McLane or the spirit of democratic revolution. More often than not, though, the sympathy that was extended to the revolutionary ideal was the futuristic outlook of whig-liberalism (which always deals in the "old causes" of the past or the new causes of the future). Whenever the millenium appeared threatened by the clumsy hands of demagogues and radical socialists, it was generally agreed that it was time to stop and consolidate the promises of the early revolution.

Europe was not only important as a sounding board or mirror for Canadian political attitudes to revolution, but also as a source of intellectual sustenance. English Canadians often cited British political or constitutional precedent for their ideas and actions, ranging as far and wide as Burke, Blackstone, Fox, and Peel, and the Chartists. French Canadians of the right, left and centre variously cited Pius IX, Aquinas, Louis Veuillot, Montalembert, or Lamartine, Lammenais, and Guizot to justify and amplify their own political beliefs. Even the current pejoratives popular in Europe survived the trip across the Atlantic, and resumed their customary virulence in the hands of the political right. The <u>clear-grits</u> and <u>rouges</u> were often designated

"socialists," "atheists," and "anarchists" despite their protestations to the contrary. The left, interestingly, did not resort to socialist forms of declamation and stayed instead well within the bounds of eighteenth century democratic terminology. Often they were even content with the epithets of seventeenth century whiggery.

What was more significant than the aggregate of continental names and nicknames used by Canadians was their lack of contextual relevance. Burke and Blackstone might be employed as far left as William Lyon Mackenzie, and the traditions of whiggery might be indiscriminately mixed with those of liberalism and even Chartism by the clear-grits. Peel and Wellington might similarly appear as the darlings of both liberals and conservatives. Although the extremes between political and philosophical traditions were somewhat sharper in French than in English Canada, there was a deliberate blunting even there of the sharpness of French political thought. Lamartine was the toast of both the French Canadian left and the right, and the conservative liberalism of Guizot might be misapplied in a liberal-democratic and even republican context. One of the fundamental causes of this purposeful distortion of European ideologies was the uniqueness of the Canadian political and social experience. The political left, as observed above, was merely a stone's throw across an artificial boundary from the political right. Nationalist considerations served to make the political left and right inconsistent in the extreme. The dictates of commercial capitalism in the fifties made liberalism in either section of the province little different from conservatism in its first assumptions.

The third form of reference to the European political experience

---

[2a]For a fuller definition of whiggism and its application to Canada, see supra, pp. 410-15.

was even more unconscious and vital than the second. There was an instinctual use of contemporary British or continental political traditions to resolve particular problems within Canada. The church-state question and responsible government issue were often justified during their resolution with ample reference to the whig political tradition. In Canada East, the abolition of seigneurial tenure was initiated by such pragmatic considerations as scarcity of land for commercial speculation, and resolved upon equally pragmatic terms of protecting vested seigneurial interests. But the form of debate gave some vital clues to this process, and to the total weltanschaung of the French Canadian political élite. It revealed for example that both sides in the debate were fundamentally agreed on a Lockean concept of property as their final point of compromise. Despite the cry of socialism and despite the Church this profound social issue was resolved then in a way not much different than it would have been resolved in the middle-class monarchy of Louis Philippe or the second Empire of Napoleon, or in the whiggish era of Peel and Palmerston.

The relatively greater use by Canadians of European as opposed to American styles and forms thus stands in direct contrast to their general assumption that their society was North American. This paradox perhaps suggests a need to perpetuate anti-Americanism by obscuring the apparent social and economic similarities of Canadian to American society. But the ease with which European precedents were substituted for American ones also suggests the universality of the bourgeois political culture in the North Atlantic world. Henry Adams' comment that there was an instinctive cousinship between the Boston "upper class bourgeoisie" of the eighteen-thirties and the London of Peel, Macaulay, and Mill, and the Paris of

Louis Philippe, Guizot and Tocqueville might also apply to the urban élite of Montreal and Toronto in the fifties.[3] Rouge and clear-grit, bleu and tory were two sides of the same commercial coin. For reasons of style they aspired to circulate with the more lustrous ideological currency of Europe, even though they knew full well that they were better off in the dollar area.

(i) English Canada: Whiggery and Splendid Isolation (1848-58)

The closest that English-Canadians came to abstract speculation on the nature of Canadian society and government was in their reflections upon the European Revolutions of 1848. The rapid oscillation of democratic and reactionary forces in those revolutions served as a distant laboratory experiment upon which they could gaze with olympian impunity. There was no apparent fear that those revolutions could shake the foundations of Canadian society, distant and different as it was from European society. This lack of engagement gave at least a façade of clinical objectivity which was certainly not apparent in their reflections upon American society. But, despite its relative paucity and isolationist detachment, Canadian comment still revealed many important assumptions on fundamental political and social change.

The left extreme of English Canadian opinion upon the revolutions of 1848 was marked by the whiggery of the Toronto Globe and the Montreal Pilot, and the right by the toryism of the Montreal Gazette. For the former, the via media of constitutional monarchy was revealed as the

---

[3] See The Education of Henry Adams (New York: Modern Library, 1931), p. 33.

practical limit of their political liberalism; the operation of laissez-faire as the beacon of their economic liberalism; and an enfranchised and powerful middle class as the core of their social theory. This essentially whig view thus differed little from tory Gazette's view of revolution, at least once the revolution was well underway. Although both differed somewhat upon the abstract question of self-determination, both coincided once the revolution was a fact, and the threat of economic and social dislocation threatened France and Europe. Had there existed at that point any radical-republican or socialist thought in Canada, there may have been a genuine red-scare. Instead, there was a general confidence that North American middle-class democracy and commercial capitalism could provide adequate buffers against political and social malcontents.

Of the conservative press in English Canada, the Montreal Gazette was the most vocal on the subject of the revolutions in Europe.[4] For the editor, Robert Abraham, little had changed since the first French Revolution of 1789. He registered little surprise at the news of the Paris uprising in February of 1848, rendering its causes in familiar terms of gallic genes--bankrupt leadership, and commercial distress--and measuring its effects by the standards of Europe's previous democratic revolutions in 1789 and in 1830:

> There can be little doubt that this great movement will shake Europe to its centre, and exercise prodigious influ-

---

[4]The British Whig commented but rarely upon European news. The British Colonist was also loath to comment on the subject of revolution, and when it did speak it did so with some ambivalence. See Colonist, Jan. 9, 23, 1849; Aug. 30, 1850.

> ence in every portion of the continent, from the Scandinavian peninsula to the Morea. As for France governing herself in a constitutional way we have no faith whatever. It is not the nature of the people, they have no moderation. France always was a military despotism, and never will be anything else. . . . The turbulence, rashness and impractibility of the French, the general unpopularity of Louis Philippe; the excitement of the Italian revolutions; the natural discontent that while every other nation was progressing in liberty, France was going backwards; the heavy taxation and disordered state of the finances; the excessive dearness of food; the commercial distress which had thrown a number of persons out of employment. To these may be added the general profligacy of the governing classes, which, as in the last century has deprived them of all moral influence.[5]

As the revolution in France went from excess to excess, the Gazette saw little resolution of their problems in any other than military terms. Like its first revolution the second could only be resolved by a war and a dictatorship.[6] The Gazette even appeared to regard the prospect of war in Europe as not only inevitable, but in some ways philosophically desirable! Sometime later when discussing the subject of the Peace Congress in Frankfort, Abraham noted that such attempts to avert war were Utopian in the extreme. He then went on to cite Burke and Alison at length to prove that the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars had a leavening effect upon the rest of European civilization: "Perpetual peace would transform men into beasts of burthen--perpetual war reduce them into beasts of prey."[7]

As Abraham contemplated the ineptness of the French to solve their

---

[5]Montreal Gazette, Mar. 20, 1848. See also J. Strachan to R. Gillespie, Aug. 3, 1848, Strachan Papers, P.A.C. microfilm. Strachan's Burkean comment was: "Frenchmen incapable of liberty, pushing free trade too far."

[6]Montreal Gazette, Apr. 28, May 31, 1848. The Gazette's man on horseback was General Cavaignac, ibid., July 31, 1848.

[7]Ibid., Sept. 18, 1850.

internal problems, he appeared oblivious to any but the constitutional ones. The complex political and social problems of mid-summer 1848 in France were largely ignored as the editor used the French situation as an example of a faulty constitutional mechanism. A single assembly of nine hundred representatives, elected by universal suffrage, and unchecked by any conservative force above could only lead to political suicide. Canadian readers were even lectured on the various forms of government between democracy and despotism in order that they might avert the awful lessons of two French Revolutions.[8] The eighteenth century view of the Gazette upon the central issues of 1848 was most apparent in his later assessment of the revolutions as a "contest between the aristocratic, democratic, and monarchical principles in politics, like that between faith and reason, authority and free-will in religion, is incessant and incident to human nature."[9]

On the subject of revolution or incipient rebellion elsewhere in Europe, the Gazette was generally unsympathetic. Certainly those Irish revolutionaries and Chartists who threatened the territorial integrity of Great Britain and the sovereignty of the Queen were held in utter contempt. The issues were blurred sufficiently by the editor so that these political dissidents were portrayed as the apostles of anarchy and communism, who stood to subvert the time-honoured system of Saxon liberty and compromise:

> It is in no disrespectful spirit to Ireland or to Irishmen that we speak of this rebellion with contempt. When the

---

[8] Montreal Gazette, Apr. 7, Sept. 12, 13, 1848.

[9] Ibid., Sept. 13, 1849.

> first and greatly magnified rumours of the Chartist insurrection in England and Scotland came to this country, it will be recollected that we spoke of it with utmost scorn, and that our predictions of its character and results were exactly realized. The causes and circumstances are somewhat different; but, still, we believe that the enemies of law and order in Ireland are almost as few and as truly insignificant as in England. It is evident to us that the heart of Ireland is sound, and that the great body of the nation is attached to the existing order of things, with all its faults. They do not desire communism or republicanism, the destruction of all order, and the barbarisation of society. Many evils has Ireland had to labour under, and the wise and prudent will strive to remedy them. . . . but if there be a man or race in the world, who is desirous to redress the one or to effect the other, it is the much abused Saxon.[10]

Whereas the Gazette had been unwilling to admit the fundamentally social character of the revolutions in France, it did so in the case of Chartism and the Irish repeal movement. The English workers and Irish peasants were asked to look after their own economic interest, an interest which was certainly not abetted by the destruction of the aristocratic social order. Chartism would thus have succeeded if it had only retained its "rational" and "temperate" character, but would never by violent intimidation be able to frighten off the majority who were "peaceable, industrious, moral and religious."[11]

Only the cause of Louis Kossuth and the insurgent Hungarian populace appeared to cause Abraham and other Tories some doubt. Yet, even that concession to European liberty was made after the subsidence of general revolution in Europe. While the revolution was still in progress the Gazette congratulated itself that the Atlantic separated them from the awful events which shook Europe, and that peace and plenty were "in all

---

[10] Montreal Gazette, Aug. 23, 1848; see also Aug. 10, 1848.

[11] Ibid., Aug. 15, 1848.

our tents."[12] When the embers of revolution were safely dying or dead, the Gazette was somewhat more inclined to see some long-range benefits from the continental revolutions, and especially that in Hungary.

If Kossuth and the Hungarian revolutionaries served any useful purpose in advancing human liberty it was in the opposition they offered to continental despotisms like Austria and Russia.[13] Yet, when the United States made the slightest gesture in 1851 towards the official support of universal human liberties in Europe, the new editor of the Gazette, James Ferres, withdrew even his niggardly concessions to Hungarian patriotism. He openly chastised Daniel Webster for his open and inflammatory letter to foreign representatives of Austria suggesting that Hungary be made a republic, on the grounds that

> neither Europe nor America are in such a settled state as the advocates of peace would fain have us suppose, . . . and remarks like Mr. Webster's might again produce similar results to those produced in 1798 [sic] by the publication of the Declaration of the Rights of Man in France.[14]

The liberal-reform press in English Canada was more hopeful of the ultimate progress of liberty that was promised at least by the outbreak of the revolutions in France. Like the British Whigs and American Democrats who optimistically greeted the revolutions of 1789 in France, Brown of the Globe and the Hincksite Pilot were generally elated at the crumbling of continental despotism. Much as those earlier liberals greeted the Declaration of the Rights of Man as an unparalleled event in human

---

[12] Ibid., Jan. 1, 1849. [13] Ibid., Dec. 31, 1851.

[14] Ibid., Jan. 8, 1851. See also Dec. 17, 1851.

progress, both the Globe and the Pilot hailed the decision of the newly formed Provisional Government in France to abolish slavery in the French West Indies as sufficient justification for the violent overthrow of Louis Philippe:

> The Revolution was but eight days old, when the decree that France should no longer have slaves was issued to the world. A more noble mode of celebrating the new born freedom of France could not have been devised; and it will be hailed with shouts of joy wherever justice, humanity, and liberty prevail. We hope it is an omen for good. It shows that selfishness does not predominate there, and that the men who were knocking off their own fetters would not retain the fetters so unjustly imposed by their country on the injured sons of Africa. It is a step in the march of freedom, almost equal to that of the Revolution itself; for it will tell on Cuba, and it will tell on Brazil, and it will tell on the guilty Republic in out neighbourhood, which preaches freedom, but practices it not.[15]

The Globe went on in May further to congratulate the Provisional Government of Lamartine for the abolition of the death penalty for political offences, and the establishment of absolute liberty to all religious denominations. These concessions, Brown claimed, separated the Provisional Government from the revolutionists of 1792 "whose history was for years marked by the most shameful excesses, perpetrated with a ferocity disgraceful to human nature."[16]

Yet, neither of these journals was so naive or so democratic to accept without reservation the progress of the French Revolution even in its most conservative phase. Brown's fundamental objection to the political gains made in this early phase was against universal suffrage

---

[15] Globe, Apr. 1, 1848. See also Montreal Pilot, Apr. 18, 1848.

[16] Globe, May 20, 1848.

as the franchise for the new Convention. This issue served as a vehicle for Brown's whiggish and anti-Gallic prejudices as he commented upon the inevitability of popular despotism as a result of universal suffrage, and the inability of the "excitable and impulsive" French to exercise a universal franchise rationally.[17] A second source of nagging worry to English Canadian liberals was the previous association of militarism with revolution in France. The Pilot only hoped that the chauvinistic excesses of the first revolution could be avoided by an internalization channeling its vigor into healthful labour, industry and study.[18] Brown, too, was concerned about the prospects of a new continental war in Europe since the despotic countries on France's borders had not forgotten the military occupations under Napoleon. He therefore counselled the French to contend not for dominion, but for principle.[19]

A third and final source of concern to these liberals was the internal economic dislocation that would result from a revolutionary régime, however conservative. The fundamentally utilitarian and mercantile outlook of English Canadian liberals was revealed in the concern of the Globe and the Pilot for the economic stability of France. Both feared the excessive participation of the government and public officials in the economic affairs of the country because it conflicted with their laissez-faire concepts of political economy. The Pilot was particularly horrified at the prospect of public agents in banks, markets, and in manufactures, and the dependence of all workingmen upon the

---

[17] Globe, Apr. 1, 1848. See also Pilot, June 20, 1848.

[18] Pilot, Apr. 18, 1848. [19] Globe, Apr. 19, 1848.

government. The only result could be disastrous speculation and bankruptcy on the one hand, and the total loss of economic initiative on the other:

> This dependence on the Government--this seeking of assistance from the Government--this looking to the Government not for protection in the preservation of property, but for the purpose of using every man's property according to the views of the majority of a Legislature--is one of the most terrible blows of civilization and society that has ever been attempted. It is this which makes the position of the Provisional Government of France dangerous. They stand at the edge of a volcano about to explode, and may be overwhelmed with all the fertile plains and population below them.[20]

George Brown was even more directly concerned with the socialistic potential of the Provisional Government. For one, the working classes in a revolution by necessity become dependent upon government to save them from starvation. The sufferers are apt to conclude that Government can do far more than is in their power to accomplish, and they form theories, which can never be realized." The proper sphere of government in Brown's view was the restoration of public confidence which would result in the more active circulation of capital and the consequent transmission energy to every class of producer.[21] A particular instance of Brown's economic liberalism was his immediate suspicion of the Provisional Government's appropriation of the French railroads by government decree. Not only would the measure fail to provide anything beyond a temporary supply of work (which was not, in any case, the proper sphere of government), but it would make possible the use of the railroads for political purposes. Brown's worst fear was that they would quickly become an

---

[20] Montreal Pilot, Apr. 18, 1848.

[21] Globe, Apr. 26, 1848.

economic and military tool in the hands of a political despotism.[22]

The sticking point for Mid-Victorian liberals came with the chronic instability of the Provisional Government and its final fall in the Bloody June Days of 1848. Just as many American liberals abandoned any hope for the secure advance of liberal democracy in the terror of 1793, George Brown recoiled in horror at the tales of massacre coming out of Paris:

> Eighty-five thousand men have been either killed on the spot or temporarily or permanently disabled, four times the population of Toronto has been suddenly laid prostrate in four days. The world is overwhelmed by the extent of this calamity ... . No such calamity as this has ever befallen any city in so short a time, at least in modern days. It exceeds, we believe, the whole number that fell in Paris by the sword or the guillotine during the various paroxyims [sic] of the first revolution, and it throws entirely into the shade the losses of the three days of 1830, and of last February. It equals the number slain in the Paris massacres of St. Bartholomew, exclusive of the wounded on this occasion, and it perhaps can find no parallel except in the internal struggles during the siege, and before the fall of Jerusalem.[23]

There was but little doubt in Brown's mind that "the virtuous Lamartine" had been overthrown by a combination of the "turbulent and ignorant" of Paris (the Communists, the Socialists, the Fourierists, and the St. Simonites), and the forces of despotism (the Bourbonists, the Bonapartists, and the mercenaries of Emperor Nicholas).[24] The possibilities then of rescuing France from either popular tyranny such as appeared during the time of the Committee of Public Safety in 1793 or

---

[22] Globe, May 20, 1848.

[23] Ibid., July 15, 1848. Brown's estimate of carnage was of course, highly inaccurate.

[24] Globe, July 15, 1848.

a legitimist despotism of the post-1815 era seemed very dim at this time for Brown. The Pilot, on the other hand, seemed less concerned with the violent turn taken by the Revolution than with the importance of establishing a stable political régime. There was little doubt that it would have welcomed a man on horseback at this stage to restore order and public confidence in the economy.[25] The candidate who best combined the virtues of stability with those of liberalism to that newspaper was General Gavaignac. It was hoped that he would provide an orderly interim government of indeterminate length so that trade would recover and a new system of government be firmly established.[26]

Although Brown was not prepared to welcome a man on horseback to save France from social and economic ruin, his subsequent reflections on the revolution in France after the Bloody June Days revealed a more decided thrust in the direction of social conservatism. That is not to say that Brown abandoned hope of any more abstract concessions to liberalism since he was subsequently pleased by the attempts made in the new Constitution of October, 1848, towards establishing religious freedom, freedom of the press, and the freedom of labour. But he was even more pleased by the abstention of the state from extensive public welfare beyond the public support of orphans, the infirm, or aged, who had no near relatives to support them:

> This is a wise regulation, which rejects all the theories of the Fourierists or Socialists--theories which have their foundation in religious unbelief, and in utter ignorance of the

---

[25] Pilot, June 20, July 13, 1848.

[26] Montreal Pilot, Sept. 5, 1848.

> principles by which the human mind is governed. This will not prevent the State on great emergencies, such as occurred at the revolution in February, or such as occurred in Ireland last year, from giving extraordinary aid. But if such aid could be demanded as a right, all industry and individual enterprize would cease, and the world would be overrun with sloth and idleness.[27]

The conservative tenor of Brown's political thought at this juncture was reflected in his pronouncements upon universal suffrage in France. In a brilliant editorial beginning with de Tocqueville's statement that "I am not the more disposed to pass beneath the yoke because it is held out to me by the arms of a million men," Brown constructed a lengthy defence of the limited property franchise as operative in Great Britain. The purpose of the lengthy whig discourse was to point up the essential cause of the French devolution to socialism and violence, and to warn its readers in Canada that universal suffrage could only lead to military despotism.[28] When the Presidential elections of December were held, Brown was therefore little interested in the result for its impact on the development of liberalism. He fully expected that the French would throw away their votes in the support of an "imbecile young man" whose only claim to fame was his blood-relation to Napoleon Bonaparte. The only real point of resemblance for Brown was Louis Napoleon's demonstrated capacity for tyranny.

By mid-1848 it was also apparent that Canadian liberals were also concerned about the spillover of social revolution from France

---

[27] Globe, Oct. 25, 1848.

[28] Ibid., Aug. 12, 1848. See also Sept. 6, 1848, July 19, 1848.

to England and Ireland. Relatively early in the history of the rebellion in Ireland and the Chartist disturbances George Brown made apparent his dislike of the anti-commercial activities of Feargus O'Connor and the inordinate demands of the Chartists for "a fair day's work."[29] By mid-summer, the Pilot claimed that it too saw through the political smoke-screen thrown up by the Chartists. They were, in truth, not concerned with better Government, but with wages.[30] George Brown saw even more sinister social results arising out of the Fourierist attempt to subvert the Provisional Government of Lamartine. He took the occasion to warn his readers of the economic heresies and anti-Christian notions not only of Saint-Simon and Fourier, but also of Robert Owen. In order to discredit their remedies for the unequal distribution of wealth, Brown penned facile caricatures of Owen's parallelograms, and Fourier's philansteries, ultimately dismissing them as the feverish panaceas of quack theorists.[31]

As this fear of social revolution subsided late in 1848, liberal attitudes towards Europe returned full circle to their position in early 1848. When Canadian whigs and liberals saw Europe returning once more to the safer paths of despotic reaction, they were paradoxically renewed in their hopes for liberty and self-determination in Europe. Much like its whig antecedents in Great Britain, the Canadian variety depended upon the existence of a monarchy or a despotism so that its positive beliefs in limited authority could remain viable.

---

[29] Globe , Apr. 26, 1848.

[30] Pilot , July 13, 1848.

[31] Globe, June 17, 1848.

George Brown's ideological contentment at the triumph of despotism was apparent in his reflections on the year 1848. Human liberty was once more cast in futuristic rather than immediate terms, in romantic unattainables rather than imminent realities. As if to underline his whiggish view of progress, he then resorted to the familiar vehicle of political prophecy. Drawing upon the eschatological ruminations of an obscure Presbyterian theologian who predicted in 1498 the fall of the French monarchy in 1794 and the fall of the Papacy in 1848, Brown penned a prophecy of his own that would take scarcely less than generations to come to fruition:

> The substance of Fleming's statements in regard to 1848, as a remarkable era, points to the work not being all done then, but that the foundations of tyrannical power will be so shaken that they will never again rest on a steady foundation. How literally this seems to be in the progress of realization we need not say.[32]

Though content to congratulate the subject peoples of Europe upon their imminent overthrow of monarchy, Brown characteristically warned them against the excessive kind of liberalism which had bankrupted the revolutions in Germany and France. Only the kind of constitutional *via media* operating in England was a valid model for imitation by the oppressed. The *Globe*'s readers were reminded that in the crisis of April, 1848, the population of London had rallied to the support of the Queen, and that such loyalty required in return "the frank and ready removal of every well grounded complaint."[33]

---

[32] *Globe*, Jan. 3, 1849. See also Montreal *Pilot*, July 28, 1849.

[33] Only the Prussians in the early phase of their revolution had come up to the mark in respect to the kind of loyalty admired by Brown, since only they had resorted to the orderly process of petition. *Globe*, April 1, 1848.

With the further dissipation of the revolutionary fortunes upon the continent in 1849, Canadian liberals became even more than ever the patron saints of lost national causes. In this increasingly sympathetic role they focused mainly upon the vanishing hopes of Italians and Hungarians for national self-determination. Kossuth, Mazzini and Garibaldi became the toasts of Canadian liberalism.[34] Occasionally, however, familiar elements of condescension towards the untutored character of continental liberalism would creep in again as it did in the early stages of the French revolution in 1848. The Pilot magnanimously forgave the Italian reformers their excesses given their excitable temperament, stressing that time and the development of a free press would certainly have assuaged "the violence of bad passions."[35]

More significant even than these effusions of sentiment for the subject peoples of Europe was the current belief that Great Britain and France should maintain the balance of power against Austria and Russia for their efforts against the racial minorities within their borders. Although it is apparent that neither the Globe nor the Pilot would have been prepared for a continental war on the behalf of human liberty, they expected at least a posture of diplomatic firmness upon the part of Great Britain and France.[36] Although nothing beyond the diplomatic recognition of Hungary was forthcoming from England, the entire blame fell upon France for her failure to provide a military

---

[34] Globe, July 7, 1848; Aug. 30, Sept. 20, 1849. See also Pilot, July 28, 1849; Marcus Gunn Diaries, Entry May 29, 1849, P.A.C.

[35] Pilot, May 10, 1849.

[36] Globe, Aug. 16, 1849; Pilot, May 24, 1849.

victory:

> But what did France do?--she did not send forces to Pesth, but she sent them to Rome, she not only stood by and saw freedom struck down in Germany, in Hungary and Italy--but she put out her own hand and crushed the Roman people. Everlasting shame has fallen on her; she has shown that it was not the love of liberty, but the love of change--not the love of freedom, but the love of power which has defeated her many revolutions. She crouched under a dispute of her own choosing, and as if apprehensive that any should be more free than herself, she sent her army to subdue Roman liberty.[37]

Brown had a particularly difficult time in extricating himself from the horns of this ideological dilemma. Although he had long since given up any hope of the domestic advancement of liberty within France because of the socialist threat, he occasionally cast a wistful eye towards the left in view of the illiberal foreign policy pursued by Louis Napoleon. His only apparent exit was a feeble exhortation of divine justice to punish "the traitor who now rules France," and a plea for the restoration of a free press.[38] By so doing Brown had come full circle to the vague, whiggish nostrums he had prescribed so freely at the outbreak of the revolutions in Paris the year before.

While the English Canadian press had been challenged by the revolutions of 1848 and had grudgingly revealed their conservative philosophical assumptions and prejudices on the nature and direction of civilised societies, they receded into an isolationism punctuated only by the imperial sentiment exhibited during the Crimean War. For English Canadians, Europe now became a chess-board of lesser and

---

[37] Globe, Sept. 20, 1849. See also ibid., July 12, 1849.

[38] Globe, July 12, 1849.

greater states in the familiar contests of what Bismarckians later called machtpolitik. The decreasing philosophical relevance of contemporary European politics for English Canadian moderates during the early fifties was made apparent by the scarcity of meaty dialogue in the provincial press. Concern for the integrity of national states combined with vague aspirations after liberal-reform in Europe were the general order of the day. English Canadians were not unlike whig statesmen like Palmerston and Russell who gloried in a prosperous isolation buttressed by a faith in mechanistic balance of power and confidence in the inevitability of materialistic advance. At the extremes of this whig consensus in Canada were those old radicals and old tory and old radical elements who had not abandoned entirely their eighteenth century world-view. But, they too were steadily yielding to a more pragmatic, statist outlook.

The greatest aspiration of moderate-conservative and liberal-reform newspapers after 1848 was for the establishment of a whiggish constitutional compromise in Europe. On the one hand, this meant the reluctant acknowledgement of the legitimacy of European monarchs, especially after the revolutions of 1848. Most English Canadian journals agreed upon the evils of central and Eastern European despotism, but did not wish a return to the anarchy of 1848. The Montreal Pilot best summed up this prevailing sentiment for a via media between these warring elements of monarchy and republicanism by offering up the standard whig remedies of a free press and pragmatic reform:

> Now a pure democratic republic we consider an impossibility in any European country, in the present state of society there. Democracy means government by the people,

> and poverty is too widely extended, what may be called the uneasy classes are too numerous to allow the formation of any permanent form of government, the existence of which depended on these classes. The foundation would be as unsafe as that of a building erected on quick-sand. Another section of European liberals wish to fight the battle of freedom through the instrumentality of the press. They wish gradually to enlighten the masses, and teach them their duties and rights . . . They argue that it was by such a process that the first French Revolution was effected, that the elder Bourbons were driven from France in 1830, and Louis Philippe in 1848 . . . A third section of European politicians would be glad to accept any constitutional system of government, whether proceeding from the ruling powers or any other source, hoping that the foundation once laid, the people themselves would step by step, conquer their liberties, by peaceable means and the progress and knowledge of civilization . . . [39]

Implicit in many discussions of this particular question was the unsuitability of European societies for any form of democracy and especially republicanism. English Canadians like some late century Americans also believed in the necessity of an agricultural frontier which could act as a safety valve "consisting of boundless tracts of valuable lands, to carry off and satisfy the discontented."[40]

As Europe gradually receded into another cycle of reaction, the hopes of English Canadian whigs for liberal reform diminished in similar proportion. The decade began with a hope in the ideals of Kossuth and Mazzini and closed with an acceptance of the realism of Count Cavour and Louis Napoleon. Like the great eighteenth century Polish patriot Kosciusko, Louis Kossuth became to North Americans a symbol of unrequited

---

[39] Montreal Pilot, Jan. 5, 1857. See also ibid., May 24, 1849; Colonist, Jan. 23, 1849; Globe, Dec. 6, 1849, Aug. 8, 1856.

[40] British Colonist, Nov. 19, 1850. See also Globe, Aug. 12, 1848; A. Macdonald to W. L. Mackenzie, Marina, Mar. 5, 1855, Mackenzie-Lindsey Coll., P.A.O.

liberalism. For a brief period after the abortive revolutions of 1848 he was the last desperate hope for liberals, and was compared, among others, to Demosthenes for his heroic stand against Philip of Macedon.[41]

By the middle of the eighteen-fifties Kossuth was no longer a relevant article of liberal faith for North Americans as was indicated by his disillusioned departure from the United States in 1855, after failing to convince anyone there of the virtues of intervention in European affairs.[42] The measure of Canadian liberal thought on Europe were now realistic nationalists like Count Cavour. His schemes were seen as no less patriotic nor liberal than Mazzini's, and were even exchanged by other personal attributes of "practicality and orderliness" which had not characterized the patriots of 1848.[43]

English Canadian attitudes towards Louis Napoleon reflected this progressive shift to a more conservative ideological posture upon Europe. Although tories and radicals maintained a consistent dislike of Napoleon's political manoeuvres which finally crowned him Emperor, whiggish reformers and moderate tories went through a curious transformation of heart upon Louis Napoleon.[44] For Brown of the Globe, Louis Napoleon had effectively contributed to the demise of true liberty in France

---

[41] See Globe, Dec. 23, Dec. 27, 1851; May 18, 1852; Pilot, Dec. 20, 1851, Jan. 6, May 26, 1852.

[42] Toronto Leader, Mar. 28, 1855.

[43] Globe, June 9, 1856.

[44] An exception here is the Montreal Pilot which was quite consistently anti-Napoleonic: May 26, June 11, May 1, 1852; July 10, 1857.

in 1848-49.[45] By 1852, however, Brown and the liberals had come to appreciate more the stable aspects of the Second Empire.[46] Although he would never admit any admiration for France's or Napoleon's contributions to enduring human liberty,[47] Brown did acknowledge increasing admiration for the internal stability which the Empire promised. Should any suspect Brown's motives for doing so, he could and did raise the spectre of republican anarchy. He welcomed Napoleon III's success in the elections of 1857 upon the grounds that:

> In France, Republic means confusion, consternation, ruin; Empire, so far, is synonymous with quiet, and a measure of prosperity. Is it then wonderful that quiet People should vote for anything, state or person, strong or dexterous enough to keep them from socialistic anarchy?"[48]

There was expressed an even more fundamental concern for the preservation of legitimate authority in France during the several attempted assassinations of Napoleon III by Italian patriots. However strongly the editor of the Toronto Leader may have felt about the anti-libertarian aspects of the Napoleonic régime, he still regarded an early conspiracy as one against the "sovereign will of the French people."[49] The attempted assassination of 1857 drew even more vituperative comment from D'Arcy McGee. He, like Brown, reminded his readers that the alternatives of

---

[45] Jan. 10, 1849, July 5, 1849; Sept. 23, 1849. See also London Free Press, Jan. 15, 1852; North American, Dec. 23, 1851.

[46] June 29, July 29, Dec. 14, 1852; Apr. 30, 1855. See also British Whig, Feb. 13, 1853; Feb. 15, 1850; London Free Press, Apr. 5, 1856.

[47] May 18, 1852.

[48] July 31, 1857. See also British Colonist, Dec. 23, 1851, Jan. 2, 1852.

[49] Toronto Leader, Dec. 7, 1853. See also Sept. 7, 1853, Aug. 11, 1855, Apr. 7, 1858.

socialism and anarchy were worse than in 1793. Not even Frenchmen, he maintained, would be capable of such a heinous and anti-Christian act as Orsini and the Italian "anarchists" were:

> These Italians, on the other hand, persuaded by their masked demagogues out the last remnants of Christian morality, are ready for anything. They long for another period of anarchy, and they strike directly at the political head of Christendom--the French Emperor.[50]

The anomalous reactions of old radicals and tories to the Napoleonic Régime after 1848 merely served to underline their anachronistic world-view. Unlike most Canadian liberal-conservatives who were prepared to absolve heavy-handed government provided it was stable, old tories and radicals still professed a marked distaste for despotism, whatever the practical benefits. For the Montreal Gazette and Hamilton Gazette the Napoleonic Empire remained a living monument to the perpetual inability of the French to govern themselves. Hopes that Napoleon would or could establish a stable peaceful régime were therefore doomed from the beginning to inevitable failure:

> Whatever may be the fate of Legitimacy and Orleanism, we hold it to be utterly impossible to extirpate the republican spirit in France; and we have no doubt that the second part of Louis Napoleon's "mission" will be to mimic his uncle by grasping at a throne and a crown. His mission is Napoleonic. The man is a mad imitator of his illustrious relative; and like the latter, he will plot and intrigue, and walk "even to the knees in blood rather than abandon his purpose. . . . But this mission will not give repose to France. At the death of Louis Napoleon, it would leave the crown to be scrambled for and fought for by the leaders of the army, which would continue to be what it now is, the flattered master of a great and civilized country.[51]

---

[50] New Era, Feb. 6, 1858. See also ibid., Aug. 20, 1857, Feb. 13, Apr. 15, 1858.

[51] Montreal Gazette, Jan. 2, 1852. See also ibid., Oct. 12, 1850, Jan. 9, 1852, July 10, 1856; Hamilton Gazette, Jan. 8, 1852; Apr. 22, 1852; Apr. 9, 1855.

William Lyon Mackenzie, although considerably more sympathetic to the republican cause, was no less trenchant in his criticism of Napoleon III. Supplied as he was by reports from his son-in-law, Charles Lindsey, who viewed first-hand the repressive tactics of the Emperor in Paris, he concurred in the view that another revolution should and would come. When the crash came, they both wished that it would bury Napoleon underneath the rubble.[52]

Beyond these brief expressions of wish-fulfillment on the Napoleonic Empire, English Canadians manifested little interest in European, and specifically British politics. To be sure, there were occasional references to the labours of Daniel O'Connell and the Irish national cause, but these lacked any philosophical content beyond that of simple chauvinism or sense of fair play.[53] Numerous other references were made to newsy items concerning the rise and fall of ministries in the British Parliament by all journals, but most lacked any consistent partisanship, let alone ideological content.[54] In fact, those few partisan discussions of internal British politics which did appear were generally combined with political issues in Canada in order to give them some immediate relevance to colonial readers.[55] As in the case of the

---

[52]Charles Lindsey to William Lyon Mackenzie, Paris, Aug. 16, 1855; Mackenzie-Lindsey Coll., P.A.O.; Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Sept. 12, 1856.

[53]See Lewis Drummond, speech at Ministerial Dinner, Berlin, C.W., July 21, 1853; New Era, Sept. 8, 1857; Mackenzie's Weekly Message, June 16, 1854.

[54]See e.g. North American, Mar. 4, 1852, "Lord Palmerston's Resignation"; Montreal Pilot, Apr. 3, 1857, "The Palmerston Ministry"; The Globe, "The Continent and Great Britain," July 12, 1848; ibid., "Palmerston's Resignation," Jan. 31, 1852.

[55]See Globe, "English Toryism," June 19, 1852; Montreal Pilot, "The Ferrie Revelations," June 23, 1849.

continental revolutions of 1848 and the Napoleonic Empire, British constitutional and political development then served largely as a mirror which reflected back in greater brilliance the whiggish self-image of political ideas in Canada.

The scarcity of direct comment in the English Canadian Press upon the burning issues developing in European social theory served further to underscore the isolationist view of continental European politics. Unlike the French Canadian conservative press which entered into active polemics against Proudhon's socialist theories, the Montreal Gazette gave scarcely a passing thought to such heresy. On the occasion of Orestes Brownson's[56] lectures on "Christianity and Socialism" in Montreal, the Gazette merely yawned at the self-evident principles expressed therein:

> The main object of the gentleman's lecture on Socialism was to show that all ideas of human improvement and society which were not funded on religion were essentially false, and struck not only at the root of the well-being of society, but of its very existence, and tended towards anarchy. He depicted in a forcible graphic and eloquent manner, the frightful horrors and despotic tyranny of such a state. He showed clearly how infinitely worse was the tyranny of the many to the one. The truth of this we do not believe any Christian is prepared to deny.[57]

Most reformers, on the other hand, were largely intent on absolving themselves from the taint of European socialism. They reacted strongly

---

[56]The ex-Jacksonian editor of Brownson's Quarterly Review, and Boston pundit of Roman Catholicism.

[57]Montreal Gazette, April 19, 1850.

to the charges by Joseph Cauchon that the clear-grits and the rouges were North American extensions of European socialist and anarchist thought. From the moderate-reform journals like the Montreal Pilot came the retort that clear-grittism like American democracy was merely "extreme liberalism, radicalism of the purest water, but not socialism."[58] The clear-grits themselves were naturally the most indignant at the suggestion that they intended to abolish property à la Proudhon. Defending Caleb Hopkins' charges against the clergy reserves in the Provincial Assembly, the North American pointed out to Cauchon that the control and regulation of public property was a sound constitutional maxim differing greatly from Proudhon's claim that "all property is a robbery."[59]

Upon those rare occasions when clear-grits and radical reformers did condescend to a discussion of socialist political and economic theory they were uniformly conservative in their reactions. When George Brown contemplated the rise of militant industrial unions in New York, he left little doubt that he disapproved of anything that would undermine a laissez-faire economy where each man had the right to sell his labour at the highest price and to combine freely with others to raise it. The New York Tailors' combinations in restraint of trade or their proposed extinction of capitalist owners were so repugnant to Brown that he scarcely gave them further comment than

---

[58] Pilot, Nov. 18, 1851.

[59] North American, Dec. 26, 1851. See also Apr. 6, 29, 1852. Only once did the North American express indirectly a favourable opinion on socialism. This was a letter to the editor on "WHAT IS SOCIALISM?" by HOMO, Toronto, Feb. 14, 1852, and appeared in the Feb. 19th edition of the North American. Socialism was compared to Christianity because its impulse was basically humanitarian.

that they were contrary to natural law![60] In a somewhat different vein, William Lyon Mackenzie delivered a similar verdict on Proudhon's strictures against property. Borrowing directly from Guizot's discourses against Proudhon's social republic, Mackenzie denied many of the maxims he had originally promulgated in the eighteen-thirties. He appeared not even to notice Guizot's denial of the right to happiness, his conservative theories of the familial origins of sovereignty, or his belief in the depravity of the human will.[61] The philosophical contradictions inherent in this support of Guizot against Proudhon, and his yearning for a revolutionary overthrow of Napoleon III were not untypical of Mackenzie's confused political thought, but in this case even George Brown was not far behind in his inability to reconcile his liberal political impulses with his conservative social theories.

In their use of the British political tradition, the English Canadian press was no less conservative. If a single word might be used to describe the British political heritage in the Canada of the eighteen-fifties it would be "whiggery." No one including the clear-grits and Mackenzie purported to speak consistently in the interests of the English or the Canadian poorer classes. In reply to the Montreal Herald's comparison of the English poor to American slaves the Montreal Pilot recoiled in whiggish horror:

> True the lower classes of England and Ireland endure much privation and suffering but they are free! They can go where they please and manage their personal affairs with-

---

[60] Globe, Aug. 20, 1850. See also May 11, 1854.

[61] Mackenzie's Weekly Message, Apr. 11, 1856, Dec. 7, 1855.

> out interference from other quarters. Their wives are their own--their sons and daughters are their own. There are no laws to keep them in mental darkness, but on the contrary, vigorous efforts are made to secure to them the blessings of education, and liberal grants for that purpose are annually voted by Parliament--besides which, philanthropic plans for their general improvement involving the expenditure of large sums of money, are continually in action.[62]

The Toronto Leader similarly chastized the Chartists, especially for their dogmatic insistence upon the holy writ of their charter and their insistence upon narrow "class legislation."[63] Even the more sympathetic Free Press of London ignored the political and economic demands of the English poor. Its editor was more content to prescribe simplistic short-run cures such as self-help associations and permanent ones like emigration.

One also looks in vain to the pages of the North American for any concern for fundamental social reform.[64] Instead one finds finely spun out legal arguments for such political reforms as the fixed meeting of Parliament. In answer to Robert Baldwin's argument that such an innovation would infringe directly upon royal prerogative, McDougall countered not with a recitation of radical precedents, but with an impeccable citation of whiggish constitutional landmarks such as Magna Carta, and the Glorious Revolution and whig authorities like Lord Macaulay and the Edinburgh Review.[65]

---

[62] Pilot, Apr. 2, 1850.

[63] July 23, 1853.

[64] May 1, 1851. See also Oct. 26, 1853. "THE INSURRECTION OF INDUSTRY."

[65] North American, Nov. 30, 1852, May 28, 1850.

If the clear-grits admitted of a radical political heritage from Great Britain it was generally the liberalism of Cobden and Bright, and further back, from Bentham, O'Connell, and the Philosophic Radicals. When Charles Clarke later paid his intellectual debts to British politics he stressed at length his debt to Richard Cobden's free trade principles and only professed "slight acquaintance with the Chartist demands for reform."[66] The deeper intellectual heritage of the clear-grits to British political tradition in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was again consistently whiggish. On the sectarian struggle of the eighteen-fifties between Protestant and Catholic the North American pleaded for an abandonment of the spirit of "bigotry and intolerance worthy of the days of Titus Oates."[67] Similarly the Reform Ministry's denial of the right of reporters to sit in and report the proceedings of the House of Assembly in 1850 was compared to the arbitrary actions of Charles I's Court of Star Chamber.[68] Unlike early American republicans like Jefferson and Madison who referred copiously to the English republicans of the seventeenth century, the clear-grits studiously avoided anything within the British constitutional tradition which might brand them as republican and disloyal.

The extent to which all centrist politicians and journalists had become "liberal-conservatives" is apparent from the whiggish derivation

---

[66]Charles Clarke, Sixty Years in Upper Canada, with Autobiographical Recollections (Toronto: Wm. Briggs, 1908), p. 45. See also North American, Apr. 30, 1850, "Reformator."

[67]Dec. 9, 1851.

[68]North American, Aug. 2, 1850.

of their political presumptions. As might be expected, liberal reform elements were most vocal in their whig ancestral pride. The Montreal Pilot in a short series of personal sketches of great reformers in 1850 paid homage to the great Whigs, Charles Fox, Sheridan, Tierney, and Whitehead.[69] Fox stood the tallest of all because of his eloquent espousal of such great liberal measures as religious toleration, Catholic Emancipation, and his steadfast opposition to tyranny whether in the form of the Stamp Acts, Test Acts, or the Slave Trade. But Fox was more than just a liberal or radical politician; he was a statesman "because he could throw over their principles the shield of argument, adorn them with the grace of scholarship and dignify them with the lustre of birth and station."[70]

What was perhaps more interesting was the fact that tory journals like the Montreal Gazette should profess similar attachment at least to whig principles if not whig heroes. The retiring editor of the Gazette, Robert Abraham, expressed in 1848 his attachment over the last six years to "those great Whig principles, the practical enunciation of which has saved England alike from monarchical and mob despotism"[71] Nor did the Gazette abandon these whig principles after Abraham's departure, for in 1853 his successor conducted an argument on religious toleration in precisely the same terms. He sang the standard whig praises of the Seven Bishops in 1688, of Ridley and Latimer, and even

---

[69] Jan. 22, 29, 1850. See also ibid., July 11, 1848, May 3, 1849.

[70] Pilot, Jan. 22, 1850.

[71] Montreal Gazette, Dec. 4, 1848.

the barons at Runnymede to make his point.[72]

Despite the fact that English Canadian tories often claimed different British heroes as their own, they often praised in them many of the same qualities that adorned the great whig men of history. The Duke of Wellington was over and above his military prowess the perfect embodiment of aristocratic civic virtue,[73] and William Pitt was almost indistinguishable from Fox in the personal attributes which separated him from the corrupt politics of the eighteenth century:

> The display of this last [public virtue] by Mr. Pitt won the public heart in an age when corruption was disgracefully prevalent, and the people learned to regard with esteem this solitary thinker, who, exposing the jobs of the Court, spoke in respect, never servile, of the King, and who advocating popular opinions never pushed them into heated extravagance.[74]

The aristocratic political ethics professed by the mid-century politician in Canada will be described in some detail,[75] leaving only the question of their British derivation to be explored here. That the British aristocracy operated as the model for Canadian imitation almost goes without saying. Despite the reform of the provincial legislative council, most Canadian politicians and journalists still revered the British peerage.[76] Even a moderately liberal journal like the London Free Press lauded the elevation of Macaulay to the peerage.

---

[72] Ibid., July 21, 1853. See also Toronto Leader, July 24, 1854; Hamilton Gazette, Mar. 9, 1854; Montreal Courier May 10, 1852.

[73] British Colonist, Dec. 14, 1853.

[74] Montreal Gazette, Dec. 14, 1855.

[75] See infra, ch. 6, pp. 409-43.

[76] Exceptions were Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Sept. 12, 1856; North American, June 28, 1853.

Especially gratifying to that journal was the de-emphasis of military heroes and pure party politicians in the appointment of this giant of arts and letters.[77] The whiggish posture of the Free Press was even more evident in Josiah Blackburn's disappointment at John A. Macdonald's political tactics during the "double shuffle" of 1858. On that occasion Macdonald's "low sense of public honour" was contrasted unfavourably with the behaviour of the great whig, Edmund Burke, and the Rockingham Whigs during the Stamp Act Crisis of 1765.[78] Notwithstanding this criticism, the tories themselves needed no encouragement in the direction of British aristocracy.[79] Perhaps the most ironic instance in this regard was the rigid insistence of Canadian judges for titles and preferment over Canadian peers. Chief among the complainers was John Beverly Robinson of Canada West, who along with Sir Edmund Head was under some pressure by the Colonial Office to yield before a legislative councillor and baronet upon a matter of precedence.[80] On this occasion Robinson was extremely worried that colonial titles in Canada might not be equivalent to British rank when, "There has never, I think been any reluctance in the Colonies, at any time to see the claim of high

---

[77] Sept. 27, 1857.

[78] London Free Press, Aug. 23, 1858. See also Sept. 1, 1858.

[79] See Hamilton Gazette, "A Canadian Peerage," May 10, 20, 1852.

[80] See E. Head to Labouchere, Feb. 23, 1856, C.O. 42/603. The dispute involved the claims of the wife of P. B. de Blacquière over Ch. Justice Robinson's wife on official occasions.

hereditary rank acknowledged to the fullest extent."[81] Though the result of this teacup-tussle was relatively unimportant,it nevertheless reflected the stubbornness of British-derived aristocratic pretensions in mid-century Canada.

Perhaps the most valid index of the aristocratic cast of English Canadian political ideas in the eighteen-fifties was the lukewarm debate upon responsible party government. Not only moderate Reformers but also radicals and tories had gradually come to accept, during the fifties, the principles of responsible government, according to the rhetoric if not the practice of the British constitution. As might be expected, the Canada West Reformers and their political descendents were no less sanctimonious than old tories in their comparison of the Canadian constitution in 1849 to the British original.[82] Upon the occasion of the resignation of the Baldwin-Lafontaine ministry in 1851, Francis Hincks delivered a lengthy justification of his assumption of power taken directly from Sir Robert Peel's remarks upon a similar situation in the British House of Commons some years earlier:

> No indifference to public life, no disgust with the labors which it imposed, no personal mortifications, no deference

---

[81] J. B. Robinson to Gov. E. Head, July 8, 1856, Head Correspondence, vol. II, P.A.C. See also the Montreal Pilot, July 11, 1848, "The Precedence Question"; The Leader, Mar. 26, 1856, "English Aristocracy." It is significant at this juncture that only one semi-literate presentation was made to Governor Head against either the claims of Robinson or de Blacquière, and this by one "Cosmopolite" against "Artificial and Aristocratic Titles," to Sec. of State, London, C.W., Jan. 1, 1855, C.O. 42/602.

[82] H. J. Boulton, Debates of the Prov. Parlt., Apr. 27, 1849, reported in Pilot, Apr. 30, 1849; H. J. Boulton to R. Baldwin, Montreal, May 17, 1849, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C.

> to private feeling could sanction a public man in withdrawing on light grounds from the post in which the confidence of Sovereign had placed him. (Much cheering) But at the same time there was an evil in exhibiting to the country, a want on the part of the government, of that support in the House of Commons which could enable it satisfactorily to conduct the public affairs and which could enable it to exercise a control conferred upon it by the possession of confidence. (Hear, hear) There was an evil in such an exhibition of weakness to which limits must be placed, and he must say in reviewing all that had occurred since the commencement of the session . . . to the fact that ministers had on each of the [last] four nights to be left in a minority, . . . the time was come when it was incumbent on the ministers of the Crown to withdraw from the responsibilities which office under such circumstances imposed on them.[83]

The only contribution that the clear-grits and radicals could make to these theories of responsible government was to invoke it regularly during the fifties for political purposes, but never to question its derivation nor add to the lustre of Peel's or Baldwin's glosses upon ministerial responsibility.[84]

The tories, too, invoked the doctrine of responsible government for political advantage, and they like the moderate reformers chose also to dress it in the garb of recent liberal practice. After recovering from their violent pique of 1849, the tories carried on a somewhat desultory attack against responsible government.[85] But by 1854 tory journals like the Montreal Gazette began to warm to the

---

[83] Cited in Documents Relating to the Resignation of the Canadian Ministry (Quebec, 1852), pp. 13-14.

[84] See North American, Aug. 1, 1851, "The Anomalous Position of the Cabinet"; Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Oct. 20, 1853, "Responsible Government"; J. Johnstone to G. Brown, Mar. 4, 1854, Brantford, C.W., Brown Papers, P.A.C.

[85] See Montreal Gazette, Apr. 20, May 18, 21, 23, June 4, Oct. 19, 20, 1849; Mar. 17, 1852; Apr. 13, 1853; Aug. 18, 1853.

principle of responsibility, although in a much looser sense than the moderate reformers. Likely because of the fluid political situation, the tory press now began to accommodate responsible government to fit new circumstances. Citing liberally from such disparate sources as Peel, Derby, and Gladstone, the Gazette nimbly undermined the theory of rigid party government. In its place was raised the familiar tory coalition of moderates thinly disguised beneath a veneer of ministerial responsibility:

> Now we take these statements of British ministers [Gladstone and Derby] to be an admission that if the old theories of party government are not effete they are at least revolutionized. To pass over Burke and other constitutional authorities, we may come down to Sir R. Peel. He declared in the earlier part of his career, before his famous measures of 1846 that open questions were the last immoral resource of weak government. Open questions are of course the basis of all coalitions; or we should speak more precisely if we said that coalitions are the most aggravated kind of open questions, for they are founded upon the waiving of party issues, a thing which strikes at the very root of party government. If it is admitted that the government of Great Britain cannot be carried without coalitions, what are we to say of the theory of party government? . . . And if the system has come to such a pass in England, what shall we say of the "transcript" of it, which we have the ineffable blessing to enjoy? . . . For this reason we have little care what Coalition government is formed, not yet of what elements, as far as respects the principle of the system . . . Something more important is it to disgrace the present administration for its sins that have outraged the public mind, and trust say to the chapter of accidents, to turn up another composed of better men.[86]

It was not long before the tory press abandoned even this notion of moderate coalition government and began to insist as strongly upon the fundamentals of responsible party government as the reformers had. The Gazette now began to inveigh against changes in government except

---

[86]Montreal Gazette, Aug. 17, 1854. See also July 30, 31, 1855.

for "adequate causes," and the Toronto Leader now began to insist that the executive councillors all hold a seat in the provincial assembly.[87] In the latter case, which revolved about the absence of the President of the Privy Council from the House, the precedent of Robert Peel's brief absence in 1827 upon Catholic Emancipation was anticipated by the Toronto Leader. The editor then countered with as pious a defense of executive responsibility as ever fell from lips of the Great Ministry. James Beaty now saw "the safeguards of British constitutional liberty being swept away" and popular discontent being aroused at this irresponsible political system.[88]

The church-state controversy like the responsible government debate also served in Canada West as a tilting ground for whig rhetoric. Gone was the extreme polarization that had been generated on the alliance between church and state. Generally, the church-state controversy as reflected in the clergy reserves question and education created divisions over means rather than ends.[89] Similarly it could be said that the thrust of the two early antagonists--the Methodists and Anglicans--was now internalized. Questions of internal organization and doctrinal truth now preoccupied the archrivals, Ryerson and Strachan.[90]

---

[87] Montreal Gazette, May 22, 1856; Toronto Leader, June 18, 1856.

[88] Toronto Leader, June 18, 1856.

[89] See especially A. Wilson, The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), chap. xiv, pp. 197-222.

[90] See G. French, Parsons and Politics (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962), chs. x, xi, pp. 248-87; G. French, "The Evangelical Creed in Canada," in W. L. Morton (ed.), The Shield of Achilles, pp. 15-36; J. S. Moir, "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches," CHAAR, 1966, pp. 56-69.

If the philosophical locus of the church-state question had shifted, where had it gone? It could be argued (as is implicit in much of the historiography of church and state) that interdenominational strife was gradually being muted by North American environmental influences and political compromise in the provincial assembly. If the rhetoric of church and state relations be examined it is apparent that it had merely shifted fronts. On the right extreme, tory pretensions to establishment were dying a slow, painful death. But out of the embers of this moribund philosophy arose something more positive and aggressive. The high-church tory Anglicans had since the forties become whigs, now accepting a modified concept of establishment, and directing their negative impulses from the sects to the Roman Catholics of Canada East. On the left, the overburden of Americanism which had tainted the radical and non-conformist cause of the thirties was no longer apparent on the ideological clothing of the clear-grits or the voluntaryists. They too had become constitutional whigs, deriving their intellectual force from anti-Romanism, and from a long non-conformist tradition dating from the Reformation.

That few groups pressed any longer for the formal separation of church and state upon the philosophic terms that Mackenzie and Ryerson had was evident in the debate on the Price Resolutions for the Secularization of the Clergy Reserves in 1850. That all was open to political negotiation was evident from the split votes on different sections of the bill, and from Elgin's claim that debate was moderate and reasoned.[91]

---

[91]See Elgin to Grey, June 28, 1850, II, 688, Elgin-Grey Papers. See also Canada, Journals of Legis. Assembly, 1850, pp. 87-88.

Price, however, incurred the wrath of nearly the whole House when he dared bring out the philosophical bête-noire of separation, and in terms so daring as the following:

> The hon. member for Cornwall [J. H. Cameron] tried to show that the support which the Church received in the United States was of the greatest benefit to the community. He ought to have shown the effect of the voluntary system, and he would have seen that the English and Dutch Reformed Church, which alone are supported by endowments are the least in point of numbers, the other Churches supported by voluntary contributions are daily increasing in numbers and usefulness. The hon. gentleman had also alluded to the French Revolution and the infidelity which followed it. He might also have shown that the infidelity which overspread France was engendered by the union of Church and State, the one corrupting the other; whereas if they had been separate the Revolution perhaps would never have taken place, and both Church and State would have remained intact.[92]

Price was roundly censured by the House, which according to a Parliamentary reporter had opposed his analogy to revolutionary France so vigorously that he had to yield the floor. He was then followed by Malcolm Cameron, a grit of similar views, and he also was prevented from speaking.

This pathological fear of introducing the reserves question in the philosophical context of the late eighteenth century was also reflected in the public press. Charles Lindsey's classic polemic against the clergy reserves published by the North American in 1851 merely dealt with the reserves as a test case in legislative self-government.[93] Only rarely did the radical North American and the Toronto Examiner

---

[92] Debates, House of Assembly, June 21, 1850, reported in Pilot, June 29, 1850.

[93] C. Lindsey, The Clergy Reserves: Their History and Present Position (Toronto, 1851), p. 1. See also North American, May 20, 1853.

claim as they did in early 1853 that it was "philosophically wise and just [that] Religion wants no state support; that its purity and efficiency has always been impaired by the State connexion," and directed its readers to the constitution of a neighboring state to the South which denied the public appropriation of any money for religious purposes.[94] It may also have been that the politicians were also masking their private feelings in this regard in order to avoid public wrangling within the party. An emphatic letter from William Notman, the ex-Reform member for Middlesex, to George Brown appears to indicate that this might have been so: "I am still as ardent a Reformer as I ever was, nay moreso--I should like to record my vote of the coming struggle in favor of that all absorbing question--the utter annihilation of all Church and State connexion and the establishment of complete Religious equality."[95]

The philosophical issue for English Canadian radicals and liberals had shifted to whiggish fronts from democratic ones, to religious toleration and liberty from early radical and non-conformist demands for the separation of church and state. George Brown's caricatures of Roman Catholic Spain and Portugal where Protestantism was not acknowledged civil and political liberty were typical of the thrust of Upper

---

[94] North American, Feb. 4, 1854 (s.w.) reporting from the Toronto Examiner. See also North American, July 19, 1850.

[95] W. Notman to G. Brown, Dundas, July 3, 1854, Brown Papers, P.A.C. Yet, this hypothesis is tenuous because of Notman's public reticence on the church-state question, and secondly the general unwillingness of the clear-grits to go beyond the demand for religious euqality. For a differing interpretation of voluntaryism see J. M. S. Careless, Brown of the Globe, I, 122-29.

Canadian liberalism in the early fifties.[96] Brown was at his metaphysical best on this subject when he expressed great disappointment in 1848 at the failure of the revolutions on the continent to procure, or even aspire after, religious liberty:

> While the whole world resounds with the cry for civil and religious liberty, and the chains which have been worn by continental Europe for centuries are dropping off; while governments which for ages have been accustomed to abject submission to their every mandate, are compelled to yield to the masses, and Institutions venerable for their antiquity and hitherto regarded with respect, are falling into ruins under the overwhelming influence of popular force; there is one feature in all of these changes, of a most disheartening character, the little anxiety shown for religious freedom. Liberty is usually classed into Civil and religious, and we hold it to be an inconvertible truth, that no man has truly imbibed the spirit of liberty who does not maintain and contend for its predominance in both departments. If there is one aspect in which liberty is more fair and attractive than another, it is when dispensing and securing to every man the inestimable blessings of free religious profession. Liberty has by some been worshipped as a goddess. This is the madness of infidelity, and robs the true giver of honor due to him. Next to the revelation of true religion, liberty is God's best gift to man. But can that man or that people be truly free who tamely yield up to their fellow men the right of private judgement in the most valuable branch of human freedom. If we look at the present state of the world, we cannot fail to see many men of liberal views in civil matters, dead to the value of religious freedom.[97]

Even if one looks to Mackenzie, the champion of separation in the thirties, one also looks in vain for its re-appearance in the fifties. Although the impulse was similar, Mackenzie now associated religious establishment with the issue of "religious equality, and the absence of all right upon the Parliament to establish religious preferences."[98]

---

[96] See Globe, Sept. 15, 1853, Oct. 7, 1851, Nov. 25, 1853.

[97] Globe, Sept. 16, 1848.

[98] Debates, House of Assembly, June 16, 1851, reported in Pilot, June 21, 1851. See also P. Perry to R. Baldwin, Whitby, Dec. 7, 1848, Baldwin Papers, vol. IV, P.A.C.; Mackenzie's Weekly Message, Nov. 24, 1853.

Perhaps the most convincing evidence of whiggery from the old radicals was John Rolph's lengthy condemnation of the clergy reserves. After a lengthy whig justification of self-government on grounds ranging as far and wide as Magna Carta, Hampden, Locke, Blackstone, Simcoe, and Durham, Rolph then applied this same argument to the church-state question. Canada would do well, Rolph argued, if it would only avoid the pitfall of theocracy which had captured every nation in continental Europe over the centuries, and could operate as a haven for the religiously oppressed.[99] In short Canada would languish "without an atmosphere with those vivifying elements of civil and religious liberty, in which the people of Great Britain exult and breathe and live."[100]

Somewhat further to the political right among the moderate Reformers the same whiggish presumptions were operative. Anti-Popery, using the Catholic nations of Europe as their focus, was as familiar here as it was to the old radicals and clear-grits. In his letters to his senior law partner, John Sandfield Macdonald, A. M. Mackenzie regularly flayed that "lazy pack of foreign priests who have no stake nor [sic] interest in the country" and those "sedulous" French Canadians and Irishmen they carried in their train.[101] Despite these strictures

---

[99] "Speech of the Hon. J. Rolph on the Clergy Reserves Question," Sept., 1852, printed by the Quebec Gazette, pp. 6-8, P.A.C. Pamphlet Collection.

[100] Ibid., p. 7. See also Wm. Hewitt to Wm. McDougall, Apr. 26, 1854, Norfolk Hist. Soc. Collection, P.A.C. (microfilm); Wm. Hewitt to J. Rolph, Apr. 19, 1854, ibid.

[101] A. M. Mackenzie to J. S. Macdonald, Cornwall, June 19, 1851, Aug. 30, 1852, Mar. 15, 1853, June 13, 1853, Sept. 11, 1853; Macdonald Papers, vol. I, P.A.C., London Free Press, Mar. 20, 1849.

against Roman Catholic establishment, most moderates would go no further than equalization of state endowments when opposing the Church of England's claims to the clergy reserves. As one correspondent of John Sandfield Macdonald put it:

> I am not for State Churches in Canada,--[that] I shall never be whipped into Brown's notions of voluntaryism. . . . It may do for electioneering purposes to hold up a cry against certain churches, but it is not a safe principle--I fear for the community.[102]

Internal liberalization of the Anglican Church was then seen by the moderates as the only valid mode of preserving that church as a vital element in society. The London Free Press proudly pointed to the election of the Anglican bishop in London in 1857 as a marked step away from Romanism towards "true Protestantism" and "the right of private judgement."[103] The editor, Josiah Blackburn, identified himself completely with those elements like the Church Reformation Society of England which also sought doctrinal and hierarchical changes. Severe chastisement therefore awaited British politicians and the Colonial Office for persisting in making the Canadian Episcopate functionaries of the monarchy when self-government in political affairs had already been conceded.[104]

The tory philosophy of church-state relations was identical to

---

[102] D. E. McIntyre to J. S. Macdonald, Cornwall, Aug. 25, 1851, vol. I, Sandfield Macdonald Papers, P.A.C. See also same to same, Aug. 15, 1851, ibid; Anonymous to R. Baldwin, Jan. 19, 1848, vol. IV, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C., London Free Press, Mar. 18, 1852.

[103] July 8, 1857. See also July 10, Apr. 18, 1857, Apr. 28, 1856.

[104] Ibid., Apr. 14, 1858.

the moderate-Reform view. As in the case of responsible government, the tories had rapidly become whigs. A distinct difference was drawn in the tory press on the difference between the Anglican Church in the Mother Country and in the colonies. In the former, it was argued by the Leader that its legal privileges and immunities affected the entire population of the state, whereas in the latter the Church of England was only considered a quasi-state church because the Crown's interference did not go beyond its particular adherents.[105] The unkindest words of all came for George III's attempts to create a state church in 1791:

> When the Constitutional Act of 1791, making provision for the rectories was passed, the ignorant and bigoted George III was in closer alliance with the church than any English Sovereign had been since the days of Charles I. After the accession of this prince, all the old doctrines about the divine right of kings, which the revolution belied and was supposed to have destroyed, were revived. The church sounded the praises of the reactionary king and the king, in turn, was willing to add new strength to the political church . . . It was during the reign of a prince in which such things as these occurred,--a prince, who, with the single exception of PITT never took a really able man into his councils--that the provision for covering Canada with a network of rectories was made.[106]

Both the Leader and the Montreal Gazette concluded with the moderate-reform press that all was within the competence of a responsible Canadian Parliament to redress these errors essentially British in origin. Ample whig precedents were then cited, such as the seizure of monastery lands by Henry VIII and slave emancipation without full compensation in the eighteen-thirties. In the words of both tory editors, there was no

---

[105] Toronto Leader, May 3, 1854, Apr. 16, 1856. See also Montreal Gazette, Mar. 11, 1850.

[106] Leader, Dec. 1, 1858.

difference between tory principles and liberal ones in this matter of equalizing all churches to a point where religious equality was a fact.[107]

Anglican clerics and laymen reluctantly but surely abandoned their eighteenth century concept of the alliance of church and state. By and large it was only those Anglican clerics of the second rank and below who sometimes advocated the old connection.[108] Perhaps the most empassioned defence of the old alliance of church and state in the eighteen-fifties came, ironically, from a visiting Episcopalian from the United States, who in visible frustration appealed to his Canadian brethren to imitate the British model.[109] The first rank including the Bishops of Quebec, Montreal, and Toronto had no such illusions. The Bishop of Quebec, George Jehosophat Mountain, realistically outlined his concept of church-state relations in Canada insofar as Anglicans were concerned in a lengthy discourse to the Colonial Secretary, John Pakington:

> It comes then to <u>this</u>, that if we are to be entitled to no higher consideration than that which is extended to all other religious bodies, and to be in this respect identified with the Episcopal Church in the adjoining republic, we ought to command--in whatever necessary manner modified, the machinery for conducting our operations, which has been adopted by that branch of our Communion. I am a firm and decided upholder of the alliance, in a Christian country, of Church and State, and I would not under any circumstances be a party to measures which would tend to invalidate or impair the supremacy of the Crown, but if we cannot have, in the Colony what the Church

---

[107] See Montreal <u>Gazette</u>, Aug. 20, 25, Sept. 7, 1853; <u>Leader</u>, Dec. 1, 1858.

[108] See, e.g., T. H. Grant to Lord Derby, Quebec, Sept., 1852, Strachan Papers, reel 7, microfilm, P.A.C.

[109] See A. Townley, <u>Seven Letters on the Non-Religious Common</u> School System of Canada and the United States (Toronto, 1853), 53 pp.

> has at home, in virtue of its connection with the State, we ought to have something substituted for it, which would do for us what is done by the connection. We ought not to have the odium of being called a State Church without the benefits attaching to it.[110]

In a later address to the Young Men's Association of the Church of England in Montreal, Mountain became even more definite. He now considered the connection of church to state as secondary to the Church's true mission:

> Whether there be this connexion between the Church and civil Government, as first established by Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, and as now exists in England, or whether the Church . . . be independent of such a connexion, as we see it on this continent can merely be seen as an accidental circumstance, assisting or impeding the work of the Church.[111]

Perhaps the most convincing evidence of a modified view of the chruch's temporal role came from the aging bishop of Toronto, John Strachan. Despite his vigorous fight against secularization of the clergy reserves and his trenchant opposition to a secular provincial university,[112] Strachan had pulled in his horns a long way from their aggressive position in the eighteen-thirties. Still a fierce competitor, he was prepared to use the Anglican Church's diminished status, as an object of sympathy or solitary defiance, whichever the occasion demanded. In his letter to Lord John Russell in 1851 he used the first tactic,

---

[110] B. of Quebec to Pakington on Church Establishments, Oct. 22, 1852, C.O. 42/588, #10764.

[111] Reported in the Montreal Gazette, Feb. 19, 1857.

[112] See J. Strachan to R. Baldwin, Jan. 15, 1849, Toronto, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.; J. Strachan to J. H. Cameron, Mar. 10, 1856; J. Strachan Papers, microfilm, P.A.C.; "A Memorandum of J. Strachan's interviews with Robert Peel, June 10, 15, 18, 1850, ibid.; J. Strachan, Memorandum, St. James, London, May 29, 1850, ibid.

claiming that the charge of establishment against the Anglicans by the minor sects was "ridiculous and untrue," since "the unequal application of the principle of civil and religious liberty in 1827 and 1829, she has been left the target for all sects and denominations to shoot at."[113] The second tactic was employed effectively in a sermon in 1856 when Strachan smugly pronounced that the legislature had failed in the mission to separate totally church and state, for the Church of England remained indissolubly tied to the parent Church and the Monarchy, and merely reawaited the return of the fostering care of the latter.[114]

That whiggery had invaded the tory camp was evident both from the tory-Anglican impulse for internal reform and from the new strain of anti-Romanism that had developed since the Union of the Canadas. The opposition of Francis Hincks notwithstanding, the Anglican clergy and laity pressed resolutely on towards synodical election of a bishop in Kingston to forestall the Crown's appointment of Hincks' brother Thomas.[115] Whatever the predilections of the laity in the new see for a closer or

---

[113] J. Strachan, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord John Russell on the Present State of the Church in Canada (London, 1851, G. Bell), p. 17.

[114] J. Strachan, A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Toronto (Toronto: Henry Rowsell, 1856), p. 5. That Strachan was mostly whistling in the dark in this latter instance is apparent from the contrast that these public pronouncements present to his private torment at being unable to control the political process as he had in the past. He felt now that he could only trust the old tory, Sir Allan McNab, and that the rest of the moderate conservatives, especially John A. MacDonald and Cayley could not be relied upon. Strachen to Allan McNab, May 16, 1855, Toronto, Strachan Papers, P.A.C.; J. Strachan to A. N. Bethune, Apr. 14, 1856, Toronto, Bethune Papers, P.A.O.

[115] J. Strachan to the Archd. of York, Jan. 24, 1856, Strachan Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm). See also Strachan to the Bishop of Nova Scotia, June 2, 1854, ibid; J. H. Cameron to Labouchere, Toronto, July, 1856, C.O. 42/608.

a looser relationship between church and state, all agreed on the heavy-handedness of royal prerogative in this case. The Anglicans had clearly accepted the dictum of responsible government now that there was no apparent tie between Church and State. As one worthy put it at the Brockville meeting of the laity: "Self-government and self-support must under these circumstances be the watchword of the Church in Canada. It has lost the support of the State, why therefore should it be injured by the odium of the alliance with the State."[116] This was hardly whiggery at its self-righteous best, but in fact it was no less a challenge to monarchical and imperial interference than Baldwin's concept of responsible government.

The anti-Papist content of conservative thought has generally been regarded as the natural preserve of the radical political fringe and some Orangemen in Canada West, but it appears that high Anglicans also shared in the "protestant crusade" which swept the English-speaking North Atlantic community in the eighteen-fifties.[117] It is interesting to observe the adverse response of John Strachan to the "popish aggression" in view of his earlier favouritism of Roman Catholicism as an established church, and also in view of the Oxford Movement in England. In a letter to his heir-apparent, A. N. Bethune, Strachan wrote in great pique over the secularization of the reserves by Lower Canadian Papists:

---

[116] See "Papers and Correspondence relative to the proposed new See of Kingston," Brockville, J. McMullen, 1856, 75 pp., in C.O. 42/608, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[117] See R. A. Billington, The Protestant Crusade, (1800-1860) (New York, 1938).

> You will have learned this time that our worthless Colonial Legislature have carried resolutions through the cordial cooperation of Roman Catholics to secularize the Reserves. I thought at first that the Romanists would want to help us for fear of their own far richer endowments, but not so. Since the Popish aggression they have taken bolder ground. They now desire to destroy us and think they will not only preserve their own property but get a large share of the Secularization money for their schools which will be taught as usual and this in addition to their present rich endowments gives them redoubled power for proselyting the whole country [sic].[118]

Even lesser lights within the Church of England protested vigorously against the "Romanists" for their betrayal on the issue of state endowments. One Anglican divine warned his congregation on the eve of secularization that the Papists aimed at the severance of the British connection, and (no doubt because of the Gavazzi riots) the promotion of "intestine civil strife and anarchy."[119] Now that the Church of England stood to be dispossessed, they too indulged themselves in whiggish aversion to endowments of any kind. In his polemic on the clergy reserves in 1853, A. N. Bethune demanded that either all endowments should be left alone or that every vestige of ecclesiastical property in the United Province should be swept aside.[120] It is significant that Bethune should then resort to a typically whiggish rationalization of their newly diminished status. Now he defended not only the Crown

---

[118] Strachan to Bethune, Oct. 14, 1852, Toronto, Bethune Papers, P.A.O.; Strachan to Bethune, July 15, 1853, Toronto; J. Strachan, Letters to Lord John Russell (Toronto, 1851), pp. 21-22.

[119] H. C. Cooper, The Duty of the Members of the Church of England Respecting the Clergy Reserves (Toronto: Henry Rowsell, 1854), pp. 10-11.

[120] A. N. Bethune, The Clergy Reserve Question in Canada (London: R. Clay, 1853), p. 23.

and Empire as tories traditionally did, but also recognized the prerogatives of Parliament as well as the Crown. Loyalty to Empire was now perhaps less important qualitatively than abstract principles of religion, order, justice, constitutional liberty, and above all, property rights.[121] Anti-Romanism thus fit well into this new via media that Anglicanism had found between the extreme claims of ultramontanism on the one hand and voluntaryism and irreligion on the other.

Before 1854 and the political realignment which affected secularization, the tory press and politicians in English Canada also indulged in anti-Popery. It was no small source of surprise to E. P. Taché that Roman Catholicism should now be assailed so strongly by the representatives of the Church of England "which approaches nearest in its form and organization to the Roman Catholic Church."[122] The tory Gazette of Montreal was now militantly whiggish in its stress upon the social and constitutional superiority of British protestantism over continental Catholicism:

> We consider the English constitution good, the direct product of popular revolution. We consider the Reformation good; and we like Protestant freedom. In Protestant countries, the people are better off, better informed, less ascetic, and less superstitious than in Catholic countries.[123]

The Gazette was no less indignant at the Gavazzi episode than Brown of the Globe, demanding not only the classic whig remedy of freedom of speech, but also the formation of a Protestant Alliance to secure

---

[121] Ibid., p. 23.

[122] E. P. Taché, Debates, Legis. Cl., July 17, 1851, reported in Pilot, July 24, 1851.

[123] Montreal Gazette, Apr. 12, 1850.

religious liberty.[124]

Despite the fact that these cracks between tory-Anglicanism on the one hand and French Canadian Roman Catholicism on the other were papered over after 1854, their simultaneous appearance in the old Reform alliance between 1851 and 1854 would indicate that English Canadians were not widely divided as to ends but largely as to means (i.e. voluntaryism, denominational schools, non-sectarian universities). Whiggish Protestantism had thus come as much to dominate the philosophy of church-state relations in English Canada, as whiggish notions of political groupation and self-government had come to permeate the political rhetoric of the day.

The whig outlook of English Canadians is a more complex one when examined as a total cultural phenomenon. On the one hand it resembled the American whig tradition in its emphasis on the middle class commercial ethic. Canadian whiggery also appeared to assume many of the features of American isolationism and North American hebraism, i.e., an almost republican distaste for despotic governments of continental Europe; and a thorough revulsion at European class conflict. On the other hand, English Canadians were English whigs in their preservation of aristocratic forms, their belief in limited constitutional monarchy, and their whig historicism. The untangling of these threads then becomes almost impossible because of their thorough jumbling in eighteenth century America and England.[125]

---

[124] Ibid., June 21, 23, 1853.

[125] See H. T. Colbourn, The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution (Chapel Hill: University of N. Carolina Press, 1965).

Canada's total cultural position vis-a-vis Europe presents a possible resolution to the ambivalent character of its political outlook. The intellectual traditions of the American nation in the early national period, and Elizabethan and early Stuart England present possible models for explanation of the Canadian political outlook on the world at mid-century. In both cases, these emergent nations had in a social sense turned their backs on European aristocratic societies in their emphasis upon an emergent middle class. Both held forth in splendid isolation, stressing as much as possible their indigenous social development, economy, and political centralization.[126]

Mid-Victorian Canada could also be described as an emergent political culture in the struggle for responsible government, a growing popular culture in the creation of a comprehensive educational system and popular press, and an emergent economic nation in the commercial revolution of the late eighteen-forties. It is of little surprise that English Canadians should relate psychologically and historically to those periods which combined most positively with their own ethos. Since contemporary Britain and continental Europe with their dangerous class problems, revolutions, and wars were generally repugnant, Canadians like good whig-historians let their instincts carry to those historical examples which would justify their own purposes.

The attraction of Canadians for empirical whiggery had thus

---

[126]See L. Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641 (Oxford Press, 1966); L. Hartz, The American Liberal Tradition, pp. 50-64.

assumed a complex social and psychological dimension, rather than a purely ideological one. Classical whiggery had clearly not been an adequate intellectual antidote for the revolutionary challenge of 1848, or for the ultramontanist reaction which followed it. The doctrines of 1688 were quickly abandoned for pure social conservatism, and the gospel of religious tolerance for anti-popery and francophobia. When political and social sanity was restored to Europe by 1850, whiggery had reappeared as an unconvincing gloss upon despotism, and more important as a sense of relief in the social isolation of Canada. Similarly, English Canadian attitudes upon such broad whiggish issues as tolerance or responsible government were always predetermined by political relations with French Canada or the political status of coalitions. Classical whiggery had thus devolved in English Canada to the status of a widely used rhetorical tool, the servant of social and political reality.

(ii) French Canada: Liberalism, Catholicism, and Romanticism (1848-58)

Historians of French Canada have been considerably more prolific in their description of French Canadian attitudes towards Europe. This narrative has taken two directions. In the first instance, the impact of French ultramontanism upon French Canadian political and religious thought of the forties and fifties has received increasing notice from Canada's clerical historians, Pouliot, Monet, and Sylvain.[127] This

---

[127] See L. Pouliot, Mgr. Bourget et Son Temps (2 vols.; Montreal, 1955-56); J. Monet, "French Canadian Nationalism and the Challenge of Ultramontanism," CHAAR, 1966; R. Sylvain, Alessandro Gavazzi (2 vols.; Laval); P. Sylvain, "Libéralisme et Ultramontanisme au Canada Français: Affrontement Idéologique et Doctrinal (1840-65)," in W. L. Morton (ed.), The Shield of Achilles, pp. 111-39, 220-56.

historiography has largely shown the irreconcilable division which developed between clerical ultramontanes and the bleus on the one hand and the Institut Canadien and the rouges on the other. In the second instance, there has been a relation of the closer cultural ties between the French Canadian intelligentsia and that of France.[128] Garneau, Chauveau, Barthe, and Crémazie have all been shown or suggested as particular examples of a broader liaison with the mother culture, and in the case of the last two even of a spirit approaching neo-colonialism.

Both views require re-examination when examined from an ideological standpoint. Ultramontanism and liberalism were never as dramatically opposed on the continent or in Canada as either Louis Veuillot or Ignace Bourget claimed they were. Whether viewed philosophically or pragmatically they were closer than the prophets of ultramontanism would admit. Romanticism was their common mode of expression, Lamartine and Lammenais their most common political and philosophical root. Although ultramontanes divided politically with liberals after 1849, French Canadian historians have pushed that division too far back into the eighteen-forties. The fact is that they were not really very far apart in their reactions to the revolutions of 1848. Finally there has been an altogether too neat equation between Bourget's ultramontanism and French Canadian conservatism. Often they were at

---

[128] See Mason Wade, The French Canadians 1760-1967 (1967 ed.), vol. I, pp. 285-308; S. Marion, Les Lettres Canadiennes d'Autrefois (Ottawa, 1954), III, pp. 39-73; J. Bruchési, "L'Institut Canadien de Québec," Cahiers de Dix, XII (1947), 102-114.

cross-purposes. They were not in the annexation crisis, but they were on the issue of the revolutions of 1848, and later on Confederation. Occasionally as happened in 1848, the ultramontanes were even divided among themselves upon what to make of the revolutions in Paris and Rome.

The second view that French Canadians as a whole were being drawn into France's cultural orbit also needs qualification. An examination of French Canadian historical journals reveals as in the case of English Canada, a rather distant interest in the revolutions of 1848, the fortunes of the Napoleonic Empire, and continental politics. Yet, those reactions, like those of English Canada were predetermined by internal ideological tendencies. European ideology was thus the mirror of internal political and psychological needs. The revolutions of 1848 created no Proudhonist or Blanquist cadrés in French Canada. Nor did they create circles of monarchical reaction. Only the democratic ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity, and the position of the Catholic Church were important to French Canadians of the left and the right respectively. In neither case had they as a whole modified their essentially eighteenth century view of revolution. Although an overburden of romantic thought was certainly more in evidence in 1848, the essential ideological controversy was little different from the middle-class phase of the revolution of 1789 and the one of 1830. Just as French Canadians had generally congratulated themselves upon remaining immune to the ravages of the great revolution, they did so again in 1848. As Judge Charles Mondelet said to the grand jury in Montreal in 1849:

> Located as we have been, by Divine Providence, on this continent, free from the cumbrous machinery of privileges, suitable to the decayed state of some old tottering Continental Institutions in Europe, blessed with an atmosphere which is as pure as nature is grand and sublime, in this region there would be no semblance of palliation if we allowed our minds to be clouded by prejudices and sectional feelings, and if we were to be found deficient in awarding to each man his due, when all men are, in the eyes of the law, upon a footing of perfect equality.[129]

Isolationism and whiggery thus represent as basic a theme in French Canadian reactions to Europe during and after 1848 as they did in English Canada.

As implied above, the French Canadian response to the revolutions of 1848 was not so fundamentally divided as has generally been assumed. The rouges and Papineau have been regarded as a radical anomaly in French Canada and Lord Elgin taken at his word that "French Republican sympathy . . . has only served to mark out Papineau and his adherents as a faction disconnected from the body of French Canadians."[130] What has often been neglected is that both Elgin and Lafontaine were engaged in a political duel against Papineau for political primacy among French Canadians, and that both sides were therefore not above using political events in Europe as convenient political propaganda. It is significant that Lafontaine indirectly admitted broad liberal sympathy in French Canada for the French Revolution, although he proceeded to caution against the relevance Papineau claimed for it: "We would wager that our compatriots, however they admire the French Revolution, prefer responsible government with its perspective

---

[129] Reported to the Montreal Gazette, Oct. 24, 1849; see also Judge C. Rolland to the Grand Jury, Mar. 17, 1854, ibid.

[130] Elgin to Grey, Nov. 30, 1848, Montreal, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 265.

to the Provisional Government of Paris with the menacing horizon that it presents."[131] Lafontaine's exhortations notwithstanding, it appears that even his own party press believed it possible to sympathize with French revolutionary experiments and also to oppose Papineau's attempt to subvert responsible government. On the other hand it is also apparent that the rouges of L'Avenir were generally more conservative in their appreciation of the events in Europe than previous historiography has allowed.

The late departure of the papacy from the camp of Italian liberalism allowed the French Canadian moderate-reform press to view the revolutions of 1848 with partial detachment. By January of 1849 and the circular letter of Bishop Bourget on the subject of anti-Christian revolutionaries and incendiaries, rational dialogue on the European revolutions ceased.[132] But, before that embargo on free thought there had been a significant liberal consensus on the French Revolution especially in the French Canadian press. After that, there were left only the young editors of L'Avenir to support the progress of liberal-democratic nationalism in Europe. Had the rouges been given a reasonable choice it is apparent that they would have preferred a more moderate posture than the extreme one they were finally forced to take by the ultramontanes.

The most extreme secular position taken against the revolution in France was that of Joseph Cauchon's Journal de Québec. It was

---

[131] Elgin-Grey Papers, I, p. 159, translation from La Revue Canadienne.

[132] See Bourget, Mandements, II, pp. 20-32.

essentially the same view advanced by the English Canadian tories and whigs. Although somewhat attracted by the conservative Provisional Government, Cauchon was by July firmly convinced of France's devolution into anarchy. Like the editors of the tory Gazette of Montreal, he recoiled in horror at the violent turn of the revolution:

> La démagogue a jété les hauts cris contre le roi de Naples, parce ce que ses troupes en voulant le maintenir sur le trône avaient sacrifié un grand nombre de vies, mais le sang qu'a fait verser la royauté, héréditaire n'est qu'une goutte comparée aux flots de sand qui au nom de la république et de la liberté, ont perdant quatre jours inondé les rues de la grande cité démocratique.[133]

For Cauchon the remedies were relatively simple. First, the legally constituted government must be rescued from "le canaille des rues [qui] a le droit de détruire en trois jours de luttes sanglantes l'ouvrage des siècles."[134] Secondly, Cauchon left little doubt that he preferred a narrowly circumscribed franchise and a limited constitutional monarchy to the French experiments with the dynamite of universal suffrage.

The pro-liberal and pro-clerical response of La Minerve to the outbreak and progress of the revolutions had no exact parallel either in the secular outlook of the French or English Canadian conservative. It was prepared to go much further left on the political spectrum simply because Pius IX and the Catholic Bishops of Europe were so heavily involved in the struggle for self-determination and political

---

[133] Journal de Québec, July 15, 1848. For Lafontaine's adverse reaction see La Revue Canadienne, cited in L'Avenir, July 15, 1848.

[134] Ibid., Mar. 31, 1849.

reform. It was only after the Pope returned to a more orthodox conservative posture that clerical liberals in Canada came to their senses much further on the political right. The claim of La Minerve to uniqueness as the voice of moderate liberalism thus vanished in the repolarized political atmosphere of 1849 when ultramontanism and conservatism were once again united.

The news of the French Revolutions of February elicited considerable ideological sympathy from La Minerve. That newspaper conformed more to liberal type in the idewy optimism with which it greeted the first reports from Paris: "Que les premiers actes de la révolution française sont nobles et grands! qu'ils sont dignes d'admiration comme ils font battre les coeurs généreux des vrais patriotes, des bons citoyens."[135] What augured particularly well for this revolution in the opinion of La Minerve was the rapid acceptance of the new republic by the army, the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, and the clergy. The editor Duvernay then demonstrated its essential orthodoxy by reprinting the mandements of the Archbishop of Paris and Lyon as evidence of the clergy's "adhesions franches et cordiales, à la république française."[136]

It was soon apparent that Ludger Duvernay hopefully regarded the Provisional Government as the final orderly phase of an essentially conservative revolution. Normalcy in the legal and commercial affairs of the nation were visible signs of public confidence in the government.[137]

---

[135] La Minerve, Apr. 3, 1848. See also Mar. 23, 27, Apr. 6, 1848.

[136] Ibid., Apr. 13, 1848. [137] Ibid., Apr. 13, 1848.

Similarly, the swift advent of elections to the new constituent assembly were seen as a genuine attempt to avoid another Napoleonic dictatorship. Nor did the operation of universal suffrage in these elections evoke in La Minerve the whiggish repugnance it had in either the Globe or the Journal de Québec. Such a broadened franchise merely convinced Duvernay that the interest of the greatest number had been served.[138]

The two strains of pro-clerical and pro-liberal thought had emerged clearly from the editorial policy of La Minerve by May of 1848. Although the self-confessed position of that newspaper was liberal it was clear that it only endorsed that liberalism because it had the imprimatur of Pius IX:

> Il était réservé au 19e siècle de voir un Pape faire adorer son autorité en déployant la pourpre du Saint-Siège au dessus de drapeau de la liberté politique des nations, et emprunter au prestige de la religion la force presque surhumain dont les peuples allaient avoir besoin pour réconquérir leur droits primitifs.[139]

The limits of political liberalism as defined in these early stages of revolution did not extend beyond Lamartine's government. It excluded in this early phase the radical republicanism of Ledru-Rollin who was compared to the bête-noire of French Canadian republicanism, Louis-Joseph Papineau.[140] The development of a more distinct threat from the socialist and communist left in May and June soon made Ledru-Rollin more respectable and somewhat obsolete as a threat

---

[138] Ibid., Apr. 20, 24, 27, 1848.

[139] Ibid., May 29, 1848.

[140] Ibid., May 22, 1848.

to the liberalism of Lamartine. When the followers of Louis Blanc and Blanqui took to the streets on May 13, they became the new apostles of anti-Christ. A lengthy rationale was then developed by the editor, not upon the theoretical and tactical defects of socialism, but upon the simple threat that these "Utopistes" and "reveurs" presented to the Lamartine government.

Unlike the English Canadian whigs or tories or even bleus like Cauchon, Duvernay did not dwell excessively upon the violence and bloodshed in June. When forced to choose between revolution or reaction, he remained faithful to the principles of popular sovereignty, but admitted that such bloodshed left him with "une vive et profonde douleur."[141] Rather than retreat to a position of legitimism as Cauchon had, Duvernay was prepared to support a borad liberal coalition in order to preserve the revolutionary experiment:

> Lamartine, Arago, Ledru-Rollin, le verteux Dupont de l'Eure, avec quelques-uns de leurs courageux colleagues, se sont franchement cordialement dévoués au triomphede la cause sacrée de la démocratie; et cette cause a triomphée car la France par ses représentants a accepté la revolution du 21 febrier, en proclamant le 4 mai, par acclamations la République. Pour accomplir cette grande oeuvre on le comprend, Lamartine et ses amis politiques ont de s'appuyer sur des hommes ardents, passionaux, qui étaient les chefs du parti républicain exalté en dehors du parlement, de deux-là qui avaient combattu ouvertement pour renverser la dynastie de juillet, et reprendre la grande oeuvre de 1789 interrompue par la dictation de Bonaparte.[142]

Nor was Duvernay especially naive as to the means by which such a coalition might be sustained, since he congratulated the French assembly for appointing General Cavaignac to their executive. Throughout the

---

[141] Ibid., July 20, 1848. [142] Ibid., July 20, 1848.

remainder of the year, La Minerve continued to support this triumvirate of Lamartine, Ledru-Rollin and Cavaignac in the continued hope that they would rescue order out of the fires of June.[143] The depth of this conviction is further reflected in the studied neglect which Duvernay accorded to the political extremes on the right and left. Neither the socialists nor Louis Napoleon received more than passing contempt after the violence of June, despite the fact that they represented the only logical alternatives to the bankruptcy of moderate government.[144]

The depth of La Minerve's commitment to clerically-inspired liberalism was further reflected in its editorial policy upon the struggle for self-determination elsewhere in Europe. Duvernay was particularly sympathetic to the peoples of Italy and Ireland in their quest for freedom, but made it clear to his readers that his support for those revolutions hinged upon the continued ideological support of the Pope and the bishops of Ireland.[145] There was in fact some early doubt expressed upon the development of the repeal agitation in Ireland because of the inordinate number of protestants among its number.

Duvernay was on the other hand immediately suspicious of the chartist agitation because of its radical and socialist overtones. Their demands were quickly labelled as "des appels incendiarès à une sédition ouverte qui ne peuvent s'expliquer que par l'agitation revolutionnaire.[146]

---

[143] Ibid., Octy 9, Nov. 13, 1848.

[144] Ibid., Nov. 27, Dec. 11, Jan. 2, 1848.

[145] Ibid., July 20, Nov. 9, 13, 1848.

[146] May 1, 1848.

He proved more sympathetic to the degraded slavs of central and east-central Europe, and to the middle-class assemblies at Frankfort, Vienna, and Berlin because he saw there a repetition of the classic theme provided by the first French Revolution--that of democracy versus feudal aristocracy.[147] Rather than recognize the French socialists or the chartists of 1848 Duvernay preferred to search for obscure stirrings of the spirit of 1789 in such unlikely areas as Spain, Portugal, and Russia.[148]

With the consequent collapse of the liberal-national movements in Catholic countries such as Italy and Ireland, and the anti-revolutionary mandement of Bishop Bourget in early 1849, La Minerve and liberalism soon parted ways. By the spring of 1849 the ultra-montane clergy of Montreal had found a sympathetic ear in La Minerve. As one of Bishop Bourget's close advisors stated in a letter to Raphael Bellemare:

> Ne Craignez rien, car vous avez l'opinion publique pour vous en ce moment plus que jamais; comptez que la Minerve, en soutenant les principes religieux, ralliera l'immense majorité des citoyens et du peuple qui sentent par l'instinct, comme actuellement en France, que là est le vrai et seul principe d'ordre et de sécurité.[149]

From then on La Minerve merely reflected the growing disenchantment of Roman Catholicism in the North Atlantic community with the radical doctrines of liberalism and socialism. Ideological differences which had not been openly divisive between that newspaper and L'Avenir

---

[147] Dec. 11, 1848.

[148] Jan. 2, 1849.

[149] L'Abbé Pinsonnault to R. Bellemare, Montreal, Mar. 27, 1849, Bellemare Papers, P.A.C.

widened into irreconcilable enmity in 1849.[150]

The newspaper, Le Canadien of Quebec, further promoted the anomaly of pro-liberal and pro-republican sentiment among moderate bleus in French Canada. Although in severe financial straits because of the competition of Cauchon's Journal, that newspaper gamely persisted until its final demise in 1849. While in its death throes it still offered its readers in Quebec an alternative source of liberal comment upon the revolution in France.

There were few substantive differences in the outlook of Le Canadien and La Minerve upon the subject of revolution in France. The overthrow of Louis Philippe's July Monarchy and the creation of the Provisional Government were greeted with similar optimism to that display by Duvernay.[151] The editors of Le Canadien were also careful to reprint the mandement of the Bishop of Paris against excessive egoism and violence, no doubt to show its readers that the Church approved provided that the revolution did not go too far.[152] Despite the frantic concern of its Paris correspondent for the stability of the Provisional Government, Le Canadien persisted in the hope that Lamartine's coalition would make "des réformes salutaires et indispensables, qu'on n'obtiendra ailleurs malheureusement qu'au prix de beaucoup de sang et d'affreuses violences de tout genre."[153] Scarcely

---

[150] La Minerve, Mar. 29, Apr. 9, 1849.

[151] Le Canadien, Mar. 29, 1848.

[152] Ibid., Apr. 10, 1848.

[153] Ibid., Apr. 28, 1848.

breaking stride at the violence of June, the editor, Fréchette, still clung tenaciously to Lamartine as the sole hope for constitutional liberalism. His sole proviso at this stage was that General Cavaignac should secure the government from any overthrow from either the right or the left.[154] Only during the elections for the presidency did Le Canadien finally desert Lamartine, but only because of the extreme improbability of his election. With the choice then narrowed to Cavaignac and Louis Napoleon the editor deserted the former because of the militarists who now surrounded him. The latter on the other hand had some promise of guiding the French through the dangerous shoals of absolute monarchy and anarchy to the safe haven of "une république sage moderée et par conséquent progressive."[155]

Where La Canadien differed substantially from La Minerve was in its more secular outlook. This tendency was most apparent in the posture of its editor on the subject of communism which had reared its ugly head in the struggle over the Paris workshops in mid-summer of 1848. While La Minerve chose not to confront that particular threat because Rome had not yet addressed itself to it, Le Canadien chose to assault that heresy with a curious assortment of ideological weapons. Fréchette reprinted not only the extracts from the Bishop of Langres' book against Proudhon (Cas de Conscience, published in 1847), but also from an obscure Chinese mandarin's strictures against property held in common![156]

---

[154] Ibid., July 14, 19, Aug. 11, Sept. 20, Oct. 4, 9, 1848.

[155] Ibid., Dec. 11, 1848. [156] Ibid., Sept. 1, 20, 25, 1848.

Yet another measure of Le Canadien's coolness towards ultramontane liberalism in 1848 was its relative lack of interest in the prospects of clerically-inspired liberal movements in Ireland or the Italian states. In addition, that newspaper evinced little concern over the fate of liberal movements in the German states or in the Austrian Empire, by comparison to its concern over the French Revolutionary experiment. Only when news from France was scarce did the editor appear to concern himself at all with the fate of European liberalism. Even then his pessimism upon the fate of any liberal gains other than in France was apparent in his low opinion of the debased nature of society elsewhere in Europe.[157] The only possibility that Fréchette saw for redemption in those ancient states was that their absolute monarchs would moderate and direct reform within their kingdoms. But even then he despaired of any concrete reforms "lorsqu'on voit l'empereur d'Autriche célébrer sa victoire par des executions publiques."[158]

The response of the radical left as represented by Papineau and L'Avenir must not be considered together. On the one hand, Papineau was somewhat of an ideological anachronism, anchored as he was in the political ideology of the pre-rebellion period and its eighteenth century philosophical assumptions. His rhetoric at Bonsecours Market in April of 1848 manifested little change from these early assumptions:

> The French Revolution will upset (doit bouleverser) the world. The English people crushed under the two-fold oppression of its aristocracy, religious and secular, they

---

[157] Ibid., Sept. 27, 1848. [158] Ibid., Dec. 11, 1848.

> too perhaps will make an effort. The general conflagration may extend to England; it will follow or precede a revolutionary movement in Ireland.[159]

Papineau's immediate concern was also to use every ideological advantage to political advantage in his struggle against Lafontaine. therefore, he tried to exploit the Franco-Irish republican axis in order to build political support in the Irish community of Montreal (although to little avail against Lafontaine's powerful political machine).[160]

On the other hand, the young idealists of L'Avenir were more genuinely interested in the ideological aspects of the revolutionary struggle which raged in Europe, and more especially in France. They soon abandoned the theme of Irish-Catholic cooperation in the advancement of liberal-democracy.[161] By September of 1848, L'Avenir had despaired of any democratic result in Ireland, leaving France as the sole surviving hope for human liberty:

> La France avait convivié tous les peuples au banquet d'une liberté universelle. Son appel avait été donné et reçu avec une rapidité electrique. En trois jours elle avait dévoré tout ce que dix huit siècles avaient pu donner des libertés, et les autres peuples arrivés trop tard n'ont pu ronger que des os. . . . La Pologne est encore à l'autocratie, et l'Italie à l'austocratie. L'Irlande n'a éprouvé que des velleités de l'energie. Ses fers se sont resserés. Elle est retombée plus épuisée que jamais dans la profondeur de sa misère et dans les douleurs de l'oppression. Elle a

---

[159] L'Avenir, Apr. 15, 19, 1848. See also speech in Legislative Assembly, ibid., Apr. 8, 1848; Papineau to O'Callaghan, Oct. 28, 1848, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.

[160] Elgin to Grey, Nov. 28, 1848, Montreal, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 263.

[161] L'Avenir, Apr. 20, June 17, May 13, 1848.

> perdu dans une lutte sans nerf et sans succès tous ceux qui pourraient encore élever la voix pour elle.[162]

French Canadian fraternalism with their brethren in France thus played a more important role with the young rouges than it did with Papineau, who still clung to an eighteenth century concept of international revolution. This essential difference was demonstrated early in the progress of the French Revolution when the young radicals of Montreal sent a warm address of encouragement to the revolutionaries in Paris. Beginning with a lengthy delineation of French Canada's fraternal attachment to France since Jacques Cartier, it concluded:

> Membres de la grande famille française à quinze cents lieues de la France, nous la suivons du coeur, dans la voie qu'elle vient d'ouvrir au monde; et les milles échos de notre St. Laurent ont répété le cri de Liberté parti des rives de la Seine.[163]

As the revolution became more radical in midsummer, the editors of L'Avenir became more unrestrained in their enthusiasm for the French revolutionaries. Late in August, at a dinner celebration for the young editors of that newspaper, toasts were drunk to a variety of causes célèbres until three in the morning. The only ones which received any special comment or applause were those dedicated to the French Republic and to French Canadian nationality. One of the editors, D. Latte, received a rousing ovation for incorporating both themes in a lengthy toast to the mission of French-speaking peoples in the advancement of human liberty. Two months later, the rouges became even more radical in pursuing the theme of fraternalism. They

---

[162] Ibid., Sept. 27, 1848. [163] May 17, 1848.

now congratulated the working classes of France in a formal letter to the newspaper of working-class republicanism, La Ruche Populaire:

> L'echo que nous provoquions au delà des mers a répondu à nos voeus. La Ruche Populaire la voix du grand, du malheureux peuple ouvrier de Paris--l'âme de ce peuple--qui étudie ses souffrances pour les soulager--qui calcule ses maux pour calculer les remèdes--qui cherche le faible pour rendre fort, le riche pour le rendre humain et tous pour les rendre frères--la Ruche Populaire a compris l'ardeur de nos sympathies et, par là les mers, elle nous a fait entendre ce cri que nous lui renvoyons avec toute la sincerité de notre âme--"SALUT ET FRATERNITE."[164]

Fraternalism and liberal-republicanism were the limits of rouge radicalism. The same fraternal address to La Ruche Populaire was no Marxian rallying call to the working classes of the world to unite. Instead, it affirmed a faith in the February Revolution and Provisional Government. The Bloody June Days were cause for lament, and the restoration of order by General Cavaignac cause for rejoicing.[165] Not even La Minerve could have related a more romantic and Rousseauian idyll of new-world innocence than did the young rouges on the irrelevance of the radical phase of French social revolution for French Canada. L'Avenir affirmed that France's urban ills were unknown to Canada: "L'Association n'est plus une idée parmi nous, c'est un fait répandu dans toutes les classes de la société, sous diverses formes, mais avec le même but: instruction et secours mutuels." Then followed a familiar conservative recitation of the social benefits accruing to French Canadian society from its corporate associations, the Institut Canadien, the Saint Jean-Baptiste Society, and the Mercantile Banking Association. Secondly, its rural ills were also much less severe

---

[164] Ibid., Nov. 4, 1848. [165] Ibid., Nov. 22, 1848.

because of the multiple partitioning of seigneurial lands, and also because of the existence of a frontier safety-valve until the nineteenth century. Even the rural overpopulation that followed did not disturb L'Avenir for there was the inevitable "association" for that too--the Townships Colonization Society.[166]

The rouges of L'Avenir were no less conservative in their scrupulous concern for private property. Quoting from such sources as Lamartine and La Ruche Populaire. Eric Dorion demonstrated his visible apprehension at the doctrines of communism. Property was after all the basis of society, "et la propriété, résultat du travail, appartient de droit légitimement, au travailleur."[167] To demand from the French government as some radical Parisian workers did, "l'organisation du travail" and national workshops, was pure socialist heresy.[168] More important for France was the resumption of work by the lower classes, and the reform of political and economic abuses which hindered French productivity.[169] Beyond that the economic laws of laissez-faire should prevail, whether according to the physiocrats or Adam Smith, or their political apostles, Lamartine, Peel or Cobden.[170]

It appears, too, that L'Avenir like its progenitor in France reluctantly abandoned the hope that Pius IX would provide leadership for liberal Catholicism. The editors initially greeted the revolt in

---

[166] Ibid., Nov. 4, 1848.

[167] LA PROPRIETE, de la Ruche Populaire, cited in L'Avenir, Nov. 11, 1848.

[168] Ibid., Oct. 25, 1848. [169] Ibid., Sept. 30, 1848.

[170] Ibid., Jan. 13, 1849.

the Italian states with great hope:

> En Italie l'avènement à la chaire apostolique d'un grand homme en même temps que saint Pontife comprenant le progrès des idées et les besoins des populations, leur soif de ce qui est vrai, juste et bon; cet avènement a été le jour marqué dans les décrets de la providence comme le déclin de l'oppression et la fin de la servitude pour les peuples nombreux mais petits états de ce beau pays.[171]

Although the rouges did not keep as vigilant a lookout for papal political policies in 1848, they were never openly hostile to liberal Catholicism in Europe. Only when they were forced in early 1849 to choose between the republic in Rome and the temporal pretensions of the Pope that they opted for popular sovereignty.[172] It was only with obvious reluctance that the rouges made this difficult choice which had been forced upon them by the ultramontanist priests, politicians, and journalists. In an extremely bitter editorial in early April, J. B. E. Dorion demonstrated the falsity of the notion that Catholicism and liberalism were ideally incompatible. Citing the circular letters of the former Bishop of Paris as evidence he hoped to demonstrate that "le clergé aurait fait cause commune avec le peuple."[173] Given the impossibility of such an alliance in the intolerant atmosphere of ultramontane reaction in 1849, the rouges had little choice but to search out new grounds. Their only probable regret in choosing a more radical position was that they had wasted a great deal of time and energy in pursuing an ideological via media.

---

[171] Ibid., Apr. 29, 1848. [172] Ibid., Mar. 14, 1849.

[173] Ibid., Apr. 4, 1849.

What was perhaps most surprising in their political and philosophical course after 1849 was that they never really abandoned this ideal while searching out a new position from which to combat aggressive ultramontanism. In that respect they were like the much-maligned Catholic liberals of France, Lacordaire and Montalembert, who used every devious ploy in their struggle against Veuillot and the French ultramontanes in the eighteen-fifties.

At this point the familiar tale of worsening relations between the parti rouge and the ultramontanes weaves its ugly path across French Canadian politics of the eighteen-fifties. It is a narrative that has been told well by French Canadian historians and to tell it again would be superfluous.[174] What has emerged in the historiography of this schism and conflict in the fifties is an increasingly clearer delineation of the intellectual roots of conflict that reached as far as Paris and Rome. One is struck by the apparent willingness of the rival French Canadian factions to imitate the personal and philosophical rivalries that divided French ultramontanes like Veuillot, Parisis, and Gaume, against Catholic liberals like Lammenais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert. But French Canadian historians appear content to leave it at that. Given the recent historiographical division over the nature and significance of the original struggle in France, it seems somewhat surprising that such a firm consensus exists in

---

[174] See P. Sylvain, "Libéralisme et Ultramontanisme," op. cit.; N. S. Robertson, "The Institut Canadien, An Essay in Cultural History," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1965; M. Dandurand, "Les Premiers Difficultés Entre Mgr. Bourget et l'Institut Canadien de Montréal," Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa (1955), 155-307.

Canada. Some intellectual historians of France now see a much narrower philosophical gap between ultramontanes, liberals, and even socialists. The similarities between Lammenais and Veuillot, for example, were often much greater than their dissimilarities.[175] Both were romantic, both were evangelical, and both were Catholic, yet one was liberal and one was conservative politically. Veuillot's polemics successfully obscured that consensus, much as did Bourget's on the liberals in French Canada. French ultramontanism has been reappraised, but its French Canadian counterpart has not.

The overt controversy between liberals and ultramontanes in French Canada was an anachronistic one, even by European standards. It consited by and large in a reversion by the priests and conservative politicians to the same anti-revolutionary posture that they had held since the late eighteenth century. Within a few short months in 1849 the old politics had reasserted itself in Lower Canada, with liberals continuing in their familiar liberal-democratic demands, and conservatives now denouncing the panaceas of eighteenth century rationalism. What appeared interesting about this reversion to type was that it appeared to mitigate against serious social breakdown by channeling into familiar paths this ancient antagonism between the left and the right. The sound and the fury of conflict in the eighteen-fifties belied, much as it did in France, the closeness of each side's first assumptions. It was not a philosophical conflict, or even a

---

[175] See D. G. Charlton, Secular Religions in France, 1815-70 (Oxford University Press, 1963); P. Spencer, The Politics of Belief in Nineteenth Century France; Lacordaire, Michon, Veuillot (London: Faber, 1954).

viable ideological one by mid-nineteenth century standards. It was, as one recent French Canadian politician has put it, "this game of politics."

If one were to accept solely the evidence of the bleus and the ultramontanes one would have to conclude that French Canada was on the verge of a revolutionary overthrow by Proudhon's agents in North America. Joseph Cauchon used the "Red Scare" constantly in the early fifties to internal political uses. He gave it as an excuse for example for his resignation from the Hincks-Morin Ministry in 1851. On that occasion he drew some ominous parallels to the fate of Lamartine's Provisional Government:

> Le socialisme a eu ses jours d'essai en France comme gouvernement après les journées de fevrier et l'on sait comment M. Louis Blanc et ses frères en socialisme savaient dévancer le temps, en poussant la France vers un cataclysme social et vers la banqueroute. Le clear-gritisme n'est pas socialisme, dites-vous, parce qu'il ne prêche pas les doctrines de Fourier et Proudhon. Mais ces hommes n'ont pas accaparé à eux seule le privilege de promulger des doctrines plus ou moins subversives de la société, et après eux les clear-grits pouvaient reclamer le droit d'établir des plate-forms. Pourquoi vous mettre en contradiction avec M. Hincks qui déclare à la convention électorale d'Oxford que ses doctrines sont socialisme comme celle des clubs de France? Mais le socialisme c'est le nivellement, c'est la destination des institutions sur les quelles une société est assisses, c'est la mise en question de tout les droits et des bases mêmes de la société, c'est la négation formelle du droit de la propriété. Un oratour clear-grit ne disait-it pas en chambre en durant la dernière session "Qu'il n'y avait pas de droits acquis." Si ce n'est pas le socialisme tel que pratiqué par les democs en blouses de Paris, ce n'est assurément pas le spiritualisme, et dans tout les cas, de quelque nom qu'on appelle tous les hommes honnêtes de tous, les partis doivent le combattre comme un monstre que veut dévorer la société . . . Lamartine porte au pouvoir par huit millions de voix, succomba malgré son integrité, parce qu'il avait donné entrée à un principe mauvais dans

> son administration. C'était le conciliation, si non la peur qui le portait à cette alliance monstreuse, et cette alliance, l'a perdu dans son retour Ledru-Rollin plongeant ses bras jusqu'aux épaules dans le coffre de l'état, n'eut qu'un tort, à la manière de tous les démagogues, celui de "dévancer le temps" et d'aller un peu trop vite.[176]

The philosophical basis for this red scare that chilled the hearts of conservatives was a familiar one. It was none other than the recurrent anti-Voltairean neurosis which periodically descended upon French Canadian conservatives since the seventeen-nineties.[177] "Le tactique de l'impiété" as it was called by these conservatives was the thin edge of the wedge which ultimately toppled France in 1789 and again in 1848.[178] The intellectual heritage of the latter revolution was for Cauchon unmistakably linked to the eighteenth century doctrines of self-sufficiency and progress:

> Leroux et Proudhon sont des enfants horribles des boucheries de '93; que les barricades et le poignard ont été en 1849, sur toute surface de l'Europe, les instruments de cette perfectibilité, et que ce sont les incendiaires et les assassins qui, en Canada, vous tendent leurs mains fraternelles, armées de couteaux, et de torches ardentes, comme les signes incontestables

---

[176]Journal de Québec, Nov. 15, 1851. See also ibid., Jan. 12, 1850, LE PROUDHONISME AU CANADA/BARABAS; Jan. 17, 1850, LE PROUDHONISME A QUEBEC; Aug. 9, 1849; Jan. 19, 1850; Feb. 16, 26, 1850; April 18, 1850; Sept. 25, 1851; Nov. 27, 1851; Jan. 17, 1852; La Minerve, Apr. 11, 1850; Aug. 2, 1849; Aug. 14, 1852; Dec. 15, 1855; Dec. 12, 1857; H. Langevin to E. Langevin, Montreal, Apr. 2, 1850, Taché-Langevin Coll., APQ; L'Abbé Matté to H. Langevin, Dec. 21, 1857, ibid.

[177]See M. Trudel, L'Influence de Voltaire au Canada (Fides, 1945), 2 vols.

[178]La Minerve, July 21, 1857.

de la perfectibilité humaine au plein midi de la civilization et du siècle.[179]

The rabid ultramontanes were even more acutely attuned to the dangers of rationalism. Perhaps the classic denunciation of Voltairism and philosophisme came from the pen of Ignace Bourget in his pastoral letter, "Les Erreurs du Temps."[180] No less a warning to the wavering on the poisonous tendencies of rationalism came from the central organ of ultramontanism in Paris, L'Univers. Le Courrier du Canada faithfully reprinted the harangues of Veuillot and his disciples against rationalism, protestantism, and revolution.[181] Should its readers miss that particular warning, Le Courrier serialized in the winter of 1858 a lengthy series on the evil influences of rationalism on civilization. Reason was conclusively shown to be excessively egotistical, egalitarian, and anti-fraternal, in the true Christian sense.[182]

The relatively greater emphasis by the right of anti-liberal

---

[179]Journal de Quebec, Dec. 15, 1849. See also ibid., Oct. 6, Nov. 15, Dec. 4, 1849; Mar. 23, 1850; La Minerve, Apr. 9, May 14, 1849; Feb. 7, 1850; May 6, 1840; "L'ATHEISME, Lettre d'un Croyant; July 16, 21, 1857; July 6, 1858; C. S. Cherrier to the editor of Le Moniteur Canadien, Apr. 30, 1850, May 19, 1853, C.S. Cherrier Papers, P.A.C.

[180]L. Bourget, Les Erreurs du Temps, May 31, 1858 (Montreal: Plinguet and Laplante, 1858), pp. 6-9, T.P.L. Pamphlet Coll. See also La Minerve, Feb. 7, 1857, "Les Philosophes Français."

[181]Le Courrier, Jan. 22, 1858. For evidence of the editor's ultramontanism see Hector Langevin to his brother, Edmond, May 2, 1850, in which he exults at the return of Pius IX to rome, Taché-Langevin Coll.

as opposed to anti-socialist propaganda was testimony to the conservatism of the left. There was in effect no real threat from socialism or radical republicanism. The rouges on the other hand appeared content to perpetuate an anachronistic rivalry, likely because eighteentth century liberal ideals were much less offensive politically. On the face of it, the editors of L'Avenir appeared more interested in the state of radical ideas not so much in the nineteenth century but in the watchwords of the American and French Revolutions of the eighteenth century.[183] In fact, at a banquet of the Montreal Institut Canadien in 1850, Charles Laberge made the outrageous claim that the only real republicans were the American colonists who revolted against the British Crown in 1776.[184] Some of the rouges took indirect issue with Laberge in their periodic flushes of enthusiasm for the first French Republic of 1789. The name of Maximilien Robespierre periodically came forward not as the monster of the Terror, but as the selfless servant of democracy and as the framer of the Declaration of the Rights of Man.[185]

This aversion to the violent phase of the French Revolution was quite consistent among the rouges who stubbornly insisted that republicanism was compatible with social order. For that reason they

---

[182] Ibid., Nov. 12, 22, Dec. 3, 15, 1858.

[183] L'Avenir, June 5, 1849, "Trente Quatre Etoiles," Feb. 16, 1850; J. B. E. Dorion, L'Institut Canadien en 1852 (Montreal: W. H. Rowen, 1852), pp. 148-49.

[184] L'Avenir, June 28, 1850.

[185] Ibid., Aug. 11, 1852, Aug. 19, 1857, Sept. 15, 1857.

found "la république de Danton et de Marat ... une souillure et une négation de la véritable république, de la république telle que l'ont comprise Washington et Jefferson."[186] Their aversion to socialism was no less plain. Upon the only occasion that the editors of L'Avenir commented upon Proudhon's works on property, they merely glossed over the problem by claiming that his works were too scarce, and that they had never read them. As a substitute, the readers of L'Avenir were treated to an innocuous homily on chastity by Proudhon to a female admirer. Such a fastidious man, the editors mused, could not be all that bad, and perhaps his Mémoire Sur La Propriété deserved a critical review after all![187]

The conservative measure of rouge liberalism was the derivation of its thought from the Catholic liberalism of Robert de la Mennais (Lammenais). Although they chose to concentrate largely on his works which postdated his break with the Papacy in 1836, the rouges still accepted Lammenais' basic synthesis of rationalism and evangelical Christianity. Unorthodox though Lammenais was in this synthesis he was nevertheless read very widely within liberal-Catholic circles at mid-century.[188] One has only to read the extracts from Lammenais

---

[186]Manifeste du Club National Démocratique, Des Presses de L'Avenir, Montreal, 1849, p. 17.

[187]L'Avenir, Oct. 9, 1856. Only negative references to Louis Blanc were made by Etienne Parent before the Inst. Canadien in 1852, pp. 23-24. See also L'Avenir, Oct. 4, 11, 1849.

[188]See W. G. Roe, Lammenais and England: The Reception of Lammenais' Religious Ideas in England in the Nineteenth Century (Oxford University Press, 1966).

presented in L'Avenir to see why he was taken so seriously by left-leaning Catholics. The Christian social gospel contained therein was an especially powerful one, linking as it did the secular political ideology of the eighteenth century with extremely conservative notions on the divine origins of society and sovereignty:

> Vous n'avez qu'un père qui est Dieu, et qu'un maître qui est le Christ. Quand donc on vous dira de ceux qui possèdent sur la terre une grande puissance. Voilà vos maîtres, ne le croyez point. S'ils sont justes, ce sont vos serviteurs, s'il ne le sont pas ce sont vos tyrans. Tous naissent égaux: nul en venant au monde, n'apporte avec lui le droit de commander ... Dans la balance du droit éternel, votre volonté pèse plus que la volonté des rois: car ce sont les peuples qui font les rois, et les rois sont fait pour les peuples, et les peuples ne sont fait pour les rois. Le père celeste n'a point formé les membres de ses enfants pour qu'ils fussent brisés par des fers ni leur âme pour qu'elle fût meurtrie par la servitude. Il les a unis en familles, et toutes les familles sont soeurs: il les a unis en nations, et toutes les nations sont soeurs; et quiconque sépare les familles des familles, des nations des nations, divise ce que Dieu a unit; il fait l'oeuvre de Satan. Et ce qui unit les familles aux familles, les nations aux nations, c'est premièrement la loi de Dieu, la loi de justice, et de charité, et ensuite la loi de liberté qui est la loi de Dieu. Car sans le liberté quelle union existerait-il entre les hommes? Ils seraient unis comme le cheval est uni à celui qui le monte comme le fouet du maître à la peau d'esclave.[189]

Even more interesting was the use by the rouges of Lammenais' reflections on liberty, revolution, and Christianity. Once again the readers of L'Avenir were warned against the specious use of official religions

---

[189] L'Avenir, Aug. 11, 1852, LIBERTE, EGALITE, FRATERNITE. See also ibid., Aug. 25, 1852, "Origine des Armées"; ibid., July 28, 1852, "La Liberté"; ibid., Aug. 4, 1852, "Origine de Royauté"; ibid., Aug. 2, 1849, "L'Esprit d'Association"; Aug. 7, 1849, "La Famille des Orphelins."

to maintain and justify oppression. True Christianity according to Lammenais was egalitarian because all men were equal before the eyes of God. The use of violence in the pursuit of liberty and equality was then no sin: "La liberté est comme le royaume de Dieu; elle souffre violence, et les violents la ravissent."[190]

The rouges also employed the philosophy and history of the nationalist and liberal Jules Michelet to instruct their readers in the ideals of liberalism and Christianity. No less than Lammenais, Michelet attempted in his early phase to reconcile the secular ideals of the philosophes with Christian ethics. In Michelet's own words from his commentaries on Vico, "l'athéisme n'a rien fondé."[191] One could scarcely conceive of a more conservative statement on faith, education, and patrie from even Bonald and Maistre than the extract which L'Avenir reprinted from Michelet's Le Peuple:

> Il faut que l'enfant croie.
>
> Qu'il croie, enfant, aux choses qu'il pourra, devenu homme, se prouver par la raison. Faire un enfant raisonneur, disputeur, critique, c'est chose insensée. Remuer sans cesse à la plaisir tous les germes qu'on dépose, quelle agriculture ... La foi, c'est la base commun d'inspiration et d'action ... Il faut chercher comment Dieu s'est manifesté dans l'homme de chaque nation, comment, dans la vérité des génies nationaux, le Père s'est appropriée aux besoins de ses enfants. L'unité

---

[190] Ibid., Aug. 18, 1852, "Le Peuple Incapable."

[191] Cited in D. G. Charlton, Secular Religions in France (Oxford, 1963), p. 187.

> qu'il doit nous donner, n'est pas l'unité monotone, mais l'unité harmonique où toutes les diversités s'aiment.[192]

The third member of this triumvirate of French liberals to hold a considerable following among the rouges was the poet-philosopher-politician, Alphonse de Lamartine. His works, specifically Le Conseilleur du Peuple and the History of the Girondins, were often reprinted in both the conservative and the liberal press.[193] It seems almost surprising to read Lamartine's strictures against "la démocratie" and "la démagogie" from the pages of L'Avenir, a newspaper devoted to liberal-democracy and reviled precisely in those same terms by the ultramontane press. The attraction of the rouges to Lamartine was certainly no intellectual flirtation, for in 1856 Le Pays announced that it was establishing a committee of Canadian subscribers to assist the impoverished Lamartine.[194] Not only did a distinguished group of worthies from the Institut Canadien in Montreal (including Dorion, Dessaulles, Doutre and Papineau) subscribe but also a few liberal bleus of some rank (L. T. Drummond, L. V. Sicotte, C. S. Cherrier, and D. B. Viger). Despite the heavy barrage encountered from Eugene Veuillot of La Patrie and other ultramontanes, the rouges held fast to their hero, holding public meetings and

---

[192]Ibid., July 28, 1852, "Une Page de Michelet." See also Aug. 18, 1852.

[193]See La Minerve, Aug. 2, 6, 1849; Nov. 4, 1850; Sept. 30, Oct. 2, 1851; L'Avenir, Aug. 2, 4, 1849; Aug. 11, 1852.

[194]Le Pays, Oct. 6, 21, Nov. 6, 1856.

lectures on his behalf through November of 1856.[195] The rouge cooperation with moderate liberals and conservatives in this romantic venture once again revealed the fundamental consensus at the base of the French Canadian political process of the fifties.

The repeated attacks of L'Avenir on the Church's temporal claims also belied the conservatism of the rouge position on church-state relations. They were insistent, for example, that religion (and specifically Christianity) played an indispensable role in preserving the morals of society. Albeit utilitarian, the role accorded by one rouge to "true religion" was certainly orthodox:

> Il est de l'intérêt de la société d'encourager tous ses membres à se conformer aux pratiques et aux devoirs de la religion; car un peuple est d'autant plus moral, plus équitable plus humain plus dévoué au bien public, plus animé de toutes les vertus sociales, qu'il est véritablement plus religieux.[196]

Others like Louis-Joseph Papineau were prepared to go much further in identifying that true religion as Catholicism, and Protestantism as its inveterate enemy:

> Le Catholicisme est partie de notre nationalité qu'il faut avouer en toute occasion. L'opposition au Catholicisme est moins souvent indépendance de conviction ou de caractère que flagornerie pour un gouvernement protestant ... La lutte peut être comprise entre le Deisme et le Christianisme. Mais le protestantisme est un sistême plus illogique que le Catholicisme. Il s'affaiblit en Europe.

---

[195]See S. Marion, "Lamartine et L'Institut Canadien de Montreal" in Lettres des Canadiennes d'Autrefois, III, pp. 39-73; R. Sylvain, "Lamartine et Les Catholiques de France et du Canada," R.H.A.F., IV (1950-51), 376.

[196]C. Dumesnil, Reflexions Preliminaires Des Vrais Principes Politiques, p. 65.

> Il n'a pas d'unité, il change incessement de nom et de doctrine.[197]

Ironically, the rouge commitment to the mission of Catholicism in Europe was rendered in precisely the same terms that George Brown reserved for Protestantism--the fight for religious liberty and toleration. This certainly was the thrust of L. A. Desaulles' eloquent defence of Galileo against the Inquisition.[198] Although construed by the ultramontanes as a typical challenge to papal supremacy by freethinkers and atheists,[199] Dessaulles' polemic maintained in utmost seriousness that:

> Je n'ai jamais dit que l'église était jalouse du talent, et cherchait à l'étouffer, qu'il ne trouvera rien de semblable, dans mon essai attribuée à l'église; que je n'ai pas une seule fois mis l'église en cause, puisque je sais parfaitement que l'église n'a jamais prononcé de jugement contre Galilée ou ses théories que c'est toujours l'Inquisition que j'ai parlé, et l'Inquisition n'est pas l'Eglise.[200]

Dessaulles no doubt erred tactically in his historical precedents, but his error reflected at least a genuine belief (likely derived from Lammenais) that science, reason, and Catholicism were ideally compatible, but were merely prevented from being so by a reactionary fringe

---

[197]L. J. Papineau, to his son, Amedée, Sept. 7, 1852, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., Papineau-Bourassa Collection, A.P.Q. See also L. J. Papineau to R. P. Aubert, Petite Nation, 1853, ibid.

[198]L. A. Dessaulles, Galilée, Ses Travaux Scientifiques et Sa Condemnation (Montreal: L'Avenir Press, 1856), 50 pp.

[199]See La Minerve, Apr. 2, 1856.

[200]Reported in La Minerve, Apr. 9, 1856. "Response à la Critique sur L'Essai de M. Dessaulles," dated Montreal, Mar. 29, 1856.

within the Church.

The rouges were no less eclectic in the historical explanations they employed to explain the progress of European civilization. The derivation was likely French at its last point of departure from Europe, but whether it belonged to Guizot, Cousin, Lammenais, or Michelet is uncertain.[201] On the one hand there were definite overtones of the first two in the rouge emphasis upon the historiosophical advance of liberty from middle to modern age. Yet the historical role of the nation state in that same process belongs to Michelet and even Lamartine. Both themes were reflected in the whiggish manifesto of the Club National Démocratique in 1849:

> Partout au moyen-âge unité, toujours unité. Unité dans le gouvernement, unité de religion unité dans l'oppression, partout cette condition inhérente aux formes voulues alors pour la société, excepté toutefois dans le droit à la liberté civile, qui par une malheureuse exclusion se trouve reduit à l'état du zéro isolé ... Aujourd'hui on a proclamé le droit de participation du peuple au gouvernement qui le régit, on a admis la liberté d'examen pour la société civile, on a decrété la liberté d'examen sur les rapports rationnels que l'être intelligent peut avoir avec la divinité; on a enfin reconnu la liberté d'opposition à tout pouvoir qui viole les libertés de la nation on ne satisfait pas à ses besoins.[202]

Further examination reveals yet another historical explanation of progress, this one deriving from Lammenais. For one zealous correspondent of L'Avenir evangelical Christianity was the moving force behind the moral as well as material advance of Europe. More than that,

---

[201]See D. G. Charlton, Secular Religions in France, pp. 176-84.

[202]Manifeste du Club National Démocratique, Des Presses de L'Avenir, Montreal, p. 18.

it also represented social salvation to French Canada, in that it promised a vigorous middle class and a moral magistracy:

> La démocratie moderne dans sa pensée des droits égaux de tous et de la responsabilité des gouvernements n'est qu'une portion détachée de cette vérité chrétienne que le fils de Dieu a apportée à la terre. L'Europe leur doit sa préeminence ... L'évangile de Jésus-Christ, voilà le sauveur du Canada ... Lui seul nous prépara une jeunesse fort, vivante, généreuse, des hommes indépendants vertueux et probes dans la magistrature, dans les chambres, dans le gouvernement, dans le commerce, dans les ateliers, dans les campagnes dans tous les dégrés de l'ordre social.[203]

Common to both of these explanations was an aversion to both the Providential Catholic view of Bossuet and Fénelon, but also an aversion to the historicism and fatalism of the Hegelian and the Marxian dialectic. The cult of progress among French Canadian intellectuals of the left was like the rest of their political philosophy, exactly in the centre of the intellectual spectrum of the early nineteenth century.

French Canadian ultramontanism was no less eclectic in its philosophical foundations. Conservative Catholic thought in France which was its inspiration blended easily with the liberal thought of Lammenais. Both were deeply rooted in the romantic tradition. One side of that tradition inspired the intensely conservative and nationalistic thought of Bonald, Maistre, and Chateaubriand (whom the French Canadian ultramontanes were fond of citing). On the other it produced the polymorphous Catholic thought of Lammenais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert who were at once conservative, liberal,

---

[203] L'Avenir, May 1, 1857.

and even socialistic in outlook. There is little astounding in the fact that Lammenais founded the romantic theory of ultramontanism which Louis Veuillot later used to such devastating effect. Nor was there any essential conflict in the easy combination by the European ultramontanes of the liberalism of Lammenais and the conservatism of Chateaubriand into a single eclectic form. The integrity of even this hybrid form of Catholicism was even further impaired upon its further transmission to Canada, where conservatives insisted upon making further philosophical concessions to liberal-Catholicism.

Perhaps the most glaring example of the eclectic aspect of ultramontanism was its Christological emphasis. Whether one reads Veuillot's pronouncements in L'Univers or his imitators in French Canada it is difficult to separate them from what one finds in Lammenais or Lacordaire.[204] When Hector Langevin lectured his readers on the duties of a Christian in the upcoming provincial elections in 1858 he was no less emphatic than Lammenais upon the universal dominion of Christian ethics:

> L'esprit de Jésus-Christ doit-être en chaque chrétien comme un principe de vie universel, qui anime et vivifie toutes nos actions, pénêtre toutes les puissances de nôtre âme, consacre et sanctifie tous nos droits, et tous nos devoirs. L'homme est un tout, un ensemble, un unité indivisible.[205]

Similarly, when one examines the classic exposition by Etienne Parent on the role of the priest in French Canadian society one is struck by the romantic emphasis on the social mission of the Christian

---

[204]See Le Courrier du Canada, Dec.23,28,1857.

[205]Ibid, Dec.23,1857.

gospel: "C'est vers la réalisation sociale de l'évangile que l'on veut marcher, et loin de vouloir s'asseoir au banquet des Dieux, les peuples ne demandent que du pain et de la liberté."[206] It is also significant that Parent's address was, like most others he delivered, given before the radical Institut Canadien in Montreal, but was also reprinted with no pejorative comments by the Journal de Québec.[207]

The philosophical consensus between conservatives and liberals was also apparent in the French Canadian conservative's whiggish view of the Catholic Church as a liberalizing force in European history. Perhaps the best exposition of this theme was that given in the parish lecture hall of Montreal by Hercule Beaudry. Speaking in 1857 on the subject of "La Religion et la Liberté," Beaudry like Guizot in his History of Civilization in Europe paid homage to the Church's contribution to progress from the fifth to the fifteenth century. To this he added a eulogy of the service Catholicism had made to French Canadian liberty and nationality since the Conquest.[208] Joseph Cauchon was also particularly fond of reminding his readers that Catholicism in French Canada was not beset

---

[206]E. Parent, "Du Prêtre et Du Spiritualisme Dans Leurs Rapports Avec La Société," reprinted in the Journal de Québec, Jan. 23, 1849. See also ibid., "Un Ami de sa Religion," Dec. 6, 11, 1849; "Essai, sur Catholicisme, Liberalisme, et Socialisme, par M. Donoso Cortes," Sept. 25, 1851.

[207]On this point of the non-partisan aspect of the Instituts see N. S. Robertson, "L'Institut Canadien: An Essay in Cultural History," ch. iv, p. 56.

[208]Le Courrier du Canada, Oct. 20, 22, 28, 1857. See also La Minerve, Oct. 25, 1853, "Histoire de la Liberté"; Journal de Québec, Aug. 11, 1849.

by the same vicious challenges that the Church faced in France, and that she therefore performed her liberalizing function more effectively: "C'est bien ici que la liberté l'egalité et la fraternité ont établi leur demeure."[209] The superintendent of education for Canada East went even further than Cauchon in delineating the democratic social mission of the Catholic Church. The Church, as he saw it, still fulfilled in French Canada its classic role of upward social mobility, much as it had in the Middle Ages:

> Or, je trouve cette Démocratie dans l'Eglise même, d'où il arrive que nombre de ses pontifs les plus distingués ont été tirés de la classe plébienne. C'est la mérite et la vertue qui servent de marche pied et le trone aux dignités ecclesiastiques ... [210]

Further evidence of the proximity of Catholic conservatives to the French Canadian left was the espousal of Catholic Socialism by the moderate, Etienne Parent. The question of the derivation of that thought is a nettlesome one because of its fragmented development even within France. As the most recent historian of that movement has written French Catholics had before 1870 largely ignored the suffering brought by the Industrial Revolution: "La plupart des Catholiques français ne comprennent pas ou ne veulent pas comprendre l'intérêt préponderant qu'il y aurait pour l'Eglise de France à regagner la classe ouvrière en participant à ses tentatives

---

[209] Le Journal de Québec, Sept. 1, 1849, Letter of L'Abbé Macquet to Msgr. Monnet, B. of Pella. See also "De la Religion dans la Politique," Le Courrier du Canada, Nov. 13, 1857.

[210] J. B. Meilleur to M. Bois, Oct. 20, 1851, J. B. Meilleur Papers, P.A.C., microfilm.

d'emancipation."[211]

Once again, the omnipresence of Lammenais is felt when scrutinizing Parent's works. Both were antimaterialists, evangelicals, and humanitarians; each emphasized the fraternal mission of Christianity; but both insisted on a formal separation of Church and State.[212] The parallel must not be taken too far, however, because of the admittedly fragmentary character of Lammenais' thoughts on Catholic socialism in such major works as Paroles d'un Croyant (1834) and De L'Esclavage Moderne (1839). It may well be that, as G. D. H. Cole has put it, Lammenais was "the direct progenitor of much Christian Socialist doctrine," but he was not a self-conscious exponent of it as were the later English variety of Christian socialists like Ludlow, Maurice, and Kingsley.[213]

Parent, like Lammenais, saw a basically humanitarian impulse in socialism which might be combined with Catholicism as a force for

---

[211]J. B. Duroselle, Les Débuts du Catholicisme Social en France, P.U.F., Paris, 1951, p. 702. There is, despite this obscurity, some evidence to show that French Canadians were aware of, although not necessarily sympathetic to, Catholic Fourierists like Victor Considerant, author of La Phalange et la Démocratie Pacifique. See an extremely unsympathetic review of his works in Le Journal de Québec, Feb. 24, 1852.

[212]See F. Ouellet, "Etienne Parent et Le Mouvement du Catholicisme Social," Bull. de Rech. Hist., LXI (1955), 99-118.

[213]See G. D. H. Cole, Socialist Thought, The Forerunners, 1789-1850 (London, 1953), p. 199; Alec R. Vidler, Prophecy and Papacy: A Study of Lammenais, The Church and the Revolution (London: SCM Press, 1954), pp. 13, 176, 180; Louis Le Guillou, L'Evolution de la Pensée religieuse de Félicite Lammenais (Paris: Colin, 1966), chap. iv, section iv, pp. 388-402; W. G. Roe, Lammenais and England (Oxford, 1966), pp. 152-85.

human progress. When he looked at Louis Blanc's workshops, Parent was impressed with the good intentions that operated there. Blanc's obvious error was neglect of certain divine and natural laws, one of the foremost of which was that discovered by Malthus--that the whole animal kingdom expanded beyond the means it possessed to feed itself:

> Je vous disais, il y a quelques instants, que Louis Blanc est le moins déraissonable, de nos utopistes modernes; son système est précieux, en ce qu'il est empreint d'une pensée généreuse ... L'association universelle et solidaire de l'industrie de l'apôtre socialiste se réduit, en fin de compte, à faire d'une société d'hommes en vaste atelier, où chacun, produisant selon ses facultés consommerait néamoins selon ses besoins ... Le résultat est facile à prévoir. A présent que l'ouvrier n'a qu'un avenir incertain devant lui; que les misères qui l'entourent s'il charge d'une famille; si dans ces circonstances, dis-je, les populations tendent à dépasser les moyens de subsistance que sera-ce lorsque les classes laborieuses n'auront ou croiront n'avoir plus rien à craindre pour la satisfaction de leurs besoins? Comme Louis Blanc fournit pas le moyen d'échapper à cette loi universelle de la nature dont nous venons de parler, il arrivera, bientôt que sa société ne sera plus qu'une immense aumônerie, sans aumônier encore; car, il n'y aura plus de riches pour faire l'aumône.[214]

Other features of Lammenais' thought which shone more clearly through Parent's discourses were the latter's preoccupation with social order and authority, his stress upon the role of the priest in the creation of the new social order, and his affirmation of the inevitable moral and material progress of mankind.[215] But like the French liberal and

---

[214]E. Parent, "De L'Intelligence dans ses rapports avec la Société, devant 1'Inst. Canadien de Québec, le 22 manvier, 1852," reported in Le Journal de Québec, Feb. 3, 1852. See also ibid., Jan. 29, 31, Feb. 19, 24, 1852.

[215]Ibid., Jan. 29, 31, 1852; E. Parent, Discours Prononcé Par Etienne Parent Devant la Chambre de Lecture de St. Roch, E. R. Fréchette, Quebec, 1852, 26 pp.

even the rouges Parent refused to ascribe any determinist qualities to that idea of progress. Man's free will and his faith were still inevitable ingredients to his moral and material advance.

Parent's Christian Socialism was unique in other respects. He believed like Maistre and Bonald in the fundamental inequality of mankind, the only difference being that he, like John Adams, substituted an aristocracy of virtue and intellect for a prescriptive aristocracy. His concern for the material progress of society also far surpassed that of Lammenais, in that Parent like the rouges was preoccupied with the problems of the emerging bourgeoisie and liberal professions in French Canada.[216] Finally, his proposal for a progressive income tax to benefit the poorer classes was distinct from anything the French liberals suggested because of its admission that society was divided into hostile economic groups which could not be reconciled solely by reason and the spirit of Christian fraternalism.[217] In this respect at least, Parent came dangerously close to the secular spirit of the French socialists whose irreligiousness he generally could not abide. His synthesis of these disparate political and social theories was either so skilful or so confusing that it drew little direct comment from either the conservative or the radical press. That they could be combined at all without arousing the hostility of either camp was testimony not only to the eclecticism of

---

[216]See E. Parent, Importance de l'Etude de l'Economic Politique (Montreal, 1846).

[217]See Journal de Québec, Feb. 24, 1852.

Parent, but of his readers as well.

This eclecticism was demonstrated as well in the idea of progress adhered to by the conservative journal, La Minerve. That newspaper reprinted for its readers perhaps the most popular liberal expression of progress current in mid-nineteenth century France--Eugène Pelletan's Profession de Foi du Dix-Neuvième Siècle (1852). Pelletan's book was merely a distillation of the liberal-catholic idea of progress implied in the works of Guizot, Cousin, Michelet, Quinet, and Lammenais. But, neither Pelletan's republican proclivities nor his reputation as a "progressive illuminist" were mentioned by the editor, Ludger Duvernay. It was likely hoped that these idiosyncrasies as well as the immanentist cast of this thought would pale before the essential message--the association of Divinity with human progress:

> Le ciel, ce livre infini de la vie, déployé sur notre tête, nous enseigne donc l'Evangile de Dieu, qui est le progrès. Il nous dit que l'irresistible tentation de l'immensité et de l'éternité qu'il éveille en nous que notre destinée est une participation continue à l'espace et à la durée.[218]

Although it may have been a genuine effort by Duvernay to get back to the Providential view of Bossuet, he was at least playing with outright heresy in order to combine a nineteenth century progressive ethic with a seventeenth century Catholic outlook. That he could find no philosopher who could fill that prescription and had to

---

[218] La Minerve, Mar. 18, 1852. See also ibid., June 26, July 27, 1852.

resort to a pantheist republican as the closest thing was indicative of the peculiar demands of French Canadian thought. Conservatives like liberals wanted the best of both worlds, and were prepared to make many a philosophical concession to enjoy both.

In the purely secular sphere it was once more apparent that La Minerve drew from the centre of the European intellectual spectrum. Despite its definite loyalties to the Papacy in any temporal conflict,[219] its philosophical tastes were decidedly whiggish. What could be more so than Francois Guizot's account of the Revolution of 1688 in England, or Lamartine's History of the Restoration?[220] No less whiggish were the reflections of Montalembert on the liberalizing influence of the propertied aristocracy in British history, or an obscure French writer's reflections on the contributions of the bourgeoisie to French civilization.[221]

Joseph Cauchon's Journal de Québec was no less discriminating when it came to the application of French conservative and liberal thought to French Canadian uses. On the one hand his readers were variously treated to the pundits of ultramontanism (Veuillot, Parisis, and Cortes) and even to periodic lessons on the divine origins of sovereignty from Thomas Aquinas. Similarly, Bonald, Maistre,

---

[219]See La Minerve, Sept. 13, 18, 23, 1856.

[220]See La Minerve, Mar. 25, 1850, "Pourquoi La Revolution d' Angleterre a-t-elle Réussi," Sept. 30, Oct. 2, 1851.

[221]Ibid., Aug. 23, 1856, "Coquille"; Le-Roux de Lincy, "Les Bourgeois Illustres," Sept. 6, 1856.

Mallebranche and Fenelon all received their just due as literary giants while Luther, Voltaire, Mirabeau, Lamartine, Lammenais, and Proudhon were seen as "sectaires et démagogues."[222] On the other hand, Cauchon was clearly susceptible to the lure of continental liberalism and British whiggery. He deeply admired, for example, Daniel O'Connell, Lacordaire, and Montalembert, placing their names alongside those of Bonald and Fénelon.[223] That all were liberals and that two were currently out of papal favor appeared not to deter Cauchon in his praises. The historical claims of the Church to supremacy were also discarded when they conflicted with his whiggish predilections in constitutional thought.[224] He expressed for example great pleasure at the failure of Catholic Restoration under James II. Echoing Macaulay's History of England, Cauchon wrote:

> On ne se sent nullement disposé à regretter que le dernier des Stuarts ait échoué dans la tache qu'il s'était imposée. Il en eut trop couté à la religion à la liberté de conscience, à la liberté politique, de voir le vraie foi reconquérir sa position par des agents aussi impurs.[225]

Much more preferable was the happy coincidence of liberal-national aspirations and the Church in common cause, as in Ireland of the eighteen-forties.

---

[222]Journal de Québec, Sept. 20 to Oct. 16, 1849 (Parisis); July 3, 5, 1849, Sept. 25, 1851 (Cortes); Jan. 20, 1849, "Origine de la Société et du Pouvoir Politique d'Après St. Thomas D'Aquin;" Mar. 12, 1850, "Le Philosophe Catholique."

[223]Ibid., Mar. 12, 1850.

[224]See Apr. 10, 1849, "Le Pouvoir Temporel du Pape."

[225]Ibid., Apr. 10, 1849.

On those occasions when Cauchon discussed British politics he more than once focused upon the liabilities that Catholics suffered at the hands of a British government, which had only twenty years before granted emancipation.[226] It was therefore with some pleasure that he observed Anglican Evangelicals and Tractarians within the official church moving to a more enlightened stance upon Catholicism, despite politicians like Russell and Gladstone.[227] Cauchon like his fellow whig journalists in Canada West was no less pleased to observe the democratization of the old Church of England, that last great bastion of aristocratic monopoly and privilege.[228]

Cauchon's ideas on political sovereignty were, like those of his counterparts in Canada West, aristocratic, and beyond that, more whig than tory. The great constitutional theorists, Blackstone and Delolme, were cited regularly by Cauchon to uphold the doctrines of responsible, popular government. When Le Canadien favourably compared the petitions against seigneurial tenure to the cahiers in France of the seventeen-eighties, Cauchon scornfully replied: "Les projets des conventions sont des cahiers, des mandats impératifs que vous devez repousser d'après Blackstone, de Lolme et tous les commentateurs de la constitution anglaise?"[229] Upon those few occasions when Cauchon referred to Edmund Burke, he did

---

[226]Ibid., March 8, 1851, February 18, 25, 1851.

[227]Ibid., April 7, 1849.

[228]Ibid. See also La Minerve, November 18, 1850.

[229]Ibid., January 24, 1854. See also ibid., March 13, 1851; April 5, 1853; July 8, 1854.

not refer to the latter's strictures against France in 1790, since those prejudices were already so deeply ingrained in French Canadian conservatism. Rather, he chose to compare the politics of the fifties to that of the seventeen-eighties in England, and to laud the virtues of Fox and Burke. The latter was singled out for special accolades because of his vigorous role in rescuing the independence of Parliament from the venal and corrupted Tories.[230] The parallel did not end there, for Lafontaine and Baldwin were then lionized as the living embodiments of that statesmanlike whig tradition. They too had established parliamentary primacy, and they too would ensure that political power would never devolve into the hands of demagogues and fanatics.[231]

The intellectual debt of the French conservatives to the whig constitutional theorists was also apparent in the popular legal and constitutional manuals of the day. Jacques Cremazie's digest of civil and criminal law contained, for example, a preamble on the balanced constitution that echoed Blackstone and deLolme:

> Le gouvernement d'Angleterre appelle ainsi quelquefois gouvernement mixte, monarchie limitée est formé par la combinaison des trois formes regulières de gouvernement, savoir;--la monarchie representée par le roi, l'aristocratie, representée par la chambre des Lords ou des Pairs, et la république ou démocratie representée par la chambre des communes. Le but de cet amalgame est de réunir tous les avantages des diverses formes de gouvernement, sans en avoir les inconvenients.[232]

---

[230] Ibid., Oct. 8, 1853.

[231] See ibid., Aug. 7, 1852, July 19, 1853.

[232] J. Crémazie, Manuel des Notions Utiles sur les Droits Politiques, Quebec, 1852, p. 4.

Gerin-Lajoie's Catechisme Politique was even more blatant in its imitation of Blackstone's Commentaries, following quite closely the formal of the latter.[233] The great jurist's emphasis upon the unlimited legislative jurisdiction of the House of Commons after the Revolutions of 1688 was also apparent in Gerin-Lajoie's digest.[234] The major departure from the eighteenth century apologists for aristocratic government was the diminished status he accorded to the House of Lords, but this is likely where nineteenth century whigs like Grey, Macaulay, and Durham would have taken issue with Blackstone and deLolme as well.

Perhaps the most singular issue of the eighteen-fifties which was to reveal the essential consensus within French Canadian political and social thought was that of seigneurial tenure. A particularly prominent part in that debate was played by European concepts of property, but these were largely obscured by the insistence of the conservatives in raising la grande peur de revolution. Yet, like the issues of nationalism and church and state there was a latent agreement between conservatives and liberals on their ideal concept of property. As Professor Ouellet has so ably shown, the

---

[233]A. Gerin-Lajoie, Catechisme Politique (Quebec, 1851).

[234]Ibid., pp. 61, 13.

spirit of John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau pervaded both camps.[235]

The property tenures issue offered the perfect opportunity for the bleus to raise the spectre of socialism, and they were not wanting in exploiting it. Once again, Cauchon dared to raise the dreaded name of Proudhon. He appeared to recognize no inconsistency in publicly denouncing the rouges and clear-grits as apostles of Proudhon in their desire to abolish private property, and as eighteenth century philosophes in their attack upon seigneurial tenure. He no doubt recognized that many of the latter were vigorous exponents of private property as a natural right, but made no attempt to dissuade his reading public of their association with the social disorder of the French Revolution and with the anarchy that Proudhon's

---

[235]See F. Ouellet, "L'abolition du Régime seigneurial et L'Idée de Propriété," Hermes, IV (Jan., 1955), 22-36. The author is in essential agreement with Professor Ouellet who has seen the abolition of seigneurial tenure as part and parcel of a rise of a capitalist concept of property in French Canada, and a response to specific rural grievances. F. Ouellet, Hist. Economique et Sociale du Québec, pp. 462-67. Ouellet's bold claim that there was merely a reform, not abolition of seigneurial tenure in 1854, has been strongly challenged by the special historian of that subject, Georges Baillargeon, in a recent article, "A propos de L'Abolition du Régime Seigneuriale," R.H.A.F. (Dec., 1968), 365-91. Baillargeon, though technically correct in terms of the final settlement, makes far too much of the force that habitant petitions played in that settlement. See G. Baillargeon, "La tenure Seigneuriale a-t-elle Eté Abolie par suite des Plaintes des Censitaires?", R.H.A.F. (June, 1967), 1954-55. Baillargeon's view is essentially that of the nineteenth century conservatives who equated reform of feudal tenure as equivalent to a repetition of the French Revolutionary tradition. Ouellet's view appears more within the Marxian frame, viewing land reforms of this kind as a passage from feudal or semi-feudal status into the stage of commercial capitalism.

theories promised.[236] Privately, Cauchon appeared to fear more the pragmatic implications of the demand for abolition. The threat of social demoralization from the excessive exaction of seigneurial dues was more to be feared than the demands for abolition from the political and commercial elites of Montreal. Only if ignored would the first bring in its train the second, and "elle finira cette boule, dans ses zigzags multiples, dans ses bonds énormes et ostensiblement inintelligents, par tracer au terme de sa marche au fond de l'abîme, ces mots horribles: 'La propriété est un vol.'" Perhaps more important, the failure to institute judicious reform would seriously divide the Reformers of Lower Canada, and by default, "la majorité se séparait de ses chefs ... à l'appetit vorace de la démagogie."[237]

What the seigneurial interests feared above all of these pragmatic political considerations was that the sacred principle of private property would be violated. That issue shone clearly through the protest of the seigneurs against abolition in 1854: "If there be a right which as British subjects is inherent in Your Petrs. it is that of property, which consists in the free use, enjoyment and disposal of all their acquisitions, without any control or diminution." Blackstone was then cited on the necessity of public protection of

---

[236]See Le Journal de Québec, June 18, 1850; May 23, 1850; July 3, 1851; Aug. 16, 1851. For Cauchon's speech in the Assembly on Drummond's Bill in 1851 see Montreal Pilot, Aug. 26, 1851, report of debates in Provincial Parliament.

[237]J. Cauchon to L. H. Lafontaine, Toronto, Aug. 13, 1851, Lafontaine Papers, vol. XII, P.A.C.

private property, but its echoes were purely Lockean: "The public good is in nothing more essentially interested, purely than in the protection of every individual's private right as modeled by law."[238] Perhaps the most outspoken defence of seigneurial tenure as the private property of the seigneur (which it was not) came from Christopher Dunkin, a Montreal lawyer. In an empassioned, lengthy, and somewhat confused presentation of his clients' case at the bar of the House of Assembly, Dunkin employed and often tortured history and reason to make his case. First he constructed a lengthy defence of public trusts from the monarch in the Middle Ages as the private property of the aristocracy. Secondly, the destruction of those rights during the French Revolution damned that nation to perpetual anarchy. Thirdly, the analogy to France in 1789 (which he had introduced) Dunkin considered invalid because the seigneurial system in Canada was not at all onerous. The final anti-climax came with Dunkin's final submission, that the seigneurs would have no opposition to commutation with reasonable compensation since "they are not guilty trustees to be punished, but proprietors to be protected."[239]

---

[238]Pierre Boucher de Boucherville and other Seigneurs (O. Perrault, P. Panet, S. Gerrard, L. J. Papineau, R. M. Villeneuve, et al.) to Col. Secy., April, 1855, C.O. 42/597, P.A.C. microfilm. See also Debates, House of Assembly, 1853, P.J.O.Chauveau, cited in Débats de l'Assemblée Legislative sur la Tenure Seigneuriale (Quebec, 1853), pp. 24-26; Lafontaine speech in the House of Assembly, Aug. 19, 1851, reported in Montreal Pilot, Aug. 26, 1851.

[239]C. A. Dunkin, Address Delivered at the Bar of the Legislative Assembly on Behalf of the Seigneurs in Lower Canada (Quebec, 1853), pp. 2, 67-68.

The persistent and muddled defence of private ownership was too genuine to be overlooked. It threatened the cohesion of the ministerialist party from Canada East to the point where the commercially minded Cartier lectured his own chef, Lafontaine, on private ownership in the assembly.[240] And it clearly made the French Canadian conservatives look somewhat foolish ideologically in their use of Locke and the eighteenth century French exponents of natural law, when the latter were clearly responsible for the abolition of the feudal system. This confusion reached its height, as Professor Ouellet has observed, in the polemics of Denis-Benjamin Viger against abolition. He readily invoked not only Locke's defence of private property, but also Rousseau's criticism of its inegalitarian tendencies.[241] Viger was obviously less concerned with ideological consistency than with the preservation of French Canadian nationality against the threat of the commercial ethic and cultural assimilation. That kind of commitment did not preclude the use of Locke's possessive individualism to defend against an enemy which employed that same rhetoric to precisely the same ends as Viger's.

The rouges had an obvious ideological advantage in pressing the principles of natural right in that those forces carried the day against the feudal system of France in 1789.[242] There was also

---

[240]Debates, Pilot, Aug. 19, 1851.

[241]F. Ouellet, "L'Abolition du Régime Seigneurial," pp. 24-32.

[242]See L'Avenir, May 4, 1850.

a parallel in the popular impulse for abolition without compensation ever since 1830.[243] By 1848 that demand from the grass roots had grown to mammoth proportions, with the formation of the "Association Pour La Réforme des Droits Seigneuriaux." Yet the rhetoric that subsequently emerged from this supposedly volatile combination of habitant grievances and philosophic idealism was anything but revolutionary. Rousseau was rarely mentioned except in a pejorative sense by those who sought to reform the abuses of seigneurialism.[244] The lessons of the French Revolution were never invoked directly by the petitioners because of the rhetorical advantage which would be given to the conservatives. Some like Papineau went even further in betraying the principles of the revolution, for he as a seigneur could not accept abolition in any form. He saw Drummond's bill calling for reversion of unceded lands to the Crown as "Robespierrien" and "terroriste." His argument as stated to Robert Christie was that abolition was merely a political ploy used by the middle class to dispossess the aristocratic establishment, whereas in France it had been a case of the proletariat's reclaiming what it had lost by violent usurpation. The result of abolition then as he saw it would be disastrous, in that the property rights enjoyed by the small farmer would give way

---

[243]See G. Baillargeon, "La tenure Seigneuriale a-t-elle été Abolie par suite des Plaintes Censitaires?", R.H.A.F., XXI, p. 66.

[244]See Letter to the Editor of La Minerve signed DEMOPHILE, April 18, 1854.

to a vast rural proletariat.[245] The irony of Papineau's new platform of "Feudal Tenure and Democracy" did not escape the withering satire of the Pilot which immediately styled him an ineffectual ape of the great liberals he professed to admire.[246]

Those rouge propagandists who actively promoted abolition from their central base in Montreal were no less concerned than Papineau and the conservatives with the threat that it posed to private property and the traditional character of French Canadian society.[247] It is difficult to escape the impression that the anti-seigneurial convention in Montreal on the eve of abolition was anything more than an association of philosophical whigs and bourgeois economists. Lord Durham might well have issued their address condemning seigneurial tenure as the vestigial tail of the baronial age, unsuited to enterprising, industrial, and moral societies of the nineteenth century.[248] Beyond that the rouges were merely content to use natural right as a justification of or adjunct to material progress, not as a watchword of revolution:

---

[245]L. J. Papineau to R. Christie, Mar. 15, 1855, Petite Nation, Neilson Papers. See also Papineau to his children, Mar. 12, 1852, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., A.P.Q.

[246]Pilot, Dec. 9, 1851.

[247]Only one rouge, Jacob Dewitt, ever expressed a determination to take away the seigneur's property without compensation, Mirror of Parliament, Nov. 3, 1854.

[248]"The Anti-Seigneurial Convention of Montreal to the People," Montreal, 1854, Montmagny & Co., p. 5.

> La tenure seigneuriale est une violation du droit naturel; elle est degradante et vexatoire elle décourage l'agriculture; paralyse l'energie de l'homme et de toutes les industries ... Il est nécessaire, pour tous les intérêts du pays de fermer les sources d'oppression privé comme publiques, auxquelles la loi peut parvenir; que les Canadiens puissent être entièrement convaincus, qu'il ne seront plus troublés, vexés, molestés, tyrannisés dans l'occupation de leurs terres, qu'ils pourront enfin se livrer librement à toutes les améliorations agricoles et à toutes les enterprises industrielles; et pour cela il faut absoluement que l'on détruise les vestiges de la féodalité qui les oppriment et les écrasent encore, au dix-neuvième siècle, sur la sol d'Amèrique.[249]

These same rouges were equally quick to assure their readers that a just indemnity must be paid to the seigneurs, and that French Canadian nationality would in no way be endangered. And they were good to their word. In 1854 they closed ranks on two occasions with the bleus in the House of Assembly when it appeared as if the payment of an indemnity or its free use by the dispossessed Catholic orders might be endangered by the Upper Canadian amendments.[250]

French radicalism although it played a superficial role in the rouge rhetoric of abolition was a mirage that dissipated the closer that the issue approached resolution. More relevant to the victory of the abolitionists was the union of commercially-minded French Canadians of both parties in and around Montreal with the mercantile English in the same region. Together they effected a

---

[249]C. Dumesnil, De L'Abolition Des Droits Féodaux et Seigneuriaux au Canada, Et Sur le Meilleur Mode à Employer Pour Accorder Une Juste Indemnité aux Seigneurs (Montreal, 1849), L'Avenir, pp. v, 46.

[250]See votes on Amendments by W. L. Mackenzie and George Brown, Mirror of Parliament, Nov. 21, 1854.

transformation of a feudal-agrarian anachronism to a system of property-holding which gave free play to the forces of commercial capitalism. The dictates of pragmatism thus forced a twisting of European ideologies either to fit or distort the facts in French Canada. Proudhon's name was raised by the conservatives though he was never an issue. Rousseau was used by the same conservatives to maintain the status quo. The abuses of the church and aristocracy were similarly used as a diversion by the rouges to conceal the bargain with English Canadians to secure abolition--the clergy reserves for seigneurial tenure.[251]

Alexander Galt's comment that the vote in the House on seigneurial tenure was not founded "on any correct principle" was certainly accurate as to the means used to secure abolition.[252] But there was a latent principle at stake which neither Galt nor any of the progressives would openly admit--that of the protection and extension of propertied interests. That both, and especially the latter, had been served without another French Revolution was no small source of congratulation to George Cartier who smugly announced in 1857 that everyone now "est d'accord que la tenure en france alleu doit prévaloir."[253] That most rouges would have shared those exact

---

[251]See A. Wilson, The Clergy Reserves, pp. 213-14. For ideological support given the rouges from English Canada see Montreal Gazette, Jan. 26, 1849, Aug. 16, 24, 1851, Toronto Leader, Nov. 1, 1854.

[252]Mirror of Parliament, Nov. 3, 1854.

[253]J. Tassé, Discours, p. 130. Speech in Legislative Assembly, April 27, 1857.

sentiments, and that Lafontaine and Papineau would have found them in the main objectionable revealed a new consensus in operation. This shift to new ground obviously had little to do with European or French ideology, which had just been sacrificed on the altar of expediency. It likely had a great deal to do with the new dictates of cultural survival. French Canadians as a whole obviously felt that the old methods were bankrupt and that new ones deserved experimentation in the age of commercial revolution.

The affrontement idéologique between continental liberalism and ultramontane Catholicism therefore proves an inadequate model for the ideological development of French Canada in the eighteen-fifties. There was little sedulous imitation beyond a few clerics and politicians like Bourget and Langevin of the French ultramontane tradition. Although they certainly determined a great deal of the "confrontation" with the rouges, they were not concerned with total cultural victory, nor were they equipped to secure it alone. Beyond the specific problems of church and state and education, the French Canadian ultramontanes could not effectively determine social and cultural direction. The liberal-professional and bourgeois élites in politics, in the Instituts Canadien, and in the popular press were in a much better position to do so. And for them European ideology was more of a legal or medical manual than a Bible, to be used to restore and maintain a healthy body politic and society, and not as articles of absolute belief.

What varied considerably from the English Canadian concept

and use of European political and social theory was that French Canadians were more current in their tastes. Certainly, the confrontation between ultramontanes and rouges was often waged by the former upon the anachronistic battleground of theocracy versus the tenets of deism and infidelity, and by the latter as a struggle between liberal-republicanism and aristocratic reaction. But that may have been a function of the richness and variety of nineteenth century French political thought as compared to its skinny English counterpart. Veuillot and Chateaubriand spared the conservative French Canadians the trouble of retreating to Bossuet, Fénelon, and even Aquinas, and in the process, acquiring the label of irrelevance from their critics. Similarly Lamartine, Lacordaire, and Lammenais gave a contemporary and liberal-Catholic lustre to rouge thought and enabled it to abandon the stigmas attached to Rousseau and Jefferson.

Yet the results were in most cases the same as in English Canada. The promotion of the progressive interests of an emergent bourgeoisie were simply justified by different means. Catholicism often made a peculiar combination with Locke and with Rousseau to justify this advance, but the eclecticism apparent in such bastardized social theory revealed greater rather than less practical strength. Cartier, Cauchon, and the Dorions were of a new generation surer of its first priorities and premises than Papineau and even Lafontaine. There the confusion of theory and practice reached almost tragicomic proportions in Papineau's ideological acrobatics in the rebellion of 1837 and in Lafontaine's odyssey from democratic revolutionary to patrician and jurist in the short space of a decade.

Even though the new bleu still had considerable trouble, as did Alexander Hamilton in resolving his aristocratic pretensions with popular rights, he was still as instinctually sure of himself as Hamilton when it came to socio-economic directives to serve the interests of "whig capitalism." He was as comfortable in the bond markets and expositions of London and Paris as were Hincks, Merritt, or Galt. Secondly, those pilgrimages were often more frequent for Cartier, Cauchon, and Taché than quests after the shrines of ultramontanism.

French Canadian liberalism on the other hand was shorn of much of the arcadian element in its thought with the emergence of the Montreal-based rouges. They had moved ideologically from Jefferson's Monticello and Papineau's Montebello to the less opulent haunts of the liberal cercles in Paris. But there was no longer the romantic veneration extended to the French liberals (with the possible exception of Lamartine) that characterized the early idolization of Jefferson by Papineau. French liberal-catholicism had merely become for the rouges an intellectual tool to be used in the same pursuit of national interest that activated the bleu. French Canadian liberal thought had thus become more self-consciously internal and nationalist in its thrust, and dedicated specifically to the service of bourgeois interests. Perhaps the only real difference from the "whiggish capitalism" of the bleu was that the rouges promulgated a more democratic form of capitalism, designed to serve the lower rather than upper middle class. The conscription

of the Catholic social teachings of Lammenais to the purposes of this class and to material progress was testimony to the cocky ingenuity of the rouges. No longer was French Canadian liberalism the agonized "âme divisé" of the early Papineau who never related or translated his confused political philosophy to reality. Its ideological tools were now fewer but much sharper, and its hand rarely shook as it attempted to cut open the diseased members of the body politic.

CHAPTER II

THE CANADIAN IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Since European whiggery and liberalism provided Canadians with ideological tools for their own peculiar uses, the United States had become somewhat superfluous as a source of anti-revolutionary political ideology. The European revolutions of 1848 had effectively displaced the American Revolution of 1776 as an active source of anti-democratic comment. There was also less danger than ever that Canadian political or national identity would be threatened by American militarism or its messianic democratic ideology. If the failure of the rebellions and the rout of annexation in 1849 had not established that fact, the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 must have convinced many Canadians that the American Eagle had been domesticated.

A much greater fear for the political élites of the province was that Canadians were rapidly becoming socially indistinguishable from Americans. Undefended border or not, the international boundary between Canada and the United States was a rope of sand through which sifted trade, ideas, and people. The gradual invasion of social custom and economic organization dictated a different response than did imminent military invasion or political subversion. Almost as a natural consequence, the content of anti-Americanism shifted to social from political grounds. It was no longer a reasoned faith in superior British institutions which separated Canadians from Americans but a firm conviction in their social superiority. This

conviction rested upon a broad variety of prejudices against American business ethics and even their table manners.

Freed from the restrictions of an anti-republican creed, Canadians were for the first time free to discern the evils as well as the virtues of American institutions. Republican institutions were now defined less by their abstract value than by their workability in a social context. Since the American federal constitution was no longer an experiment but a fact, its founding fathers were now endowed with a wisdom beyond their limited knowledge in 1789. It was no accident that mid-century Canadians contemplated and soon instituted two of the most salient features of the American constitution in the eighteen-fifties and sixties--the elective upper house and a federal state. But Canadians were still as firm as ever upon those American institutions which threatened to alter in any way the structure of Canadian society. An expanded suffrage, elective local institutions, or increased popular participation in political parties were as distasteful as ever to mid-century Canadians. Socially defined, these institutions were dangerous in that their acceptance meant the intrusion of the American way of life.

Canadian attitudes to the United States had thus taken on a modern cast. Anti-Americanism had become a popular social source of national self-identification. Loyalism had taken on more value than blind allegiance to the Crown or a reasoned faith in monarchical institutions. Since the British Empire itself had become a fragmented value structure after 1849, Canadianism had to be defined in other

than unitary and symbolic terms. Thrown upon their own psychological resources Canadians had begun to define themselves empirically as a people, as a society, and a nation.

(i) Manifest Destiny and American Expansionism

In their external encounters with the United States, Canadians were practically concerned with only two issues--imminent conquest and trade. Whereas the former had been the central fear at the heart of the Compact's ideology,[1] it merely became in the fifties a general conviction of American profligacy. More often this conviction was cast in the societal pejoratives common to racism rather than in the political catch-phrases of the earlier period. There was little point in maintaining the myth of a democratic pariah on the borders when every conservative knew that the virus was already gnawing within the body politic.

Feeding the growing conviction that the United States was less concerned with democratic revolution than with mammon was the rapid expansion of central Canadian trade and communication with the republic. Consequently there was little danger that any of the politicians of the centre would overthrow an entire system of British political and social values for commercial union or even annexation with the United States.[2] Even the rouges, whose orientation towards the United States was decidedly political, realized after reciprocity

---

[1]S. F. Wise and R. C. Brown, Canada Views the United States (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), chap. i, pp. 16-43.

[2]See infra, ch. iii.

in 1854 that a programme of annexation was totally superfluous. In the minds of the politicians then, the economics of trade had become an opiate for Canadian fears of American expansionism.

Both English and French Canadians subsequently shared ritualistic misgivings about American invasion and conquest.[3] They were ritualistic because Canadians knew full well that the thrust of American expansion was southward towards the Caribbean and Mexico. Only occasionally did the French Canadian conservative still express some very real fears for survival in an anglo-saxon continent. When Joseph Cauchon cast his critical eye over Millard Fillmore's presidential message in 1851, he roundly denounced the expansionist designs upon Cuba contained therein:

> C'est là, dans notre opinion, le véritable langage d'un homme d'Etat républicain, et nous avons la ferme conviction que la prospérité durable se trouve pour les Etats-Unis, au bout de ces sages en même temps que libérales doctrines, bien plus sûrement que derrière ces aventures quoiquelles on voudrait les entraîner, sous le prétexte séduisant de faire d'eux les suprêmes régulateurs du monde.[4]

As J. C. Taché subsequently contemplated the filibustering of General Walker in Costa Rica in 1857, he also was most fearful of a repetition of similar expeditions to the north. The lessons of a besieged

---

[3]An exception might perhaps be made in the case of the recipients of Edmund O'Callaghan's letters from Albany. He predicted the ultimate Americanization of the whole continent to both F. X. Garneau and John Neilson; O'Callaghan to Garneau, July 17, 1852, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.; O'Callaghan to Neilson, June 15, 1849, Neilson Collection, P.A.C. See also London Free Press, June 11, 1857; Wm. Crafts to Mrs. W.H. Merritt, Utica, Jan. 14, 1848, Merritt Papers, vol. 23, P.A.C.

[4]Journal de Québec, Dec. 16, 1851. See also ibid., Jan. 23, 1855.

central America were obvious to Taché since they demonstrated that "la liberté et l'ordre ne sont pas le produit de vains mots, ni de longues constitutions écrites, ils ont leur siége [sic] dans la conscience des nations et la sentiment intime du devoir qui seul peut les établir ne se développe que sous l'influence de l'éducation réligieuse."[5]

The English Canadian press was much less concerned with the realities of American filibustering. They clucked in mock dismay at the threat of American expansion in central America, but there was little real sympathy with her "weak and imbecile neighbours" to the South of the Rio Grande. In anticipating the prospect of universal American dominion upon the North American continent, the Leader realized that it would not be stopped by any balance of power such as existed in Europe, but by the mere assurance that "generations must elapse before any scheme of universal dominion could be practically attempted, and in the meantime means of resistance may be sufficiently consolidated to stay the march of so daring an ambition."[7]

The real source of Canadian confidence lay in British military presence and involvement in the western hemisphere. Whenever Great Britain challenged the Monroe Doctrine, the Canadian press exulted in their newly-won security. Upon the occasion of British expansion into the Caribbean and South America in the fifties,

---

[6]Toronto Leader, Apr. 26, 1854. [7]Ibid.

Canadian journalists took great delight in describing the colonizing abilities of other members of the anglo-saxon family. It was no small source of pleasure for them to remind Americans that,

> before Monroe had been elected to the Presidence, or the Monroe Doctrine, in any shape heard of, England had come into possession of what were formerly the three Dutch colonies of Berbice, and Essequebo, in 1814, and in 1831 they took the name of British Guiana.[9]

Confident as they were of their own territorial survival Canadians focused their attention upon more nebulous spheres of American economic invasion. The Family Compact's instinctive and pragmatic responses against American ownership of the Welland Canal Company or the Bank of Upper Canada were inflated into a superfluous critique of American business ethics.[10] Canadians now reacted as strongly against the "sharp" trading habits of Americans as the underdeveloped nations of the twentieth century were later to respond to "Yankee imperialism." George Brown gloated in the misguided calculation of Americans upon increased trade during the Crimean War, endowed as they were with "a natural aptitude for smart business operations."[11] William Lyon Mackenzie hit even closer to the nerve when he pointed out that James Buchanan was playing as fast and loose a game with Canadian financiers and British

---

[8]Montreal Gazette, Aug. 28, 1852; Apr. 28, 1851.

[9]Toronto Leader, Dec. 22, 1858. See also British Whig, Aug. 5, 1852.

[10]Montreal Gazette, Feb. 19 , 1849, May 30, 1850; Toronto Leader, Dec. 16, 1853.

[11]Globe, Dec. 21, 1854. See also ibid., Mar. 17, 1849, Aug. 4, 1855; Montreal Pilot, Feb. 21, 1850; British Whig, June 1, 1850.

bondholders as Polk had with Mexico a decade before. The deliberate mismanagement of Canadian finances would then lead Canada as inexhorably as Texas to ultimate independence and annexation.[12] The converse naiveté of Americans in propagating their gross material and social gospel abroad was no less an object of contempt to the Hamilton Gazette:

> Not overly particular is he as to the nature and character of novelty provided it be novelty. Hungry dogs turn not their noses in scorn when dirty puddings are placed within their reverence; and Don Dollar in the like manner is thankful for microscopic mercies in the excitement line. All that he stipulates for is that he may have unrestrained license to praise himself, and magnify his country and the institutions thereof. This being conceded, the death of a President, and the arrival of a fugitive rebel [Louis Kossuth] equally engross his affections, and serve as spigots wherewith to tap the ever replenished tun of his bunkum.[13]

Canadian objections to American social ideals were reflected in their frequent coupling of anti-annexationism with anti-slavery. Throughout the eighteen-fifties English Canadians combined the slave question with Caribbean filibustering in a devastating two-pronged attack upon expansionism. The Montreal Pilot led the charge by repeatedly harking back to the dangers of being coupled in the sordid kind of bargain entered into in 1812.[14] That agreement would call for the equal extension of slave territories along with

---

[12] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Oct. 31, 1856.

[13] Hamilton Gazette, July 22, 1852.

[14] Montreal Pilot, July 17, 1849, Dec. 4, 1849; June 26, 1854; May 10, 1856; Montreal Gazette, Oct. 22, 1849. See Julius W. Pratt, The Expansionists of 1812 (New York, 1925). The 'bargain' in 1812 was Florida in the southwest for the Canadas in the northwest.

free territories. Turgid though it was, the Hamilton Gazette's revulsion against the prospects of annexation spoke for the wounded consciences of Canadians upon slavery:

> If we were joined to the adjacent republic, the hellish bay of the man-hunters' blood hound would soon be heard amongst our forests and plains! Never would the haughty and grasping Southern [sic] rest till he had acquired the privilege of making Canada a hunting ground where the game would be 'God's image fashioned in ebony'--to use good old Fuller's striking expression . . . Annexation to slave-cherishing Dollardom. Never! No Never![15]

When French Canadian conservatives contemplated the alarming prospects of annexation they did so with many of the same feelings as English Canadians. On the one hand they were capable of the most realistic expression of their loss of status and power in a union with the United States, and on the other they could conjure gothic images of horror at the mere mention of annexation. When J. C. Taché's mythical hermit 'BON SENS' imparted his wise advice to the cultivators against annexation in 1849, he did so with the clarity of Machiavelli and the xenophobic phrenzy of Herder:

> Que gagnerez-vous donc à l'annexion? L'honneur de faire partie intégrante d'un grand état? ceci peut être trèsbeau en théorie; mais est très laid en pratique quand cet honneur s'achète au priz des sueurs du peuple. Et la possession de cette chimère indimnisera-t-elle le peuple des sacrifices, qu'il aura à faire pour soutenir une armée, une marine, un corps diplomatique, un gouvernement fédéral où il ne possédera qu'une influence à peine senti et point du tout comprise? Est-ce le plaisir de se dire partie nulle d'un peuple chez qui vous ne le trouverez ni

---

[15] Hamilton Gazette, Aug. 31, 1854. See also Globe, Mar. 19, 1850; Oct. 11, 1854; New Era, Jan. 28, 1858.

> votre culte, ni votre langue, ni vos tendances ni vos moeurs si douces, si pures, qui indimnisera le Canadien des dangers que son existence doit courir sous ce nouvel ordre des choses? Est-ce au moment qu'une guerre civile est imminente, au moment qu'il se porte d'une dissolution de l'Union américaine que vous ferez preuve de sagesse, en vous adjoigant à un peuple dont une moitié veut soutenir les armes à la main, quoi ... les droits de l'homme la liberté, l'egalité, la fraternité? Non; mais droit d'avoir des esclaves: droit diria (?) droit antérieur à toute constitution, droit imprescriptible et sacré, disent nos voisins.[18]

Throughout the eighteen-fifties the negative stricture of French Canadian moderates was reserved largely for American treatment of Canadian emigrants. In receipt of alarming reports from the likes of l'abbé, Chiniquy in Kankakee, Illinois, upon the sorry plight of the Church in the United States, politicians, priests and journalists in French Canada discouraged as best they could the tide into New England and the American West.[19] The internal result was the promotion of colonization in the townships, and the external one an increase in propaganda against American society. The prospective emigrant was warned to beware of those smiling confrères from the

---

[18] La Minerve, May 16, 1850; see also ibid., Oct. 15, 1849, May 13, 1850; A.N. Morin to L.H. Lafontaine, Montreal, Mar. 9, 1850, Laf. Papers, P.A.C., Le Moniteur Canadien, Oct. 20, 30, Nov. 8, 1849.

[19] C. Chiniquy to J. C. Chapais [n.d.], Ste. Anne, Mount Langum, Illinois, J. Barnard (ed.), Mémoires Chapais, II, pp. 88-90; C. Chiniquy to Mgr. Cook, Mar. 8, 1856, Ste. Anne, Kankakee, Séminaire de Trois Rivières; C. Chiniquy, Fifty Years in the Church of Rome (London [n.d.]) Marshall Press, chs. i-lviii; F. Cypiot to ed. of La Minerve, San Francisco, May 15, 1857; La Minerve, July 4, 1857; Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly to inquire into the causes and importance of the emigration which takes place annually, from Lower Canada to the United States (Montreal: Rollo Campbell, 1849), 83 pp.

United States who had returned with a fortune, and to contemplate instead the high spiritual price at which they were bought. Exploited by the American bourgeois as "boeufs de l'étranger" and stripped of their faith in that "contrée irreligieuse," the French Canadians were encouraged to stay and fight where survival had greater spiritual rewards.[20]

Counterpoised against these growing convictions in the social threat posed by the United States was the increasing awareness that Canada's economic interest lay with the United States. The index of this interest lay in Canadian preoccupation with trade statistics between the two countries, the American bond market, and even the fiscal soundness of the American government itself.[21] Even such a conscious economic nationalist as D'Arcy McGee assuaged the fears of his readers in the wake of the mounting panic of 1857 in New York with these uncharacteristic remarks:

> There is no need therefore, for holders of American bills, or for anyone interested in the New York money market--and who among us is not?--to be alarmed as to the soundness of the rallying power of the free banking system in the neighbouring republic.[22]

Nowhere was the paradox of distaste for American society and solicitude for the material benefits it bestowed more apparent than in the diplomatic crisis of 1856. When war threatened between Great Britain

---

[20] La Minerve, June 6, 1857.

[21] Globe, July 19, 1848; Dec. 22, 1849; British Whig, Feb. 15, 1850; La Minerve, Dec. 6, 1856.

[22] New Era, Oct. 1, 1857.

and the United States, there was considerable spirit-wrestling among Canadians over the priorities of imperial allegiance, anti-Americanism, and American trade.[23]

The technical advances in communication between Canada and the United States also served to soften anti-American sentiment. For the occasion of the Boston Jubilee in 1851 a Canadian delegation composed of Lord Elgin and prominent Canadian politicians of both races joined President Fillmore and American luminaries in dedicating the opening of rail communications between Montreal and Boston.[24] In the wake of that convivial gathering, which was marred only by a braggadocian speech from Daniel Webster, the Canadian press responded warmly to improving Canadian-American relations. Joseph Cauchon was so taken with President Fillmore that he could only attribute that attraction to his nobility of character and his air of "douce majesté!" It was, moreover, hoped that that occasion had ushered in a new era of industrial and commercial co-operation rather than conflict on the battlefield.[25] Cauchon's hope appeared to come to fruition a few years later when telegraphic connection was established between Newfoundland and Ireland. On that occasion the staunchly conservative British Whig of Kingston lauded the co-operative efforts of England and America in laying the cable, but could not resist in indulging some outsize pride in

---

[23]See infra, ch. v, pp. 289-99.

[24]Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 893-99.

[25]Le Journal de Québec, Sept. 30, 1851. See also ibid., Oct. 7, 1851; British Whig, Sept. 25, 1851.

Canada's own achievements:

> By hostile rivalry we can gain nothing, and must necessarily lose much. The natural field of exertion and activity that lies before both countries is the same; it is large enough for both, and we may there, by mutual aid, gather peaceful triumphs far more magnificent and enduring than any of those miserable successes which are stained by human blood . . . We would remember that in all our national intercourse the great rule of individual Christianity--'Do as you would be done by.' We would go hand-in-hand while each pursues its own magnificent career, and, by making ourselves a credit to the religion we profess and the freedom we enjoy, we would gradually persuade other nations no longer to fear our power or envy our greatness, but to follow our example and to emulate our triumphs.[26]

It was not surprising that many Canadians outside of the political left were prepared to accommodate the realities of continental power-politics and economics. A nation which no longer demanded 54° 40' on her northern border, and did fifty million dollars worth of business with the Canadian provinces by 1856,[27] was bound to win some active friends, or at least modify the rancour of her outright enemies. Few Canadians would have dared two decades before to claim during strained diplomatic relations that the Americans and British were of one family "bound together by the most sacred and endearing ties of friendship and brotherly love."[28] Fewer still would have delineated at length as Charles Sangster did in his

---

[26] British Whig, Sept. 7, 1856.

[27] La Minerve, Dec. 6, 1856.

[28] One M.P.P. to Sec. of State, London, C.W. recd. June 28, 1856, C.O. 42/608. See also J. Rose to E. Ellice, Montreal, Dec. 15, 1856, Ellice Papers, vol. XXXII, P.A.C.

poem "England and America" their common culture, and placed the names of Webster, Cooper, and Irving along with Milton, Shakespeare, and Pope![29]

(ii) American Society and Politics

Canadian observations upon American society and politics steadily assumed more importance than atavistic responses to American expansionism. There was generally less concern for what the United States was to do with Canada, than with what the Americans were doing to themselves. In part, this quasi-objective view was a reflection of the changing thrust of American democracy in the eighteen-fifties. The internal social ferment produced by abolitionism, nativism, and westward expansion had usurped the primacy of manifest destiny and filibustering as national concerns.

American quiescence on her northern borders thus allowed Canadians a free peep-show into social decadence. The symptoms of social breakdown were in manifest profusion--nativism, slavery, violence, prostitution, divorce, and general social insubordination. Causes were less important to discover than morals, and the moral of this tale was that democracy applied in a social context could not survive. American republicanism was thus no longer an abstract political negative for Canadian conservatives to speculate upon, but a socially proven failure.

The gradual displacement of republicanism as a source of

---

[29] C. Sangster, The St. Lawrence and Saguenay and Other Poems, (New York: Miller & Orton, 1856), pp. 154-57.

political comment was especially apparent in the growing disinterest of the left in either annexation or even in democratic political forms. Certainly the clear-grits and the rouges displayed an early interest in the political benefits accruing from American institutions, but after the subsidence of annexation their interest clearly waned. The dictates of political orthodoxy no doubt had some influence in producing this disinterest, but the increasing concern of the left in the social results of political theory also turned them away from American institutions.

Their age and experience with the vagaries of American republicanism caused Papineau and Mackenzie to recede to an outdated type of republicanism epitomized by Jefferson's thought. Although Mackenzie admired the openness of American society, its dynamic electoral process, and pressed for the importation of more popular innovations such as popular conventions and the secret ballot,[30] he ignored most of the American political tradition since Jackson as invalid.[31] He no doubt commiserated with fellow 'rebels' and 'old reformers' like Isaac Buchanan and W. N. Wells when they communicated their bitter feelings upon the Jacksonian betrayal to him: "Since Van Buren betrayed us in 1838, for which I thank God! I helped to defeat him in 1840, down to his hypocritical 'free

---

[30] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Aug. 18, 1853; Oct. 27, 1853; Dec. 21, 1853; May 22, 1857; Aug. 2, 1857.

[31] Ibid., May 2, 1856; Nov. 14, 1856. See also Lillian Gates, "Mackenzie's Gazette: An Aspect of W.L. Mackenzie's American Years," XLVI (Dec., 1965).

soil' movement in 1848, I have given up the Democrats, and the Whigs, or at least the leaders, are scarcely Republicans after the school of Jefferson."[32] Mackenzie went one step further on the Whigs when he berated Thurlow Weed and other American politicians for having done more to retard the progress of freedom in Great Britain and France than all the efforts of European despots and politicians. In a parting shot of spleen at Weed, he claimed that if he had his life to relive he would only omit "the years spent in this republic."[33]

Papineau, although more temperate, saw little that was redemptive in the politics of the republic, except its original constitution and its open electoral system.[34] The prospect of a protectionist Whig administration under Millard Fillmore and of the Whig aristocrats like Webster made Papineau pine for a return to "ces Apôtres de l'égalité et du patriotisme le plus noble, les Jefferson et les Jackson."[35] Papineau also yearned for the patricians of the early republic when seigneurial tenure was under attack. Although he appreciated Sir Allan MacNab and the "lumières d'integrité

---

[32] W. B. Wells to W. L. Mackenzie, Prescott, C. W., Mar. 20, 1850. See also I. Buchanan to W. L. Mackenzie, Toronto, June 28, 1856; W. L. Mackenzie to A. N. Buell, Washington, Mar. 15, 1850, Mackenzie Papers, Ontario Archives.

[33] W. L. Mackenzie to Thurlow Weed, Aug. 9, 1849, N.Y. Mackenzie Papers, P.A.C. (originals in Rush Rhees Library, U. of Rochester).

[34] L. J. Papineau to the Electors of Montreal, Petite Nation, Nov. 24, 1851 (Montreal, 1851), 2 pp., Papineau Papers, P.A.C.

[35] Papineau to his son, Amedée, Dec. 12, 1850; same to same, Mar. 20, 1857; Papineau-Bourassa Collection, A.P.Q.

politique" among the right-wing conservatives for their political support of seigneurial tenure, he preferred the abstract refuge of aristocratic ideals in the early American republic: "Il faudrait avoir autant de calme et de génie qu'en a eu Jefferson, autant de calme et vertu qu'en avait Washington pour excercer cette plénitude de puissance sans en abuser."[36]

The issue of annexation further divided the French Canadian left. It is generally accepted that the rouges officially promoted the cause of annexation in 1850.[37] Once that movement was routed, there is little evidence after 1850 of anything but admiration of republican institutions.[38] Papineau on the other hand was never an unqualified proponent of annexation. At the height of the movement he acted largely as a negative catalyst against the Union rather than as a positive force for annexation. Although he did publish a letter in L'Avenir in November of 1849 supporting the principle, he remained conspicuously silent upon the request of the Upper Canadian tories in Hamilton to co-operate in the formation of

---

[36]L. J. Papineau to A. M. Christie, Nov. 9, 1854, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., v. 581, A.P.Q.

[37]See L'Avenir, July 2, 14, 26, 31; Sept. 1, 15, 20, 27, 29, 1849; Aug. 23, Oct. 5, 1850; A. Dessaulles, Six Lectures . . . (Montreal, 1851). J. Monet, "French Canada and the Annexation Crisis, 1848-50," C.H.R. (Sept., 1966), pp. 249-64.

[38]L'Avenir, Oct. 16, 1856; see also ibid., June 17, 1852; Feb. 22, 1856; July 8, 1856; Aug. 7, 1857.

three Canadian states to join the Union.[39] Even at the height of his enthusiasm for annexationist fortunes in the Quebec by-election of 1850, Papineau still had his reservations. In a letter to his staunch friend and proponent of manifest destiny, Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan of Albany, Papineau expressed grave doubts about the American political system:

> Cette demande imprévu d'annexion semble être un secours providentiel qui nous advient, mais, par contre et comme pour nous nuire, voilà que votre Congrès est moins sage cette année qu'il ne l'a jamais été en aucun autre temps. Au début je pouvais expliquer et excuser la lenteur de l'Election du Speaker en vue de l'immensité des intérêts qui s'y rattachaient mais le même archanement se prolonger pour l'élection du serjeant d'armes et des portiers devaient un enfantillage difficile à excuser.[40]

After 1850, Papineau rarely raised the question of annexation in a positive way, except during the brief diplomatic scuffle between Britain and the United States over Cuba in late 1855. On that occasion he reflected somewhat disconsolately that "si les Etats-Unis avaient offert pour les Canadas la Dîme de ce qu'ils ont offert pour Cuba, ils feraient partie de l'Union."[41] Yet it is unlikely that had annexation been as tangible a reality in 1855 as it was in 1837 or 1849, Papineau would have been any more energetic in achieving it

---

[39] Ibid., Nov. 3, 1849; H. B. Wilson to L. J. Papineau, Aug. 28, 1849; D. Latte to L. J. Papineau, Montreal, Jan. 21, 1849, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., A.P.Q.

[40] L. J. Papineau to E. B. O'Callaghan, Montreal, Feb. 1, 1850, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.

[41] L. J. Papineau to his wife, Nov. 11, 1855, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., v. 106, A.P.Q.

than he had been on those two former occasions.

In Canada West, annexation received even less sympathy from the clear grits and old Reformers like Mackenzie. Despite their radical-republican political platform, the clear grits had never advocated unqualified annexation. They merely expressed a conviction early in the development of the movement that annexation would likely be the result if certain vital reforms were not made in Canada. One such concession was Canada's control of her own commerce, which if not granted by the Mother Country, would lead to separation, and likely annexation.[42] Yet when pressed upon the issue as they were by the moderates, the clear grits receded to a position where they admitted annexation was not politically feasible, and that a federal union was perhaps a better alternative.[43] By 1852, McDougall no longer found it necessary even to defend American politics, as he damned the Whigs generally for their elitist attitudes towards the "great unwashed," and Daniel Webster specifically for his senile and drunken performances in Congress.[44]

As William Lyon Mackenzie returned to Canada in 1849 under most stringent conditions of loyalty, he made no mistake in communicating to his correspondents his distrust of everything even remotely

---

[42] North American, Mar. 21, 1851. See also, Ibid., May 24, 1850.

[43] North American, Dec. 13, 1850.

[44] Ibid., Mar. 18, 1852.

republican:- "Annexation, elective legislative councils - elective governor etc. are lures to divert the people from seeking practicable reforms - from using the constitution from the general good, from the working out the problem of Responsible Government."[45] By 1853 Mackenzie was probably more relaxed and was then found predicting the inevitability of annexation, but only if Canadians should strive for premature national status. As was typical of his woolly thought, Mackenzie was next found in 1856 conjuring a dark plot by President Buchanan to seize Canada by economic subversion.

What most destroyed the unanimity of the left upon the United States was their common concern with the moderates upon the three alarming social developments - nativism, slavery, and violence. Only the rouges had any faith in American abilities to solve their problems by democratic means. Nativism appeared not to worry the rouges, since they believed French Canada would be delivered out of the bondage of anglo-saxondom into republican equality and freedom. According to L.A. Dessaulles, French Canadians would for the first time since the Conquest be masters of their own house because of the written guarantees provided by the American constitution:

> Notre nationalité court donc avec l'Angleterre les plus grands risques!! Et personne ne peut nier qu'avec les institutions qu'elle nous a données, nous ne soyions à sa merci. Avec les Etats-Unis, au contraire nous avons dans les institutions mêmes toutes les garanties nécessaires. Personne n'aura le droit ni le pouvoir de s'immiscer dans nos affaires locales; nous serons les

---

[45] W.L. Mackenzie to J. Lesslie, N.Y., Nov. 23, 1849, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O. For a shomewhat contrary view see J. Lesslie to Mackenzie, Toronto, Jan. 30, 1850, ibid.; Marcus Gunn Diaries, entries Oct. 18, 1849; Jan. 10, 1850, July 4, 1850; Marcus Gunn Papers, P.A.C.

> maîtres absolus de notre organisation intérieure: nous ferons notre constitution, nous règlerons notre administration locale sans l'intervention d'aucun pouvoir politique extérieur, serait-ce même le gouvernement fédéral. Les lois exceptionelles sont chose impossible avec les institutions Américaines; sous le régime colonial, elles sont les fonds du système.[46]

Dessaulles was even so naive to suggest that Protestantism was not so hostile to Catholicism in the United States and that there were a considerable number of cases where Protestants contributed to the erection of Catholic churches![47] The rouges similarly glossed over the evils of slavery and the increasing violence in the territories by claiming that worse oppression existed in England and that new territories like California possessed model constitutions.[48]

Other rouges disagreed markedly with their brethren upon the two social issues of slavery and violence. On the latter subject Joseph Doutre suggested to the Institut Canadien that all was not well in the golden utopia of California. Revealing a fundamentally conservative social outlook, Doutre scored the violence of that society:

> Un exemple que nous avons encore sous les yeux fera voir la nécessité d'application de cette verité, pour le bon ordre de la société et de la famille. Nous avons vu dernièrement, en California, des bandes d'assassins, et de voleurs massacrer et piller pendant quelque temps impunément. A quoi tenait l'impunité

---

[46] L.A. Dessaulles, Six Lectures..., p. 173. See also L'Avenir, July 5, 28, 31, 1849.

[47] Ibid., p. 179.

[48] L'Avenir, Dec. 20, 1849; Feb. 1, 1856; Oct. 30, 1856; Aug. 7, 1857.

> qui a couvert leurs actes, dans les premiers jours de leur apparition? Au fait bien simple que la doctrine de l'intérêt des familles et de la société n'a pas été de suite bien entendu et mise en pratique. Les chefs de la famille, à la première nouvelle des vols et des assassinats qui se commetaient à San Fransisco se renforment dans leur maison respective, afin de la couvrir de leur protection.[49]

Doutre's whole discourse was in fact anchored in the social philosophy of Tocqueville and dedicated to prove the conservative hypothesis that Canada was in a state of transition from an aristocratic to a democratic society. Within it were also heavy overtones of Catholicism, in that society was seen ideally by Doutre to be the product of mutually co-operative interests, rather than the sum of mutually antagonistic individual interests.

Other rouges could not abide the naiveté of L'Avenir's optimistic faith in republicanism. Le Pays endorsed Frémont over Buchanan in 1856 not because he would be more likely to espouse annexation but because he stood against slavery: "Ce n'est pas comme partisan du système politique américan plutôt que nous nous sommes prononcé en faveur du colonel Frémont; mais c'est comme philanthrope comme partisan de la liberté universelle, et nous croyons que la grande majorité de nos compatriotes partagent nos opinions à cet égard."[50] Louis-Joseph Papineau's objections to slavery were more fundamental than even this minor revision of the rouge position, since he argued that the northern abolitionists were hypocrites for

---

[49] J.B.E. Dorion, L'Institut Canadien en 1852 (Montreal, 1852), W.H. Rowen, P.A.C., pamphlet collection, p. 190. See also C. Dumesnil, Reflexions Préliminaires (Montreal, 1849), p. 40.

[50] Le Pays, Oct. 30, 1856. See also ibid., Oct. 26, 1856.

focussing solely upon the political and legal status of the slaves. By implication the orthodox rouge position was also hypocritical since it ignored the social and economic status of slaves, and more important, free Negroes. In an extremely trenchant letter to Dr. O'Callaghan, Papineau prophesied quite accurately the post civil-war development of race relations:

> Ces farouches républicains du Nord qui ne peuvent voir l'esclavage des noirs sans insulter à leur confédérés blancs font malgré leur hypocrites déclamations, le sort des noirs libres au milieu d'eux plus intolérable que la déplorable institution imposée jadis à l'Angleterre à ses colonies, ne fait malheureux des noirs asservis. Ils supportent un travail indu et mal payé; les noirs libres ont à supporter l'outrage et l'insulte à tous les instants de leur vie; ils doivent haïr et mépriser l'hypocrisie de lois qui les déclarent citoyens, et la fourbe des blancs qui par ses dédains et ses repulsions les flétrit et les repousse incessement de tout droit à de la civilité et à de la bienviellance. Ces adorateurs de la piastre, en ont-ils jamais glissé dans un tronc pour améliorer le sort des noirs. Ont-ils des fonds pour leur donner des bourses dans les collèges et des lits dans les hôpitaux avec les blancs. Ont-ils des déclamations annoncant d'avance que les noirs qui pendant un nombre d'années auront été moraux, industrieux, à l'abri de tout censure des tribunaux et de bonnes manières, seront admis dans les salons, les assemblées, les théatres et les églises avec la même faveur qu'ils étendraient à un blanc placé dans un situation analogue...Moins de verbiage contre l'esclavage, et le courage de tendre une main amie, vers le noir pour élever sa condition sociale, et d'ouvrir plus souvent la bourse que la bouche, pourrait faire respecter la sincérité des négrophiles du Nord. Si c'est impossible ils doivent vouloir que tous les noirs libres ou esclaves soient rendus à l'Afrique ou parqués ensemble dans l'Antilles.[51]

Whether Papineau was actuated by the same sort of paternalism that drove him to care for the physical and moral welfare of his habitants, or by

---

[51] L.J. Papineau to Dr. O'Callaghan, Jan. 21, 1856, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C. See also same to same, Feb. 1, 1850, ibid.

the sympathetic socio-economic status of the French Canadian and the Negro is difficult to ascertain. On the one hand he spoke in the same letter of true philanthropy towards the blacks and the role of the nation and of religion in breaking down the barriers of race. Paradox that he was, Papineau could still conclude, that despite its present bleak conditions, the United States "sont sous les rapports politiques le meilleur pays qu'il y ait au monde."[52]

The ambivalence of the left upon the social evils of the republic was no less apparent among the clear grits and old reformers of Upper Canada. Mackenzie and his circle mentioned slavery but rarely, but when they did they universally condemned it with all the moral rectitude of the abolitionists.[53] On the few occasions when the North American entered the fray, McDougall was as trenchant as George Brown on such topics as the Fugitive Slave Bill.[54] Yet, by the mid-eighteen fifties it appeared as if these same ultra-reformers who had now merged with the Brownite faction had lost the faith of the anti-slavery forces in Canada West. These same politicians were now accused of being a mere extension of the old Locofocos and even of being "white yankees who came to this free country for more liberty but who true to their inferior training and dirty instincts, are carrying into practice here the same tricks as

---

[52] Ibid.

[53] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, April 21, 1853; Dec. 21, 1855; J. DeWitt to W.L. Mackenzie, June 13, 1856, Montreal, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O., Isaac Buchanan to W.L. Mackenzie, Toronto, June 28, 1856, ibid.

[54] North American, Oct. 9, 1850; Apr. 4, 1851; April 1, 1852.

they would have done at home."[55] The ambivalence of clear-grit comment on the United States was perhaps best reflected in contradictory articles upon the violent tenor of life at the gold-diggings of California. Early in 1851 McDougall reprinted a letter from a correspondent delineating the recurrent pattern of murders and robberies, yet six months later he reprinted a sympathetic account of California's legislative achievements.[56]

Given the unevenness of the response from the political left upon either the issue of political annexation or the purity of American society, it then becomes of some value to examine the counter-reaction of the centrist parties to the disorganized left. When English Canadians contemplated the evils of internal republicanism they no longer recited the frantic litany of the Compact. Terse ad hoc declamation sufficed to discredit the clear-grits and the rouges. Whereas the Compact Tories might have been tempted to tilt upon the abstract grounds of constitutional theory with such subversives as Mackenzie or Perry, George Brown dismissed their platform of 1850 as thoroughly irrelevant rationalizations. The fundamental question now was whether one social order was more viable materially and morally than another:

---

[55] Provincial Freeman, Dec. 8, 1955, April 11, 1857. Cited in A. L. Murray, "Canada and the Anglo-American Anti-Slavery Movement, A Study in International Philanthropy," unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, U. of Penn., 1960, pp. 315-16.

[56] North American, Oct. 21, 1850; Mar. 28, 1851.

> 'Responsible Government' says Mr. Perry, 'is itself not a reform, but a principle in government.' And what more is the republican system but another principle in government? Neither form will ensure justice and prosperity to any country; they can but furnish aid towards developing the industry and intelligence and moral principles of the people; and if we are to judge the two systems by their fruits, the high-toned principle of British legislation and the solidity and purity and prosperity of the British government, labouring as it does against the sore evils of an over-crowded population, will not suffer by contrast with the tyranny and restlessness of Republican France, or of the corruption and immorality of slave-holding, slave-extending Republican America. No constitutional system has any magical charm in it to make a country prosperous. That system is the best which works the most harmoniously, which gives the greatest security to life and property, which inspires the most confidence in its stability and permanence, which best moulds itself to the matured verdict of public opinion, and which extends equal protection to all classes of the community.[57]

When it therefore came time to dismiss the clear-grits, Brown scarcely gave them more consideration than grievance-mongers and disturbers of the public peace.[58] When the Montreal Pilot contemplated the secret designs of the rouges for annexation in the elections of 1856, it discredited them by referring repeatedly to the "licentiousness of republicanism." Mindless loyalty to Great Britain was demanded from the electors not so much upon the grounds that Britain possessed superior "time-honoured institutions," but that Canadians would be stamped with the "plague-spot of slavery."[59] The emphasis in English Canada upon the threat of internal republicanism had thus shifted

---

[57] Globe, Mar. 23, 1850.

[58] Ibid., Dec. 20, 1849; Mar. 28, 1850.

[59] Montreal Pilot, Sept. 23, 1856.

markedly from the siege mentality, from an alert against the propaganda of subversion to the hygenic one, an alert against the social diseases of American republicanism.

In their regard of the political left, the bleus were less concerned with anti-American social prophylactics than with preserving the citadel from imminent capture by international anarchism. What distinguished them from the English Canadian moderates was their identification of the rougeism with European radicalism. To them the 'demagogues' of the left went far beyond the institutional status quo in the United States, because they attacked the very fibre of society itself. Most serious to Joseph Cauchon and Ludger Duvernay was their anti-institutionalism, particularly their anti-clericalism:

> Eh bien, messieurs, les rouges de Montreal, vous avez été surpassés à votre grand étonnement sans doute. Vous qui prenez intérêt dans le gouvernement des Etats-Unis, êtes-vous pour l'abolition de la présidence, et des Sénats? Etes-vous pour l'abolition des dimanches, des prières, des serments sur la Bible, de l'enseignement religieux? Faites de nobles efforts, et vous pourriez égaler vos confrères des Etats-Unis. Les gens de votre trempe dans tous les pays, ne trouveront jamais assez de liberté dans le monde tant qu'il y aura des lois.[60]

What was perhaps most distinctive in the bleu rejection of the left was the constant and almost hysterical reference to rouge demagogery and socialism.[61] Much more so than English Canadians were they fond of caricaturing particular personalities and their

---

[60] Le Journal de Québec, Dec. 21, 1851, taken from La Minerve, Dec. 20, 1851. See also ibid., Mar. 4, 1852.

[61] See supra, ch. 1, pp. 80-84.

inordinate appetite for power. This classic mode of anti-revolutionary declamation was used particularly against Papineau and Desaulles. After the coup d'état, it was certain that the former would be offered "la présidence à vie, l'empire même si'il le désire."[62] No less a fear among the bleus was the conviction that the demagogic rouges would lead French Canada down the slopes of democratic anarchy. E.P. Taché was so convinced of this return to barbarism "où nous couperions fraternellement la gorge comme on le fait dans les républiques de L'Amérique du Sud" that he thanked heaven for the presence in Canada of the anglo-saxon population, whatever their faults.[63]

If any political group in Canada inherited the conspiratorial outlook of tory reaction, it was, then, the French Canadian moderate. Although he participated in the general and ritual condemnation of American society, and had little fear of its territorial domination, he still nourished a persistent neurosis of revolutionary subversion. This fear stemmed from international, but particularly European sources, since that area alone had preserved and amplified the democratic revolutionary ideology of the eighteenth century.[64]

The moderate's view of republican politics had become so intimately bound up by the eighteen fifties with a particular view of American society that it becomes impossible to separate the one

---

[62] La Minerve, Aug. 14, 1852; Dec. 12, 21, 1851; May 17, 1851; Mar. 23, 1852.

[63] E.P. Taché to J.C. Chapais, Jan. 13, 1855, cited in J. Barnard, ed., Mémoires Chapais, II, pp. 114-15.

[64] See supra, ch. 1, pp. 79-83.

from the other. The consequence of this homogeneous outlook was an erosion of the former politico-constitutional view of the United States. The view of American politics was henceforth less theoretical and more tactile in nature. To use a modern analogy, Canadian observers of the American political scene had become by the fifties behaviourists rather than political theorists.

Perhaps one of the fundamental reasons for this transformed outlook was that more and more Canadians visited the republic and had therefore to depend less upon theoretical constructs for a refutation of the republican political process. Almost all so-called travellers to the United States rarely returned fellow-travellers in republicanism, but usually found enough evidence to confirm them in the virtues of their own representative process. Even the somewhat pro-American entrepreneur and bureaucrat, William Hamilton Merritt, observed during one of his many visits to Washington that politics played too prominent a part in American society: "The conversation is all confined to one Topic, Politicks, Politicks, - Politicks - who will be selected out of the different candidates, in the approaching conventions for President by the two great parties."[65] Yet other travellers were so disgusted by this republican scramble for office that they called its hypocrisy to the attention of their fellow Canadians:- "The whole system appears to be a base scramble

---

[65]W.H. Merritt to his Wife, Washington, Apr. 28, 1848, Merritt Papers (microfilm), P.A.C. See also J. Jones to W.H. Merritt, Stamford, C.W., July 1, 1853, ibid; Montreal Gazette, Aug. 19, 1856.

for office and pelf; presenting a hideous caricature of what a subject would think citizens governed in Republican simplicity should manifest in the maintenance of the institutions of a country in which the government is all in the hands of the people, and which theoretically, at least, is for the interest and benefit of the people...."[66] These personal testimonials against American democracy were most vehement when pronounced Canadian emigrés who wished to return to Canada. They confessed their utter repugnance at having witnessed raw democracy in action.[67]

Yet another means by which Canadians were familiarized with the United States was by the press, which either maintained correspondents in New York or Washington, or culled the American partisan press for internal evidence of reprobation. Upon an examination of the Richmond Enquirer's strictures against northern office-seekers from Vermont, the tory Colonist's editor, Hugh Scobie, compared the American spoils system to the superior British system of dispensing patronage:-

> We do not say that the British system does not produce these nuisances; it unfortunately produces too many; but it certainly holds out fewer inducements to them than the American, which throws into the scramble of every general election, all the offices in the state. Such temptation is too much for the suckers. We think that the moral effect of it is pernicious; and that its tendency is to induce the

---

[66] Toronto Leader, Oct. 31, 1955.

[67] See A. Gorham to R. Baldwin, San Francisco, Feb. 25, 1850, Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 642-44.

> worst kind of men to pursue politics as a trade. In the second place, we consider the British system superior to the American, because the rendering of offices permanent, which are not necessarily political, may justly be supposed to secure an effective discharge of their duties.[68]

Even the London Free Press, which strongly promoted Canadian-American trade relations, indulged in unfavourable comment upon the "tyrant of public opinion" in the United States. Josiah Blackburn reprinted a series of letters from the New York Tribune which roundly condemned the intolerant character of American public opinion on such issues as slavery. The perpetual resort to violence against the political dissenter was thoroughly reviled by the Tribune: "This is our king, our executive, and our judiciary. Judge Lynch lives in our drawing room, makes our laws, and controls our press - and with how much justice?"[69] Although less indignant in tone, a similar article from Le Courrier des Etats-Unis found its way into the French Canadian press. It depicted with crushing objectivity the violent election battles between Tammany gangs, and such colourfully-named groups as the Dead Rabbits, the Rock Boys, and the Forty Thieves.[70] Reports of similar violence from Kansas, Baltimore, and New Orleans further confirmed Lower Canadians in the belief that American order and liberty had been sacrificed on the altar of violence.[71]

---

[68] British Colonist, Dec. 14, 1852. See also Globe, Apr. 9, 1850; May 17, 1851.

[69] London Free Press, Apr. 24, 1856.

[70] Le Courrier du Canada, Nov. 11, 1857.

[71] Le Journal de Québec, July 20, 1850, Nov. 12, 1850; New Era, June 30, 1857, Mar. 18, 1858.

Despite this growing conviction in the debased state of American society, mid-Victorian Canadians were not really sure of its cause. Some still adhered to the early tory belief that imperfect political institutions lay at its root, yet others were convinced of its social source. An issue upon which this causal confusion revealed itself clearly was that of legislative corruption in the United States. Most conservatives and reformers were agreed upon the universal turpitude of Congress and the state legislatures.[72] Conservative journals like the Montreal Gazette looked at the moral, political, and social evils of the city of New York much as Hobbes did the corrupted corporations of the Commonwealth. Like Hobbes, the Gazette believed firmly in institutional sources as well as cures for these evils. The lessons for Canadians from this unfortunate extension of "the democratic principle" in New York, was "to seek for that government by checks, which has been the strength and safety of the two great anglo-saxon nations."[73] The moderate reform journals also ranted at length about the compacts entered into daily between railway lobbies and the politicians, but they placed the blame upon the legislators themselves.[74] Joseph Cauchon ascribed cause to both public men and their institutions, but it was obvious upon elaboration

---

[72]Journal de Québec, Sept. 14, Oct. 15, 1850; Dec. 6, 1851; Montreal Gazette, Oct. 26, 1855.

[73]Montreal Gazette, Mar. 18, 1853.

[74]London Free Press, Feb. 24, 1857.

that he favoured the former as the ultimate cause: "Si la société américaine n'était-elle même corrompue jusque dans ses entrailles, y souffrirait-on la corruption qui règne dans la région politique et qui va croissant dans une progression effrayante? La vertu, l'integréte, le désentéressement et la morale publique y nagent isolés et désolés dans un gouffre sans limite et sans fonds."[75]

Because of its behavioural approach, the moderate press was also more inclined to greater charity towards American politicians and their political style. Conscientious pursuit of the inductive method dictated that they should find at least some redemptive features in the American political system. The tories, although prepared to extend consideration to the American political mechanism, would concede little to their political or social behaviour. The Montreal Gazette conceded competence and clarity to the presidential messages of Millard Fillmore, but always returned to the hypocritical statements of abstract right therein while slavery cursed the American nation.[76] Liberals on the other hand extended a few compliments to Americans, especially upon their political gamesmanship. The Toronto Leader was highest in its praise of American parties, and especially the Democratic party for their ability to bury the hatchet once a convention or election was over:

---

[75] Journal de Québec, Mar. 29, 1851.

[76] Montreal Gazette, Dec. 6, 1850; Apr. 28, 1851.

> Look at this mode in which our neighbours do these things. The Democratic party is desirous to elect a Democratic candidate for President. Here is a common ground of agreement. Beyond it is all antagonism even within the party itself. When it comes to the question, who of the prominent members of the Democratic Party shall be elected, there are numerous and adverse responses. This question cannot be settled to the satisfaction of all. The friend of all the would-be candidates but one must be disappointed. But do they in consequence of that disappointment, oppose the candidate selected? On the contrary, every man of them, no matter whom he supported at first, he falls in with the policy of the party. To do otherwise he knows would be to invite defeat.[77]

The Leader was even moderately tolerant of the violence of American politics. The editor left-handedly complimented them by claiming that Canadians were not far behind Americans in the art of personal altercation:- "The license of language, the grossness of insult, the swell of the bully, the large numbers of informal challenges show that in everything but physical courage we fully match the Americans."[78] What was disturbing to the Leader was not so much the periodic outbreaks of electoral violence in the United States, since Canada had her own election riots, but American pride in upholding such contests "as an instance of superior manhood, and of high independence of republican citizenship."[79]

As has been suggested, the sources of identity which these politicians drew upon for their anti-Americanism were social ones. In

---

[77] Leader, Jan. 11, 1854. See also, ibid, Sept. 7, 1853; London Free Press, May 15, 1849.

[78] Ibid., June 30, 1858.

[79] Leader, Aug. 16, 1854.

English Canada this distinctness was generally expressed in arrogant rather than defensive terms. Gone was what Professor Wise has called "the Vesuvian mentality" of the Upper Canadian Tory, only to be supplanted by another characteristic he has identified as "British Israelitism."[80] Stripped of much of its frothy theological justification that Israelitism had been transformed by the eighteen fifties into a crude and secular social gospel. If it had a religious equivalent any longer, it was evangelical Methodism, not high Anglicanism.

In French Canada the same anti-American social gospel caught hold, although its driving force there was the Roman Catholic Church. Because of its affiliation it was necessary that the lesson be altered in its tone and emphasis. The Vesuvian mentality persisted longer there because of the threat of American society to Catholic education and marriage in Lower Canada. The magnification of petty racial differences also played less of a part in Lower Canada since that people already felt racially unique. But beyond these differences in moral outlook, there was a surprising coincidence in French and English Canadian assumptions on secular development in the United States.

The institution of slavery was the foremost blot upon American society and politics. Canadians derived more ego-gratification from

---

[80] S.F. Wise and R.C. Brown, Canada Views the United States, p. 42; S.F. Wise, "Sermon Literature...", United Church Bulletin, 1965, p. 14; S.F. Wise, "God's Peculiar Peoples," in W.L. Morton, ed., The Shield of Achilles, p. 59.

the 'peculiar institution' than from any other American flaw. One of the foremost sources of self-congratulation to conservative Canadians was the irony that American liberty and equality did not extend to its whole population. As the foremost authority on this subject has put it:- "Canadians, when they thought of the matter at all were generally hostile to American slavery. Their hostility flowed to a large degree from their consciousness of being British, of being part of an Empire which had voluntarily taxed itself to free millions of human bondage. But such a consciousness produced no active participation in the anti-slavery movement. It was enough to somewhat smugly give thanks that they were not other men."[81] On the tory side, Bishop Mountain congratulated British statesmen and his fellow Anglican clerics upon their abolition of an institution which still haunted the American republic:

> The monstrous anomaly exists, the political contradiction unsurpassed rather unequalled in the world, - that some millions of men (it makes no particle of difference in the case, that their skins are not white), are held as mere articles of property by their fellow creatures, in a condition of studied and carefully contrived degradation under a bondage often marked by revolting cruelties, in a country which vaunts itself aloud to the world, as the only really free country upon earth, and unfurls the proud flag of its self-achieved independence, inscribed as it were in broad and conspicuous characters, with a proclamation of the principle, that all men were born free and equal. The slaveholding interest in the meantime, maintains its supremacy in the chair of Government... and within the halls of legislation: the wars of the

---

[81] A.L. Murray, "Canada and the Anglo-American Anti-Slavery Movement," p. 56.

> country are connected with the maintenance of slavery...[82]

George Brown also saw fit to head off the annexationist threat by a lengthy comparison in the Globe of British and American contributions to human liberty. A lengthy editorial was devoted to Britain's valiant struggle against Napoleon and subsequently the despots of Eastern Europe in the cause of liberty.[83] The melancholy history of the United States on the other hand merely exhibited the external expansion of slavery and the internal consolidation of slave-holding aristocracy.[84] Particularly obnoxious to Brown was the American tendency to support revolutions abroad in Hungary and Rome in the name of liberty and prevent its application at home:- "We turn with disgust from the men who have hearts apparently open for their sufferings, but shelter within their own country evils ten times greater than are to be found in the most despotic region of Europe."[85]

Abolitionism made considerable impact upon Canada, not as an active philanthropic organization, but merely as pious sentiment.[86]

---

[82] G.J. Mountain, "Thoughts on Annexation"..., p. 23. See also Montreal Gazette, Apr. 1, 1850, Jan. 24, 1853, July 11, 1855, May 12, 1857; Pilot, Dec. 4, 1849, Sept. 13, 1849, Aug. 31, 1855; Colonist, Oct. 4, 1850; Hamilton Gazette, Dec. 12, 1853.

[83] Globe, Oct. 30, 1849.

[84] Globe, Nov. 1, 3, 6, 15, 17, 1849.

[85] Ibid., Nov. 3, 1849.

[86] A.L. Murray, op. cit., ch. 3, pp. 57-79.

After the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, Canadian politicians, journalists, and clergymen generally denounced the American Congress for failing to keep the slaveholder aristocracy in check. On that issue American society and politics henceforth became inseparable from one another in Canadian eyes.[87] The works of abolitionists like Harriet Beecher Stowe were generally lauded in the Canadian press. The British Whig saw Uncle Tom's Cabin as the visitation of divine Providence upon a people steeped in immorality. Not only slaveowners but ministers, politicians, and an entire nation deserved divine punishment for their transgressions:

> And this is the image ye barter in, ye tobacco-chewing, yellow visaged, heartless, dogged Southerners, who hold up your heads amongst the favored ones of the earth, who dress up in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day, and who have the unblushing temerity to meet God face to face in his holy court, with the air of men who are continually doing him good service. But this is not to be wondered at, when even the Ministers of Religion from their pulpits uphold this state of things. Those, of course, are God-fearing men, who respect the laws and quote scripture, or rather twist it into shape, to give it a color to the sanction they afford to the bestial traffic, that any professedly Christian nation should purge from its midst, as it would a fearful leprosy or plague that threatened it with annihilation... If there be an enlightened nation under the sun that deserves to be visited with the severest judgements of heaven, it is that which authorizes by legislative enactment the traffic in human flesh - that upholds it by the passage and enforcing of such brutal laws as those now existing in the United States of America.[88]

---

[87] Ibid., p. 282.

[88] Whig, Jan. 4, 1854. See also ibid., Dec. 13, 1853, Globe, Apr. 24, 1852, Nov. 3, 1853; Anglo-American Magazine, V, pp. 450-58; Montreal Gazette, Sept. 20, Mar. 31, 1854; May 12, 1857.

Although the French Canadian press also rendered its homage to Mrs. Stowe, it did so in less righteous terms than its English Canadian counterpart. Social and political injustice were not the special preserve of Americans, therefore divine assistance not retribution was invoked on their behalf:- "Dans la paix, l'union et la fraternité une réforme utile à tous s'opérera sans doute dans le système actuel de l'esclavage pour la gloire d'une grande nation à la cause de l'humanité."[89] Others like Joseph Cauchon gloomily predicted that the slavery question could only be resolved by a war to the death between North and South, but did not ascribe any divine retribution to it.[90]

Canadians were also very lively to political and judicial change which might affect the status of the Negro. Presidential elections especially drew their attention since it was felt that the presidency was a powerful instrument for social and political change. Most newspapers were more sympathetic to the chances of pro-abolitionist candidates than compromisers. In 1856 the Globe and Le Pays supported the Republican candidate, John Frémont, because they considered him opposed to any further extension of slave territory.[91]

---

[89] La Minerve, Feb. 25, 1854.

[90] Le Journal de Québec, Nov. 12, 1850.

[91] Globe, June 19, Oct. 20, 1856; Le Pays, Oct. 21, 30, 1856; Montreal Gazette, Oct. 20, 1856. Le Journal de Québec, on the other hand supported Buchanan because it feared the possibility of annexation by the North should Frémont be elected; reported in Le Pays, Oct. 21, 1856.

The Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court in 1857 created further consternation among philanthropic Canadians. Their social sensibilities had always been aroused to a boil in those rare cases when a slave was returned from Canada in co-operation with the Fugitive Slave Bill,[92] but the complicity of the Supreme Court was too much to bear. Hector Langevin penned a jeremiad in Le Courrier du Canada upon the subject of the Dred Scott case, which in his view merely perpetuated the principle that "la couleur de la peau ou la sang est le seul titre que l'homme possède aux droits et privilèges du citoyen américain."[93]

Not all Canadians were so scandalized by the slave problem. Those who were directly in contact with the slave refugees in the extreme western end of the province were generally unconvinced of the virtues of abolition. The sitting conservative member for Kent, E. Larwill, kept up a decade-long fight in the Assembly against Negroes and Negro immigration into Canada.[94] By 1857 he had even succeeded in recruiting Colonel Prince of Essex, who had been an ex-benefactor of the Negro cause, to the support of a scheme of

---

[92]See Toronto Leader, July 22, 1854, reported from Le Pays.

[93]Le Courrier du Canada, Mar. 20, 1857.

[94]See Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1851, p. 182; Mirror of Parliament, Dec. 1, 1854.

colonizing Canada's Negro population on Manitoulin Island.[95] The depth of feeling of their constituency in the Sandwich area no doubt had much to do with Larwill's and Prince's perversion. The ugliness of the popular mood was apparent in a Windsor resident's complaint to John A. Macdonald upon an incident of Negro ruffianism on the Great Western Railway. The issue, he noted, was a serious one, because it affected Canadian commercial and diplomatic relations with the United States:

> There is a wide difference between a Slave escaping from his Master and availing himself of the protection of British laws, and the case of a rabble of black ruffians forcing their way into a train of cars and with violence abducting a Passenger upon a mere assumption that he is a Slave... The principle of allowing Negroes to take the law into their own hands is regarded as one likely to lead to evil consequences by all well-thinking men in these Western Counties who live amongst them; the tone of the American press is strong against this outrage; and it behooves our government to act with vigor, promptness and decision in this case...[96]

One Canadian traveller who took the trouble to visit the South was also jarred loose from his prejudices against slavery. In his account of his visit to the Southern states, he remarked upon the inaccuracy of the abolitionist literature, especially of the visions of cruelty conjured by Mrs. Stowe. Like the contemporary exponents of slavery in De Bow's Review or later apologists like Ulrich B. Phillips and T. Nelson Page, this Canadian commented upon the happy

---

[95] Mirror of Parlt., Legis. Cl. Debates, June, 1857.

[96] S.S. Macdonald to J.A. Macdonald, Sept. 30, 1858, Windsor, J.A. Macdonald Papers, vol. 336, pt. 2, P.A.C.

and contented state of the Negro, who would not trade, if given the choice, slavery for freedom. Even more impressive was the gentility of Virginia society which was a truer approximation of the "old country" than its Canadian counterpart. Yet when all was said and done, that observer was happy to return to his Canadian sanctuary with all its natural beauties and advantages, "Where happily there is neither the inclination nor the necessity for the existence of any such institution which is peculiar to the South."[97]

Another illiberal feature of American life to Canadians was the growth of nativism and its political manifestation, Know-Nothingism. Although many Canadians themselves were involved in a Protestant crusade of their own,[98] they viewed that movement in the United States as further evidence of American hypocrisy. Both liberal and conservative journals took their turns in making unfavourable comparisons between that movement and Orangeism in Canada or the persecution of the Huguenots by Louis XIV.[99] The Montreal Pilot was particularly trenchant in its criticism of a movement which "knows nothing of the industrial history of its own country" since Americans were so heavily indebted to Europe for their labour, intelligence, and

---

[97]"Remarks on the Southern States and Their Institutions by a Canadian," Anglo-American Magazine (Toronto, 1854), pp. 129-38. See also Montreal Gazette, Apr. 8, 1850 for obituary of Calhoun.

[98]Globe, Aug. 10, 1854. See supra, ch. i, pp. 46-58.

[99]New Era, Nov. 14, 1857; Hamilton Gazette, Jan. 25, 1855.

skill.[100] Other journals like the Leader were most incensed when they witnessed such illiberal fanaticism abroad in Canada against such groups as the Germans of Waterloo County.[101] Although French Canadians had less to fear from the remote crusade against popery in the United States than the internal one led by Brown and the Liberals of Canada West, there was expressed a periodic apprehension at comprehensive programmes for the anglification of immigrants such as that outlined by Governor Gardner of Massachusetts in 1855.[102] This concern was no doubt a reflection of recent French Canadian emigration to New England.

A greater source of concern to French Canadians were American educational theories, transmuted and transposed to Canada. In his reports on education in the early fifties, the new superintendent, Egerton Ryerson, made it plain that he would no longer pursue the Compact's previous competition with the State of New York:- "I have not viewed the noble and patriotic exertion of the American people in any spirit of jealousy....I hold up their example to the admiration and imitation of the people of Canada."[103] Ryerson soon became the focus of anti-American xenophobia for the Catholic

---

[100]Montreal Pilot, Aug. 16, 1854.

[101]Leader, Oct. 29, 1855; Nov. 5, 1858.

[102]La Minerve, Jan. 16, 1855. Journal de Québec.

[103]Superintendent's Report for 1851, in J.G. Hodgins, ed., Ryerson Memorial Volume (Toronto, 1889, Warwick and Sons), p. 91.

community which recognized the clear threat to the denominational character of Canadian education. In his widely publicized polemics against Ryerson, Reverend J.M. Bruyère of St. Michael's Cathedral in Toronto delineated the issues with a clarity that Bishop Strachan would have admired:

> The common schools presided over by Dr. Ryerson are but an importation from the New England States where they have produced their disastrous effects. Our common schools are but the worthy daughters of Yankee Land. Their contempt of all religion and its Ministers, infidelity, know-Nothingism, riot and bloodshed, have kept pace with the progress and prosperity of State Schoolism...What I mean to say is, that such total disregard of Christian feeling and good manners is the result of that system of education pursued in Common Schools, viz: the absence of religious training...Education without religion, will never cure the vices and ill-manners which are observable among the pupils of the Common Schools. Religion is the only antidote to crime.[104]

Defenders of French Roman Catholic interests were at one with Bruyêre in their fears of a godless system of education penetrating Lower Canada. Concern was expressed by the superintendent of education in Canada East, J.B. Meilleur, that French Canadians were fleeing into godlessness by their emigration to the United States. He advocated as remedies the dissemination of accurate information of conditions there, and the spending of one hundred thousand pounds for an educational system in the Townships.[105] The conservative

---

[104]Controversy Between Dr. Ryerson and J.M. Bruyère on the Appropriation of the Clergy Reserves Funds (Toronto, 1857), Leader and Patriot Office, pp. 44-45.

[105]J.B. Meilleur to M. Bois, May, 1852, Meilleur Papers, P.A.C.

press at the same time conducted a propaganda campaign in defence of Catholic education. In response to the taunts of the North American that Archbishop Hughes of New York advocated heretical notions of religious liberty and separation, Joseph Cauchon replied that the vital difference in Canada "n'est pas de savoir si une église dominera l'autre, mais simplement de savoir si certaines dénominations religieuses arracheront pour se les partager entre elles, les dotations religieuses légalement fait à l'une d'elles."[106]

The proof of the immorality produced by the American education was everywhere in her society and her politics. The bankruptcy of American morality was exhibited politically in the violence which erupted over the Kansas-Nebraska slave question. What most Canadian critics could not understand was the inability of Congress or State authorities to deal with the state of civil war which existed in Kansas. La Minerve placed its finger directly upon the familiar theme of insufficient institutional checks, and the determination of opposing parties to resort to go to any lengths to achieve their political objects:

> Que faut-il penser des principes de ces partis qui préfèrent laisser libres et impunis des anarchistes souillés de toute espèce d'actes de brigandage, de crimes et de meurtres affreux, plutôt que de se rallier à leur gouvernement pour faire cesser ces atrocités? Et pourquoi, si ce n'est l'un ou l'autre espérent par la faire triompher ses principes sur ceux de son adversaire? Comme si la cause qui ne peut réussir qu'a l'aide de pareilles horreurs ne devait pas associer son triomphe à l'infamie et à l'abomination.

---

[106] North American, Mar. 25, 1852; Sept. 16, 1853. Le Journal de Québec, Apr. 24, 1852; Oct. 21, 1854; Le Courrieur du Canada, May 27, 1857; La Minerve, Aug. 22, 1857.

> Mais quelle idée doit-on avoir d'un gouvernement, ou plutôt d'une administration et d'autorités à qui il manque la volonté ou la puissance de remplir leur premier devoir, celui de faire respecter des lois et la morale publique et de protéger la société contre toutes tentatives criminelles? On prétend que la question débattue si violemment du Kansas touche de près au maintien de la confédération des Etats-Unis, c'est-à-dire à leur existence même; mais l'impunité assureé à l'assemblée chez les partis et au crime chez les individus est de toutes les causes de désorganization celle qui conduit de plus directement et le plus sûrement au résultat que l'on prétend vouloir éviter.[107]

Even George Brown who initially supported the claims of the Free Soil Party in Kansas,[108] soon modified his position when he realized that the situation in that territory had deteriorated to a state of civil war. By September of 1856, Brown too was attributing causes to that frontier violence which were not far off original sin. He alluded specifically to the intemperate character of American politics, their capacity for exaggeration, and their failure to provide the requisite machinery of orderly territorial expansion.[109] More serious than even the violence in the territories was the assault of Charles Sumner of Massachusetts by Preston Brooks of South Carolina in the Senate

---

[107] La Minerve, Sept. 16, 1856. See also Leader, Oct. 29, 1855; J.C. Taché, Des Provinces de l'Amérique du Nord, pp. 104-118.

[108] Globe, May 29, 1856.

[109] Globe, Sept. 1, 1856. See also Gov. E. Head to G. Lewis, June 9, 1856, Toronto, Head Papers, vol. 4, P.A.C.; same to same, June 16, 1856, ibid.; Hamilton Gazette, June 4, 1855.

Chamber.[110] The Montreal Pilot was outraged at the small fine imposed on Brooks for such a serious public offence. Such inequity only confirmed the Pilot's conviction in the superiority of British "even-handed justice" to the American variety which exhibited a pliancy and convenience "beautifully graduated to the position of the offender."[111]

The conviction that the United States was descending into anarchy was confirmed by reports of lawlessness in California. Letters from that territory by Canadian emigrants and newspaper reports from Sacramento or San Francisco provided further condemnation of American society.[112] For Le Courrier du Canada criminal statistics alone were needed to tell the sorry tale of social disintegration, - 5000 arrests in a single year, 2500 convictions and 1300 detentions (720 for robbery, 20 for train robbery, 606 for suspected murder, 7 for arson, etc.)[113] For some the violent tenor of life in California was enough to convict an entire nation. One observer for the Anglo-American Magazine accordingly depicted the United States as a society under military siege, even in the urban East.

---

[110]For the Foote-Benton scuffle in the Senate, see Montreal Gazette, Apr. 26, 1850.

[111]Montreal Pilot, Jly 21, 1856.

[112]British Colonist, Nov. 16, 1852; La Minerve, Apr. 18, 1850; Hamilton Gazette, Mar. 8, 1852; British Whig, Aug. 28, 1851; Journal de Québec, Mar. 1, 1851; Wm. McGillivray to his mother, Nov. 15, 1864, San Francisco, McGillivray Papers, vol. 15, P.A.C.

[113]Le Courrier du Canada, Mar. 22, 1858.

> Need I avert to the murders which have made New York Philadelphia, and Baltimore famous all the world over, which in the second city have seriously affected the value of property, and in the last so terrified the inhabitants that churches have been closed in the evenings through dread of the savage and reckless population? Need I remind you of your leading cities, the tragedies of your firemen's fights and murderous mobs - and youths pervading your towns with knives and revolvers, have given you a deserved and world-wide reputation. Are not even your policemen armed with pistols, and in the exercise of a martial law, as if it were a time of siege of armed occupation are they not called upon to shoot your ruffians down? And yet in the face of all this, you have the temerity to say, "It is certain that there is more public order in the United States than anywhere else."[114]

Canadians were not so slow to ascribe cause to this American inability to maintain public order. One favourite theme was that Americans lacked a fundamental sense of filial subordination. No less a liberal than the well-travelled Irish-American, D'Arcy McGee, proclaimed his distaste for the precociousness of American youth. A fundamentally patristic view of society shone forth from his homily upon the hearth as the source of healthy diversity and order:- "The father is the first magistrate, and at the fireside, under parental sway alone, are good men and valuable members of society to be made! I admire many traits of American character: I honour their indomitable energy...but my reason cannot approve, and my heart revolts against a system which teaches children that they are persons before their time."[115] Worse yet, reasoned another observer of American manners,

---

[114] Anglo-American Magazine, V, pp. 422-23.

[115] New Era, Oct. 22, 1857. See also ibid., June 11, 1857.

there was little regard for the sanctity of the 'Domestic Hearth' in a country where "boarding" was a national pastime. Children hence had no privacy, "no holy calm, no daily example of order and self-denial, no evening lisping of prayer, the echo of the gentle tones of the nursing mother." It was not a far step from this unattended state that youths soon became intemperate in their language as well as deed, and a violent generation was born.[116]

A somewhat separate explanation was that which related to the lack of social subordination in the United States. Nowhere was the great chain of being broken on the rack of social change so much as it was in the United States. Everywhere in evidence was the man without social consequence, who had reached beyond his grasp into professions where he never belonged:- "They are like vessels without helm or anchor, having no natural resources within themselves, and having failed in acquiring any, they are driven to vice as their only amusement, or drag out a miserable existence."[117] Such misfits were a socially volatile element because they invariably combined as they did in the United States with the destitute, corrupting them with their social discontent. The depth of this republican malaise was felt to be deepest in the cities which were rife with a social disintegration uncommon in the agrarian era of Washington and Jefferson:

---

[116]Toronto Leader, Oct. 7, 1853.

[117]Anglo-American Magazine, V, p. 467. See also, Montreal Gazette, Apr. 1, 1850.

> And now in the great towns the armed force of the federal authorities is called in to protect the public treasury from the violence of starving people, who, in the cities of this new and in so large a proportion unsettled land, demand with demonstrations of physical force - work, bread, or death, luxury and vice in their most hateful features, have been triumphant among the republicans. The simple manners characteristic of the earlier days of the republic have passed away, the rich scorn the poor; the poor envy the rich and domineering employers. Corruption is rife in the high places...The lesson is one of which Canadian democrats should take good heed. Republicanism is no panacea for political or social evils.[118]

The final attribution of cause to the breakdown of law and order in the United States was the superficial one which related to the lack of institutional and legal checks. More often than not it was the old tory or the French Canadian bleu who ignored the social sources of depravity since they accepted it as the natural condition of man. The remedy lay not in environmental restoration of rural arcadias and domestic hearths, but in institutional remedies such as a sound magistracy, sound moral education, and legal checks upon crime. The comment of the Montreal Gazette upon the naiveté that surrounded the California experiment was a classic tory rejoinder upon American innocence in face of the brutal facts of European history:

> After the experience of the last 60 years in Europe, after the dreadful horrors and bloodshed that had there been attendants of republican ideas, it was strange that men actuated by a fierce thirst for gold should settle in a country by the thousands, and possessing neither government nor laws, quietly and peaceably carry on their avocations. Still more strange when the inhabitants exceeded 60,000 and the Congress of the United States had not framed for them a territorial government as by law it was bound to have done...The question is will law and

---

[118] Montreal Gazette, Nov. 17, 1857; London Free Press, Jan. 10, 1856.

> order be restored? They may but we must confess that to our view, the prospect is rather lugubrious. It is natural from the conflicting nature of the interests concerned, and the character of the men, that the very fierce passions must be engendered, and those of such a kind as not readily to be allayed.[119]

French Canadians similarly attributed American violence to the lack of an effective magistracy to prosecute criminals. La Minerve even instructed its readers in Machiavelli to draw the lessons of primitive justice. Americans, so the argument went, had failed to recognize in their popular folly that "toute infraction est un désordre et toute désordre entraine une punition. Plus le criminel est élévé, plus l'offense est grande et funeste, plus aussi la peine doit être terrible."[120] The fatal flaw in the American system of justice was that this naiveté concerning punishment was further extenuated by the absurdities of an elective magistracy and a corruptible jury system.

If Canadians had a final objection to American society it related to the status of women and the institution of marriage in that country. English Canadians were almost exclusively absorbed with the former concern and French Canadians with the latter. Although there was some vague deference to women's demands for

---

[119] Montreal Gazette, Sept. 25, 1850; Nov. 17, 1857.

[120] La Minerve, July 7, 1857.

amelioration of their social condition,[121] most English Canadian journalists manfully balked at any suggestion of female suffrage. The most liberal of the English Canadian newspapers, the North American, resorted to the dictates of primeval natural law to oppose the participation of women in the political arena:

> Nature has charged the male sex unmistakably with the duty of defence. Look at the man's superior physical power. Look at the tusk of the wild boar, at the spur of the cock, at the strength and courage of the Bull. When danger threatens the herd, where do you find the males? In front and on the flank, with the females and little ones in the centre. The males are the natural protectors....The mother cannot leave her infant, but the father may. He may go abroad and concert measures for the protection of his house; she must stay at home and minister to the almost hourly necessities of their progeny. - Nature does not seem to have made any provision for her absence to vote at political meetings or sit in Parliament during this period at all events. - Well, she has weaned the youngster and it is able to run alone. But it still requires her constant care. And behold, in the course of nature, in obedience to its laws, she is again in that interesting condition! And so the process continues until she is past child-bearing, and...has served her allotted purpose...To confer the Suffrage, is to confer the privilege of taking direct and active part in that government, and as nature has not in our opinion, formed woman for the business of government, nor allowed her time to attend to it, we are compelled, reluctantly of course, to deny that she has any right to the suffrage.[122]

---

[121] One genuine liberal, John Ryan, hoped for women's progress but knew it would be slow against the forces of conservatism:- "Progress doubtless will be slow against the Organized Hypocrisy of Popery, Protestantism, and Property, they are adhering to Frances Wright's Holy Bible alias the Declaration of Independence principles in lieu of British or American expedient compromise." Ryan to E.B. O'Callaghan, Quebec, July 24, 1854. O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.

[122] North American, Aug. 3, 1852. See also Aug. 17, 1852.

There was little doubt that the 'pernicious' doctrines of female suffrage were issuing from "a small party of strong-minded women in the neighbouring republic," women like Abby Kelly, Lucretia Mott, and Lucy Stone Blackwell (derisively labelled 'Ladies' and 'Amazons'). Their conventions throughout the urban northeastern United States in the eighteen fifties were perhaps regarded as the most serious social disturbance in that country since the Revolution.[123] The British Colonist exaggerated their claims beyond all proportion when it claimed that they advocated abolition of the Bible, the constitution, and the laws of the country, as well as universal miscegenation.[124] George Brown clucked happily when Horace Greeley informed the Women's Rights Convention of New York that he would be willing to concede the suffrage only when "a majority of the ladies themselves asked for it."[125] The demands of American women were almost as obnoxious to other Canadians as the women themselves. Their gross eating habits alone would have been enough to discredit any of their political demands. To their disgusting habit of eating with their knives the British Whig could only manage a terse rejoinder:- "American women dress like ladies, and eat like pigs."[126]

---

[123]For the progress of women's rights in the United States see A.F. Tyler, Freedom's Ferment (New York, 1962), Harper's, pp. 424-63.

[124]British Colonist, Nov. 1, 1850.

[125]Globe, Dec. 26, 1856.

[126]British Whig, Nov. 26, 1852.

For the French Canadian a much more serious concern than feminism was the alarming erosion of the institution of marriage in the United States. Their primary source of social comment was patriotic in derivation. Divorce was simply another ground upon which to condemn a nation so obviously steeped in immorality of all kinds:- "Qu'aurions-nous à dire si nous parlions de la moralité publique aux Etats-Unis, dans un pays et les tribunaux prononcent chaque année une moyenne de cinq mille divorces, en sorte que dix milles individus acquèrent annuellement le droit de vivre en adultère légal."[127] The causes of this social malaise were readily apparent to the French Canadian conservative. Rationalism, materialism, and sectarian protestantism were generally agreed upon as its intellecutal and social roots. Its effects were so catastrophic that the entire burden of French Canadian criticism of American society might be laid at the altar of its imperfect marriage customs. It was to this single cause that J.C. Taché attributed a plethora of social ills:

> Il arrivent que l'enfant de seize ans se libère de l'autorité paternelle, que les liens de famille sont à peu près nuls, que l'âge et la qualité des personnes sont plutôt le suject du mépris que du respect des masses que les autorités dans toute la hierarchie religieuse et sociale sont le point de mire les attaques des partis et des factions. Il arrive que les individus, qui ne veulent pas que la société ait d'armes pour la protection de tous, s'arment eux-mêmes pour les vengeances ou leur defénse personelle. Au lieu des tribuneaux réguliers siègent avec calme et décence, les

---

[127] La Minerve, Dec. 19, 1854. See also Le Courrieur du Canada, Mar. 23, 1857, Feb. 8, 1858. Some English Canadians also shared this sanctimonious outlook. The New York correspondent of the Leader recoiled in horror at the Free Love Club of that city, labelling it the "lowest form of socialism," Leader, Oct. 29, 1855.

> crimes ou les prétendus crimes sont jugés dans la rue par une populace avivée (Lynch Law) qui se fait sur le lieu et à l'instant même l'executrice de ses propres décrets.[128]

The marriage issue was more than mere propaganda to convince Canadians of their moral superiority over Americans. There was a genuine fear, especially among French Canadians, that their own culture would be undermined if radical protestantism and especially Mormonism were to make inroads upon Catholicism.[129] The bleus therefore reacted extremely against a bill proposed by Dr. John Rolph in 1853 which would have introduced into Upper Canada civil marriage as a general practice. The United States was used by the Courrier de St. Hyacinthe as an example of the inoperability of that principle, "Dans cette contrée, aujourd'hui la gloire du Protestantisme, le mariage, simple contrat civil, déchu de sa dignité de sacrément, résilié par fantaisie, comme un bail de boutique, n'est plus suivant l'expression d'un honnête Américain, que, à légal prostitution!"[130] Somewhat more appealing was the countermeasure presented by John Rose of Dundas which would have permitted an ordained priest or minister appointed by the state to marry any two persons not under legal disqualification. But even this was ultimately unacceptable because it encouraged Catholics towards unsanctified marriages before Methodist and Tunker ministers.[131] Given the nature of these

---

[128] Le Courrieur du Canada, Mar. 23, 1857.

[129] Ibid., Feb. 8, 1858; La Minerve, Dec. 19, 1854; Journal de Québec, Mar. 17, 1853.

[130] Cited in Le Journal de Québec, Apr. 2, 1853. Ibid., Mar. 10, 1853.

[131] Ibid., Apr. 28, 1853.

proposals, the French Canadian no doubt had ample justification for his belief that Upper Canada was a hotbed not only for sectarian protestantism,but also the weird doctrines of spiritualism and occultism which flowered in American society at this time.[132]

Americans might have tolerated almost all of this internal criticism of their society, since they more than anyone have taken Tocqueville, Bryce, and Brogan to heart. What they would have found difficult to abide was the condescension displayed towards them by backwoods Canadian colonials. Relying upon the power of Empire as their sheet-anchor in the blustery wind of Americanism, Canadians manifested an arrogance beyond their real status. Conceding material progress and industrial genius to Americans, the Canadian would then launch into such inflated and racist pronouncements upon the destiny of that nation:

> The nations of the earth may be viewed as forming the leading links of this chain, each taking precedence according to its comparative amount of national genius, and thus descending step by step, until the general features which characterize the human species, and are lost or confounded in those of the brute creation. Now the Yankee lives in this very climate, and being himself an admixture of all human gradations in the chain just referred to, the distinctive characteristics of the Briton and of the African are, in meeting equally lost in him. He is consequently a mongrel, incapable of great mental effort...The destiny of Jonathan is evidently to

---

[132] La Minerve, Mar. 14, 1854. A casual reading of the Marcus Gunn Papers gives some credence to these suspicions. See "Thoughts on Theology" in a letter in reply to Dr. John Rolph, 1854. Marcus Gunn Papers, vol. 9, P.A.C.

> be limited to the raising of food for a higher class of "humans" than his own.[133]

This and other statements referring to the "virulent micronimity of little mindedness" among the American people no doubt reflected a certain degree of editorial garrulousness,[134] but combined with a conviction in the bankruptcy of American society they could only have a negative effect on Canadian-American relations.

A sense of separate Canadian identity in North America therefore came at a high price. If Americans were indeed obsessed by a micronimity of mind, Canadians had responded in similar kind. The overriding social concerns of the Republic had indirectly become the concerns of central Canadians, just as the revolutionary ideology of the early national period had been the obsession of the Family Compact. What was rather surprising in the conservative direction of socio-political thought was the broad consensus of anti-Americanism. That is not to say that Canadians of all political factions equally denied the validity of the republican experiment. As will be seen below they still saw much that was worthy of imitation in the American constitutional and legal mechanism. Their criticism was at once deeper and at once more superficial. It pretended to be organic, aimed at an entire people and their life-style, yet it was clearly not the

---

[133] British Whig, Aug. 13, 1849. See also Anglo-American Magazine, vol. IV, pp. 34-48.

[134] London Free Press, Jan. 10, 1856.

sociological treatise of a Tocqueville. At best it was crude empiricism in the service of an emergent nationalist impulse. Few of the charities of Tocqueville or of contemporary British travellers like Trollope shone through the murkiness of Canadian comment.[135] Canada's second generation of politicians, businessmen, and journalists were paradoxically less afraid to descend into the Stygian blackness of the republic, but appeared to be holding their breath in reflexive repugnance until they were safely home.

(iii) American Constitutions and Institutions

American institutions served as a rusty anchor in the muddy waters of anti-Americanism. While the sea above boiled in the popular turmoil of national and racial ideology, the Canadian debate upon the American constitution bubbled at its customary pace beneath the surface. While the conservatives and reformers reverted to the archetypal rationalizations of eighteenth century constitutional thought inherited from Compact Toryism, the radical left relied mainly upon the inherited 'old-republican' outlook of Papineau and Mackenzie.

Whereas those radicals of an earlier era could cite immediate instances of American superiority, the new left was neither so instructed nor so inclined. Most rouges although comparatively well instructed in early nineteenth century European liberalism were relatively ignorant of American political and constitutional

---

[135] See A. Nevins, America as Seen Through British Eyes (N.Y., 1948), Oxford U. Press, chapters 2 and 3.

development since 1800, and saw in that nation a liberal-constitutional mirage which was no longer real. The clear-grits, if somewhat better read in the democratic traditions to the south, were embarrassed to acknowledge that fact because of the tactical defeat that would likely befall their movement if they became too closely associated with American political tradition.

The political right easily carried the constitutional debate upon republicanism against this timid and uninstructed left, so much so that they were forced to be charitable to American institutions to preserve a semblance of the former tension which had existed in the hot debate of the eighteen thirties. Conservatives and liberals almost unilaterally declared a thaw on American political thought as they became even more secure in their sense of social distinctness from Americans. The founding fathers of the republic were now declared persona grata since they were so tangibly different socially from contemporary Americans. If anything, they were seen as whig aristocrats in their breeding and sophistication. The thaw was also apparent on such conservative institutions as the Supreme Court, and to a lesser extent the Senate, both of which had transcended American commonality. Although the Canadian conservative often condemned the personnel who presently manned these institutions, he had a genuine respect for the wisdom of the founders for having deadlocked those bodies in such a way as to refine out human weaknesses.

The political right thus had its own way even more than did the Family Compact. It was they who determined the ground rules of debate upon questions of democratic reform and they who determined the limits

of orthodoxy. The mere fact that a plethora of factions persisted throughout the eighteen fifties in no way promoted a similar pluralism in constitutional thought. What did happen as a result of this political flux was that monstrous anomalies could occur, such as the creation of an elected upper house which few positively desired, but many found politically expedient to promote. Yet, the concession of an elective upper house was more apparent than real in the final analysis, and the centrist political groups certainly held firm in other more vital areas such as local elective institutions and the suffrage. The great constitutional debates of the eighteen fifties assume more the character of a monologue than a dialogue. The recitation was of secondary importance to the wealth of Canadian social comment on the United States. Whereas the Compact might have been criticized for attempting to popularize impossibly difficult constitutional sophistications, the politicians of the fifties could never be accused of that. Critiques of Yankee manners were much more potent grist for the mill of provincialism and nationalism than the airy speculations of Burke and Blackstone.

Canadian moderates had begun to distinguish between their growing national antipathy for Americans and their respect for American institutions. This thaw was apparent in a speech by A. Rankin, the independent Reform member for Essex, on the future prospects of Canadian nationhood. He dismissed the idea of annexation because he could not live as a "Yankee." For this chauvinistic plea he received warm applause from the House, but he went on to say, "He did not admire their institutions and he disliked their manners, and could

never sympathize with their social habits. But there was much to be admired in their Constitution and their form of government."[136] Yet another critic of American manners prefaced his lengthy harangue upon American ruffianism by a few extremely charitable remarks upon their constitution. He even had a few kind words for the apostle of deism, Thomas Paine, who was so prominent in the formation and articulation of the first principles of that constitution. The Rights of Man and Common Sense, this critic claimed, made many friends "to the great principle of honest, economical, humane and rational government." Paine's only mistake was to follow with The Age of Reason which was at once "the enemy of his own fame and the liberties of the whole human race."[137]

The revolutionary and early republican period of American history became an object of whiggish nostalgia for mid-Victorian Canadians. Americans were admired first for the "energy of character" they had exhibited in the revolt against the Mother Country, and in "the rational manner" in which they went about framing a new constitution.[138] Although there was still some considerable doubt

---

[136] Mirror of Parliament, Feb. 22, 1856.

[137] Toronto Leader, Oct. 7, 1853. See also L.J. Papineau to E. O'Callaghan, Jan. 21, 1856, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.

[138] Toronto, Leader, Nov. 23, 1853, "The Colonies their Own Constitution Makers," Abraham Joseph, Mar. 12, 1853, Quebec City, note of a lecture on the American Revolution, reel 1, Abraham Joseph Diaries, P.A.C.

even among the more charitable Canadian observers "whether the American Revolution will be productive of permanent advantage or injury, to the cause of human freedom," the very fact that such doubt existed was somewhat surprising.[139]

The Founding Fathers of the United States gradually achieved greater recognition largely through the aristocratic contrast they provided to the likes of Zachary Taylor, Millard Fillmore, and Franklin Pierce. Bishop John Strachan wrote in some concern to William Hamilton Merritt concerning his shifting allegiances towards American institutions, and warned him that, "Your estimate of the Constitution of the United States and its daily results differ from mine - I think it has deteriorated since Washington's time."[140] George Etienne Cartier was not at all embarrassed to invoke the ghosts of Washington and Jefferson and their "fine old State of Virginia" to support his argument against the introduction of the vote by ballot in Canada.[141] Given this kind of endorsation it is little wonder that W.H. Boulton referred at length to Madison, Jefferson, and Montesquieu in his theoretical justification for an elective upper house in 1852.[142] Nor was the Montreal Pilot in the least chagrined in conceding that the Founding Fathers "were highly

---

[139]W. Nelson, Assembly Debates, reported in, Pilot, May 30, 1850. "Eight Years in the United States," by AMICUS, Anglo-American Magazine, I, p. 412.

[140]Bishop Strachan to W.H. Merritt, Toronto, May 16, 1856, Merritt Papers, P.A.C.

[141]Mirror of Parliament, Apr. 20, 1857.

[142]Debates reported in Pilot, Oct. 13, 1852.

accomplished men, who had carefully studied the history and science of government." Their only defect was their unreasonable rejection of the English form of government, much as the Lutheran Reformation was unreasonable in its attack upon Catholicism.[143]

When Canadian conservatives contemplated revision of their constitution they were now less restrained in their references to the American experience, whether or not they intended to imitate or reject that tradition. John A. Macdonald regularly referred to the American way if only to find it wanting in many respects. He rejected the idea of a plebiscitary ratification of the proposed constitution in 1864 on the grounds that it was "unconstitutional and anti-British."[144] Macdonald was somewhat more charitable to the American federation upon the occasion of imminent breakup in the Civil War. He merely cautioned Canadians to read well the brutal lessons of decentralized power:

> He still looked hopefully to the future of the United States. He believed that there was a vigor, a vitality, in the Anglo-Saxon character and Anglo-Saxon institutions of the United States, that would carry them through this great convulsion as they had carried through our mother country in days of old. (Loud cheers from both sides of the House). He had hoped with that hon. gentleman (Mr. McGee) that if they were to be severed in two he believed

---

[143] Montreal Pilot, June 25, 1855. See also ibid., Oct. 22, Dec. 14, 1852; J. Cauchon, Etude sur l'Union...., p. 15; J.C. Taché, Des Provinces de l'Amérique du Nord, pp. 186-88; C. Dumesnil, "Reflexions Préliminaires Des Vrais Principes Politiques (Montreal, 1849), L'Avenir, p. 16.

[144] J.A. Macdonald to S. Amsden, Quebec, Dec. 1, 1864, S. Amsden Papers, P.A.C.

> they would be two great, two noble, two free nations would exist in the place of one. (Hear, Hear) But while he thus sympathised with them, he must say let it be a warning to ourselves that we do not split on the same rack which they had done. The fatal error which they had committed and it was perhaps unavoidable from the state of the colonies at the time of the revolution was in making each state a distinctive sovereignty, and giving to each a distinct sovereign power except in those instances where they were specially reserved by the constitution, and conferred upon the general government.[145]

When other more liberally-inclined politicians proposed constitutional change they often did so with a copy of the American constitution and the Federalist Papers close at hand. When William Hamilton Merritt and Alexander Morris proposed a constitutional convention for the government of Canada in 1859, the former was immediately encouraged towards annexation by an American correspondent,[146] and towards a written constitution by a Canadian correspondent. The latter facetiously suggested a wide study of eminent British constitutional authorities like Blackstone and Hume, and someone other than George Brown for American constitutional traditions:- "If we have no men to cope with Jefferson and Hamilton, and the Adams's you may find at least some who may follow those great lights of the American constitutional system in humbler paths."[147] The parallels in Canadian and

---

[145] J.A. Macdonald, To the Electors of Kingston....1860-61, p. 100.

[146] William Crafts to J.P. Merritt, Utica, Apr. 5, 1859, Merritt Papers (microfilm), P.A.C.

[147] H.B. Wilson to W.H. Merritt, Ontario, Apr. 2, 1859, Merritt Papers (microfilm) P.A.C.

American society so impressed some that they would have been prepared to reject the British constitutional tradition. When the radical-tory, W.H. Boulton, looked at Canadian slavishness to monarchical traditions, he questioned its rationale:- "We were as republican as the United States. The whole power was vested in the people, and he was sorry to see their representatives so much inclined to abuse it. He showed that the Ministry had copied almost word for word the school bills, assessment bills, and municipal bills, and almost all others from the State of New York."[148]

English Canadians also appeared to concede more to the practice and even the theory of local party democracy as practised in the United States. The convention was talked of in reform circles not only as an instrument of constitutional reform,[149] but also as a means of establishing closer political contact with the people.[150] One of the best means of achieving the latter was of course the nominating convention at the local level. The North American observed with some pleasure in 1851 that, "We have been pleased to observe a general desire manifested by the electors of Upper Canada to make a proper selection of Candidates. Conventions of the people have met and decided that which was heretofore been left to the decision of one man, whose chief motive for offering his services

---

[148] Debates, Montreal Pilot, May 21, 1850. See also Minutes of British American League (Mr. Gamble), pp. lxiii, xix.

[149] North American, Aug. 16, 1850.

[150] Mackenzie's Gazette, May 22, 1857.

was, too often, nothing higher than personal ambition."[151] The moderate Reformers in Lennox and Addington went so far in this regard that they offered in that same year the nomination to the popular rebel exile in New York, Marshall Spring Bidwell.

The Conservatives were no less aware of the dynamic political techniques developing south of the border. Although John A. Macdonald considered the convention as both expensive and detestable,[152] he did consider "the Yankee system of caucus" or local nominating conventions occasionally acceptable in order to avoid disunion.[153] He was no less sensitive to such democratic techniques as provincial and county associations of the party, headed by experienced and salaried party politicians.[154] Macdonald's concessions to American practice and his maintenance of theoretical separateness would have mystified the Compact Tory, but was thoroughly orthodox behaviour for the Canadian politician at mid-century.

The mere evidence of such flexibility in the constitutional thought and practice of Canadian politicians does not mean that they

---

[151] North American, Dec. 4, 1851. Mackenzie also declared openly that "unless the people nominate candidates for office, they do not appoint. If there is no legal and efficient mode by which public opinion can declare itself in favour of nominating candidates...the best men will seldom be elected," Weekly Gazette, July 7, 1853.

[152] Macdonald to C.R. Becher, Mar. 15, 1862, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.

[153] Macdonald to Capt. J.M. Strachan, Feb. 9, 1854, ibid.

[154] Macdonald to S. Amsden, Kingston, Dec. 26, 1863, S. Amsden Papers, P.A.C.

were any less sure of what their own constitutional traditions were. The political right felt free at any time to reject the theory or the practice of the American constitution, but felt compelled on the other hand to maintain a quasi-empirical objectivity in any move to alter their own tradition in that direction. Such a pseudo-spirit of enquiry demanded at least a thorough knowledge of the American frame of government. The mere objectivity of legal language rendered Canadians less hostile to American institutions and laws than to American manners. While almost all literate Canadians felt qualified to comment on American mores from a casual observance of their behaviour at banquets and elections, only a few lawyer and journalist-politicians either felt so inclined or qualified to observe and criticize their mechanism of government. Since the corpus of constitutional law was a relatively fixed quantum since 1787 by comparison to American mores, Canadian politicians relied largely upon their inherited presumptions upon that subject to fix their own position. Whereas American social dynamics often left Canadians confused and ready to resort to blind prejudice to maintain their own sense of identity, the constitutional debate found few such lacunae in the Canadian mind. The combatants of the right and left simply reverted to archetype as they debated in the rationalist moot-court of eighteenth century constitutional thought.

The most persistent defence of the British constitutional tradition in the eighteen-fifties came usually from reformers and liberals. Tories would not, even when challenged, defend the

principles that were almost physiological in their depth of conviction. John A. Macdonald, for example, found "abstract and theoretical questions of government" a waste of the Legislature's time and the people's money."[155] Robert Baldwin and his ideological disciple, George Brown, were on the other hand eager to the point of old-tory dogmatism in their defence of the British constitution. In the debate upon H. J. Boulton's elective legislative council bill, Baldwin triumphantly delineated Canada's arrival at the true British constitution in 1849, and the decided superiority of representative responsible government over American democracy:

> Between the two systems--Monarchical and Republican, he believed, there was not a mere formal difference; there existed in reality, an essential difference that was not altogether in our favor. The ministry were appointed by the representatives of the people as watchers on the towers, to resist every attempt to interfere improperly with public institutions, and to introduce measures which they conceived to be requisite. On the other hand what is the system in the United States? The fact is that they have no regular government at all. In consequence of the bad system of government established in the old colonies they became so suspicious that they excluded every member of the cabinet from their legislature; and consequently no member of the Cabinet can be held responsible for his conduct . . . In any point of view he thought the comparison was decidedly unfavourable to the American system of government.[156]

George Brown's critique of the American constitution was essentially the same as Baldwin's differing only in the comprehensiveness of its

---

[155] Cited in B. W. Hodgins, "Attitudes Towards Democracy During the Pre-Confederation Decade" (unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1955), p. 202.

[156] House of Assembly, debates, June 3, 1850. Reported in Montreal Pilot, June 8, 1850.

denunciation. In a final and trenchant defence of the upper house against the elective principle in 1855, he methodically shredded every aspect of American government from the presidency to the electorate. He traced the fundamental weakness of the American system to the general principle of antagonism behind the American constitution, as contra-distinguished from the harmony inherent in the British constitution. Beyond that, the written character of the republican constitution further immobilized government by subjecting each office-holder to "a written law regulating his individual conduct, and by that law he must walk and be nothing else."[157] Under the British system by contrast, responsibility was rendered in the more flexible and personal terms of collective wisdom.[158]

What was perhaps most impressive about Brown's analysis was that no one supporting the measure of an elective upper house took issue with his defence of British constitutional superiority. Nor did they meet another back-bench reformer's demand that the House define clearly their constitutional position vis-à-vis the representative and democratic traditions.[159] Only William Lyon Mackenzie managed the feeble reply that their present constitution bore little resemblance to the British constitution, and after all, what were American institutions but "British constitutions made to suit the

---

[157] Mirror of Parliament, Mar. 27, 1855.

[158] See also J. H. Cameron, Mar. 27, 1855, Mirror of Parlt.

[159] J. Wilson (M.P.P. for London, C.W.), Mirror of Parlt., Mar. 28, 1855.

circumstances of the new world, where there was nothing of the aristocratic element."[160] The dispirited character of the Conservative and bleu defence of an ideologically indefensible change in their constitution was revealed in the unaccustomed nitpicking of John A. Macdonald and Joseph Cauchon on the issue. The former managed only to muster a skilful interjection or two, but the latter was so befuddled that he handed the advantage back to the defenders of the British tradition.[161]

Cauchon's ineptness in political debate upon the primary principles of government was no doubt occasioned by some embarrassment since he had been the most trenchant opponent of any elective proposals while the Reform Alliance had hung together.[162] Yet Cauchon's tacit conversion to the measure in 1854 revealed as fundamentally pragmatic an outlook as that of their new allies, the tories of Upper Canada. The pragmatic tory outlook upon such questions of constitutional revision was best expressed in Cartier's claim that an upper house was vital, but more important that it was workable--something

---

[160] Ibid., Mar. 27, 1855.

[161] Ibid. The exchange ran as follows: "MR. CAMERON..And will not the next demand be for a two years' assembly, and ultimately we will come to an annual assembly, and assimilate our institutions to those of the United States? ATT. GEN. MACDONALD..Are annual parliaments institutions of the United States? MR. CAMERON..No! To save them from that they have a written constitution. MR. CAUCHON..Which is changeable every ten years by a convention. MR. CAMERON..Yes! That is what we are coming to. We too will have our conventions and our written constitutions, and annual Parliaments, and elective judiciaries."

[162] Journal de Québec, June 6, 11, 1850; Apr. 15, Oct. 5, 1852; Jan. 7, June 7, 1853; Sept. 20, 1854.

that the American and French experiments had not been: "L'essai d'une chambre unique a été fait maintes fois aux-Etats Unis, et très souvent, n'a pas réussir. Dans la grande France démocratique, l'expérience a été également tentée, pour finir par le despotisme, par l'empire."[163]

When these same French Canadian politicians resisted change they also did so in the name of utility. Nowhere was this more obvious than upon the question of federal union. The bleu rejected the American constitutional tradition not because of any ostensible rift with its founders. On the contrary, these men and their product were affectionately regarded as "hommes illustres" by Joseph Cauchon.[164] He and other conservatives objected to federation upon utilitarian and historical grounds: the evolution of a constitution which favoured the central government over the states; the development of the elective principle to an excess at the local level; and the administrative deadlock created by a rigid division of powers.[165]

The two foremost legal popularizers of the day in French Canada were also fundamentally conservative in their constitutional outlook. The first tract on public and constitutional law was written in 1851 by the lawyer, publicist, and author, Antoine Gérin-Lajoie. His

---

[163] J. Tassé, Discours . . . , May 27, 1853, p. 40. See also E. Taché, Legis. Council, Debates, Mirror of Parlt., May 21, 1855; F. Evanturel, Assembly Debates, Mirror of Parlt., Feb. 20, 1856.

[164] J. Cauchon, Etude . . . , pp. 15-16.

[165] Ibid., p. 16. J. C. Taché, Des Provinces de l'Amérique du Nord, pp. 164-65, 172-73, 180-82.

Catéchisme Politique instructed a generation of Canadians in the governmental process and in the complexities of Canadian constitutional history. In the best traditions of Burke, Blackstone, and Coke he instructed his readers that imperial statutes like those in 1774, 1791, and 1841 did not comprise a written constitution such as those of the United States and France, but were merely the core of many other uncodified rules, regulations, and popular customs:

> Ces règles et coutumes sont nombreuses et n'ont jamais été publiées dans un ordre méthodique et complet. L'histoire et l'expérience peuvent seules mettre au fait des règles applicables aux divers cas qui se présentent sous le fonctionnement de tout gouvernement constitutionnel.[166]

The second legal manual was written a year later by the lawyer-educator of Quebec City, Jacques Cremazie. He particularly stressed the practical as opposed to theoretical character of the British constitution. The burden of his proof for this conservative dictum was the monarchy, which on first glance might appear little more than subtle despotism. Upon further examination of the practical exercise of monarchical authority, "On s'apercevra que tout ces formidables prérogatives ne sont que des vaines cérémonies remplacés par une influence sûre et puissante, surgissante de l'énorme patronage que l'étendue et la richesse de l'empire ont mis entre les

---

[166] A. Gérin-Lajoie, Catéchisme Politique ou Elemens du Droit Publique et Constitutionnel du Canada, Mis a La Portée du Peuple (Montreal, 1851), Louis Perrault, p. 9.

mains de l'exécutif."[167]

Proceeding upon this pragmatic view of the British constitution and of its superiority over the theoretical rigidities of American institutions, Canadian moderates and conservatives sought further and more specific evidence of their election. As they examined the functional aspects of each working part of the governmental apparatus, they invariably came away confirmed in the superiority of their own mechanism. Yet there were practical instances of breakdown, such as that of the elective upper house. But in such instances, the ideology of British pragmatism served to gloss over the apparent inconsistency.

The political right and centre were universally of the opinion that the American Presidency or any elected executive was inferior to the monarchical executive. The first and most fundamental objection was the system of popular election which in one observer's mind was extremely precarious, in that "the masses in the United States are not distinguished from those of every other country for the possession of information, as to requisite qualifications for a ruler." He needed only to cite the lamentable selection of Zachary Taylor who was chosen for military and personal attributes which actually hindered him under the heavy burden of an office "to the duties of which he was a stranger and which he was utterly powerless to

---

[167] J. Crémazie, Manuel de Notions Utiles Sur les Droits Politiques, le Droit Civil, la loi Criminelle et Municipale, les Lois Rurales, etc., (Quebec, 1852), J. & O. Crémazie, p. 4.

control."[168] Another criticism levelled at the election of the president was that it was undemocratic in the extreme. George Brown was especially prominent in this criticism of the caucus and convention system of selection where "a few gentlemen meet together in caucus, pull the strings, and a king is made for the next four years."[169]

Once they had the president elected conservatives then differed upon the four-year term. Although all appeared to agree that the president enjoyed excessive patronage, some thought the mandatory four-year term too long and others too short. John Strachan lamented the fact that the American constitution had no safety valves such as dissolution to provide a change of ministry where required. To Strachan a mandatory four-year administration in a nation noted for its political frenzy was tantamount to national suicide. The only reason he could think of for American survival was that they had no powerful neighbours, and that its steadily expanding frontier had operated as a social safety valve for rebellious spirits.[170] The tory Gazette of Hamilton on the other hand considered the four-year tenure much too short to provide any sustained continuity of policy or any real executive wisdom.[171]

---

[168] Anglo-American Magazine, I, p. 489.

[169] Mirror of Parliament, Mar. 27, 1855; Globe, Feb. 12, 1852.

[170] Bishop Strachan to W. H. Merritt, Toronto, May 16, 1856, Merritt Papers, P.A.C. See also G. Brown, Mirror of Parlt., Mar. 27, 1855.

[171] Hamilton Gazette, June 28, 1852.

The clear-grits, rouges, and other fellow-travellers of the radical fringe studiously avoided comment upon the American presidency as a model for Canada, but by implication appeared to admire it in their support of an elective governor for Canada. Only one extremely piqued French Canadian moderate expressed that desire in positive terms of imitating the American presidency. In a series of open letters to Edmund Head, the ex-legislative councillor, Colonel Gugy, vented his spleen upon Elgin and Head for not conferring office upon him. After congratulating Oliver Cromwell for his regicide, and condemning all attempts at limited monarchy since the Restoration, Gugy declared his open admiration for the American Presidency:

> I know that, born on this continent, I am as much an American as Zachary Taylor, Andrew Jackson, or Franklin Pierce. I know, too, that in the United States every distinction, save that of President alone, is within the reach, God help me, of such as I am. But unless the office you occupy become elective, what is there worth having to which we can aspire?[172]

The most common tack taken by the critics of monarchy was to ignore the American experience and to concentrate upon the flaws in the monarchical system. Some reformers traced the fault to the people themselves for their excessive veneration of royalty. The retired reformer, J. H. Price, decried the deference displayed to the young Prince of Wales upon his visit to Canada in 1860 because

---

[172] Col. Gugy, Letters Originally Published in the Quebec Gazette addressed to His Excellency Sir E. Head, Bart. (Quebec, 1855), E. R. Middleton, p. 27. See also an upper Canadian Tory's advocacy of election (J. Gamble), Mirror of Parlt., Sept. 19, 1854.

of the impulse it had given to absolutism:

> No wonder we have so many worthless Kings when we find a sensible prudent people like the Canadians worshipping a Boy of eighteen with capacity not above the middle order of intellect and thus teaching him that he is only one degree below the deity . . . If this boy should become a fool by flattery and adulation, who will the people of England have to thank, for depend upon it, that, altho' the Government is the hands [sic] of a responsible ministry, still the Sovereign has much power for good or evil.[173]

Other radicals employed the traditional arguments of excessive power and patronage in the hands of appointive officials, or the excessive expense of maintaining an extravagant establishment.[174] The rouges periodically raised the subject in L'Avenir in the early fifties,[175] but it was not until 1856 that they really became earnest about an elected executive. Partially it came as a result of an increasing awareness that annexation would never come about, and that the tactics of compromise were more realistic. The catalyst was provided by Governor Head's insulting remarks upon the French Canadians in 1855. In the next session of the House J. B. E. Dorion introduced a petition from the village of L'Avenir calling for the recall of Head and the election of a new Governor.[176] From that point on, not only L'Avenir but the liberal nationalist journals Le Pays and Le National

---

[173] J. H. Price to L. H. Lafontaine, Oct. 29, 1860, Bradford, England, J. H. Price Papers, P.A.C.

[174] J. DeWitt to W. L. Mackenzie, Montreal, July 18, 1851, W. L. Mackenzie Papers, P.A.C.; Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, May 22, 1857; Marcus Gunn to St. Thomas Observer, Jan. 20, 1848; Marcus Gunn Papers, Vol. I, P.A.C.; North American, Feb. 21, 1851, Nov. 22, 1850.

[175] Jan. 5, 1850; June 8, 1850; July 7, 1852.

[176] Mirror of Parliament, Feb. 18, 1856.

became ardent supporters of the principle.[177]

The tories who defended the Governor-General did not do so often because the real threat of election was so remote. When they did, they often defended the men rather than the office. Colonial governors were after all aristocrats, or at least close to it--"Men whose minds could be actuated by no sinister motives, who could have no selfish purpose to accomplish, and who being selected from the higher walks of life, and most of them distinguished for their military services, were guided by a high sense of honour."[178] Another argument frequently employed was that the Governor was free from local prejudice and party attachments unlike the elective state governors to the South. Evidence of this phenomenon lay in the Italian republics of the eighteenth century which finally resorted to importing aristocrats of high reputation from neighbouring republics in order to eliminate nepotism.[179]

The issue which prompted much of the discussion upon an elective governor and even an elective magistracy was the reform of the legislative council. The fundamental difference between the proposed change of the legislative council and the other two, was that the impulse for an elective upper house came not only from the political left but also from the political right. The former saw the

---

[177] L'Avenir, Mar. 28, 1856; July 24, 1856; Feb. 9, 1857; Le National, cited in Le Pays, Apr. 20, 1856.

[178] Anglo-American Magazine, Dec. 3, 1849.

[179] Montreal Gazette, Dec. 3, 1849. See also J. H. Cameron, Mirror of Parliament, Sept. 18, 1854; Globe, Nov. 12, 1850.

American senate was as a democratic check upon executive irresponsibility, and the latter as a check upon the folly of the lower house. Somewhere between these two positions were those moderates who saw the American system in an entirely different light. For them the American upper house was seen as the co-operative hinge which facilitated the closer working of the executive and the lower branch. Those, on the other hand, who opposed any change were smugly orthodox in their defence of the British system of representative and responsible government.

Yet another factor which perhaps overrode all others of an ideological character upon the legislative council question was that of political expediency. The elective upper house of 1856 came not as the result of a great democratic crusade, but as the result of specific tactical objectives, especially upon the part of the centrist political groups.[180] The support lent to it by the clear-grits and the rouges was understandable from an ideological point of view, but the tories and bleus had more limited political objectives. The rump of the Baldwin-Lafontaine reform party appeared to be concerned at its losses to the clear-grits in the West. Hincks therefore included Rolph and Cameron in his cabinet to steal their thunder, and with Morin already supporting election in Canada East, the Reform Alliance was committed by 1852. The Tories were then

---

[180] S. E. C. Hart, "The Elective Legislative Council in Canada under the Union, Its Role in the Political Scene" (unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1956), pp. 259-64.

drawn in in 1854 with election being part of the price of political realignment. From then on the measure appeared in little danger until its final passage in 1855 except that it was gradually made more conservative as the price of Macdonald's and Cartier's support. The coolness with which they approached the measure is reflected in Macdonald's comments upon the departure of A. N. Morin to the Bench in 1854: "Now that Morin is out, it is our intention to throw out his hobby, and adjourn the Legislative Council Bill for a year. Sir Edmund Head has taken up the subject and I have no doubt will make valuable suggestions . . . "[181] Macdonald was also reported to have said some three months later in an interview with an independent Reformer that he favoured as few real changes as possible in the Legislative Council since "it is wiser to go about those changes which partake of an experimental character by degrees that it is found difficult and dangerous to retract in legislation."[182] Although Macdonald's first delaying tactic of a hoist did not materialize, his second strategy of gradually emasculating the bill by conservative amendments certainly did. In any case, both letters reveal a lack of ideological commitment to the elective upper house.

The debates in both houses of the Provincial Legislature from 1850-56 reflected to a considerable degree this pragmatic outlook.

---

[181] J. A. Macdonald to Henry Smith, Quebec, Jan. 27, 1855, Smith Papers, P.A.O., transcripts in P.A.C.

[182] Minutes of a Meeting of Independent Reformers, Mar. 28, 1855; T. M. Daly Papers, P.A.C.

Few comparisons were made to the American constitution and Senate, except to demonstrate the conservative composition of the upper house. Defence of the American constitutional tradition appeared then defensible only as regards to means rather than ends.[183] Even if a proponent of election alluded to the United States it was often to point up their essentially British outlook. The liberal-independent of Canada East, J. S. Sanborn, was one of those who supported election of the upper house but had no further democratic designs:

> He had not so great a respect for what was called Responsible Government as some persons professed to have. If our social circumstances could not admit of the British constitution which was a monument of wisdom, he saw nothing un-British in adapting our constitution to those circumstances. He did not think this was adopting the constitution of the United States; nor was it meant to be followed by an elective Governor-General; but he did see difficulties in making a ministry responsible to two houses, and this was why he did not very much admire our present system.[184]

The most compelling arguments presented in defence of the measure were those which remained strictly within the pale of British orthodoxy. John A. Macdonald was most effective in the defence of election because there was no equivalent in Canada to the check provided by the House of Lords. He then proceeded to cite precedents in other countries and in Belgium for an effective upper house without a single reference to the United States Senate.[185]

---

[183] H. Sherwood, debates reprinted in Montreal Pilot, May 17, 1853; Crooks, Mirror of Parlt., May 21, 1855.

[184] Debates, reported in Montreal Pilot, Oct. 23, 1852.

[185] Mirror of Parliament, Mar. 27, 1855.

Even the detractors of the Bill in the House, led by George Brown did not press their advantage much on the issue of republicanism, although they might well have. Apart from a few rhetorical questions upon the potential overthrow of British institutions and the adoption of American institutions, Brown allowed the majority to stand on their precarious limb with impunity.[186] Instead he chose to concentrate upon the issue of the incompatibility of an elective upper house with responsible ministerial government.[187] Only occasionally in the freer medium of journalistic debate did the Globe probe the nerve of disaffection, and the specific weaknesses of the American Senate and state upper chambers.[188] Brown demonstrated an unaccustomed restraint in labelling those who supported the elective upper house as actively disloyal. He charitably attributed their support of election to their misguided rather than malicious motives: "I admit readily that a fair argument may be maintained as to the comparative merits of the two systems; and I think nothing can be more absurd or hurtful than to charge all those who would adopt the American system in Canada, as enemies of their country."[189]

Outside of the forum of debate there was an apparent freedom of debate upon all aspects of the elective issue. American precedents,

---

[186] Pilot, debates, Oct. 23, 1852; Mirror of Parlt., Mar. 21, 27, 1855.

[187] Mirror of Parlt., Mar. 27, 1855.

[188] Globe, Feb. 13, 1851; Oct. 19, 1852.

[189] Ibid., Mar. 21, 1855.

although not indiscriminately scattered about, were much more in evidence than in the strained legislative debates upon the question.[190] Both radical journals, L'Avenir and the North American, provided ample evidence of open emulation of American elective institutions.[191] William McDougall drew a frank parallel between the cultures and institutions of Canada and the United States with an object to demonstrating the superiority of the elected bicameral legislature:

> If we look at the example of the thirty adjoining States of the great Republic--composed for the most part of people speaking the same language, governed by the same common law, and having the same moral, social and religious tendencies, as the people of this country--we find that in every state, without exception, the legislative power divided between two bodies--an Assembly and a Senate--a lower and an Upper Chamber. In several of these states changes have, from time to time, been made in their constitutions; but we do not recollect an instance in which it was even proposed to lodge the law-making power in a single body. . . . If then the notion of a single chamber is not even entertained by the constitutional reformers among our neighbours, who, may we be assured, would not be slow to adopt it, if they believed it to possess any merit; if in all the free states of Europe, the principle of two chambers is recognized, why should we repudiate it?[192]

The corollary of two co-operative rather than antagonistic houses

---

[190] Even private correspondence upon the issue never reached the intensity it did in the partisan press: A. M. Mackenzie to J. S. Macdonald, Mar. 24, 1855, J. S. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.; M. H. Foley to W. L. Mackenzie, Simcoe, Oct. 21, 1856, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O., P. B. de Blacquiere to Lord Elgin, Kingston, Oct. 29, 1849, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C.; R. E. Caron to L. H. Lafontaine, Mar. 20, 1850, Quebec, Lafontaine Papers, vol. 14, P.A.C.

[191] L. A. Dessaulles, Six Lectures . . . , pp. 140-47; L'Avenir, June 8, 1850, Jan. 5, 1850, July 3, 1849, July 7, 1852; Le Pays, Sept. 16, 18, 1856.

[192] North American, May 13, 1853. See also Oct. 5, 1852, Mar. 26, 1852.

gradually gained wider acceptance even among the partisan journals of the political centre as political support in the House grew for the elected upper chamber. By 1855, the moderate conservative Toronto Leader even disputed the "theory of deadlocks" insofar as the American constitution was concerned. Briefly leafing through the history of the United States since 1789, the editor concluded that there were never any significant clashes between the two houses, and that the administration was seldom left in a minority in either House.[193]

The journalistic debate reached somewhat ironic proportions when not only the opponents but the supporters of the elective upper house employed the theory of separate and countervailing power as evidence of their constitutional correctness. The opposition newspapers divided into two camps: those like the Globe and the London Free Press who believed that the harmony of British cabinet government would be destroyed by internecine deadlock between the two houses,[194] and those like the Journal de Québec which believed before 1854 that the elective upper house was the thin edge of the American wedge aimed at the heart of monarchical government.[195] As Cauchon argued, the United States at least had a very real constitutional buffer in the Supreme Court, but there would be no staying the power

---

[193]Toronto Leader, Apr. 5, 1855.

[194]Globe, Dec. 19, 1852; London Free Press, Apr. 3,1851; Oct. 13, 1853.

[195]Journal de Québec, June 6, 11, 1850; Apr. 15, 1852; Sept. 28, 1854.

of the masses with two elective houses: "Le gouvernement sera donc impossible, et la démocratie que l'on implante partout, sera bientôt remplacée par la démogagie, et l'anarchie."[196] Lastly there were those opponents of elective techniques like the Toronto Leader, which in the early fifties opposed the proposed system of indirect election by municipal councils because these had no real parallel in the state legislatures. Whereas the latter were likely to elect the best man in the state from among their numbers, the former would likely produce councillors who collectively had "neither weight, nor consideration."[197]

Finally there were those newspapers like the Montreal Gazette whose editorial policy was the key to tory behaviour upon the elective question in the House. In supporting the establishment of an elective upper house immediately upon the granting of responsible government, the Gazette developed a long-winded rationale based upon the separation of powers.[198] Although the Gazette often used the House of Lords as its model of aristocratic wisdom against the madness of the Commons, the American Senate was for obvious historical and sociological reasons, its second choice:

> No one has declared more emphatically than ourselves the futility of endeavoring to create in Canada, by Letters

---

[196] Ibid., June 7, 1853.

[197] Toronto Leader, Oct. 12, 1853. The Montreal Pilot (Sept. 28,1852) went even one step further in denying the validity of either the American Senate or the House of Lords as a model, and called for total abolition of the upper house.

[198] Montreal Gazette, Mar. 9, 15, Apr. 6, 20, Dec. 17, 1849.

> Patent, an upper house which would represent a distinct element in our system of government. The attempt to do so has been abortive; and all similar attempts will, we are persuaded, be equally futile. We accept the conditions in which we are placed, and deem it our duty to accommodate our political and social system. We recognize the sagacity which dictated the American constitution to its framers. A government of checks was necessary there as well as in England. The Senate of the United States is the next best Upper House after the British House of Lords, in the world. Before the concession of Responsible Government, an appointed Council was best suited to our form of government; now that we have acquired the power of self-government wisdom dictates an assimilation of our form of Government to that of the United States.[199]

Implicit also in this division of powers was the clear separation of the executive from the legislative branch, a concept which accorded well with eighteenth-century constitutional theory, but not with either eighteenth-century political practice or that of the eighteen-fifties in Canada. Although the rhetoric of tory parliamentary opinion often differed from the woolly model provided by the Gazette, its underlying assumption of antagonistic powers was similar. The conservative nature of the elective upper house finally agreed upon in 1855 was testimony to that doctrine of countervailing power. A smaller upper house, elected upon a property qualification of £1,000 and a higher property franchise of £75 was hardly a concession to democracy.[200] Though the constitutional concession to the American model was implicit in the legislative actions of the conservative

---

[199] Ibid., Mar. 19, 1852. See also May 21, 1852; Sept. 29, 1852; Sept. 26, 1854; Apr. 29, May 3, 1856.

[200] On the franchise see Cartier and Langton, debates Montreal, Pilot, May 18, 1853; (Macdonald) Mirror of Parliament, Mar. 15, 1855.

politicians, the political reality was more akin to the aristocratic model described by Bagehot a decade later.

The House of Representatives in the United States was not considered an institution worthy of much note, and only received mention insofar as its political style was concerned. Constitutionally considered, it was irrelevant except as a democratic forum of the most vulgar kind which even the Americans were trying to hold in check. Since it was irrelevant, the lower house interested Canadians only as a showpiece of American debasement. Corruption and political venality were not considered special attributes of the House of Representatives, but were indicative of a wider social malaise. The Montreal Gazette, while on this subject, compared the cut of the current American Assemblyman to the British M.P. solely from the standpoint of political leadership:

> Men will have leaders, you cannot make the masses think for themselves. As a people grows corrupt, so will its leaders. Some American journals commenting upon the remarks of the Times say that it is to the baneful system of leadership in the House of Representatives, and all the evils of their present state are attributable. True and the leaders they follow are political mountebanks, who live by the profession of politics. This is the rule there, political respectability the exception . . . In England they have other leaders, men whose personal stake in the country is large, who run greater risks of personal injury, when the interest of the country are endangered, than any of their followers. This is the rule and demogogueism the exception.[201]

---

[201] Montreal Gazette, Aug. 25, 1852. See also ibid., May 21, 1852; La Minerve, Feb. 9, 1854; Journal de Québec, Dec. 12, 1854. Even William Lyon Mackenzie was convinced that Americans were a corrupted people, and that their representatives reflected this in their behaviour in Congress; Mackenzie's Gazette, May 22, 1857.

Another source of botheration to the Gazette was the intricate committee structure of both houses, but especially the lower house. The interminable wrangling upon policy in these committees was seen as destructive to the principle and practice of ministerial responsibility.

More important than the mere institutional character of the House of Representatives or even the Senate were the principles of representation upon which they were based. On that vital issue there was a clear demarcation between the political left and right since the difference between the suffrage and the constitution was one between real and theoretical power. If social conservatives united on any constitutional issue it was the suffrage. John A. Macdonald was unalterably opposed to even representation by population not only for its political implications for the tory-bleu alliance, but also because his conservative political and social philosophy would not allow it:

> Experience had shewn that it left a nation weak and let it towards anarchy and despotism. Unless there was a middle power, unless property was protected and made one of the principles on which representation was based, they might perhaps have a people altogether equal, but they would soon cease to have a nation altogether free.[202]

In the same debate upon representation in 1861 Cartier precisely echoed rhetoric of Macdonald.[203] Nor was Cartier a recent convert

---

[202] J. A. Macdonald, Addresses . . . , debates in House, Apr. 19, 1861.

[203] J. Tassé, Discours . . . , debates in House, Apr. 5, 1861, p. 268.

to these doctrines for the mere sake of expediency since his condemnation of the proposed vote by ballot in 1857 drew from him a denunciation of American voting procedures. He noted that there had been a successful movement to repeal the ballot system since "corruption and bribery were just as prevalent as heretofore; and riot and bloodshed . . . if anything more rampant."[204] To him, property was the key to either candidacy or electoral eligibility since the man who had acquired property was generally more intelligent, moral and energetic than the man who had not.[205]

In the debate upon the suffrage in the House of Assembly the convention was once again one of denying American precedents as a valid medium of debate. Only the conservative side was really heard upon the vital question of the suffrage, likely because a proposed extension of the suffrage rather than mere electoral redistribution would have necessitated a justification from American electoral practices. Because the suffrage issue was such a fundamental one, as opposed to the idea of an elective upper house, the provincial press was also less prone to introduce American custom where British custom would suffice. If the parallels were too obvious the authors of electoral reform often omitted any reference to American political practice.

---

[204] Mirror of Parliament, Apr. 21, 1857.

[205] Debates reported in Pilot, Sept. 25, 1852. See also Laterriere, Legis. Cl. Debates, Mirror of Parlt., May 20, 1858.

The exceptions were few. The Globe was always careful to remain strictly within British traditions, whether as the opponent of manhood suffrage or elective principles like representation by population.[206] Only early in his formulation of "rep. by pop." did Brown make such slips as the following: "We are merely applying a just and equitable rule, which has been recognised in England, as far as practicable in the United States."[207] Of all the conservative politicians and journalists who declared their public or private support for vote by ballot or universal suffrage only the tory Gazette of Montreal dared admit its ideological debt to the United States.[208] Brown Chamberlin suggested that some American remedies such as the senatorial age qualification or a literacy test, like that employed in New England, be applied in lieu of a property qualification which never prevented "a dishonest man from getting into Parliament, although it may the honest man."[209] Where possible, however, even the Gazette made copious reference to British electoral reform, which was as yet only an idea in the minds of her journalists and politicians.[210]

The rouges by their relative reticence upon the issue of an

---

[206] Globe, Aug. 12, 1848, Dec. 20, 1849, Mar. 23, 28, 1850, Jan. 7, 1857, Apr. 12, 1861.

[207] Ibid., Dec. 10, 1856.

[208] See G. F. Detlor to W. H. Merritt, Sept. 30, 1854, Kingston, Merritt Papers, P.A.C.; London Free Press, Apr. 17, 1851; Toronto Leader, Sept. 28, 1853; Dec. 13, 1854.

[209] Montreal Gazette, Oct. 16, 1852, Oct. 5, 1854.

[210] Ibid., Jan. 20, 1858.

expanded suffrage revealed their fundamentally defensive outlook.[211] American democracy for them was concerned mainly with its rights rather than its mights. Political power in its raw form was ultimately suspect, and only acceptable within the framework of eighteenth century negatives. If the American constitution was admired for a single aspect it was not the system of local elections, but rather for its decentralized powers which would permit local autonomy for collective groups like the French Canadians:

> Elle laisse à chaque Etat de l'Union le moyen le plus sur de sauvegarder sa nationalité, c'est-à-dire le choix de son gouvernement intérieur, et l'élection de ses officiers publics. Le gouvernement général des Etats-Unis n'a absolument à veiller qu'aux affaires extérieures de l'Union et aux intérêts generaux des divers Etats ... De plus nos intérêts généraux seraient representés dans la chambre des représentants et dans le sénat des Etats-Unis par un nombre de membres suffisant pour les faire connaître et par conséquence faire respecter.[212]

Similarly, when L. A. Dessaulles spoke of annexation to the United States he did not cite Paine and Jefferson as the apologists of American democratic mights, but rather Tocqueville to demonstrate the real restraint apparent in American government.[213] The democratization of the franchise was particularly dangerous to French Canadians as a collective group since it would place political power

---

[211] L'Avenir, Oct. 25, 1849, Nov. 28, 1851; Le Pays, Oct. 21, 1856.

[212] Ibid., July 3, 1849.

[213] L. A. Dessaulles, Six Lectures . . . , pp. 68-70.

squarely within English Canada. When there were divisions upon important electoral reforms such as representation by population or vote by ballot, Papineau and the rouges were generally on the side of the status quo.[214]

Although there was much support for electoral reform in Canada West among the clear-grits and Mackenzieite factions, there were few private or public apologists for it in a republican context. Even the prophet of elective institutions in English Canada, William Lyon Mackenzie, found it necessary when advocating a broader franchise to refer back to the founding of Connecticut by freedom-loving Englishmen, rather than referring directly to contemporary state constitutions.[215] Mackenzie was even privately accused by a proponent of household suffrage of being an insincere Burkean in his advocacy of universal suffrage:

> You mention in your remarks on the extension of the suffrage that if we gave to any but freeholders we ought to give it to all above 21 - why so cannot householders plead as good a right, as freeholders - but perhaps you hold with Burke who said that if we pleaded right, everyone had an equal claim - cannot we go on expediency - I think we can although Burke said we should not deviate from the constitution - for circumstances alter with the times, and if one age made a constitution to suit their convenience another age has a right to alter it, to adapt it to theirs. I am certainly in favour of household suffrage as I think it is the only form at present practicable, many would be in favour of it who would oppose universal. I do not think

---

214 Journals of Assembly (1852-53), I, p. 539; division against representation by population (57-15); Montreal Pilot, May 23, 1853, division on vote by ballot (39-6).

215 Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, March 27, 1857.

> that you are much in favour of extension of the suffrage but that you adopt the opinions of Burke and are unwilling to admit anyone who does not possess a permanent stake in the country's welfare. . . .[216]

The clear-grits were, no less than Mackenzie, advocates of an extended franchise and vote by ballot.[217] Yet when it came to a direct exposition on the suffrage or the secret ballot it was equally difficult to find anywhere a suggestion of American republicanism. On the occasion of the adoption of the ballot system in municipal elections in Montreal, the North American was merely content to count the heads that had been spared a clubbing by its introduction.[218] Only in its infant stages was any suggestion made by that newspaper that the ballot was a superior American innovation: "The ballot obtains for a man perfect security as well as liberty to exercise his elective franchise as he pleases without molestation. So at least is the experience of the working of the system in the neighbouring union."[219] As the suffrage issue passed into the more tangible and orthodox alternative of reformed representation in 1852 and 1853, the left

---

[216] T. Tipton to W. L. Mackenzie, Walpole, July 3, 1851; Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O. See also James Grant to W. L. Mackenzie, June 7, 1851, Martintown, ibid.; House debates, Pilot, Aug. 24, 1852 (Christie); May 20, 1853 (Mackenzie).

[217] North American, Mar. 5, Sept. 10, 1850; Jan. 17, 24, 1851; Nov. 30, Dec. 24, 1852; Walsingham Reform Association Proceedings, Nov. 29, 1851, Norfolk Hist. Soc. Collection (microfilm), P.A.C.; Marcus Gunn to St. Thomas Observer, Jan. 20, 1848, Marcus Gunn Papers, P.A.C.; P. Perry, Assembly Debates, Pilot, July 18, 1850.

[218] North American, Apr. 22, 1852.

[219] North American, Mar. 28, 1851, from the Bathurst Courier.

abandoned any association with the American electoral process.

The only other popular issue centering upon American institutions was the movement for local election of sheriffs and magistrates. The fascinating aspect of the heated debate in the press was that the conservative political élite considered it worthier of opposition than other contentious points in the radical programme. The conservative press largely ignored many of the revolutionary proposals made by the North American for adoption of the American system of impeachment, the American policy of retrenchment, and the system of legislative appropriations in New York State.[220] In the House, the conservative majority merely placed a summary gag upon clear-grit proposals for sweeping reforms in government, as they did with Peter Perry's omnibus motion in 1850; or, they would stoop to conquer in bored somnolescence, as they did with W. H. Boulton's proposal for retrenchment in 1853.[221]

By contrast, the debate on local elective institutions in 1852 saw the militant forces of conservatism come out in full battle-dress. The clear-grits and tory-radicals who proposed the motions in the House studiously avoided any untoward references to the American model.

---

[220] Ibid., Nov. 22, 1850; Feb. 14, Mar. 14, 1851; Dec. 29, 1853; Globe, Mar. 23, 28, Oct. 31, 1850; Geo. B. Thomson to C. Clarke, Berlin, Jan. 25, 1855, C. Clarke Papers, P.A.C.; La Minerve, Sept. 12, 1850; Journal de Québec, June 6, 1850.

[221] Proc. of House of Assembly, Aug. 10, 1850; Sept. 7, 1853; reported in the Montreal Pilot, Aug. 16, 1850, Sept. 11, 1852. Boulton was chided for wasting the House's time with discursive debate upon "irrelevant subjects" and somewhat sheepishly withdrew his motion.

W. H. Boulton reminded the head of the government, Francis Hincks, that the 'old fossil' tories raised similar objections to the local election of town wardens in 1840, "yet they had seen that the municipal system had given satisfaction . . . and that Canada was still a British colony."[222] Despite the temperate character of the opposition, the majority led by Hincks, Brown, and Drummond interpreted the motion as the precursor to totally elective institutions. Drummond launched into a discussion of responsible government, concluding that the measure "must eventually lead to elective officers throughout the government, so that with him this was a simple question between republicanism and monarchy."[223] George Brown and P. J. O. Chauveau then used the opportunity to lecture the House on Burke's notion of the national as opposed to the local character of each appointee of the Crown. The only member who dared defend American institutions against these classic tory arguments was W. H. Merritt. He shared the concern of the conservative majority upon an elective magistracy but pointed out that such obdurate resistance could only lead to the entire abolition of the appointive system as had happened in New York. Rather, they should look to Vermont where more conservative elective institutions obtained. Yet Merritt's voice of reason was lost in a swelling tide of pro-monarchical sentiment. As one minor light put it, local election was "an entering wedge" which would be followed by

---

[222] Debates in the House of Assembly, Sept. 13, 1852, reported in the Montreal Pilot, Sept. 17, 1852.

[223] Ibid., Sept. 17, 1852.

an elective magistracy, governor, and finally, President.[224]

In the subsequent journalistic debate and popular reaction it was apparent that moderate reformers and tories both shared the apprehensions of their representatives in the House. One concerned and semi-literate onlooker wrote to Robert Baldwin on the alarming ramifications of the elective changes sought in the local system of courts:

> . . . The placing of the said courts in the hands of the township councils wold [sic] at once Render them if possible fourfold more Contemptible than the court of Requests was in the hands of the old Commissions a part of the Bench wold no doubt Change once a year and a perfect Simpleton who knows no more of the law than he does of the Greek language is just as liable to be Elected a Councilman as one whose knowledge of law and English Jurisprudence would be sufficient to Rival the Immortal Blacstone [sic] himself the thing would be perfectly Ridiculous.[225]

The conservative press then took up their cudgels actively against the elective magistracy in the State of New York in verbiage strongly reminiscent of Compact anti-Americanism. The Montreal Gazette sang the litanies of "popular fickleness," and deplored the dragging of "the ermine through the filth and mire, for a miserable pittance."[226] The Toronto Leader then proceeded to cite examples of the abuses of magisterial authority in New York State and the difficulties of redress

---

[224]D. B.Stevenson, debates, Sept. 13, 1852; Montreal Pilot, Sept. 16, 1852.

[225]Henry Bleecker to R. Baldwin, Sydney, June 11, 1850, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.; see also A.Chewett to R. Baldwin, Sandwich, June 2, 1850, ibid., P.A.C.; J. Macdonell to J. S. Macdonald, Cornwall, Mar. 29, 1850, J. S. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.

[226]Montreal Gazette, Nov. 13, 1852; May 22, 1853.

in a system where complaint must really reside against the judge's constituents and not himself: "Justice is a thing absolute. Popular election is a thing capricious. The two have no necessary connection at all."[227]

Nowhere was this concern for an independent judiciary so apparent as in the reactions of the provincial press to the acceptance by Chief Justice William Draper of a position as envoy to the British Government on the subject of the Hudson's Bay Territory in 1857. The conservative and reform press in both English and French Canada immediately pounced upon Draper for accepting the position. Hector Langevin censured his loss of "disinterestedness" in the face of public opinion, and the consequent loss of stature for the abstract principles of justice he supposedly embodied. George Brown similarly protested the "unconstitutionality" of the appointment, arguing chiefly from the political precedent established by the British judiciary.[228] The Colonist went perhaps further than any in citing the American Supreme Court's observance of strictly separated powers as a model for Draper to follow![229]

The rout of the left was in fact so complete by the mid-

---

[227] Toronto Leader, June 30, 1855.

[228] Le Courrier du Canada, Feb. 18, 1857; Globe, Feb. 23, 1857; New Era, Nov. 5, 1857.

[229] British Colonist cited in the Globe, Feb. 13, 1857. The anti-political reputation of that body was more highly respected among French Canadians: Journal de Québec, June 7, 1853; L'Avenir, June 5, 1856; Papineau to R. Christie, Sept. 19, 1854, Neilson Papers, Vol. 14, P.A.C.

eighteen-fifties upon all issues of election, that the political right could afford to taunt the radicals as did the bleu, T. J. Loranger, in the House in 1856. He asked them what they had done in the way of fulfilling their democratic principles so loudly proclaimed in the early eighteen-fifties, and answered his own question by claiming that they had bowed to expediency:

> Where, he would ask was their elective governor, elective magistrates, universal suffrage, &c, &c? All were dropped. Why? Because the Lower Canada Opposition who had themselves promulgated these views, sometimes wanted to catch a vote from the hon. members for Lambton or Lincoln. The opposition was not he would assert one of principle, but of men, Its sole desire was to put out the present men.[230]

Loranger no doubt touched a sensitive nerve since the left had hardly pursued elective institutions with much democratic fervor, and were now playing the same political game of combination that the political right had been since the Act of Union.

The age of whig realism had again left its mark upon Canadian political ideas. Whiggery had been the predominant ideological grain in Canadian comment upon American political institutions. Few now denied Americans their right to revolt or to form a new nation and constitution. That their constitution was so conservative endowed its framers with a practical wisdom that whigs found irresistibly appealing. These two concessions had certainly been a marked advance from the consistent negatives of toryism upon the American Revolution, or their "tinkered-up" constituion. But the whig politicians of the

---

[230] Mirror of Parlt., Feb. 22, 1856.

fifties were as stubborn as the old tories when it came to upholding an élitist political structure against the inroads of American political democracy. The tip of the iceberg had melted but its substructure remained as solid as granite.

Realists that they were, the politicians of the fifties also realized that the struggle for a Canadian identity was no longer being fought in the Provincial Legislature. The technology of print had dictated a more popular form of anti-American persuasion. The arid intellectualities of eighteenth century constitutional theory were not fit commodities to persuade a broad middle-class readership. A social gospel founded upon prejudices against "Yankees" would innoculate a population against American democracy far more effectively than legislative enactments against elective magistrates. The changing medium of persuasion had in effect altered the thrust of the anti-American message.

CHAPTER III

ATTITUDES TO EMPIRE: THE LOYALTY CRISES OF 1849

The crisis of the colonial connection in 1849 has had a common historical explanation. Basically it is this. The political crisis over responsible government in April and the annexationist movement of October had their common root in the decline of the old preferential system. Not only were the two outbreaks of discontent associated with the same economic cause, but annexationism was linked causally to the residual discontent created by the Rebellion Losses Bill.[1] Annexationism is often treated as the more serious of the two crises because it represented the cumulative product of a year's discontent, and was qualitatively more radical than dissent against a Governor-General.

Yet each historian is faced with the inescapable fact that annexationism was a pitifully weak movement, "a final bout of Montreal fever, not the herald of a new popular upheaval."[2] Its economic impact was negligible in that the economy rebounded quickly by 1850 and within four years a reciprocity treaty was signed with

---

[1]See J. M. S. Careless, The Union of the Canadas, 1841-57 (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1967), pp. 122-31; G. N. Tucker, The Canadian Commercial Revolution, 1845-51 (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964), pp. 128-47; D. Creighton, The Empire of the St. Lawrence (Toronto: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 370-82.

[2]Careless, The Union of the Canadas, p. 129.

the United States. Politically it was insignificant in that many of the signers of the Manifesto returned rapidly to public life without serious impairment. The lasting benefit of its appearance is usually rendered in whiggish and nationalistic terms. The defeat of annexation was a "victory of self-government over the habit of political dependence, of incipient nationalism over the international commercial state."[3] In short, Lord Elgin's whig view of the political events of 1848 and 1849 still stands. Responsible government, according to Elgin, marked the hazardous course of constitutional monarchy between French republicanism in 1848, and American annexationism in 1849.[4]

But the abhorrence of a radical idea is not enough to constitute a political crisis. Crises are usually measured by the amount of popular concern that they generate, and the severity of the measures that governments contemplate and use to combat them. Civil disobedience and violence are normally considered more critical than a proposed change of political system,if the demand for change is neither widespread nor accompanied by extra-legal procedures. If the annexation crisis be measured in these terms it recedes in total significance.

Historical evidence suggests that economic dislocation in

---

[3]D. Creighton, Empire of the St. Lawrence, p. 382. See also Tucker, op. cit., pp. 147-48; Careless, The Union, p. 131.

[4]See Elgin-Grey Papers, A. G. Doughty (ed.), I, 264; II, 579-80, 608-13, 775.

the autumn of 1849 was confined by and large to the Montreal business community. The annexationist movement was confined mainly to a business class, and took the legal form of a petition, followed by a press campaign, and an attempt to elect candidates. By comparison to the Metcalfe Crisis or the Rebellion Losses Crisis it was a tame affair. The people were never consulted. Acrimonious broadsides were not issued. Shots were not fired. Finally, the government did not see fit to seek a popular mandate. Executive dismissals, a lukewarm press campaign, and a strong statement from the Imperial Government were enough to intimidate the annexationists. In Upper Canada little coercion was even needed, as Baldwin found a strong consensus for the imperial connection even among the tories.

The Rebellion Losses issue qualifies as a more genuine political crisis. Violence had accompanied the passage of the bill, and partisan discontent was general in tory strongholds in the province. Even nonpartisan business discontent contributed to the general malaise which persisted in the spring of 1849. A harassed Reform Party fought back the challenge by a frank resort to loyalism as a popular issue. By the late summer they had won. The only context which could be found after that point had to be found on the basis of interest, not political allegiance. The Montreal businessmen could try to persuade the tory party to support them, but it was highly unlikely that it would risk another defeat on an even more precarious issue. Short of widespread economic collapse, Montreal annexationism was a hypothetical rather than a real political problem.

Given the political nature of the loyalty crises, the nature and use of loyal and imperial sentiment assume vital importance. The difference between the two kinds of sentiment is a crucial one, since it distinguished the French Canadian from the English Canadian response in 1849. At no time during that year did the French Canadians become the exponents of empire. The basic issue was one of political allegiance to Lord Elgin, and indirectly the monarchy. There was then only one loyalty crisis for most French Canadians. The annexation crisis which followed was an issue in national interest not imperial allegiance.

For most English Canadians there were two complementary responses to the crises of 1849. In Upper Canada, the Reformers used both personal loyalty and imperial sentiment to defeat the tories in the spring of 1849. The tories in the upper province clearly missed the mark on loyalty by their demonstrations against Elgin, but by the fall and the annexation crisis they were not to be outdone in the rhetoric of Empire. They had quickly realized loyalty was no longer a special badge of distinction, and that soon radicals like William Lyon Mackenzie would be claiming it. With their economic interest essentially intact, they easily made the transfer from the empire of mutual interests and service to the inessential empire of style, the whig empire. For the Montrealers the transition was more difficult because their interests were so closely engaged in the old Empire. They continued to operate well into the annexation crisis upon the principle of murdered allegiance,

but they too adjusted to the purely political character of the new liberal Empire. In a few short months their attitudes upon Empire were indistinguishable from the English-speaking community of Canada West.

(i) Canada West - The Rise of Imperial Sentiment

In the western portion of the province there was some disenchantment with the imperial government's abandonment of imperial preferences, but the interests of the tory mercantile class there were never so gravely affected as those of the Montreal tories. It is significant that in 1850 the exports of wheat from Canada West via the Erie Canal were nearly fifteen times those of exports out of Quebec, and that the absolute volume of freight via New York was gaining rapidly over that clearing through Montreal.[5] In spite of the superiority of the Canadian canal system along the St. Lawrence after 1848, New York remained the preferred port it always had been since the opening of the Erie system. In addition, the American Drawback Acts of 1846 allowed Canadian exports to be transported across American territory without payment of duty. This enabled the merchants of Canada West to import and export directly, and avail themselves of the cheaper ocean freight costs out of New York. The Upper Canadian mercantile community therefore had much less reason

---

[5]See W. T. Easterbrook and H. G. Aitken, Canadian Economic History (Toronto: Macmillan, 1956), p. 291; G. P. de T. Glazebrook, A History of Transportation in Canada (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1964), Vol. I, p. 93.

to espouse annexationism than the Montreal commercial class since only their feelings were really affected. Had their interests been as deeply affected they might also have repeated their tantrum of 1833, when Lord Stanley had liberalized the bank charters of Upper Canada.[6]

A closer examination of the economic situation reveals that Elgin's comments on bankruptcies as the source of annexationism did apply to Upper Canada, but only in the winter and spring of 1849.[7] At that time, there were those politicians like Allan MacNab, and entrepreneurs like Jacob Keefer of Thorold who were in dire straits.[8] Keefer, despite his reform affiliations and sympathy for the Governor-General, was prepared to espouse annexation as the only remedy to Britain's withdrawal of imperial preferences:

> We are labouring in vain and spending our strength for naught--we may flounder in this way for years and only be going from bad to worse--only falling so much father behind the world--the fates are <u>against</u> us--The policy of Great Britain is <u>ruinous</u> to us, the Commercial relations of the world put us in the background--<u>Annexation is the remedy</u>, and I wish the men in power only believed as I do --and they would if they had the same reasons to feel that I have . . . . I would willingly remain a subject of Her Majesty, <u>if I could</u> afford it, but having built my hopes upon the continued prosperity of Canada, <u>and that foundation having failed</u>, the reflection that I am a British

---

[6]<u>Journals of the House of Assembly of the Province of Upper Canada</u>, March 3, 1834.

[7]See Elgin to Grey, Jan. 4, 1849, Elgin Papers; Elgin to Grey, March 19, 1849, <u>ibid.</u>; Elgin to Grey, April 23, 1849, <u>ibid.</u>; Elgin to Grey, March 14, 1849, <u>Elgin-Grey Papers</u>, I, 307.

[8]See Elgin to Grey, March 5, 1849, <u>Elgin-Grey Papers</u>, I, 352.

> subject does not afford substantial relief nor content me--We are to have no favour then let us have fair field. Annexation would give us that.[9]

The Toronto newspapers, the Examiner, the Patriot, and the Colonist were also incensed at the mother country's indifference to colonial interests. It was not surprising, declared the Patriot, that "loyalists" should then look southward to "men of kindred blood, who, however, differing on questions of public policy--are at least English in name, in language, in history, in feeling, aye, even more so than it will own."[10]

The political climate in Canada West was explosive. During the spring of 1849 reports of Orange and tory violence throughout Upper Canada filtered into the office of Robert Baldwin. The militancy of the tory demonstrations against the Rebellion Losses Bill was captured well in a reform account of the Napanee and Belleville exercises:

> The meeting was very disorderly from beginning to the end. The tories got possession of the ground and opened the meeting before the time advertised for it and proceeded to pass their resolutions, but the Reformers remonstrated, but to no effect, consequently at the proper hour they proceeded to appoint a chairman and passed a resolution of confidence in the Government and were about dispersing when they were attacked and some of them waylaid by the Orange Mob. . . . You have no doubt heard of the meeting

---

[9]J. Keefer to W. H. Merritt, May 5, 1849, Merritt Papers, MG 24, Vol. XXIII, P.A.C. See also same to same, Jan. 14, 1850, Merritt Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[10]Cited in enclosure from Elgin to Grey, April 11, 1849, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 333. See also Colonist, March 23, 1849, April 25, 1849; Toronto Examiner, April 5, 1849.

> held in Belleville upon the subject of Lower Canada Rebellion Losses. The proceedings were of a most shameful and disgraceful character. The Orange Lodges appeared to have been used for the training of the Tory party as they came out prepared with clubs, and report says also a good supply of pistols evidently determined to have a fight before they went home. At the nod of their leaders . . . they pounced upon the Reformers and cruelly and shamefully beat some of them down driving them off the ground.[11]

The Reformers had little choice but to yield. Their opportunity for reprisal came later with the public abhorrence at the treatment of Lord and Lady Elgin. Reformers who had been too timid to oppose the enraged tories in the open field now circulated loyalty addresses to the Governor General and Queen.

It appears that some Reformers were fully prepared to use the loyalty addresses as a vehicle for embarrassing the tories politically. The baldest statement of vengeance came from petty office-seekers. Presuming to speak to Robert Baldwin for the loyal people of Peterborough, W. S. Conger exulted in falling tory stock:

> The gross and ruffianly insult offered to Her Majesty the Queen through the person of Her Noble Representative, will have a tendency to sink, if possible, that miserable faction lower than ever, in the estimation of the truly loyal and right-thinking people of the Province.[12]

David Roblin of Napanee similarly assured Baldwin that "the

---

[11]M. P. Roblin to R. Baldwin, Ameliasburgh, Feb. 23, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L. See also G. Ridout to R. Baldwin, Toronto, March 28, 1849, ibid.; D. W. Macdonald to R. Baldwin, L'Original, May 5, 1859, ibid.

[12]W. S. Conger to R. Baldwin, Peterboro', May 5, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

respectable part" of that village would sign loyalty petitions.[13] With such popular support he argued, the demise of the tories was assured.

Although a few party regulars advocated internal purges akin to the later dismissals in Canada East, the voices of restraint were in the majority.[14] Elgin's forbearance in Montreal clearly had a mitigating effect upon the Upper Canadian reformers.[15] Implicit in the Reformers' restraint was a conviction that their long-term political objectives would be better served. Tolerance would, for example, wean away from the tories many loyal moderates and Orangemen. Secondly, patient and energetic action might bring "responsible government out on a firmer footing than ever."[16] Baldwin's son-in-law, John Ross, smugly observed on the efficacy of these judicious tactics:

> The opposition from one end of the country to the other seem anxious to wriggle out of their late statements [on] this movement and I think it would be the policy of the Reform Press to let them get back again as rapidly as possible without goading them into a readvocacy of the

---

[13]D. Roblin to R. Baldwin, May 3, 1849, Mill Creek; J. Lesslie to R. Baldwin, Toronto, May 7, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[14]See P. Carman to R. Baldwin, Matilda, May 22, 1849; William Reid to R. Baldwin, Sharon, May 12, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[15]Elgin to Grey, Monklands, June 3, 1849, A. G. Doughty (ed.), I, 361. G. Ridout to R. Baldwin, May 5, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[16]Isaac Lewis to R. Baldwin, Goderich, May 5, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

> scheme. The matter will keep well enough for use, as material for mere party attack bye and bye.[17]

The popular reaction to the Montreal riots was emotionally loyal. In some cases the loyalty addresses were barely literate, such as the one which affirmed faith in the "governar general who has stud by the pepol of order [sic]."[18] Most petitions were by contrast well-written, and of a cut well above the rural population of Canada West. The average number of signatures on the addresses and the size of the deputations that carried them to Montreal is difficult to determine. The greatest number of signatures was likely achieved by the massive deputation from Hastings which was estimated by Elgin to contain "upwards of three thousand persons."[19] The lower limit was probably reached in the presentation from the obscure town of Georgiana in the Simcoe district where a "record" petition of one hundred and thirty names was signed.[20]

Approximately one hundred and twenty petitions reached Elgin from Canada West. More astounding than that was the total number of signatures appended to them--an impressive seventy to eighty thousand names.[21] Assuming these figures to be accurate, it would have meant

---

[17] J. Ross to R. Baldwin, Belleville, July 19, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[18] Isaac Bennett to R. Baldwin, May 4, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[19] Elgin to Grey, May 21, 1849, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 357.

[20] W. Johnson to R. Baldwin, Georgiana, May 16, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[21] Elgin to Grey, May 26, June 4, June 18, 1849, C.O. 42/558, 559, P.A.C.

that the actively loyal would have approached one-half the adult male population of Canada West. Of the sample petitions examined some forty-five were concentrated in eight counties. These eight counties, apart from York and Middlesex, were not particularly populous, and even more significant, were less than a fifth of the total number of counties in 1851. It was no coincidence that these eight counties were Reform strongholds represented by such party stalwarts as Baldwin, Hincks, J. C. Morrison, W. H. Merritt, J. S. Macdonald, and R. Bell. While less than ten per cent of the counties represented by Reformers failed to return a loyalty address, almost fifty per cent of the Tory-dominated counties failed to support Lord Elgin.

The content of the petitions was blatantly whiggish. After considerable declamation on law and order,[22] the petitioners got to the nub of the issue:

> We rejoice as British subjects, that the impartiality of Your Excellency in giving effect to the great British and now Canadian system of responsible government, has so clearly shown to the country its true working, namely carrying out the will of the people constitutionally expressed. And we rejoice in the security experienced, that this fine country shall no longer be ruled by an "overbearing minority backed by force."[23]

It was in upholding Lord Elgin's constitutional position that the reformers' whiggery took flight. Contrary to the common tory belief that the governor would be reduced to a cipher under the system of

---

[22] Inhabs. of Village of Paris, Gore District, May 29, 1849, Addresses, P.A.C.

[23] Inhabs. of Beaver Creek Settlement, London District, June 25, 1849, ibid.

responsible government. the reformers now maintained that it was Elgin who was maintaining the "even balance of the constitution" with "a firm and equal hand."[24] Under Elgin and responsible government neither the crown nor the people was encroaching too much on the constitutional sphere of the other. The greatest insurance perhaps that Elgin could maintain a neat balance between these seemingly discordant elements was his aristocratic position: "Confident in your Constitutional knowledge, we are satisfied that nothing unconstitutional will be done; confident in your ability, we feel assured the interests of the Province will be wisely sustained; confident in your noble standing and integrity, we know the dignity of the Crown and the Rights of the People will alike be guarded."[25]

The petitioners' appeals to the social utility of British institutions were equally whiggish. They were perhaps prompted by Elgin's own utilitarian view of the loyalty question. In his reply to the mammoth petition from the Wellington district, Elgin deplored those Montreal tories who had chosen the path of violence since they had lost sight "of their interests altogether." He urged the people that the British Constitution and its practical promises of justice

---

[24]Inhabs. of Albion, Home District, July 2, 1849; Inhabs. of Moulton, Seneca, Cayuga, Niagara District, (n.d.), Addresses, Vols. 13-15, P.A.C.

[25]Township of Oro, Simcoe district, recd. 4th of June, ibid., P.A.C. See also Elgin to Grey, Montreal, March 7, 1848, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 139-40; B. F. Davy to Robert Baldwin, Belleville, May 6, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

and equity need only be accepted respectfully by the inhabitants. If it were, the Province would inevitably prosper "in wealth and population so as to become the envy of these Communities," and if not, there would only be "ruin to trade and unhappiness among the people."[26] The people of Canada West apparently needed little prompting to spread the whig gospel of progress, for the inhabitants of Perth soon penned an address in the florid style of Macaulay and Durham:

> Under those principles the Motherland has attained to great confidence among the nations of the earth and has been recognised as the guardian of the liberties of Christendom. Under the glorious flag "which for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze" live men who have from their childhood been taught to appreciate the sentiment of our ancient Kings, who proclaimed that "Britons should be free as the air they breathed." Slavery has been swept from the British soil amid the heartfelt congratulations of the British people. We have cherished the thought that having attained so much of genuine liberty as is guaranteed to all Her Majesty's subjects . . . [that] old prejudice would in due time vanish and be supplanted by a general disposition towards the improvement of the country and its people.[27]

The only source of Reform disunity was upon the question of a second petition to the Queen. Although many Reformers signed petitions to Elgin, a large number refused to sign a second and separate petition of loyalty to the Queen. Because the tories were circulating counter-petitions to the Queen for Elgin's recall, they argued that a

---

[26]Elgin's reply to the Inhabs. of the Wellington District, May 17, 1849, Addresses, op. cit., P.A.C.

[27]Inhabs. of Perth (n.d.), 1849, Addresses, ibid. See also Inhabs. of First Riding of York, Home District (n.d.), ibid.; Inhabs. of Colchester, May 15, 1849, ibid.

reform petition would appear as an obsequious supplication to the Crown to interfere in Canadian affairs.[28] One candid rustic genuinely feared that such a royal petition would "acknowledge a principal [sic] that we may regret hereafter." Instead he preferred to "uphold that Constitution inviolate that has given us the power of local self government."[29] Other reformers looked at the problem solely from its tactical aspect. They argued that the Queen would disregard the tory petitions to her for Elgin's recall; therefore a second petition was unnecessary.[30] Where both groups were united was in their apprehension that a refusal to sign a second petition might be misinterpreted as disloyalty. The nominal rather than the real presence of the monarchy was therefore their prime concern.

The second rank of reform assault upon disloyalty was the reform press of Canada West. Although there were some pro-annexationist newspaper editors like James Lesslie of the Examiner,[31] the bulk of reform opinion was loyally led by the Globe. As early as January of 1849, George Brown left no doubt where he would stand upon the issues of reciprocity and annexation. Although he lauded the future prospect of free trade between Canada and the United States, Brown was

---

[28]See B. F. Davy to R. Baldwin, Belleville, May 6, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.; E. Gorham to R. Baldwin, Newmarket, May 11, 1849, ibid.

[29]J. Clement to R. Baldwin, Brantford, May 26, 1849, ibid.

[30]K. Mackenzie to R. Baldwin, Kingston, May 26, 1849, ibid.

[31]J. Lesslie to W. L. Mackenzie, Toronto, March 4, 1850, Mackenzie-Lindsey Collection, Ontario Archives.

angered by the American presumptions: "We can never approach them to buy their sugars or teas, or calicoes, and to give them our wheat and timber, but they immediately suppose we have fallen in love with their government."[32] In March, the Globe further warned his readers to beware of a coalition between 'extreme tories' and 'a small Republican faction' to effect annexation. An eloquent loyalist appeal was then issued to demonstrate the absurdity of "dissevering our connection with the Mother Country" and plunging "into the vortex of hazardous innovation" for mere free trade.[33]

Even before violence erupted over the rebellion losses issue, the Globe anticipated the swelling of annexationist support within tory ranks. In a magnificent piece of whig journalism, George Brown demonstrated the essentially rebellious character of toryism. Despite the Colonist's protests to the contrary, the tories were caricatured as chronic rebels ever since the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745. Their fatal flaw was their fractious attitude towards constituted authority ever since the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which had divided sovereignty between the three branches of King, Lords, and Commons. Therefore, their conspiracies "against the integrity of the People's House" were as traitorous to the constitution as those who would overturn the executive power.[34] Even more important to the Globe than the constitutional blessings that Great

---

[32] Globe, Jan. 10, 1849. [33] Ibid., March 14, 1849.

[34] Globe, March 21, 1849. See also London Free Press, March 6, April 10, 1849.

Britain had bestowed upon Canada were the practical ones. Whig interest even more than sentiment demanded an acceptance of responsible government:

> Great Britain has removed every material object to our progress, pays an army for our protection, places us in political rights on a level with her own population, left us to manage her own affairs, and will readily accede to any wishes expressed through the majority of our Parliament. She will do more and assist us with our great railroads.[35]

The immediate effect of the general reform assault on disaffection was suffocating.[31] Disloyalty rapidly lost its vitality between the formation of the British American League, and the loyalty addresses of the General Convention in July of 1849. Whether because of improving economic conditions or cooling tempers, disaffected tories soon limited themselves to opposing Elgin and the Reform Ministry.

Lord Elgin was essentially right when he claimed that, despite the existence of Americans at the first Convention, the tory leaders as a whole "do not wish things to go so far--they will be satisfied if the League acts as a lever to lift the present Government out of office."[37] Samuel Thompson, the former editor of the Colonist smugly claimed in retrospect that the Toronto tories were far too loyal and orderly for either annexation or for violence against the Crown:

---

[35] Ibid., May 5, 1849. [36] Ibid., June 2, 1849.

[37] Elgin to Grey, Montreal, April 23, 1849, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 349.

> In Toronto, sympathy with the resentment of the rioters was blended with a deep sense of the necessity for enforcing law and order--To the passionate movement in Montreal for annexation to the English race south of the line, no corresponding sentiment gained a hold in the Upper Province. And in the subsequent interchange of views between Montreal and Toronto which resulted in the convention of the British American League at Kingston. In the following July, it was sternly insisted by the western men that no breath of disloyalty to the Empire would for a moment be tolerated here.[38]

The Toronto tories' refusal to countenance annexation was supported by the outlying branches of the British American League in Brockville, Hamilton and Kingston. Even at the highest point of discontent the Brockville and Hamilton associations merely directed their hostilities internally against French Canadian domination. Despite their many commercial grievances, the Brockville Association could only muster a cryptic resolution: "That the present state of the public mind cannot be suffered to continue without serious injury to all interests in the Province, nor without placing in direct peril, our connexion with the parent state."[39]

The pull of the anti-annexationist tide in Canada West became irresistible as preparations were made for the British American League's convention in late July. It rapidly became apparent in the election of delegates that the reform demonstrations of May and June

---

[38] S. Thompson, Reminiscences of a Canadian Pioneer for the Last Fifty Years (Toronto: Hunter and Rose, 1884), p. 244.

[39] Brockville Association of the British American League, April 7, 1849, reported in the British Colonist, April 17, 1849. See also Colonist, June 5, 1849; British Whig, July 3, 1849. Address of Hamilton Branch of the British American League, Spectator Office, Hamilton, 1849 (Toronto Public Library).

had rallied many moderate tories and Orangemen to the loyalist cause. With few exceptions the local branches of the League elected anti-annexationists to represent them at Kingston. The Orange and Tory rank and file made it brutally apparent to their representatives that they would not tolerate the discussion of the matter. Delegates were then forced to pledges by their local branches to oppose annexation in the event that it should be brought up. The depth of loyal feeling became so intense that the newly re-elected Grand Master of the Orange Lodge, Ogle Gowan, would have faced expulsion by the Order if he did not honour his anti-annexationist pledge.[40] Irate tories in some areas also used the occasion to coerce such newspapers as the Cobourg Star to abandon annexationism.

The Toronto newspapers supporting annexation were quickly sobered by the loyalist tide that had swept through the League. The Patriot now avowed its determination to oppose discussion of resolutions for annexation at the next British American League Convention.[41] The Colonist, which had only just announced its support of separation or annexation, quickly began to retract within the critical week that tory delegates were elected. By mid-July the editor announced that it was the duty of the public journalist "to chronicle the news of the

---

[40] J. Ross to R. Baldwin, Belleville, July 6, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L. See also D. Roblin to R. Baldwin, June 16, 1849, Napanee, ibid.; Elgin to Grey, July 16, 1849, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 408.

[41] Toronto Patriot, July 5, 1849.

day." For that reason he scouted the extremes represented by the anti-annexationist Patriot and the pro-annexationist Examiner, since for his own part, he had "no desire to force annexation dogmas on the public."[42] After the Convention had clarified the direction of the tory party, the Colonist's affection for the British connection rose to a furious boil.

While toryism huddled to hide the ugly corpse of annexation in July, it nevertheless remained consistent in its treatment of Lord Elgin. Not only did pressure for his recall come from rabid tory journals,[43] but also from the moderate reform press in tory strongholds like Kingston. The British Whig of that city sustained considerable opposition to Elgin throughout the month of May. Finally, when it appeared to the Whig that he was no longer capable of carrying out his official functions such as the proroguing of Parliament, the editor curtly demanded "that his Lordship must go home."[44]

To the tories, Elgin's inability to fulfil his functions led to an even more serious disruption of the constitutional balance Canada had enjoyed before 1849. The Hamilton Branch of the British American League echoed Simcoe and Strachan in its concern for the

---

[42] Colonist, July 13, 1849. Even the radical-reform Examiner retreated from annexation to separation at this time. Toronto Examiner, July 11, 1849.

[43] Colonist, April 17, 27, May 22, 1849; Spectator, March 28, April 4, 1849.

[44] Kingston, British Whig, June 1, 1849.

'true' British constitution:

> The transcript of the British Constitution which has been bestowed upon us, has either been perverted from its original purpose, or is unsuited for a Colony so peculiarly situated as ours . . . The nicely balanced estates of the realm, which are the boast of every Briton, are, in this Province at present entirely unknown. The Legislative Council has been rendered subservient to, and is but an echo of the House of Assembly, and the Representative of Her Majesty is held by his advisers, to be responsible solely to the people whom he governs, without any deference being paid to the power by which he is appointed.[45]

The Colonist further elaborated upon the gradual estrangement of people and crown created by Elgin and the Great Ministry. Thompson portrayed Elgin as a highly paid but irresponsible Grand Elector, and the Colonial Office as a venerable mockery, "the shadow of a substance long since past away." Only through a direct appeal to the Queen for Elgin's dismissal would the loyal people of Canada be truly re-united with the Queen, the Parliament and people of Great Britain.[46] The British American League Convention had also declared open season upon Elgin. While the rules initially forbade members to speak disrespectfully of the Queen, the Royal Family, and the Governor-General, the last was denied immunity after some discussion. The gag which had been employed upon annexation was now removed so that "the members were at perfect liberty to speak of Lord Elgin Exactly as truth warranted, without resorting to any ambiguous

---

[45] Address of the Hamilton Branch of the British North American League, op. cit.

[46] Colonist, May 22, 1849.

phraseology."[47] He was thus publicly flayed for bringing royal authority into contempt. Notice was finally given for his recall on the grounds that "his continuance in high position cannot conduce to public peace and prosperity."[48]

The next three months proved as critical to the public position of the Governor-General as the annexation issue had to the province of Canada in the previous three months. Once again Elgin, Baldwin, and Brown proved their skill in forcing the issue into simple alternatives of allegiance versus disaffection. The tactic decided upon by Elgin and Baldwin was a personal tour of Canada West by the Governor-General. Although Elgin announced quite spontaneously to Grey his intention "to mix with the farmers" in early September of 1849, both he and Baldwin had been planning his itinerary very carefully since July. The mere suggestion was greeted with such hostility in such areas as Bytown and Kingston that he undoubtedly reconsidered.[49] A careful canvass was then made in Upper Canada by prominent members of the Reform Ministry. The President of the Council, W. H. Merritt, was dispatched to troubled sections of the Province. Baldwin then polled his supporters in critical areas like Brockville to determine whether it would be safe for Elgin to visit there. In the case of Brockville it was decided that the Governor-General would certainly

---

[47] Montreal Gazette, July 28, 1849.

[48] "Address of the British American League, Kingston, July 31, 1849," reprinted in Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 442.

[49] Bytown Gazette in British Whig, July 3, 1849.

risk a Reform defeat before irate tories and Orangement led by George Crawford and Ogle Gowan. News of such a demoralizing defeat it was felt "would go through the province like wildfire that the Governor-General had been driven from Brockville."[50] In view of this advice and Elgin's own fears that he might be murdered there, the Brockville visit never materialized.[51]

Reports from other areas of the Province were much more favourable. When Merritt returned to Toronto he advised Baldwin that public opinion was generally in favour of the Governor:

> I feel quite satisfied that His Excellency will be well received in all parts of the Country. There are exceptions to this general rule but they are rare, and were the least attempt at insult or disrespect offered it would produce a consternation which would strengthen in place of lessening the respect due to His Excellency.[52]

Similar advice issued from the environs of Hamilton. There, the reformers were confident that they could deal with any threat of disruption by the tories, because "nineteen out of twenty here have cheerfully offered their hearty assent to be sworn in an constables."[53] The most effective political itinerary would therefore be one which began in the reform strongholds in the western portion of the province.

---

[50] J. Morris to R. Baldwin, Brockville, Aug. 7, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[51] Elgin to Grey, Aug. 6, 1849, Montreal, Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 444, 447; W. H. Merritt to R. Baldwin, Toronto, July 24, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[52] W. H. Merritt to R. Baldwin, Toronto, July 31, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[53] G. Rolph to R. Baldwin, Dundas, Sept. 14, 1849, ibid.

With such demonstrable proof of the loyalty of the people of Upper Canada, Elgin could then proceed confidently to areas of tory and orange disaffection.

Before such a critical venture could be undertaken it was essential that the public be further instructed in the lessons of loyalty. The greatest partisan for the Crown was again George Brown of the Globe. He waxed enthusiastically upon the non-partisan popularity of the Governor-General, excoriating the tories for attempting to turn back the clock of political development to the days when the governor was the instrument of a minority.[54] A welcome source of recent support for the imperial connection was the Anglican clergy and their newspaper , The Church.[55] The most prominent statement of loyalty to the person of the monarch and her representative was made by Bishop Strachan's protegé, A. N. Bethune. In a sermon to the pro-annexationist members of his Anglican congregation in Cobourg, Bethune delivered a classic homily on the divine origins of monarchy and its social utility. Deriving his argument from an archetypal defence of monarchy appearing in the Church of England Magazine "some years ago," Bethune dwelt interminably upon his favorite subject--the habit of royal authority:

> We should thank God, that he has been pleased to ordain as our lot to live under that form of government which is nearest allied to the examples and ordinances furnished in

---

[54] Globe, Aug. 9, 1849.

[55] The Church, Sept. 27, 1849.

> his own blessed Scriptures. We shall feel thankful for this as having the strongest and most natural influence in restraining "the madness of the people" and preserving to us the inestimable blessings of law, order, quiet and true religion. In respect to these high and peculiar benefits--from the force of duty especially, and the constraint of the most solemn obligations, we shall gladly obey this advice of the wise man, "My son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change."[56]

He then concluded with a stirring appeal to that loyalty towards king and country, which transcended "temporary vexation or passing disappointment." For the benefit of those who persisted in their course of disaffection he reminded them that annexation and opposition to the Crown were "overt and daring" treason.[57]

The rallying effect of such public pressure by the press and clergy was considerable when combined with the presence of Lord Elgin. When he began his tour in mid-September Elgin touched briefly in the tory stronghold of Kingston where he received a warm reception at the public wharf. The editor of the Kingston Whig was in fact so piqued at the public display of affection that he facetiously suggested that it should turn "Radical," and become a supporter of Lord Elgin:

> The good old Conservative City of Kingston, Conservative par excellence, has changed its politics, and why should not its only Daily Paper do the same thing? Since the whole town, big bugs and tag rag, ran in crowds to the Queen's wharf, striving who should be foremost in welcoming His Excellency, the Governor-General, and actually

---

[56] A. N. Bethune, The Duty of Loyalty, 1849, Cobourg Star, 1849, pp. 14-15; T.P.L. Pamphlet Collection.

[57] Ibid., p. 16.

> fought for standing room on the decks of the Cherokee the rain coming down in pitiless torrents, while the favored few were left in the cabin, it is a folly to gainsay that a change has come over men's minds in this, that would be Seat of Government.[58]

Elgin's triumph in Kingston made almost certain his successes in the reform strongholds in the Niagara peninsula. Even in the town of Niagara, which was represented by a tory in the House of Assembly, the conservative press and people rejoiced in celebration of the royal visit. In the tour that followed through the small towns of the peninsula, and beyond into the western portion of the province, the farmers and townspeople were uniformly warm in their response to the Governor-General's visit. As he came to rest two weeks later in Brantford, Elgin reflected upon what had passed. He concluded that the personal nature of his visit, unaccompanied by partisan officials and unprotected by military force, had been singularly successful in eliciting non-partisan loyalty from a "high-spirited, but withall contented people."[59]

Just as Elgin contemplated his entry into Toronto, the annexation manifesto burst into public prominence.[60] The impact of annexationism upon the Toronto tories was all to Elgin's benefit. His guess that the tories and Orangemen of Toronto were generally attached

---

[58] British Whig, Sept. 13, 1849.

[59] Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 483.

[60] Elgin to Grey, Toronto, Oct. 11, 1849, ibid., II, 519; Globe, Oct. 16, 1849.

to the connection soon proved to be true.[61] Tories like Samuel Thompson who had remained openly critical of Elgin up until the time of his visit now swung their weight dramatically towards him. The names of prominent tories like Chief Justice Robinson, John Elmsley, John Hillyard Cameron, Henry Sherwood, and W. H. Boulton were found at the head of a non-partisan address favouring the British connection.[62] The stock of the Governor-General and the Colonial Office had therefore risen in direct proportion to Montreal annexationism.

The British American League now shifted to a more positive brand of anglo-saxon imperialism. At its meetings in early November in Toronto, the tories and reformers no longer saw fit to include a public condemnation of Lord Elgin as they had in July. Notwithstanding the more open and vocal expression of annexationism by such delegates as Thomas Wilson of Quebec, the Convention was of one mind upon the retention of the British connection. That imperial sentiment ran very high was indicated not only in the vote against annexation but in the powerful reaction of the convention against Thomas Wilson's charge that monarchy could never take root in the North American continent. Shouts of "No, never" went up when Wilson suggested that "We are by nature, in our feelings and sentiments, attached to a free and if you choose to call it so, a

---

[61] Elgin to Grey, Niagara, Oct. 19, 1849, ibid., II, 524.

[62] S. Thompson, Reminiscences, p. 272; Globe, Oct. 25, 1849; Colonist, Oct. 30, 1849.

republican form of government."[63]

Appeals to imperial integrity were universally applauded. Ogle Gowan drew little applause for his analogy of Canada to pre-revolutionary America, and little more when he appealed for broader elective institutions in Canada. But he did draw considerable approval from the convention by his appeal to the integrity of Empire: "Sir, annexation is a hard word for a Briton to pronounce, for as I have already stated, I was born in Briton, and hope to die one . . . With me love of Britain is a prejudice but prejudice though it be, I must confess it has become with me a principle. (Hear, Hear.)."[64] Although it was difficult for the more conservative elements in the convention to improve on either Gowan's egoism or his loyalism, they did generate a more aggressive spirit of imperialism. A. J. Macdonell of Greenfield in fact predated much of the evangelical flavor of later imperialism in his pride of connection "with the greatest empire in the world, and hav(ing) had some hand in civilizing the nations and spreading abroad the light and truth of the gospel."[65]

The cheers that greeted Macdonell's philippic against annexation marked the end of the British American League's uncomfortable association with annexationism. Even the rash Thomas Wilson of Quebec

---

[63]Minutes and Proceedings of the Second Convention of Delegates of the British North American League, Toronto, Patriot Office, 1849, xxiv, P.A.C. Pamphlet Collection.

[64]Ibid., vii-xvii.

[65]Ibid., xl.

who had been most outspoken in his advocacy of elective institutions and political union now disassociated himself from the Montreal annexationists. The League then became the whiggish exponent of self-determination in a federation of the British North American provinces. In its spring address of 1850 the League published an address that might well have been written by Lord Durham himself:

> Thenceforth the dominion of Great Britain will be one of affection instead of power; all causes of difference being thus removed, nothing will disturb the free currents of our hearts' love towards the land of our forefathers--its old associations long cherished, will grow with our growth and strengthen with our strength; the red-cross flag, still our country's symbols will uphold our national pride, and we shall still glory in the glory of Britons.[66]

The de-emphasis of an empire of interest and the elevation of an empire of sentiment was also apparent in the tory press. Not long after the November meeting of the British American League, the Toronto Colonist published a lengthy article upon 'OUR ANGLO SAXON EMPIRE' from Tait's Magazine of Edinburgh. Although the article itself purported to treat the sources of imperial strength (interest, commerce, morals, and religion), it was a decidedly romantic tract of anglo-saxon racism. The millennium of British imperialism began with Alfred the Great whose reign was, "in every particular, prefigurative of the subsequent progress of the nation." The only way that the empire could survive into a second millennium was to discard the pecuniary outlook of the Whigs and Earl Grey and return to the true mission of the race:

---

[66]Address of the Central Committee of the B. A. L., Toronto, May 1, 1850, cited in the Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 659.

> The Anglo-Saxon empire must be saved, to work out at home, in the Colonies, in Africa, in Asia, in America, a noble mission of love an [sic] truth. Let it die now in its first millenium, and it would leave a chequered memory on earth. Let it live to exhibit the generosity and power for a century--to employ its great means for the good of even one generation--to educate, the emancipate, and enfranchise wherever its power extends, and its name would be a household word.[67]

Reformers joined with tories in the intolerant spirit of imperialism which gripped Upper Canada in the wake of the Annexation Manifesto. George Brown became more strident than ever in his whiggish diatribes on empire. In a long series devoted to the dreary history of oppression in the United States, Brown proferred the alternative of British liberty. He dramatically related the American attempt in 1812 to stab England in the back as she defended the liberties of Europe: "Nation after nation fell under the power of the conquering Napoleon. In the language of Sheridan--Kings were his sentinels and Princes his domestics. The civilised world was at his feet, England alone excepted."[68] Tories like William Kirby joined hands with Brown in defending the lofty motives of the whig ministers. According to Kirby, political history had never recorded an instance of "a great country voluntarily stripping herself of a third of her richest possessions, and quietly descending from the foremost into the second rank among nations."[69] He was equally firm in his

---

[67] British Colonist, Nov. 20, 1849.

[68] Globe, Oct. 30, 1849. See also C. Ridout to R. Baldwin, Nov. 2, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[69] W. Kirby (Britannicus), "Countermanifesto to the Annexationists," Niagara, printed at the Office of J. A. Davidson, Niagara Mail, 1849, p. 6.

insistence that the British Empire was more than an association of members in common interest. Great Britain had proven that altruism was at its base in her defence of Canada in the War of 1812, and the Colonies should reciprocate "if her enemies [who] are emphatically the enemies of humanity, assail her."[70] Kirby's conversion to a whig definition of empire in an open letter to the Globe had led George Brown to admire:

> I agree with all it contains, but that about the Queen's being "too kind, forgiving and indulgent to her erring subjects." I don't believe in the apostolic succession of any priesthood, or the divine right of the ruler beyond that the people ruled give. Your sentiments are not those of a Tory. You are a Whig.[71]

By late 1849 there was no economic or political rationale for annexationism. The buoyancy of the UpperCanadian economy was no small source of congratulation to Brown and Kirby. The latter commented upon the "happy and contented character" of Hamilton, Toronto, and their rural environs, and challenged anyone to compare Canada West "not only with the United States but with any country in the world."[72] Brown also took great delight in parading favourable agricultural quotations before the annexationists to disprove their premise that "ruin and decay" was everywhere.[73]

---

[70] Ibid., p. 14.

[71] G. Brown to Wm. Kirby, July 12, 1849, Wm. Kirby Papers, P.A.O.

[72] W. Kirby, "Countermanifesto," p. 5.

[73] Globe, Oct. 20, 1849.

Most tories and Orangemen had long since come home to the British roost. Apart from a few disaffected radicals and clear-grits in Toronto and the western peninsula, the province was universally loyal. James Davidson reported to William Lyon Mackenzie by February of 1850 that, "Everyone I meet from the interior of the District [Niagara] on the subject of Annexation, and the answer invariably is 'he don't want anything of that kind!'"[74] Mackenzie himself became a powerful prophylactic against the virus of annexation spreading from the pen of his personal friend James Lesslie. From his exile in Washington Mackenzie warned of the dangers of republicanism in an open letter to the editor of the Examiner. In contrite terms he now announced that his goal upon his return to Canada would be "to preserve the British connection and to make that connection worth preserving."[75] With the confident readmission of Mackenzie in 1850 as an advocate of the British connection, Elgin had virtually nailed the last spike in the coffin of annexation.[76]

The mopping-up operations in Canada West also suggested that

---

[74]J. Davidson to W. L. Mackenzie, Feb. 24, 1850, Mackenzie-Lindsey Collection, P.A.O.; D. Roblin to R. Baldwin, Jan. 11, 1850, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[75]Toronto Examiner, Jan. 31, 1850. Lesslie's permission to print these critical letters might be attributed to the ties of friendship and the desire for circulation. The latter was a more likely consideration since Lesslie later commented to Mackenzie upon the positive reaction to his open correspondence by Orangemen and Tories who "are free to express their belief in your substantial integrity and desire for the welfare of Canada." J. Lesslie to W. L. Mackenzie, Toronto, March 7, 1850, Mackenzie-Lindsey Collection, Ontario Archives.

[76]See Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 756-57, 819.

annexationism had not divided Canada badly. Although prominent reformers like Francis Hincks and W. H. Merritt had repeatedly called for wholesale dismissals of annexationists from office, Baldwin refused to stoop to petty vendetta. He held his party in check at least a month after the executive dismissals had taken place in Canada East.[77] By his holding action which lasted until January of the new year, Baldwin was able to conduct a token purge of those stubborn annexationists who had decided to stay with an obviously foundering ship.[78]

The annexation crisis had ended not with a bang, but with a whimper. As a separate issue it had been of little significance in Upper Canada, and had only assumed importance as a part of the broader problem of loyalty in 1849. Even the loyalty crisis per se had not been a severe one for Upper Canadians, since it had evoked an affirmative from both parties on the value of the imperial connection. Its essential value had been a controversial one, a forum for the clarification of national and imperial roles. Upper Canadians of both parties had had in the short space of twelve months to readjust their styles to fit the realities of the new Empire.

---

[77]Decision of the Executive Council, Dec. 1, 1849, in Annexation Addresses, RG 4, B37, Vol. 5, P.A.C.

[78]See Prov. Secretary's correspondence with Col. Prince who was dismissed as Queen's Counsel, Col. Prince to J. Lesslie, Park Farm, March 30, April 13, 1850; Prov. Secy. C. W., Letterbook and Sheriff T. Corbett of Kingston who was warned not to advertise in the annexationist Kingston Argus, J. Corbett to J. Lesslie, Feb. 23, 1850, Kingston, ibid.

For the tories, the Gordian knot of Empire had finally been cut. Neither institutions nor interest were any longer sacred. Nation and empire had become divisible. The past had been severed from the present. In desperation many tories seized upon the attractive gospel of whig imperialism blending as it did interests with feelings, the past with the present and even future, and national and imperial loyalties. The formula was basically Lord Durham's. Its brighter side was a loose definition of Empire approaching that of the Commonwealth--a common people, a common institutional heritage, and concentric economic interests. The darker side was a social and atavistic definition of imperialism, the triumph of progressive races over lesser races and territorial obstacles. As Samuel Thompson of the Colonist observed in retrospect in 1884, the British American League had been the germ of a racial mission: "Canada was lifted into a front rank amongst progressive peoples . . . a forward step was taken towards that great future of the British race, which is destined to include in its heaven directed mission, the whole world, east, west, north and south."[79]

As victors in the loyalty crisis, the Reformers had undergone a subtle psychological change. Although their whig idea of empire was victorious, its political application had entailed a revision in content. The Reformers had fulfilled the traditional political role of the tories. George Brown had become by his eloquent defence of

---

[79] S. Thompson, Reminiscences, p. 262.

British institutions over republican ones, the willing captive of Compact anti-Americanism. As the defender of Lord Elgin and responsible government, Robert Baldwin was a whig in theory, but in fact he had pre-empted the tory's favoured position of loyalty. The reformer and tory were then at psychological par as they emerged from the annexation crisis. Whigs by imperial sentiment, by practice they were both conservative nationalists. The struggle of the eighteen-fifties was not to be a conflict between two partisan outlooks on empire but between theory and practice, between imperialism and nationalism.

(ii) French Canada - Loyalty and Nationality

Unlike the fragmentary treatment of the annexation movement in Canada West, the historiography of the loyalty crisis of 1849 in Canada East has received recent treatment.[80] The central thread of Professor Monet's narrative is the annexation crisis, and the role that the clergy and conservative politicians played in arresting it. Conspicuously absent from that narrative is a treatment of the earlier loyalty crisis of 1849, which is subsumed under the general heading, "The Rise of Annexation." Yet another assumption of that study is that the French Canadian conservatives were more concerned with the threat of the liberal-republican rouges than with the disaffected Montreal tories. Although neither assumption is necessarily invalid,

---

[80] See J. Monet, "The Last Cannon Shot - A Study of French Canadian Nationalism, 1837-50," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1964), pp. 626-737; J. Monet, "French Canada and the Annexation Crisis 1848-50," C.H.R. (September, 1966), XLVII, 249-64.

the nature and extent of loyalty, and the limits of nationality and imperial sentiment are never very clear. It is simply clear that the conservatives won and that French Canada was retained to the British connection.

The quality of French Canadian loyalty expressed in the crises of April and October is an important as its quantitative superiority. Whether it was aimed as Professor Monet has put it at "the very small intellectual French head" or at "the large English body" assumes vital importance. It appears that in the Rebellion Losses Crisis the French Canadian Reformers were aiming hard body blows at the disaffected tories, just as Baldwin was in Upper Canada. But in Canada East that struggle had an extra dimension other than pure partisanship--that of nationality and race. It then appears as though Lafontaine and his party had switched to jabbing at the elusive head of rouge annexationism by the summer and fall. But the finishing blow to the annexationist "monster" was a vicious one aimed in December of 1849 at the solar plexus of the English body. All told then, the French Canadian Reformers, with the able assistance of their English Canadian allies in Montreal, took their stiffest punches not at the rouges but at the Lower Canadian tories.

The response of the French Canadian conservative to the call of Empire was as partisan and disciplined as that of the Reformers of Canada West. Just as Baldwin, Hincks, and Merritt marshalled an impressive show of loyalty to Lord Elgin in May, their French Canadian allies, Lafontaine, Parent, and Morin were equally resourceful in manufacturing a loyal response in Lower Canada. In doing so

they relied upon the traditional sources of conservatism in Lower Canada--the Church, the politicians, and the militia. When the Tories and Orangemen burst into their destructive tantrum upon the acceptance of the Rebellion Losses Bill, Lafontaine received immediate offers of assistance from these quarters:

> Of the Tory and Orange Party in this neighbourhood and particularly Leeds, they are equally daring and ready for anything desperate, they express the same sentiments as the Montreal Rebels and are determined to fight and destroy the present Government and their measures . . . Rest assured that the adherents of the Tory and Orange Party here are ready and watching--And Alexis Coté, Notary, Major of Militia, Magistrate, and Commissioner, who persecuted the Reverend A. Lebel and the curé of St. Giles and forced him from here has been and is now actually linked with the Tory Orange Party. He is a disgrace to his country and unfit from a party spirit to be entrusted with power by the present crisis. . . . In Haste--We Actually possess the spirit of 1812.[81]

Indeed they did, for the clergy which had confirmed the habitants in their loyalty of 1812 immediately rallied to the defence of the British connection. In early May of 1849 Bishop Joseph Turgeon, the coadjutor at Quebec, quickly brought his cohorts into the fray with a circular letter demanding addresses of loyalty to the Governor-General. There is little doubt that Turgeon's motive was political for he openly stated that the clergy had to stem "le mouvement du parti qui travaille à renverser le gouvernement, et qui, en cas de succès, ne ménagerait pas plus nos institutions politiques."[82]

---

[81] J. B. Laporte and Frederick King to Lafontaine, St. Giles, d. of Quebec, April 29, 1849, Lafontaine Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 9, nos. 1743-44.

[82] B. Turgeon, Circular Letter to the Clergy, May 2, 1849, in Mandements et Lettres Circulaires des Evêques de Québec, II, 538.

In order to expedite this loyal response Turgeon included a common form and very specific instructions for its transmission to Lord Elgin. He even included a careful reminder to the cure to ensure that "deux noms au moins attestent que les noms opposés au bas de l'addresse, ont été souscrits librement et avec connaissance de cause."[83] Turgeon was taken aback when his humble parishioners

---

[83] Ibid., p. 540. Since the form was used in well over one-half of the French Canadian petitions to Elgin, it is here reproduced in full:

> Nous les soussignés, habitants francs-tenanciers de la paroisse de dans le comté de dans le district de approchons humblement de Votre Excellence, pour lui exprimer notre indignation au sujet des insultes inouies dans notre patrie, auxquelles a été exposé le représentant de Sa Majesté, et de l'acte de vandalisme sans exemple dans les annales des peuples civilisés contre le lieu partout sacré des séances législatives, où se trouvaient déposées, sous la garde de l'honneur public, les archives de la législature, et une des plus belles collections littéraires et scientifiques que possedait l'Amérique, et qui déjà faisait à juste titre l'orgueil de notre Canada.
>
> Nous sommes fermement décidés et résolus à soutenir votre Excellence de tous nos efforts, dans la voie de l'ordre et de la paix publics, et qu'au premier appel, Votre Excellence verra accourir se ranger autour de Votre Excellence et du drapeau britannique toute notre loyale et valeureuse jeunesse; fière en cette occaison de montrer combien Votre Excellence nous a rendu chers les liens qui nous unissent à l'Empire.
>
> Nous sommes convaincus que les derniers événements qui viennent de souiller les annales de la cité de Montréal, étant d'un caractère eminemment séditieux et d'une tendance évidemment révolutionnaire, ils doivent nécessairement, si l'esprit qui les a produits n'est promptement étouffé, conduire à l'anarchie et à une rupture violente du lien qui unit cette colonie à l'Empire britannique; événement que nous déplorerions et auquel nous prions Dieu de nous soustraire longtemps encore.
>
> A cette fin, nous assurons Votre Excellence, que l'appui moral de toute notre population est acquis au gouvernement

went beyond the call of duty in signing the form address to Elgin, and then circulating an additional petition to the Queen against his recall. Somewhat embarrassed by this breach in etiquette and perhaps constitutionality, Turgeon bowed gracefully to the spontaneity of the imperialist response. A copy of the hierarchy's appeal was quickly despatched, urging that they also cover their own address with numerous signatures.[84]

The reaction of the Bishop of Montreal, Ignace Bourget, was not nearly as even as that of his Quebec superiors. His initial reaction to the violence in Montreal was much the same as Turgeon's. In a circular letter of April 27, Bourget instructed his clergy in their sacred duty:

> Vous ne manquerez de maintenir le peuple dans la fidelité qu'il doit à son gouvernement. Il aura cette fois pour lui la bonne cause, et sous la protection du Dieu des armées, il se montrera ce qu'il fut dans les guerres de 1775 et 1812 . . . Déjà dans plusieurs occasions le clergé, s'est mis à la tête de son peuple, pour porter au pied du Trône, le tribut d'amour et confiance qu'avaient su se considerer ici les représentants de Sa Majesté.[85]

Within a week, Bourget had changed his mind. He now felt that the atmosphere of violence in Montreal could easily result in racial

---

> de Votre Excellence, et que celui de nos bras lui est assuré au besoin.
>
> St. le de 1849.
> (Suivent les signatures.)

[84]Circular Letter, May 7, 1849, ibid., III, 541.

[85]I. Bourget, Fioretti Vescovili, Extraits des Mandements, Lettres Pastorales et Circulaires de Msgr. Ignace Bourget, Montreal "Franc Parleur," 1872.

warfare, with the government troops aligning with the English tories. Anticipating such a situation, Bourget did not want to divide himself from his people as his clergy had done in 1837. In the rebellion, French Canadian loyalty had not been appreciated "à sa juste valeur, puisqu'il a fait brûler nos églises et a refusé de faire grace à des coupables pour lesquels l'Evêque de Montreal solicitait l'indulgence du Gouvernement, quelques jours avant l'execution des infortunés Cardinal et Duquet."[86] Presumably Bourget's fears were dispelled by the return to public order in Montreal in May, for the loyalty addresses from Montreal easily outnumbered those from Quebec City. But his reservations do reveal a fundamental distrust of secular imperial authority and its anglo-saxon bias. By contrast, his contemporaries in Quebec continued to view the monarchy and a francophile governor as the traditional guarantors of French Canadian national institutions.

Reform politicians actively co-operated with the clergy in producing this impressive response from French Canada. Many politicians of the Lafontaine contingent from Canada East forwarded printed loyalty addresses to their constituents. Michel Fourquin, the sitting member for Yamaska in the Provincial Parliament cautioned his constituents that a failure to petition for Lord Elgin's retention of office meant a denial of responsible government. He then included for their signature a political manifesto promising

---

[86]Bishop I. Bourget to J. Turgeon, May 2, 1849, cited in L. Pouliot, "Au Lendemain de l'Emeute de 1849," R.H.A.F., IX (1955-56), 118.

Elgin and the Ministry maximum moral and physical support:

> Ayant pleinement confiance dans les hommes qui sont autour de vous, en répudient comme nous le faisons ceux qui ne cherchent dans l'émeute et dans l'anarchie le triomphe de leurs principes ou de leurs projets ambitieux, nous serons prêts en tout temps à donner à Votre Excellence l'appui moral et physique dont elle pourrait avoir besoin ... La Milice Canadienne qui défendit le drapeau Britannique en 1775 et en 1812 contre l'invasion étrangère, au premier signal, accourait auprès de Votre Excellence pour défendre le sol de la souillure des troubles intestins.[87]

The politicians easily swung the local social élites behind them. Included among the signators of the petitions were local magistrates and officers of militia, both of whom held office at the pleasure of the Great Ministry. The liberal professions could also be counted upon for their support of the Reform politicians. Doctors, lawyers, and notaries were perhaps the most prominent organizers of secular petitions. A conclusive indication of the unanimity of the loyalty addresses was the presence of seigneurs at pro-Elgin demonstrations. Clinging desperately to the hope that Lafontaine and Elgin would not desert them upon the question of seigneurial tenure, they rallied round the flag.

Quantitatively, the loyalty addresses were a most impressive display, equalling and perhaps surpassing those of Canada West. There were almost two hundred petitions ranging from Vaudreuil and Huntingdon in the far West of the province to Gaspé and Bonaventure in the East.

---

[87] See M. Fourquin to J. Wurtele, Montreal, May 2, 1849, J. Wurtele Papers, Séminaire de Trois Rivières. The same petition reappears frequently in petitions to Elgin. See Inhabs. of Lachine, Ma7, 1849, CO42/558, pp. 180-81, P.A.C.

The grand total of seventy thousand signatures represented approximately one-tenth of the total French Canadian population. If the adult males be computed at one-fifth of the population, the loyalty addresses represented an impressive half of the potential voice of French Canada.[88] The regional distribution of the petitions suggests partisanship, but with racial overtones peculiar to Lower Canada. Since the French Canadian party of Lafontaine controlled nearly all of the seats outside of the Eastern Townships, and since all but a few of the secular petitions came from those counties, the loyalty addresses can be said to be both partisan and racial. The clerically-inspired addresses, which accounted for at least a half of the addresses to Elgin can also be considered partisan because of the close co-operation which existed at this time between priests and Reform politicians. On the other hand, the clergy must have attracted many non-political habitants who were merely following the clergy's lead as the traditional defenders of French Canadian interests.

From a qualitative point of view the loyalty addresses further demonstrate the Janus-like character of French Canadian allegiance. On the one side, it would appear as the smug visage of Reform smiling upon tory discomfiture in the wake of the riots in Montreal. On the other, it was the familiar face of French Canadian nationality smiling even more broadly at the unbelievable opportunity it had to demonstrate to the monarchy who were the true guardians of the palace gates

---

[89]Elgin to Grey, May 26, June 4, June 18, 1849, CO42/559, P.A.C. microfilm of originals in P.R.O., London.

in Lower Canada. Lafontaine and the French party used their opportunity well for they erased the stigma of radicalism and treason that had haunted the reform movement since 1837. In fact, the tories no longer dared tar French Canadian conservatives with that particular brush for another half-century.

The partisan aspect of the addresses is easily evident from both the secular and clerical addresses. The petitioners constantly referred to the "factious" and "disloyal" tories who attacked Elgin in the streets. Not only were those acts reprehensible in themselves, but also for their denial of Elgin's constitutional function. Moral and physical assistance was also profferred to the people's representatives who were being prevented from carrying out responsible government. The Liberal press of the country was also given thanks for its expressions of "true loyalty and sincere attachment towards our Gracious Sovereign." Lastly, the majority will of French Canada was upheld against the British American League which advocated principles "destructive of the franchises of the great majority of the inhabitants of this Province, [and] insulting to their character as British subjects."[89]

The nationalistic aspect of the petitions to Elgin was more implied than openly stated, but its presence was no less real. Some

---

[89]Kamouraska Petition, April 29, 1849, CO42/558, p. 175; Rivière du Loup Address, April 30, 1849, CO42/558, pp. 179-80; St. Antoine de la Baie Address, May 8, 1849, CO42/558, p. 181; Lotbinière Address, May 6, 1849, CO42/558, p. 203, P.A.C.

petitioners, for example, firmly believed that the motive for tory villainy was "national hatred." Others referred in the preamble of their addresses to the essentially racial source of loyalty in the "population of French origin." Elgin was also defended on the grounds that his promotion of the material interests of the country allowed the participation of "les hommes de toutes les races." Finally, there was the inevitable reference to the nationalistic role of "la milice Canadienne qui défendait le drapeau Britannique en 1775 et 1812."[90]

Neither French Canadian partisanship nor racial defensiveness can explain fully the personal adulation of Lord Elgin. Elgin the aristocrat had inspired a filial devotion not unlike that tendered to the seigneur in feudal Europe. Nowhere in English Canada did Elgin receive as much deferential reverence to his sacred person as he did from the French Canadians of Nouvelle Beauce. From them he not only received the usual expression of concern for his welfare, but the ultimate compliment as their "seigneur."

> Nos fidèles Sujets de Sa Majesté, apprenons avec une profonde indignation les insultes grosières et graves que Votre Seigneurie a récues dans l'accomplissement de ses devoirs constitutionnels par une partie de la population de la Cité de Montréal et nous somme peinés de voir qu'il se soit trouvé dans la capitale Du Canada des hommes assez audacieux et déloyaux pour oser se

---

[90]Longue Pointe Address, May 1849, CO42/558, p. 184. Rivière du Loup, April 30, 1849, CO42/558, pp. 179-80; Kamouraska Petition, April 29, 1849, CO42/558, p. 175; Lachine Address, May, 1849, CO42/558, pp. 180-81.

> porter à de tels excès de violence contre la personne du Représentant de sa Majesté Britannique.[91]

The 'personal and living bond' between the inhabitants and francophile governor had been reaffirmed again.[92] Of all the previous governors of the lower province, only Bagot, Sherbrooke, or Prevost would have elicited such a warm response from the habitants.

The conservatism of the petitioners was reflected in their romantic verbiage on social disorder and anarchy. The Lachine petitioners spoke out with great vehemence against "the spirit of infatuation and insubordination" that threatened to destroy Canada "with the torch of the incendiary." Yet other rural petitioners from county Richelieu deplored the outrages visited upon Elgin "by a rancorous and bloodthirsty faction . . . endeavoring to obstruct the working of the Government." The rhetorical climax was reached in an archaic expression of horror at the destruction of the Legislative libraries in Montreal. The citizens of Kamouraska echoed Burke and Gibbon in their condemnation of those "acts unworthy of men living in an enlightened age like the present and such as will . . . assimilate them to those hordes of barbarians, who in remote centuries burnt the valuable library of Alexandria."[93]

---

[91]Address of Nouvelle, Beauce, May 21, 1849, CO42/558, p. 261. Parish of Grandines, Portneuf, May 21, 1849, CO42/558.

[92]See J. Monet, "The Personal and Living Bond," in W. L. Morton (ed.), The Shield of Achilles (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1968), pp. 62-94.

[93]Ste. Anne de Yamachiche, May 5, 1849; Lachine Inhabs., May, 1849; St. Jude Parish, County Richelieu, May 5, 1849, CO42/558.

The English speaking community within Quebec rallied in much more pragmatic terms. Elgin's most important contribution to the Reformers from the Townships and Montreal lay not so much in his exalted political function, as in his promotion of the material welfare of the province. In fact, party politics was seen as the greatest detriment to Elgin's non-partisan and essentially economic function:

> Agricultural associations, Railway enterprises, Educational Establishments, Mechanics Institutes have found in Your Excellency their most powerful advocate; and we have observed with the highest satisfaction that Your Excellency has given a cordial and constitutional support to successive administration, whose policy has obtained the sanction of the Parliament of this country.[94]

The most extreme example of partisanship of the English-speaking Reformers of Canada East were the Irish. Choosing to swallow their anti-monarchical prejudices in order to sink the tories, the Quebec Irish resolved to preserve "the ties which bind us to the Empire," and their "unabated attachment to Her Majesty."[95]

The tories themselves were much less pragmatic in their view of the imperial connection during the spring and summer of 1849.[96] The controversy which raged between the Montreal Herald and Witness on the one hand, and the Transcript and the Pilot on the other had as its

---

[94]County of Shefford Petition, CO42/559, p. 237; Montreal Loyalty address, CO42/558, p. 176; Longue Pointe Address, May, 1849, CO42/558/181, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[95]Twp. of Frampton Address, May, 1849, CO42/558/256. See also D. C. Lyne, "The Irish in the Province of Canada in the Decade Leading to Confederation," (unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, 1960), pp. 39-55; Montreal Pilot, April 13, July 5, 1849.

[96]See Quebec City Petition, June 5, 1849, CO42/559.

focus the British Crown. Even when the Herald decided upon independence or annexation it never expressed those desires in positive material terms. The editor stressed instead the fact that "England has murdered allegiance in Canada [and] if the connection is severed it will be the consequence of her own ingratitude . . . and oppression towards those who have ever stood firm to their allegiance." If the connection was to be reduced solely to pounds and pence, the Herald would have preferred that their more vital sentiments of loyalty be transferred to American political institutions.[97]

The wavering editorial positions of the Montreal Courier and the Montreal Gazette might be taken as more accurate indices of tory indecision on annexation. The Courier by contrast to the Upper Canadian journals like the Colonist and Patriot had avoided annexation in the spring, but by the fall had declared for it. In April, the editor had staunchly opposed annexation as a third-rate solution to Canada's political difficulties. Before taking this desperate step, the Courier preferred the alternatives of an independent republic of British North America, or the retention of the status quo. By September, the Courier had become so frustrated by Elgin's favoritism of the Reform Ministry and his inability to secure reciprocity, that it opted for annexation. There was less logic than sentiment in the editor's disgust at being considered "fifth rate, despicable, ignorant colonists," and little more in his determination to join a Republic

---

[97]Herald, July 9, 1849. Cited in G. H. S. Mills, "The Annexation Movement as Seen Through the Lower Canadian Press," p. 28.

so that no one would be likely to sneer at them.[98]

The influential Montreal Gazette was a study in agonizing indecision throughout 1849. Although it was considerably agitated over the Rebellion Losses Bill, it displayed the caution of the British American League in suggesting constitutional remedies to Canadian problems.[99] The most that the Gazette would risk in the way of annexationist sentiment in the summer of 1849 were letters to the editor or editorials from other newspapers which had adopted annexation.[100] James Ferres' editorial policy remained in general accordance with the policies of the League, a British North American Union, and perhaps some form of independent status.[101]

Upon the appearance of the annexation manifesto, the Gazette still remained undecided. The manifesto was reprinted from the Courier without comment. By the sixth of October, Ferres had followed with a homily on the British constitution and its subversion by Lord Elgin. After suggesting remedies in the direction, Ferres abruptly announced that two choices were open to Canadians--independence or annexation. Yet, it was not until the eighth of October that the Gazette had come over to the annexationist position, that economic circumstances demanded a change in political connection.

---

[98] Courier, Sept. 7, 1849.

[99] See April 13, 30, May 2, June 14, Aug. 10, 1849.

[100] See SCOTUS, June 27, 30, 1849; Gazette, May 24, 1849, from London Morning Chronicle.

[101] Ibid., July 6, August 8, August 10, 1849.

The French language press was ostensibly divided on annexation. Three weeklies[102] supported the manifesto. Three larger newspapers[103] were on the side of the Crown. One, La Minerve, remained undecided. But for neither side did annexation assume the agonizing moral crisis it had for the tories. For the rouges, reason alone dictated that French Canadian interests lay with the United States.[104] The loyal French Canadian press was similarly cool in describing the virtues of British colonial rule, or the British constitution. Most of their energy was spent in demonstrating the practical disservice that would be done to French Canadian nationality by annexation.[105] That the great debate over annexation in French Canada was an exercise in intellectual counterpunching was evident in the diplomatic immunity allowed La Minerve. Lafontaine gave Ludger Duvernay as much rein as he had denied him earlier in the year. He was largely content to allow Duvernay a neutral posture upon annexation, despite some attempts within the party to have La Minerve declare itself.[106]

The total absence of imperial ideology on the conservative side

---

[102] Le Moniteur Canadien, L'Avenir, Le Canadien Indépendant.

[103] Le Journal de Québec, Le Canadien, Les Mélanges Religieux.

[104] L'Avenir, July 5, 26, Aug. 30, Sept. 1, 15, 20, Oct. 2, 4, 6,

[105] Le Journal de Québec, Aug. 18, 23, Oct. 16, 18, Nov. 27, 1849; F. Ouellet, "Denis-Benjamin Viger et le probleme de l'annexation," Bull. de Recherches Historiques, LVII (1951), 201-202.

[106] See La Minerve, Nov. 2, 19, 1849; L. H. Lafontaine to A. Berthelot, Jan. 14, 1850, Lafontaine Papers, P.A.C.; A. N. Morin to L. H. Lafontaine, Feb. 12, 1850, ibid.

was reflected in Joseph Cauchon's public attempts to persuade La Minerve of its error. There were no accusations of disloyalty, simply an outright appeal to conservatism:

> Nous regarderions ... comme un mauvais patriote celui qui refuserait ses services et ses lumières à sa patrie parce qu'elle aurait choisi ou accepté une forme de gouvernement républicain ou monarchique, qui ne serait pas dans ses convictions. Il faut servir contre des tendances mauvaises, et en avertissant du danger où elles conduisent.[107]

The Reformers clearly appeared to be avoiding a public fight over the imperial connection. Even with disaffected tories the French Canadian Reformers appeared content to stand behind the counter-manifesto of the loyal English rather than deliver a public broadside of their own.[108] There was no repetition of the spring fever for public petitions of loyalty. Those petitions that did result were entirely local responses to annexationism.[109] The clergy as well as the Ministry was as conspicuous by its public absence as it had been by its presence in the spring.[110]

Unlike Robert Baldwin who could seek out a public consensus against annexation, Lafontaine could not create a public issue. It

---

[107] Journal de Québec, Oct. 23, 1849.

[108] See Quebec Morning Chronicle, Oct. 26, 1849; British Colonist, Oct. 26, 1849.

[109] See District of Quebec Address, Nov. 30, 1849, Annexation Addresses, P.A.C. Only one address was sent by Elgin to the Colonial Office, Dec. 31, 1849, CO42/560, #127.

[110] There are only a few indications of clerical activity in the press of the perid. See L'Avenir, Jan. 24, 1850; Mélanges Religieux, Dec. 4, 1849.

had been possible over the Rebellion Losses Crisis because that had been a simple question of demonstrating party and national loyalty. The annexation crisis demanded something more in the way of defending the imperial connection. Negatively, anti-Americanism was enough, and positively, imperialism would have been enough. But the latter was apparently a price that Lafontaine would not pay. Instead he chose the means of executive reprisal against the disaffected.

Lord Elgin immediately attempted to ferret out those who had supported the annexation manifesto. Queries were immediately sent out to the prominent persons who had signed that document to ascertain their decided policy.[111] On December 1, the ministry gave Elgin a free hand in dismissing all those who had neither denied nor recanted their part in the affair. There was little doubt that the executive considered the actions of the tories and rouges as revolutionary:

> When an individual arrives at the deliverate conclusion that what he deems the evils under which his country labours require not merely a reformation of the Constitution, but its entire overthrow, and when such a person entertains this opinion not as a mere speculative thing possibly to be realized in some remote and undefined future, but actually takes measures directly intended to bring about such revolutionary change it appears to the Committee perfectly obvious that apart from all consideration or inquiry as to consequences of a still more serious character, such party should not be permitted to remain in the anomalous and individuous position of holding a commission during the pleasure of a Sovereign power which he desires to subvert.[112]

---

[111] See S. Bugg to Prov. Secy. Leslie, Montreal, Nov. 1, 1849; J. Matheson to Leslie, Nov. 1, Montreal; J. J. Mackenzie to J. Leslie, Nov. 2, 1849; Annexation Addresses, Vol. 8, P.A.C.

[112] Executive Council Decision, Dec. 1, 1849; Annexation Addresses, Vol. 5, P.A.C.

In consonance with this spirit of executive arrogance, the Lower Canadian Reformers eagerly sought the assistance of the Colonial Office in crushing disaffectin. Two of the most prominent members of the eastern wing of reformers, Joseph Cauchon and Lewis Drummond, were the most insistent in their demands for a firm denunciation of the annexationists by the imperial government.[113] Solicitor-General Drummond persistently hounded Lafontaine for such an address: "Encore une fois, mettez tout en oeuvre pour obtenir de la part du ministère Anglais une déclaration positive et ferme sur cette question. C'est le seul moyen d'arrêter le mouvement."[114]

Summary dismissals by executive fiat then followed in the Montreal and Eastern Townships. Legislative sanction was apparently regarded as superfluous until the spring session of the Legislature sat in 1850. At that time Parliament was asked to approve of a fait accompli. Many tories and grits rallied to the administration's support in a resounding 44-12 vote in favour of the dismissals. To cap this display of loyalty, patriotic addresses to the Crown were voted by both the upper and lower houses.[116] The Upper House even indulged itself in superfluous comparisons of Queen Victoria to her

---

[113] J. Cauchon to Lafontaine, Nov. 29, 1849, Lafontaine Papers, V. 9, P.A.C.

[114] L. Drummond to L. H. Lafontaine, Montreal, Jan. 17, 1850, Lafontaine Papers, V. 10, P.A.C.

[115] L. Drummond to Lafontaine, Montreal, Dec. 3, 1849, ibid., V. 9, P.A.C.

[116] Globe, May 14, 1850.

"illustrious grandfather George III who was identified with the early history of the Province."[117]

Loyalty was the only common cry of victory that could have come from the provincial Parliament. The ascendant whig imperialism of English Canada could never have been accepted by French Canadians. Although they could agree with the real concessions that had been made to local responsibility, the new empire threatened them with transcendant political and racial loyalties above those of their own nationality. The idea of loyalty was by contrast transcendent in only one aspect--the person of the monarch and her colonial representative.[118] Even then, loyalty was contingent upon the governor's solicitude for French Canadian interests.

The politicians and priests had thus won two victories upon the simple formula of national loyalty. The first in the spring required a great deal of effort, but was a simple one ideologically. A francophile governor was confirmed in his authority and allegiance unanimously demonstrated. The annexation crisis was effortless by comparison, since loyalty had already been demonstrated. Intellectually it had been more difficult to resolve because it was an issue in empire as well as republicanism. The French Canadian conservatives chose to render it as a defeat of republicanism rather than a victory for empire. Victory was thus rendered in pragmatic not ideological terms. Like the military victories of 1775 and 1812, the defeat of

---

[117] Legislative Council Debates, May 17, 1850, cited in Pilot, May 25, 1850.

[118] See J. Monet, "The Personal and Living Bond," in W. L. Morton, The Shield of Achilles, pp. 62-94.

annexation was a national victory in the field. Its purpose was to demonstrate allegiance to the Crown and nothing more.

The badly bruised and beaten English Canadian annexationists were tactically demoralized, but were quick to respond to the bell of empire. By November of 1849 an "Englishman" was writing open letters in the Montreal Gazette on the virtues of the British Empire. A. T. Galt was the target of a lengthy whig sermon on the beauties of the British constitution and the liberality of the mother country:

> England is charged with no aggression; no invasion of the rights of freemen; no Parliamentary usurpation; no tyranny of law. The national arrogance which instigated the Stamp Act and the Boston Port Bill have now passed away . . . No sir, the only fault imputed to England is that of having carried her liberality too far . . . If the sweets of liberty have cloyed upon our stomachs, it is the misfortune of that condition as much as an error in treatment. The constitution she confers upon the people infinitely more of power and of supervision and control over the acts of their government, than that of the United States.[119]

Equally unabashed by their apostasy were the "loyal inhabitants" of Sherbrooke who shortly announced their determination to Lord Elgin "to protect our country from invasion and to maintain the Supremacy of British rule in the Province."[120] The Lower Canadian English were thus having little difficulty in establishing themselves on the

---

[119]Montreal Gazette, Dec. 3, 1849. See also ibid., Nov. 22, 28, Dec. 5, 1849; G. J. Mountain, Thoughts on Annexation in Connection with the Duty and Interest of the Members of the Church of England, printed only in private circulation, Quebec, T. Cary, 1849, 28 pp.

[120]Inhabs. of Sherbrooke, Memorial to Lord Elgin, March 29, 1852, Annexation Addresses, Vol. 5, P.A.C.

throne of imperial sentiment. It was an empty title, deliberately left vacant by the French Canadian victors.

CHAPTER IV

THE DIVIDED EMPIRE - IMPERIAL SENTIMENT AND THE CHALLENGE OF NATIONAL INTEREST, 1850-58

The old colonial empire was dead. In its place was the divided empire--the empire of interest and the formal empire. In the material empire many things were now permissible. At some time the colonial commercial interest might coincide with the imperial interest and at other times it may prove more profitable for the colonies to enter a reciprocal trade agreement with the United States, or for the Mother Country to invest her capital in American railroads instead of Canadian ones.[1] The formal empire then became deep commitment to the whig colonial ministers like Grey and their colonial representatives like Elgin. To them the new empire was a moral crusade, as one author has put it "a mighty instrument of Providence for the civilization of backward races and for the spread of peace and justice throughout the world."[2]

English Canadians emerged from the loyalty crises of 1849 blinded by this mirage of whig imperialism. It is no small source of surprise to imperial historians to find that in 1850 "it is on colonial soil that a language thrives which pronounces the name of

---

[1] See J. Gallagher and R. Robinson, "The Imperialism of Free Trade," Economic Hist. Rev., 2nd series, VI (1953, Vol. I), 1-15.

[2] W. P. Morrell, British Colonial Policy in the Age of Peel and Russell (2nd ed.; London: F. Cass, 1966), p. 527.

the British Empire with unrestrained enthusiasm such as was rarely heard in the mother country."[3] To most British politicians, the style of imperial unity without the content of power and patriotism was an absurdity. As Disraeli put it, a fit subject for "professors, rhetoricians, prigs and pedants."[4] The Canadian colony was full of political rhetoricians who were experiencing the giddiness of weightless imperialism, with no Disraelis to bring them down to earth.

The period between 1850 and 1854 witnessed the ascendancy of whig imperialism. No sooner had responsible government been instituted than even the tories were lauding its virtues. Imperial unity, they argued, had scarcely been disrupted by the attainment of self-government:

> The British colonies are no more destined to remain colonies forever than the children of a family are destined forever to remain subject to parental authority. If then the British Empire--that Great Marine Dominion of which we before spoke--is to be preserved intact; if its integrity, its unity, its vigor is to continue unbroken, the whole must care for every part, and every part be allowed to take its share in the responsibilities of the whole--the head cannot survive without the body, neither can the body move without the

---

[3]R. Koebner and H. D. Schmidt, Imperialism, The Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840-1960 (Cambridge: The University Press, 1965), p. 73.

[4]Ibid., p. 47.

> limbs--there must be a union of all parts, to complete the power and symmetry of the whole.[5]

The tories now wore their loyal hearts in even more obvious view upon their sleeves.[6] When the Duke of Wellington died in 1852, he became the object of epic grief. Amateur tory poets poured out their newly acquired whiggish sentiments on the great man:

> Britain, weep! thy conquering hero
> Leads no more thy host to war;
> Weep! and let enfranchised nations
> Join thy wailing from afar
> Chiefs there were whose bloodstained laurels
> By enslaving man were won;
> But a wreath entwined by Freedom
> Graced the brow of Wellington.[7]

The Upper Canadian Reformers were hard pressed to maintain their difference from the ideologically realigned tories. George Brown created spurious differences between the reformers' emphasis upon independent and responsible government,and the tories' penchant for closer imperial integration.[8] Since the empire was not a satisfying source of difference the reformer often prided himself upon his superior loyalty. Brown choked with rage when the House sought to reduce the Governor-General's salary, reminding the opposition

---

[5]Hamilton Gazette, July 1, 1852, taken from the Toronto Patriot. See also the Colonist, Nov. 20, 1849. Loyal Canadian Society Address, Beamsville, Dec. 4, 1852, contained in Elgin to Pakington, Jan. 7, 1853, #896, C042, P.A.C.

[6]See British Whig, May 15, July 15, 1850. See also the addresses of the Loyal Canadian Society in Elgin to Pakington, Jan. 7, 1853, C042, 896, P.A.C.

[7]"W.P.," Toronto, 1852, Hamilton Gazette, Nov. 1, 1852.

[8]Globe, Jan. 31, April 29, 1852.

that such ingratitude might be expected of former American Colonies, but not of "respectful" and "grateful" Canadians.[9] Even the olympian Baldwin could be stirred to hysterical declamation when monarchical traditions were endangered. In an emotional response to a clear-grit proposal for elective town wardens, Baldwin drew thunderous applause for a speech which heralded the Macdonald slogans of 1890: "He had ever defended those principles, he had ever cherished that love--It had ever been his pride that he had lived--and he hoped to God he would die a British subject."[10]

The radical reformers were no less united upon the fundamental issue of imperial integrity. Mackenzie, who had recently returned, hat in hand, was not about to support annexation.[11] Even Lord Elgin professed in 1851 his faith that Mackenzie was "sounder on annexation than many who profess to be his betters."[12] The clear-grits were no more inclined to destroy the empire. During a dinner in honour of Malcolm Cameron in 1852, the grits heartily toasted the health of the Royal Family and of Lord Elgin. The Chairman, Dr. Workman, drew three lusty cheers for his empassioned oratory on empire:

---

[9]Ibid., July 3, 1850.

[10]Legislative Assembly Debates, July 19, 1850, cited in Montreal Pilot, July 25, 1850. See also J. Jones to W. H. Merritt, Stamford, July 1, 1853, Merritt Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[11]Elgin to Grey, May 12, 1850 in Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 756-57.

[12]Elgin to Grey, ibid., April 23, 1851, II, 821.

> If there was any place in Her Majesty's Dominions where an expression of loyalty could be given to that toast, that place was Canada, where we are bound by the laws made by our own representatives--the men of our own choice. He then briefly adverted to the different phases which the continental nations of Europe were continually exhibiting, as compared with the constitutional monarchy of Britain. We had in that monarchy a guarantee of power and peace.[13]

The nadir of clear-grit republicanism was reached in their defence of Lord Elgin. The former annexationist, James Lesslie, of the Examiner revealed a full-blooded conservatism in his claim that Canadians now enjoyed under Elgin "what Simcoe enunciated and his successors violated, the very image and transcript of the British Constitution."[14]

The Lower Canadian tories emerged chastened from the nightmare of 1849. Those who had been involved in the annexationist movement quickly came home to the imperial roost. Since patronage had been denied even the marginally disloyal, the job-starved tories in Montreal and the Eastern Townships soon recanted.[15] By 1852 the government indicated that it would no longer discriminate in its future appointments against those who had signed the

---

[13]North American, Feb. 27, 1852.

[14]Toronto Examiner, Aug. 13, 1851.

[15]Inhabs. of Sherbrooke, Memorial to Lord Elgin, March 29, 1852, Annexation Addresses, Vol. 5, P.A.C.

annexation manifesto.[16] By 1854 and the departure of Lord Elgin all was forgiven. Those magistrates who had been dismissed were now restored to "their former or similar ranks under the Crown and as soon and insofar as circumstances would permit."[17]

The tory press of Montreal had waffled so considerably during the annexation crisis so as not to require official reinstatement. Obviously insecure, they became ultra-loyal. The Montreal Courier now pontificated upon the duty "of every loyal subject and good citizen to ensure the carrying on of the Queen's Government."[18] Thomas Fenney of the Gazette chafed at such restraint and became a resolute scion of the new imperialism. Chiding the Americans for their fear of British expansion into the Caribbean, Fenney asked: "Why should they regret that their race is spreading the blessings of Anglo-Saxon civilization to the uttermost parts of the earth?"

Reinstatement proved surprisingly easy for even the disaffected radicals of Canada East. Jacob DeWitt rapidly convinced the executive of his renewed loyalty by representing an industrial group at Hyde Park in 1851. In his legislative capacity as member

---

[16]A. N. Morin to J. S. Sanborn of Sherbrooke, Quebec, Feb. 23, 1852, March 22, 1852, Annexation Addresses, Vol. 5; A. N. Morin to former militia officers dismissed because of annexation manifesto, April 17, 1852, Prov. Secy. Correspondence, Canada East, P.A.C.

[17]P. J. O. Chauveau to dismissed J. P.'s, Dec. 28, 1854, Prov. Secy. Correspondence, Canada East, P.A.C.

[18]Montreal Courier, May 19, 1852, cited in J. G. Dunning to J. Pakington, Montreal, May 17, 1852, CO42/587.

[19]Montreal Gazette, Aug. 28, 1852.

for Beauharnois he never again faltered. His posture was scrupulously āpolitical, confined to economic issues like the protective tariff or to seigneurial tenure.[20] Luther Holton and the rouges had only to abandon annexation as a platform and their political future was guaranteed. They proved so much in demand that all they had to do was forbear from overt criticism of the Crown and they would find political allies. In 1855 they were sought out by George Brown, who complimented them for not uttering "a single sentiment on general politics to which a British constitutional reformer might not assent."[21]

Among French Canadians loyalty was clearly more important than imperialism. Neutrals like Ludger Duvernay quickly scurried back to imperial favour. He could now be found along with Benjamin Holmes and Luther Holton at a public dinner toasting the royal family and Lord Elgin, or extolling the pomp of British Parliament in the pages of La Minerve.[22] For those like Joseph Cauchon who had upheld the British connection, there was no such neurosis about empire. It was enough to stand upon French Canada's demonstrated record of loyalty in 1775, 1812, 1837, and now 1849. It was politically useful to tweak the tories occasionally as "ni loyal, ni

---

[20]See L. Richard, "Jacob DeWitt," Rev. Hist. Amer. Franc., III (1949), 553-55.

[21]Globe, Feb. 26, 1855.

[22]Montreal Gazette, Oct. 6, 1851; La Minerve, Sept. 9, 1850.

loyaliste," but rarely to go much further.[23]

Unlike their contemporaries in Canada West, the French Canadians were not fair-weather imperialists. There was little sense of collective grief at Wellington's death, nor speculation upon the merits of imperial representation. Although Elgin had prophesied that the French Canadians would seek out an alliance with "any section of the British which prefers British to Yankee institutions," the realignment of 1854 had little to do with political ideology.[24] The alliance with the tories ironically deprived the French Canadians of their major platforms on empire--tory disloyalty. Had it not been for the rouges, the French Canadian conservatives would have been without an imperial policy after 1854.

The early eighteen-fifties had thus witnessed imperialism fly off at two divergent tangents. English Canadians were whig imperialists, while the French Canadians were in the main loyalists becoming nationalists. Both races could co-exist upon the issue of empire, provided that the English Canadian confined himself to the theoretical empire. So long as the French Canadian maintained a judicious silence in the interest of racial harmony, the English Canadian could satisfy his rhetorical cravings for empire. The formula generally worked well during the Crimean War which made few other than stylistic demands, but broke down during the Indian

---

[23]Journal de Québec, March 22, 1851, May 8, 1851.

[24]See Elgin to Grey, June 14, 1851, Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 827.

Mutiny when both sides saw a military contribution as an essential conflict between imperial and national interest.

(i) The Crimean War 1854-56

For Canadians the Crimean War presented all of the natural elements of an ideological crusade. English and French were now united in the great cause of human liberty. Catholicism and Protestantism were also united in a holy communion of Western Christianity against Eastern Orthodoxy. The Americans co-operated in this too-perfect script by creating a diplomatic incident late in the war. The jackal of 1812 roamed again, capitalizing upon Britain's vulnerability as she fought for human liberty. There was even the happy prospect of increased war production in Great Britain, and the heavy draw that it would create upon colonial wheat and timber. Canadian interest and feeling were happily engaged. Given all of these stimuli, the surprise was that Canadians did not provide more concrete assistance than they did to the common cause of Great Britain and France. Support was more often moral than physical, rhetorical than real.

Physical support in the form of a regular regiment would clearly have marked Canadians as rabid imperialists. It was apparent that if certain militant elements among the tories had their way that a regular regiment would have been forthcoming.[25] Sir

---

[25]See Globe, April 6, 1854, Feb. 2, May 26, 1855; Quebec Morning Chronicle, Dec. 1, 21, 1854; Toronto Leader, Jan. 12, 17, 1855.

Allan MacNab, the rabidly anglophile Premier of the Province, suggested that such a regiment could easily be raised with the inducement of land grants as a reward for service.[26] The Quebec Morning Chronicle was the most insistent in its support of a military contribution. Late in 1855, the editor, St. Michel, proposed the dispatch of a force to Europe:

> . . . We lately published an article in the London Morning Post in which it was announced that it is intended to raise a Foreign Legion which will bear the name of "the Royal British North American Regiment" and consist of 2800 men. We are now enabled to state on good authority that this intelligence is substantially correct and that a force composed of two battalions, one to be raised in each section of the Province will be immediately organized. Sir Allan MacNab, when in London, had repeated interviews with Lord Palmerston, and it has been agreed that the regiment will be essentially native Canadian in its character, both as regards officers and men, irrespective of origin.[27]

Such proposals angered especially the rouges and the clear-grits because of their sheerly political character.[28] The bleus were silent, but they were clearly depending upon the moderate tories' fears that Canada would be left vulnerable by bleeding herself dry of soldiers.

The problem of military assistance was expressed in miniature during a loyalty meeting which took place in Montreal in May

---

[26] Globe, May 2, 1855.

[27] Reported in Globe, Sept. 24, 1855. See also Quebec Morning Chronicle, Jan. 12, 1855.

[28] Globe, May 23, 1855.

of 1854. A mixed audience of French and English Canadians sat or stood to listen to a platform of speakers made up of prominent politicians and leaders of the Montreal business community. On the English-speaking side there was William Badgley, the tory, John Young, the rouge, Christopher Dunkin, Q.C., and Peter McGill of the Bank of Montreal. On the French side of the platform there was George-Etienne Cartier, C. S. Cherrier, lawyer and president of the Banque du Peuple, and A. M. Delisle. The mayor, Wolfred Nelson, eloquently defended the allied cause, dwelling at length upon Great Britain's difficulties which required her to withdraw all of her soldiers to the East. He then promised that Canadians would defend themselves against any attacker, and rashly went on to maintain that they would go abroad if necessary "pour faire réussir la guerre, à traverser l'Océan pour défendre la bonne cause pour le sol européen." Although he received considerable applause (likely from the English-speaking portion of his audience), subsequent speakers avoided that issue entirely. Delisle, Cartier, Badgley, and Young carefully confined themselves to moral issues. The nettlesome question of physical assistance in the Crimea was forgotten in the general resolution which read: "Nous serons en tout temps prêts à repousser courageusement toute aggression étrangére [sic] non provoquée qu'on pourrait tenter contre cette partie des domaines de Sa Majesté."[29] This compromise was reflected in the Provincial

---

[29]La Minerve, May 6, 1854.

legislature's action. A Canadian volunteer militia was to be uniformed, armed, and required to carry out a prescribed course of training. This force was then to be a semi-professional corps which would supplement the old "sedentary militia" and replace the void created by the withdrawal of British regulars to the Crimea. Zealous or militarily ambitious Canadians like Lt. Casault of Quebec, Augustus James Thibodo of Kingston, and John Henry Dunn of Toronto would have to enlist for service in the Crimea via the British Army.[30] Often these enlistments were a result of residences in Great Britain at the outbreak of war or were simply the culmination of a career already begun in the British Army.[31] There was hardly a wave of popular enlistments, or even an active enlistment programme in Canada for service in the Crimea.

The second means of indicating a positive commitment to the imperial cause was that of monetary donation to the Patriotic Fund. That fund was originally set up in England as a reaction to the losses suffered in the Battle of Alma in September of 1854. The intention of the founders of the Royal Commission of the Patriotic

---

[30]See A. R. M. Lower, Canadians in the Making (Toronto: Longmans Green, 1958), p. 220; H. S. Brodie (ed.), "Diary of Augustus J. Thibodo," Pacific Northwest Quarterly, XXI (1940), 287-89.

[31]E.g., Gen. Fenwick Williams, Edmond Gustave Joly de Lotbinière, and Lt. Frederick Veith of Nova Scotia. See Recollections of the Crimean Campaign and the Expedition to Kinburn (Montreal: J. Lovell and Sons, 1907); Lotbinière's letters to his family, March 27, 1855 to August 2, 1855, Lotbinière Papers (microfilm), P.A.C.

Fund was to provide some financial support to the widows and orphans of the soldiers killed in that and future engagements. There was little, if any, popular opinion expressed through the press before the motion was suddenly brought forward in the Legislative Assembly by Francis Hincks on November 6, 1854. In his motion he apologized for having surprised the House without giving prior notice, and proceeded to explain his action by emphasizing that "upon this occasion the ministry should lead rather than follow the people in manifesting a proper spirit of sympathy in the war."[32]

The reaction of the House was candid because they had obviously been taken by surprise. A racial division resulted. English Canadians obviously reacted strongly to Hincks' panegyric on England's struggle for civilization against barbarism. Not only did Upper Canadian tories respond in loyal chorus, but also liberals and rouges like A. T. Galt and John Young. Galt, however, saw fit openly to conciliate the French-speaking group by stressing the allied efforts of England and France. He hoped that the fund would admit of no distinction between "those who have fallen for liberty's cause, whichever of the nations they belonged to. (Hear, Hear)." Only one voice of dissent arose from the Upper Canadian group. The unimpeachably loyal William Hamilton Merritt saw little noble in the fight for Turkish despotism. The issues as he saw them were not at all the same at 1848, when Hungary, Poland, and

---

[32] Mirror of Parliament, Nov. 6, 1854.

Italy were truly deserving of self-government.

Merritt like Galt may have been trying to appease the French Canadian bloc which was uniformly unenthusiastic about the Fund.[33] A. A. Dorion yielded to the sense of the House but did not express much in the way of ideological approbation of the cause. Bending strenuously to the compromise that Galt had held out, Dorion gave a brief gallic flourish for the fallen "of both nations now struggling for the cause of freedom." No bleu spoke in favour of the measure. All Joseph Cauchon could do was register approval of Dorion's sentiment and promptly sat down.[34]

The crunch for the French Canadians came on the seventeenth of November. The English Canadian side of the ministry was clearly determined to have its way. Sir Allan MacNab introduced a motion for the support of widows and orphans in the sum of £20,000, and the House remained in Committee to discuss the motion. Opposition was desultory even from the rouges. Their reservation likely resulted from the acerbic mood of the English Canadians. Francis Hincks' demeaned those who were not prepared to spend five cents a head for something so valuable as European liberty. Solicitor-General Ross, feeling confident that the bleus would not desert the ministry, caused the rouge dissenters to writhe in their seats:

> He felt disappointed that any other Frenchman should oppose it, when they considered what England had done for Quebec on the occasion of that disastrous fire which had been alluded to. The sum then received by Quebec from all quarters

---

[33] Ibid., Nov. 17, 1854. [34] Ibid.

> amounted to upwards of £160,000 and from Liverpool and Manchester alone there came as much as this Province was now asked to contribute.

After an unsuccessful attempt by George Brown to convert the debate into a more positive appeal for the imperial connection, the resolution was put. Since no member dared be branded disloyal, it passed unanimously.

The Legislative Council offered no opposition to the Lower House's determination. In fact, the two speakers most eloquent in its favour were two French Canadians, E. P. Taché and Narcisse Belleau. Taché's speech was a curious mixture of appeals. On the one hand he was still the same Taché who had given the assurance that Quebec would remain loyal to "the last cannon shot" in British North America.[35] But Taché's loyalty had a clear price tag attached to it now. After denouncing the commercial motive for the grant, he then proceeded to relate in great detail the virtues of the contribution as excellent advertising for Canada. The nadir of his speech was reached when he cannily pointed out that: "The grant of this £20,000, say the commercial men, just on the eve of the great universal exhibition in Paris, will call attention to Canada, especially as half of the sum is to be presented to the widows and orphans of French soldiers."[36] The contribution to the Patriotic

---

[35]See J. Monet, "The Last Cannon Shot - A Study of French Canadian Nationalism, 1837-50" (unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Toronto, 1964), p. i.

[36]Mirror of Parliament, Nov. 20, 1854.

Fund was voted on without dissent. A fervent loyalty address was then appended, and the whole forwarded by Elgin to the Home Government.[37] The most prominent area of public support in Canada for the fund was Toronto and its hinterland. The press in Toronto led by Brown of the Globe and Beaty of the Toronto Leader and Patriot both reported and actively promoted public meetings for the fund.[38] Even the ex-rebel, William Lyon Mackenzie, who was inclined to be rather reticent about the war, indirectly endorsed the movement by reporting the progress of the fund.[39] It was however Brown, the grit, the mid-Victorian liberal, who was inclined to be the most strident in his support for the fund. He immediately endorsed Hincks' proposal of November 6 in the Globe of the eighth of November. By references to the want of feeling that might have existed in Toronto as compared to New York he attempted to shame his readers into acts of greater generosity:

> We have no active part to play in the contest, and the more reason is there for us taking a share in succoring those by whose loss we and all other subjects of the Empire are benefitted. We do not venture to point out how the first movement should be made. If there is liberality in our community corresponding to the interest which they have displayed in the present war, then we are sure that it will find some means of showing itself, and that Canadian contributions to the 'Patriotic Fund' will be commensurate with the standing and position of the Provinces as the first colony of Great Britain. We

---

[37] Elgin to Grey, Nov. 20,1854, CO42/602, #585.

[38] See Weekly Leader and Patriot, Feb. 7, 1855, Sept. 12, 1855.

[39] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Jan. 12, 1855.

> perceive that the British residents of New York and others have already opened their subscription list for the same purpose. From the names published in the Albion [English newspaper in New York] we find that the presidents of national societies commenced the work by contributions of $100 each. Shall we be behind our loyal countrymen in the United States? Most assuredly we should not. Who will be the first to move?[40]

Although Brown did not do as well as the £50,000 he had initially hoped for, the £2,500 collected from York and Peel Counties did prove a substantial donation. Proportionately it amounted to more than per capita allowance in the provincial contribution, and easily outstripped the per capita donations from Montreal and Quebec City.[41]

The English-speaking community of Montreal was clearly held back by the French Canadian residents who made up nearly half of that city's population.[42] Francis Hincks' Pilot was clearly as zealous as he himself had been in the House of Assembly:

> We know of nothing so likely to touch the heart of the Mother Country as this mark of sympathy and interest from her powerful and prosperous child. May the branches of the Anglo-Saxon family, in all parts of the world, ever be ready to reciprocate generous and kindly offers to each other.[43]

By April of 1855 the total contributions from the Montreal Fund stood

---

[40] Globe, Nov. 8, 1854. See also Nov. 16, Dec. 16, Dec. 23, 1854; Feb. 23, March 25, 1855.

[41] See Globe, Feb. 2, March 7, 1855. The York and Peel donations were 7 1/2d. per capita, and the provincial donation 5d. per capita.

[42] French-speaking population 46% in a total community of 57,000 in 1851-2, Census of the Canadas, 1851-2 (Quebec, 1853), IV, 206.

[43] Pilot, Nov. 8, 1854.

at £2,091.[44] Even allowing for late donations which trickled in over the summer, the Montreal total was considerably less per head of total population than Toronto. The answer lies in the cool response of the French-speaking population. Although the St. Jean-Baptiste Society had draped itself in Union Jacks and Tricolors it did not actively participate in fund-gathering campaigns as had the St. George's and St. Andrew's Societies. French Canadian contributions were by and large limited to the prominent politicians like L. V. Sicotte and George-Etienne Cartier.[45]

The Fund did even more poorly in the more heavily French Canadian city of Quebec. The political élite of the Provincial Legislature actively promoted donations by their own generosity at the municipal fund meeting in January of 1855, but they failed to generate any public enthusiasm.[46] Despite the fact that the French-speaking population of that city was almost sixty per cent of the total, they only numbered about fifteen to twenty per cent of the subscribers to the Fund. When measured against the donations from the outlying districts of Canada West the Quebec voluntary donation of less than a thousand pounds was pitifully small.[47] French Canadians had clearly

---

[44] Ibid., Apr. 23, 1855.

[45] See Pilot, Jan. 12, 1855.

[46] See Quebec Morning Chronicle, Jan. 25, 1855. Some of the most prominent were C. Alleyn, J. Cauchon, F. Hincks, A. N. Morin, E. P. Taché, and J. B. Forsyth.

[47] See Globe, Feb. 3, 1855 which reported contributions of £500 from Elgin County, £537 from Kingston, £250 from Dundas County, £250 from Northumberland and Durham Counties. For the progress of the Quebec fund see Quebec Morning Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1854, Jan. 25, 1855; Journal de Québec, Jan. 23, 1855.

demonstrated then that they were prepared neither to send men or money in support of the Allied cause in the Crimea. But equally clearly they had not tried to prevent the English population from manifesting their deeply felt loyalties.

The third means available to colonials to demonstrate their ideological approbation of the allied war effort was purely rhetorical. Petitions to the Queen, public meetings, illuminations for the celebration of allied victories, and public days of humiliation and prayer constituted the more popular use of rhetoric. Beyond that there were the traditional means available to the political élite, the House of Assembly and the partisan press. All of these means were used to great effect by those imperially minded elements of Canada West. The French Canadian response proved considerably cooler again, but the political élite in Canada East proved somewhat more effective in papering over by rhetoric the obvious cracks that had appeared on the issues of military and monetary contribution.

Public petitions proved as in 1849 the most direct means of demonstrating loyalty. Canada West far outstripped the lower province in this as in the Patriotic Fund. There was little doubt left from Governor Edmund Head's visit to the western province in 1855 that a militant imperialism gripped the major urban centres such as Kingston, Hamilton, London, Toronto, as well as minor towns like Cobourg, Dundas, Brantford, Woodstock, and St. Catharine's:

> At all the above placed without exception, I have been received with every mark of attention and respect as the Queen's Representative. At the same time, although I was

> accompanied by two, or three members of my executive council, there are not manifestations of feeling of a party or political character of any kind. But what struck me more than anything was the universal expression of loyalty and rejoicing in connection with the fall of Sebastopol and the progress of the Allied arms in the East. One might almost suppose the sympathy of the Canadian people with the cause of England to be shown more eagerly on account of the adverse feeling which is said to prevail in the United States.
>
> I believe that every address presented to me since I left Lower Canada--no matter from what body,--whether the corporation of a City--a mechanic's institute or a literary association--has contained more expressions of hope or congratulation with reference to the War. Almost every decoration of a street or room exhibited the word "Sebastopol" or some such emblem such as a bear claimed by France and England. The toasts and speeches at all public entertainments conveyed the same impression of loyal pride at the success of British Arms.
>
> The illumination at Montrel and Quebec gave evidence of similar feelings but these facts have not met my eye since I entered Upper Canada, and, such as they are, I report them to you, Sir, because they will, I am sure, be a source of pleasure to Her Majesty and Her Majesty's Advisers.[48]

Whig sentiments were the most pervasive feature of the petitions. Great Britain was invariably justified as having upheld the "rights of Independent nations and Constitutional Government," and the even more abstract virtues of "Justice, Liberty, and Civilization."[49] Only one petition in seven even mentioned a common argument used in England, that she was preserving the balance of power in Eastern

---

[48]Head to Molesworth, Clifton House, Niagara Falls, C.W., Oct. 22, 1855, CO42/599.

[49]See St. Catharine's Petition in Head to Russell, June 3, 1855, CO42/598; Hamilton Address in Head to Molesworth, Oct. 29, 1855, CO42/599; Woodstock Address in Head to Molesworth, Oct. 20, 1855, CO42/599.

Europe and the Mediterranean.[50] Realpolitik was generally looked upon by the petitioners as the property of despots, not freedom-loving Englishmen.

Romanticism and racism were complementary themes to whiggery. "Sentiments" and "feelings of the heart" were to provide that vital bond which separated the petitioners from the battlefields "on which our fellow subjects have so nobly fought and bled."[51] This close identification with fellow Britons led in some cases to an expression of the racial empire where every conflict "influences us as members of the same body, in whose veins the same blood circulates."[52] Loyalty as a sentiment played a customary role in the petitions as the "Unity of the Empire Loyalists" made their inevitable appearance.[53] But it had been complemented in Upper Canada by the appearance of a highly idealized concept of imperialism.

The English Canadian addresses from Canada East were substantially the same as those of Upper Canada.[54] The French Canadian memorials were neither as numerous nor as fervent. Their loyalties

---

[50]Head to Russell, June 3, 1855, CO42/598.

[51]Toronto Address in Head to Grey, Nov. 8, 1855, CO42/599, P.A.C. See also Globe, Oct. 28, 1854.

[52]St. Catharine's Petition, June 3, 1855.

[53]See Head to Molesworth, Oct. 29, 1855, CO42/599; Lincoln Militia Petition in Head to Labouchere, May 31, 1856, CO42/604.

[54]See Quebec Morning Chronicle, April 23, 1855; Montreal Pilot, June 1, 1854.

did not go beyond a traditional support of the Governor-General and Queen. There appeared even to be internal differences in their support of Lord Elgin and Head, along the traditional lines of a francophile versus an anglophile governor. The latter made himself particularly offensive to French Canadians by his tactless remarks on their backwardness while on his western tour in 1855.[55] Only Elgin received the support of the French Canadian people, but in terms so restricted that imperialism could never be interpreted as their motive.

When Lord Elgin returned from his summer visit to England he was warmly addressed on the war by the French citizens of Quebec City. The mover of the petition, Judge Jean Bruneau, was careful to stress that the war effort was the united product of the alliance between Great Britain and France, "the two great nations of Europe with whose previous history and ultimate destiny Canada must always feel a deep interest."[56] Interest, not sentiment, was therefore the key to colonial empires. That postulate was further borne out by the address of the mayor of Montreal, Wolfred Nelson, who welcomed Elgin to that city in June of 1854. Nelson did not even bother with the war, stressing instead the heroic role Elgin had played in granting responsible government to Canadians.[57]

---

[55] See infra, p. 337 .

[56] Montreal Pilot, May 22, 1854.

[57] La Minerve, June 13, 1854.

Political realism was carried even further in the Montreal public meeting of June, 1854, which had as its ostensible task an address to the Queen. The purpose of that meeting appeared the promotion of political harmony rather than the support of the Queen or the Empire. Those references made to "les nations anglaises et françaises" probably did more to cement the tory-bleu coalition than to support the war. The commentary of La Minerve on the meeting was even more enlightening. She maintained that the main purpose was to demonstrate to the Americans that there were no longer any republicans in Canada. The rouges and the clear-grits were likely the intended objects of that barb. The secondary purpose, according to La Minerve was to apprise France and Europe of "les sympathies que notre ancienne colonie conserve encore pour la France."[58] That fleeting shaft of neo-colonialism was no doubt to assure its readership that the meeting was one of racial equals, and had not been dominated by the anglophile tories.

The above is not to imply that English Canadians were devoid of realism in their use of imperial war sentiment. George Brown for one kept a watchful eye on the prices of wheat and flour. In announcing the general preparations for war he printed in bold type above the war news, "ENORMOUS RISE IN BREADSTUFFS! BREAD RIOTS IN ENGLAND!"[59] The Ottawa Citizen quickly noted that the closing off of the Baltic would affect advantageously "those gentlemen who wage war upon the

---

[58] Ibid., June 23, 1854.

[59] Globe, Jan. 30, 1854.

red pine forests of the upper Ottawa."[60] Pragmatism therefore dictated the coincidence of imperial war sentiment and imperial interest in Canada West. It also meant that English Canadians wanted to perpetuate the war until "a just and honourable peace" was arrived at.[61] Since most French Canadians reaped few economic benefits from the war except higher prices, their interest in its continuance was at a low ebb. Their loyalty addresses ended with a characteristic plea for either "a solid or permanent peace" or a "general and advantageous peace."[62]

Political realism demanded that the French Canadians tread a careful path through the developing war sentiment among English Canadians. A case in point was that noted anglo-saxon custom of war, the day of humiliation and prayer.[63] The first action in this direction was taken by the Protestant Churches of Montreal. The day chosen was May 2, 1854 in order to coincide with the day appointed by the Queen for fast and humiliation. But the French Canadian Catholic Churches did not participate. There was even active opposition. Judge Mondelet of the Montreal Superior Court refused an adjournment to celebrate the fast day on the grounds that all the powers involved

---

[60] Ottawa Citizen, March 18, 1854.

[61] Quebec Morning Chronicle, Oct. 9, 1855.

[62] Montreal Pilot, May 22, 1854.

[63] This custom was known to Canadians as early as the War of 1812. See S. F. Wise, "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History," United Church Bulletin, No. 18, 1965, pp. 3-19.

were a "pack of bloody murderers."[64]

A counter-demonstration of loyalty seemed necessary. The French Canadian business and political élite quickly provided an opportunity for loyal French Canadians to absolve themselves. The presence of William Badgley on the rostrum with George-Etienne Cartier and C. S. Cherrier suggested that more than the Crimean War was at stake. A new political alliance hung in the balance. Cherrier threw rhetorical caution to the winds in a whiggish tirade on the allied defence of civilization against the barbarian hordes of the North. Cartier was much more skilful. In the spirit of the day of humiliation he struck a clear chord--the sacred and Christian cause of the allies. He derided the Orthodox Church for its first loyalties to the Czar rather than Christ, and promised that such a barbaric form of Christianity would never triumph over Catholicism and Anglicanism.[65] Cartier had clearly dispelled the memory of Mondelet in the English mind, and had made the new alliance more secure.

The Fast Day which was observed a year later created much less controversy. The necessity for last-minute heroics was obviated by the participation of the Roman Catholic Church in this day of fast and prayer. Not only the Catholic Church but the Free Church, all wings of the Presbyterian Churches and the Jewish Synagogues conducted religious services on the appointed day.[66] The English Canadian

---

[64] La Minerve, April 29, 1854. [65] Ibid., May 6, 1854.

[66] Pilot, April 27, 1855.

community of Montreal was stirred to outright jingoism by this unanimity of spirit. The homily that was to be offered to the readers of the Montreal Gazette was little more than a harangue against the peace party in England. The virtues of war were paraded forth:

> We have not trouble at arriving at the fact that long peace does tend to national selfishness, cupidity, and abatement of the military spirit. Commerce, however great a civilizer it may be, is intensely selfish in its nature and so intense does this sometimes become that it tempts men to do things that cannot be squared with the rules of morals . . . War leads to dreadful suffering, but we have seen it ably argued, that heroic virtue arises out of suffering, and that the generous and noble affections often acquire extraordinary force amid scenes of unutterable wo [sic]. That the human heart is purified by suffering, and that in that ordeal the sins and selfishness of nations are washed out: There is something that also appeals to some of our best national feelings in the heroism of defensive war. We cannot think of the deeds of heroism of British soldiers at Alma, Balaklava, and Inkerman without a thrill of enthusiasm; and the display of such heroism with the national sympathy it has called forth, is no sign of national decay.[67]

It is likely that such jingoism confirmed Bishop Ignace Bourget's in his passive stand on the Crimean War. He allowed his clergy to participate in the second day of humiliation but he did not accompany it with a circular letter of the kind he had issued during the loyalty crisis for 1849, and later during the Indian Mutiny.[68] Bourget

---

[67] Gazette, April 18, 1855.

[68] See Ignace Bourget, Mandements, Lettres, Pastorales, Circulaires et Autres Documents (Montreal: Chapleau Freres, 1869), II, pp. 66-88. See also Leon Pouliot, "Au Lendemain de 1'emeute de 1849, Une Lettre de Mgr. Bourget à Mgr. Turgeon, May 2, 1849," Rev. Hist. de 1'Amerique Francaise, IX (1955-56), 117-19. Bourget may also have been too concerned with his other tasks in establishing ultramontane supremacy over liberalism.

presented a reticent contrast to Bishop Turgeon and his coadjutor Baillargeon in Quebec. They periodically published circular letters to the clergy appealing for heavenly benediction upon the armies of England and France, and for a quick return to peace.[69]

The first day of humiliation in Toronto had an anachronistic air to it. George Brown's comments on the Wesleyan day of humiliation might easily have been one of Strachan's resurrected sermons from 1812. He spoke of the British "nation" rather than empire, and summoned the "god of battles" to Britain's side.[70] Strachan himself had returned to the fray unrevised by age, urging his congregation to "unite with their religious brethren at home . . . and so feel themselves in all respects an acknowledged portion of the British nation."[71] These reasoned and passive abdications to providentialism appeared to result from the early stage of the war and the absence of a wartime ideology. The spirit of eighteen-twelve sufficed at least until 1855 and the birth of rabid war sentiment.

The Toronto celebrations of the fall of Sebastopol in October

---

[69] H. Tetu, C. O. Gagnon, Mandements, Lettres Pastorales, et Circulaires des Evêques de Quebec (Quebec: A. Côté, 1889-90), IV, 157-60, 217; V, 277-88. See also Quebec Morning Chronicle, Oct. 8, 9, 1855.

[70] Globe, May 1, 1854.

[71] J. Strachan to the Secretary of Canada West, June 3-6, 1854, Provincial Secretary's Correspondence, Canada West, P.A.C. See also City of Toronto Memorial for a day of humiliation and prayer, April 24, 1854; Memorial of Presbyterian Church and Church of Scotland to Secretary of Canada West, Quebec, June 2, 1854, Provincial Secretary's Correspondence, Canada West, P.A.C.

of 1855 were militant demonstrations of loyalty to Queen and Empire. The high-tory élite of that city proved somewhat behind the sentiment of public meetings in their reasoned appeals to "allegiance" and "affection." Chief Justice Robinson was clearly out of tune with general feeling in his attempt to localize their sentiments to positive uses such as the amelioration of French-English relations:

> The people of a great portion of Canada are of French origin. We cannot but suppose--for we only have to place ourselves in their situation to be convinced of it,--that they retain a great deal of sincere and deep-rooted affection for the country they have left. Hitherto it has been out of their power to rejoice in the successes of that country, without evincing a feeling of something like disloyalty towards the country to which they owe their allegiance. But on the present occasion they may rejoice as heartily as we in the success of the Allies, and we can join them in celebration, with as cordial good will as they can do.[72]

Robinson was not interrupted by cheers from his audience on this occasion. Their applause was reserved instead for references to the storming of the fortress and on the glorious cause of Her Majesty's sailors and soldiers.[73] Popular imperialism was a pariah that the high tory comprehended as little as he had democracy. Strachan's comment in the late eighteen-fifties upon the inferiority of one of his earlier sermons on deference applied well to the imperial sentiment.[74] "The glories of the crown" were intended for the few, and for the drawing-room, not the streets.

---

[72] Globe, Oct. 6, 1855.

[73] See also Toronto Weekly Leader and Patriot, Oct. 10, 1855.

[74] See S. F. Wise, "Sermon Literature . . . ," p. 17.

The blame could be laid at the feet of the cheap penny-press which had arrived with the Globe, the Montreal Gazette, the Pilot, and the Leader. Whatever the political persuasion, the message of whig imperialism was the same throughout English Canada. England upheld the cause of freedom in both a political and a religious sense. Civilization was also at stake. Great Britain was performing the primordial function of the Greeks and the Romans against the northern barbarians. Even the radical or democratic press in English Canada accepted these premises. William Lyon Mackenzie was indistinguishable from the Hamilton Gazette in his caricatures of the Russian bear and its pack of East European wolves.[75]

The flames of loyalism and anti-Americanism were also fanned by the English Canadian press even before the Anglo-American diplomatic crisis of 1856.[76] Throughout the war both the tory and reform press warned of American designs on a vulnerable Canada.[77] The argument was the same as that used during the War of 1812. The United

---

[75]See Globe, Jan. 30, March 30, Oct. 4, 20, 1854, Jan. 30, 1855; Toronto Leader, Dec. 5, 1855; Montreal Gazette, April 18, 1855; Montreal Pilot, Oct. 25, 1855, June 28, 1854; Hamilton Gazette, Dec. 12, 1853; Ottawa Citizen, April 8, 1854; North American, Sept. 27, Nov. 17, 22, 1854; Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, April 21, 1854.

[76]Apparently the cause of British attempts to recruit in the United States, followed by the dismissal of the British Minister to the United States, Mr. Crampton.

[77]See Hamilton Gazette, Aug. 31, 1854; March 1, June 4, 1855; Globe, Dec. 20, 1854, June 14, 1855; Ottawa Citizen, Jan. 20, 1855; Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Dec. 15, 1854, May 23, 1856; Montreal Gazette, May 16, Aug. 9, 1855; Quebec Morning Chronicle, Oct. 6, 1855.

States was by her friendly dalliance with the Russians, repeating the quasi-alliance with Napoleon in 1812. England was being stabbed in the back as she fought for world liberty. At the height of this 1812 overture, it was Brown the mid-Victorian liberal who emerged as perhaps the most strident exponent of loyalism:

> If people tried to take Canada, they would find an abundance of strong arms and strong hearts on the shores to meet them. No, no, Canada can or will hold her own, if need be, better in 1855 or 1875 than she did in 1812. She maintained the integrity of the British Empire then when her whole population contained of but a few hundred thousands, and repelled the entire force of the United States consisting of as many millions, and if the melancholy necessity should ever arise, she would ever do so again.[78]

Although tories as a whole did not object to Brown's xenophobia, there were some reformers who were more conscious of Canada's commercial interests. The liberal-reform London Free Press was particularly acute in its defence of the commercial connection between that portion of the province and the United States. Though the editor did not deny Britain's capacity to hold forth on two fronts and did not hide his contempt for Russo-American friendship, he still saw a confrontation with the Americans as a denial of "blood, friendship, commerce, and civilization."[79] The reform Pilot of Montreal was similarly less hostile to the Americans because of the close commercial links which

---

[78] Globe, Dec. 6, 1855.

[79] London Free Press, Feb. 27, 1856. See anti-war editorials contained in "One M.P.P. to the Sec. of State," Sec. of State Labouchere, June 28, 1856, CO42/608; Toronto Leader, Oct. 31, 1855.

tied that city to New England.[80] The Montreal tories on the other hand appeared self-conscious after their poor performance in 1849, and resolutely determined to drive back American invaders.[81]

The French Canadian press was less lively to the fortunes of Her Majesty's Armies in the Crimea. The war news, derived from common dispatches arriving in the mail clippers and from Parisian sources like L'Univers and Le Moniteur, was reported quite faithfully in La Minerve and Le Journal de Québec. Editorial comment in these conservative journals was neither so prolific nor prolix as that of the English press. The two themes which did emerge from the editorial opinion of these two journals were the anti-despotic character of the struggle against Russia, and the heroic stature of Napoleon III and the French people. Loud professions of imperial sentiment and militant support of Her Majesty's forces were rarely made except perhaps in conjunction with the local celebrations of the fall of Sebastopol.[82]

Although there was periodic reference to the alliance of France and England against Russian barbarism,[83] the positive thrust of French

---

[80] Pilot, Oct. 12, 26, 1855; July 15, 1856.

[81] See Montreal Gazette, Jan. 24, 1856; Lincoln Militia Petition in Head to Labouchere, May 31, 1856, CO42/604.

[82] Pilot, Oct. 5, 1855; Montreal Gazette, Oct. 9, 1855; Quebec Morning Chronicle, Oct. 8, 1855.

[83] La Minerve, May 2, 1854; Journal de Québec, April 29, 1854.

newspaper opinion was in the direction of a Napoleonic cult. Joseph Cauchon had long been an admirer of the political stability and economic prosperity created by a popular Napoleonic régime.[84] The Crimean campaign was seen as an excellent outlet for the genius of Napoleon III, because it could now be given a chance to manifest itself externally. The position of Ludger Duvernay's Minerve was, on the other hand, initially hostile to the Second Empire. Napoleon III's slogan "L'Empire c'est la paix" was transposed to "L'Empire c'est la guerre inévitable."[85] But with the advent of war, Duvernay warmed to Napoleon. He reprinted in great detail the plans of the "royal" marriage to Eugénie de Montigo, the dispatches of Napoleon to the Czar, and even Napoleon's addresses to the French people.[86] By the end of the war the Duvernay brothers sang the praises of the Empire as loudly as did the official press in France.[87] That a cult of Napoleon had blossomed was obvious from the reversal of even the liberal-nationalist Le Pays. Although that newspaper had initially criticized Napoleon for his interference in the Roman revolution of 1849, it now admired the stable and prosperous Empire.[88]

Only Louis-Joseph Papineau and the rouge editors of L'Avenir

---

[84] Journal de Québec, Feb. 10, 1853.

[85] La Minerve, Jan. 18, 1853.

[86] Ibid., March 8, 1853; March 11, April 25, Oct. 14, 1854.

[87] Ibid., Sept. 23, 1856; Feb. 17, Aug. 11, 1857.

[88] Ibid., Nov. 11, 1854; Le Pays, March 29, June 5, 1856.

appeared immune to the Napoleonic virus. Monarchical reaction was regarded as a plague, whatever the national form.[89] The argument that civilization was in danger held no special charm for Papineau, especially if the Turks were associated with it:

> L'ambition du Czar est redoutable, il doit être puni, si possible. Mais les Turcs sont moins susceptibles de se polir au contact de l'Europe, que les Russes. L'on ne peut avoir des sympathies pour les premiers, l'on a peur de ceux-ci, voilà tout. Je ne sais si Lord Elgin va nous demander de nous faire Mahometans. Les dames s'y opposeront; au reste cette bagatelle n'intéresse plus guères les hommes de notre âge, hélas.[90]

The immunity of Papineau and the rouges to the French Empire appeared also to have resulted from their ideological resistance to the British colonial institutions.[91] The idea that British imperial interests would be hurt by a land war in the near East or another in North America appeared to cause only mild amusement.[92] L'Avenir reduced British involvement in the Crimea to territorial ambition and to the expansion of iron and steel production.[93] French involvement in this immoral cause only reinforced the conclusion that Europe had been ideologically bankrupted by monarchical reaction, and that liberalism

---

[89] L'Avenir, July 8, 1856.

[90] L. J. Papineau to R. Christie, May 16, 1854, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., A.P.Q. See also Papineau to E. B. O'Callaghan, Jan. 25, 1852, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.; Papineau to R. Christie, Jan. 20, 1854, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., A.P.Q.; Papineau to E. Corning, Feb. 24, 1854, Papineau Papers, P.A.C.

[91] L'Avenir, Jan. 4, 1856; Papineau to R. Christie, Jan. 20, 1854, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., A.P.Q.

[92] Papineau to his wife, Nov. 11, 1855, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., A.P.Q.; L'Avenir, Jan. 18, 1856.

[93] L'Avenir, Feb. 8, 1856.

and democracy were only safe in the new world.[94]

Despite the rouges, the thrust of French Canadian attachment to France continues in its upward course in 1855. Neo-colonialism even blossomed briefly in the poems of Octave Crémazie and the prose of J. G. Barthe. The latter's tract Le Canada Reconquis par la France called for closer cultural ties with "l'ancienne mère patrie." Published in France in 1855, it also contained a preface by a Frenchman who suggested the cession of Quebec to France.[95] Crémazie's poems, "Vieux Soldat Canadien" and "Sur les Ruines de Sebastopol" were even more eloquent lamentations upon the forced severance of familial ties in 1760.[96] His melancholy was briefly dispelled by the triumphant visit of the French corvette La Capricieuse to the St. Lawrence in July of 1855. Much like Gaullist visit to Canada in 1967 the earlier one in 1855 caused considerable consternation in the official establishment. Governor-General Head was considerably angered by the francophilism aroused by Commandant Belzève and succeeded in having him ruined through strenuous protest to London and subsequently Paris.[97]

---

[94] See supra, ch. i, p. 64.

[95] J. G. Barthe, Le Canada Reconquis Par la France (Paris: Ledoyer, 1855), T.P.L. Pamphlet Coll.

[96] See H. R. Casgrain (ed.), Les Oeuvres Complètes d'Octave Crémazie (Montreal, 1882), pp. 100-106.

[97] A good account of this visit is related in Mason Wade, The French Canadians, 1760-1967 (rev. ed.; Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), I, 296-302. The curiosity of the incident was that the English language press did not take umbrage at all to the visit since it had assisted in generating bi-racial enthusiasm over the war. See Montreal Pilot, July 20, 1855.

Head's arbitrary response and his subsequent remarks on the backwardness of French Canadians were thoroughly resented. But a careful etiquette was none the less observed by French Canadian politicians in expressing their enthusiasm for France and Napoleon. The birth of an heir-apparent to Napoleon III and Eugénie in 1856 was a test of their forbearance. Although the French Canadian conservative press was quite enthusiastic, the bleu politicians were conspicuously silent in the House. All that Joseph Cauchon could say in the Assembly was that, good or bad, Napoleon was the representative of his people and should be respected accordingly.[98] He was content by and large to leave justification of the Napoleonic Empire to the English tories of Canada East. The only demonstration of bleu emotion came when the rouges and a few clear-grits tried to block an adjournment for the new French prince. The French Canadian members then proceeded to drown out the vociferous opposition of William Lyon Mackenzie by a vigorous rapping of desks and singing of French songs. The upshot of all the commotion was that the House did adjourn but refused to consider an open address of congratulation to the French Emperor and Empress.

The French Canadian politicians had learned for the first time the lessons of imperial war propaganda. Although they would have been content to stand on their record of demonstrated allegiance they had been pushed steadily to a warmer support of the war effort. First it had been the Patriotic Fund, then the days of humiliation and

---

[98] Mirror of Parliament, April 2, 1856.

prayer. Although they had fulfilled the nominal requirements in each case, they could not be stirred to militancy. When the opportunity for a meaningful transference of loyalty afforded itself in the person of Napoleon III and his warship La Capricieuse, they found that only British imperialism constituted a valid response. Confronted by these obstacles to dual sentiment, the French Canadians returned to their national cocoon. The great contribution of the war as George-Etienne Cartier saw them in October of 1855 were national ones:

> Les principales races qui habitent le Canada descendent des deux grandes nations européennes réunies aujourd'hui sous les mêmes drapeau pour empêcher une nationalité affaiblie de succomber sous la loi du plus fort. Comment pourraient-elles s'empêcher de vivre en harmonie sur cette terre qui est leur propriété commune?[99]

In English Canada the empire of sentiment had been amplified in considerable quantity since its enunciation in 1849. Wartime propaganda had in fact run a considerably higher pitch than it had in the War of 1812.[100] In fact many English Canadians appeared willing to do more than their political representatives would allow. The reins of empire were still firmly held in the hands of the political élite. Just as French neo-colonialism could not be allowed its full tether, neither could British imperialism. For the politicians a province, two nations, and a broadly based political coalition had to be held

---

[99] J. C. Tassé, Discours de G. E. Cartier (Montreal: Seneca et fils 1893), pp. 65-66.

[100] See R. A. Bowler, "Propaganda in Upper Canada: A Study of the Propaganda Directed at the People of Upper Canada During the War of 1812," (unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1964).

together.

The politics of compromise had thus muted the effects of wartime journalism and the growth of romantic British imperialism. There would be no provincial regiment go abroad, yet there would be a militia for self-defence. There were be a provincial contribution to the Patriotic Fund, but the proceeds would go to the fallen of both England and France. After the tense questions of men and money were resolved the rhetoric of empire had been studiously kept out of the Provincial Legislature. It was allowed free play in the partisan English language press, but there it vied on nearly equal terms with French imperialism. Luckily the United States loomed as a common threat for just long enough for the war to end in 1856. Had the Crimean conflict been longer and more severe in its drain on British manpower, the Macdonald-Cartier coalition may have had considerably greater problems in keeping imperial and national loyalties from colliding.

(ii) The Indian Mutiny, 1857-58

The first shots fired by the Sepoy rebels in far off Meerut sent shock waves as far as the provincial society bordering the St. Lawrence. Unlike the Crimean War, the Indian Mutiny never generated a tidal wave of imperial enthusiasm in Canada. Little was at stake for Canadians either in terms of interest or ideology. An insurrection on the borders of Empire posed as little prospect of profit as of danger to civilization and Christianity. Because of its virtually certain outcome, English Canadians viewed the Mutiny as a minor

incident in the inevitable spread of anglo-saxon empire to the farthest reaches of the earth. Most French Canadians, on the other hand, were as uninterested in its prospect as they were in the fate of the British garrison at Canton.

Despite its comparative insignificance for Canadians, the Mutiny posed a delicate problem in imperial-colonial relations. There were those frustrated imperialists in English-speaking Canada who had regretted the Canadian failure to send a contingent to the Crimea. These zealots encountered difficult resistance from those Canadians of both races who neither agreed with the ends nor the means of the imperialists. Although most Anglo-Canadians were convinced of the justice of England's cause in India, most balked at the expense of military involvement in an essentially internal problem of Empire. What was more important, most French Canadians were unsympathetic to England's cause. Military participation in the subjugation of native peoples was a sensitive subject to broach in a united province originally dedicated to the purpose of racial assimilation. They also drew a distinct qualitative difference between the sieges of Sebastopol and Lucknow. In doing so, they predicted the distinctions which were later made by Laurier and Bourassa between the Somme and Mafeking.

The slim historiography of the Mutiny's impact upon Canada stands in need of revision. Military historians have agreed that it was an event "of some note in the history of the Empire, since it marked the first occasion upon which a regiment was raised in Canada

for service abroad in the imperial interest."[101] The fundamental premise upon which such conclusions are based is that Canadians were highly sympathetic to Britain's cause and were therefore manifesting positive signs of their recent willingness to share in the fortunes of the Empire.[102] In fact, it appears that military participation was the by-product of much narrower public support. The One Hundredth Royal Canadians might be reduced to almost the level of a conspiracy foisted upon a reluctant Canadian public by its Governor-General, its military class, and a few extreme imperialists. The practical limits of Canadian loyalty had not advanced beyond the bounds established in the Crimean War. Had Canadian politicians been consulted upon the subject of a Canadian regiment, as they were to be in 1862 on the Militia Bill, the answer might have been equally embarrassing to the Colonial Office and War Office. Secondly, there was little evidence of Canadian money in aid of the India Relief Fund. Finally, Canadians were considerably less active in enlisting public petitions or journalistic support for the British cause in India.

The initial response to the Mutiny was considerably less intense than the one to the outbreak of the Crimean War. Even the most rabid of English Canadian journals were often content to treat the Mutiny as foreign news, with only sparse editorial comment.

---

[101] C. P. Stacey, Canada and the British Army, 1846-71, A Study in the Practice of Responsible Government (Toronto, 1963), p. 106; G. F. G. Stanley, Canada's Soldiers 1604-1854 (Toronto: Macmillan, 1954), pp. 215-16.

[102] C. P. Stacey, op. cit., pp. 105, 114.

George Brown was more loquacious than most editors in his whiggish diagnosis of and prescriptions for the ills of the Empire. Upon first hearing the news of the Meerut massacres, Brown confidently predicted its rapid demise. Not only would the mutineers be mollified by the appearance of British reinforcements, but also by the fact that "the Hindoo population have too long experienced the blessings of British rule, as compared with the former misgovernment and tyranny of native monarchs."[103] Brown was content also to rely upon his well-worn racial prejudices when foreign dispatches failed to ascribe any definite cause to the rebellion. Neither oppression, over-taxation nor patriotism satisfied Brown as adequate explanations of cause. Rather, the source of discontent was couched in tribal atavism:

> The Hindoo is an impulsive being, easily excited, and wild in his aimless anger,--emotional as a child, and dangerous as a strong, unscrupulous and crafty man. A small thing, therefore may impel him to strange excesses. And, by all accounts, a very small matter did lead to those under consideration . . . The Hindoo is not the person to draw nice distinctions between the opinions of the Governor and the man. Enough for him, that somehow or other, that august personage has dealt heavy blows at ancient usage. More than this we cannot expect him to think of; less than this he can hardly fail to perceive.[104]

When Brown came to prescribe remedies for India, he endorsed the elixir of Christian civilization. He managed in the process to promote a transmuted form of voluntaryism, by advocating the enforced superiority of the Bible over the Vedas: "Without fixing bayonets to circulate the

---

[103] Globe, July 13, 1857.

[104] Globe, July 24, 1857. See also London Free Press, Sept. 21, 1857.

former, they must fix bayonets to tell the readers of the latter, that if men choose to accept the faith of their European rulers, they are at perfect liberty to do so."[105]

What little dissent was voiced from these common attitudes in Canada West came from the moribund pen of William Lyon Mackenzie. Age had not diminished his crusading spirit against the abuses of monopoly capitalism and political privilege. The East India Company and the Colonial Office were flayed in a manner even surpassing Mackenzie's finest tirades against the Canada Land Company or the Family Compact, for he now chose to cast the Mutiny in universal terms of class and caste injustice. The Hindu, like the American slave and Irish commoner, was merely a pawn in the imperial ambitions of priests, politicians and businessmen. He singled out for special abuse the public media like the London Times who were the tools of all three interests:

> The immense armament of troops and warlike stores for India is as we see by the Times intended for the complete conquest of Hindoostan, which it estimates at a hundred and fifty millions of people. Is this right? That 25 nations and a sixth part of God's creatures on earth should be crushed by the iron heel of despotism to enrich the influential families of one nation of 30 millions, 12,000 miles distant! Is it Christian doctrine? Or is Christianity, its mild doctrines, merely used as a cloak to cover national crimes? . . . Who can wonder that when 200,000 Indian troopers are employed by a mercenary organization of covetous storekeeprs in London to rivet the yoke upon India, they sometimes rebel, and sigh for at least national independence of the stranger!

---

[105] Globe, July 24, 1857. See also Henry Taylor, On the Intention of the British Government to Unite the Provinces of British North America (Toronto, 1858), pp. 112-13.

> The Times advises the blotting out every possible evidence of East Indian nationality, that they may become more patient as slaves. Break every treaty!!! This is the Yankee's idea with his four millions of slaves. No reading else you may begin to think. Castes in India--colour of the skin in America--Papist and Protestant in Ireland--all of them used by priests and politicians to degrade, brutify, and enslave the human race.[106]

Mackenzie became so incensed by the arrogance of the establishment's handling of the Mutiny that he retroactively condemned Palmerston's earlier involvement in the Crimea in 1854 thus adding "400 millions to England's debt and bring grief to many a home."[107] That Mackenzie now dared for the first time since 1837 to brand the English aristocracy as the "enemies of education and true religion at home and liberty everywhere" either indicated that he was becoming too old to care about the political repercussions of disloyalty, or more likely, that his criticism reflected the freer atmosphere of public opinion upon the mutiny. Mackenzie's critical posture might therefore be viewed as an advanced poll of the later chorus of dissent against Canadian military participation in India.

In Canada East, the journalistic reception of the mutiny bordered on apathy. Neither of the two major newspapers of Montreal, the Gazette nor La Minerve, printed anything but news dispatches and British editorial opinion.[108] It was not until September that La Minerve even

---

[106] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, July 17, 1857. See also July 24, Aug. 7, 1857.

[107] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, August 4, 1857.

[108] Montreal Gazette, July 18, Aug. 1, 8, Sept. 5, 1857; La Minerve, July 25, Aug. 6, 15, 22, 1857.

mentioned the mutiny in her editorials. Even then, the reference was so oblique as almost to escape notice, since the editor buried it in a general discussion of the world struggle between religion and authority on the one hand and revolution and anarchy on the other. The editor's sole object was to convince his readers that while England was shaken by rebellion in her colonies, "seule la France élève au-dessus de cette rumeur, un front glorieux et couronné de l'auréole de la prosperité."[109] The normally anglophile Gazette was even more conspicuous in its failure to support the mother country in her time of troubles. Instead, Brown Chamberlin preferred to print borrowed extracts from the English and American press to demonstrate the beneficence of British rule in India.[110]

In Quebec City, a similar coolness to the British cause prevailed in the early phase of the mutiny. The Quebec Morning Chronicle merely reprinted the latest developments in the mutiny from the London Times and the News.[111] Some of the reprinted material was decidedly racist in tone, demanding as it did the resumption at any cost of "our power and privilege over the Asiatic races." But even this brief outburst of chauvinism was obscured by columns of monotonously described military movements. The major French language newspaper,

---

[109] La Minerve, Sept. 10, 1857.

[110] Montreal Weekly Gazette, Aug. 22, 1857, "India Under the English" from the New York Commercial Advertiser.

[111] Quebec Morning Chronicle, July 28, Aug. 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 21, 29, Sept. 2, 5, 14, 1857.

the Journal de Québec took umbrage at even these limited English outbursts for a "war to the knife's point" in the Far East. In Joseph Cauchon's opinion they could only destroy England's claim to liberality and merely escalate atrocities by the natives. In response to the Liverpool European Times' suggestion that rebellious Indians be shipped out as slaves to the colonies to cut sugar cane, Cauchon penned a savage rebuttal:

> Ces cris de fureur poussés par quelques écrivains britanniques ont fait le plus grand tort à la cause de l'Angleterre, en privant cette dernière de la sympathie des nations, si nécessaire dans une lutte semblable à celle où elle se trouve engagée, en élevant à la nation anglaise le prestige de libéralisme, dont elle prétendait avoid presque le monopole et en poussant les insurgés à redoubler de cruauté envers des adversaires qui, dans le cas de succès, menacent d'être tout aussi cruels qu'eux mêmes.[112]

Cauchon's strong opposition to English xenophobia marked a tide of swelling opposition which was to reach its peak in the winter months of 1857-58. That opposition was to centre not on the nebulous question of imperial loyalty, but rather upon the concrete issue of military participation upon Great Britain's behalf. That the politicians allowed that divisive issue even to arise in view of their initially apathetic reception was evidence of their inability to control public policy when the session was out.

Initiative upon this touchy matter then passed to Governor-General Head, whose feelings upon the crisis in India were not so ambiguous as those of his executive council or the press. Head had

---

[112] Le Journal de Québec cited in L'Avenir, Nov. 15, 1857.

been in England during the summer of 1857 and had been approached by both the Colonial Secretary Labouchere, and the Duke of Cambridge.[113] It is also of some significance that Head's closest confidence in the colony was not shared by his executive council, but with the military commander of Her Majesty's Troops in British North America, Lt. General William Eyre.[114]

Public support for Head's colonial regiment came only from the resident military establishment and from aspirant career men. Zealous support was soon found within this professional class for second and third volunteer regiments from such unlikely sources as the coloured population of Canada West. One forthright half-pay officer in Toronto not only proposed a Negro regiment of three thousand men, but also offered himself as the man best qualified to lead it.[115] The jockeying for placement in such volunteer regiments became so heated that the War Office finally was forced to call a halt to wild speculation in early October. Head himself was then forced to make public an acknowledgement of the display of public ardor and loyalty for

---

[113] D. G. Kerr, Sir Edmund Head: A Scholarly Governor (Toronto, 1954), p. 137. Head appeared so flattered by the prospect of a colonial regiment that he pursued his superiors relentlessly throughout the winter of 1857 and 1858; E. Head to Lord Panmure, Aug. 23, 1857, CO42/612; War Office to Colonial Office, Oct. 17, 1857, CO42/613; Head to Labouchere, Jan. 13, 1858, CO42/615; War Office to Colonial Office, Feb. 4, 1858, CO42/616; War Office to Colonial Office, Feb. 24, 1858, CO42/616.

[114] Kerr, ibid., p. 138.

[115] Wm. Eyre to Labouchere, Aug. 23, 1857; Eyre to Labouchere, Sept. 7, 1857, CO42/612; J. D. Hay (Bart) to E. India Bd. of Directors, Toronto, Jan. 6, 1858, CO42/616.

military service, but their serious reservation about withdrawing militia from Canada.[116]

The press of the province generally greeted the prospect of military assistance to Great Britain with dismay. Although the Morning Chronicle of Quebec urged the sending of Canadian men and money in September,[117] it no longer even demanded that French Canadians enlist in a Provincial Army. It would have been sufficient if they merely donated for the "relief of those who may suffer in the performance of duty, or become the victims of war in the East."[118] Soon after this mild exhortation to action, the Globe, the Journal de Québec , L'Avenir, and the Quebec Chronicle itself all intoned their varied dissents to military participation. The Chronicle feared for public order and safety should the military establishment be withdrawn along with the volunteers. Withdrawal was folly in a country "which is a slumbering volcano of religious and political hatreds . . . in which every volunteer company is the representative of some well-defined political party, in which secret and dangerous combinations have spread through the land." A more dangerous possibility than even violence was a potential repetition of the Mutiny in a province composed of "mixed nationalities." Secure in the confines of Toronto, the Globe was less neurotic in its opposition. Brown

---

[116] R. S. Pennefather (Head's Secretary) to Col. de Rottenberg, Toronto, Oct. 21, 1857, in Montreal Gazette, Oct. 21, 1857.

[117] Quebec Morning Chronicle, Sept. 19, 1857.

[118] Ibid., Sept. 23, 1857.

laughed heartily at the "ridiculous" spectacle of the schoolboy volunteers drilling for a "glorious war." Sufficient for them was a curt reminder that neither Great Britain nor the East India Company needed Canada's men or her money.[119]

The Journal de Québec and L'Avenir were much more serious in their intent. Cauchon became involved in a heated journalistic debate with the official organ of Quebec's garrison class, the Military Gazette. While the latter raved on about the necessity of a national army in Canada in order to secure eventual independence, Le Journal declaimed against the injustice of Great Britain's cause,[120] and the unwillingness of French Canadians to lend it even their ideological support. The rouges announced that the proposal to raise two colonial regiments was little other than taxation without representation:

> Nous n'avons pas d'objection à ce que nos volontaires aillent en masse et à leurs frais et dépens montrer leur promesse dans la guerre des Indes. Mais nous protestons contre le projet de taxer le peuple Canadien pour aider aux tyrans de l'Inde à maintenir leur cruel et barbare despotisme. [121]

By mid-October most of the English language press had also seized upon the issue of costs as the final argument against military levies.[122]

---

[119] Cited in ibid.

[120] Reported in the Toronto Leader, Sept. 19, 1857.

[121] L'Avenir, Nov. 2, 1857.

[122] The Globe, the Toronto Leader, the Hamilton Banner, the Welland Herald and the Quebec Mercury were all reported as opposed on these and closely related grounds. See Quebec Morning Chronicle, Oct. 19, 1857.

Once again the Quebec Chronicle led the assault in demanding that Canada retain her unemployed as a surplus labour force for seasonal purposes. St. Michel further urged that the militant elements refrain from embarrassing the Home government with their self-interested offers of assistance. Excessive loyalty of any kind was also out of place at a time when monetary crisis threatened the domestic prosperity of the colony. Instead, Canadians could better serve the Empire "by cultivation of a spirit of quiet acquiescence in the wise and liberal designs of the parent state."[123]

Since the colonial executive was under such adverse pressure from its superiors in the home government and newspapers in the colony, it aimed at more limited objectives. A conscious effort appears to be made to rekindle the imperial sentiment which had burned so brightly during the Crimean War. But conspicuous by its absence was any attempt by the executive to foster a spirit of militarism in the same obtuse manner of September and October. In fact, it was not until the new year and a new session that Head dared to broach the subject again.

The fangs of the Lower Canadian press were almost fully retracted in late November and the popular observance of an official Day of Humiliation. Up until the appointed day, the clergy of all denominations had remained aloof from the political controversy surrounding the Mutiny. There was only a token gesture made by the anglo-Protestant population of Montreal who gathered in Montreal's Wesleyan

---

[123]Quebec Morning Chronicle, Oct. 26, 1857.

Methodist Church in early October to pay tribute to "the great truth believed by all Christian men that the finger of Providence guides the affairs of nations."[124] Notably absent from those proceedings was the Roman Catholic Church of Montreal. Indeed, it appeared that French Canadians were active opponents of the Governor-General's policies. In order to counter the stigma of disaffection it appeared necessary that the Church intervene with a show of loyalty.

Bishop Bourget finally broke his silence that had lasted through the Crimean War. For the celebration of the public fast in November he drafted a pastoral letter, which served the combined object of a loyalty address to the Queen and an official denunciation of the atrocities in India. Beginning with the premise that the Church had always attached itself "to the Government under which Divine Providence had placed her," Bourget paid lengthy and unprecedented homage to the secular realm of Queen Victoria:

> Nous vous supplions, ô Dieu tout--Puissant, de faire croître en toutes sortes de vertus Notre Gracieuse Souveraine, la reine Victoria, qui tient par votre miséricorde les rênes du Gouvernement; afin qu'ornée de toutes les qualités qui sont nécessaires à ceux qui gouvernent les peuples, elle puisse combattre et vaincre toutes les vices, qui sont les monstres les plus à craindre, être victorieuse de tous les ennemis de l'Etat, et arriver ensuite, comblée de mérites, à Vous qui êtes la voie, la vérité et la vie.[125]

---

[124] Montreal Gazette, Oct. 10, 1857.

[125] Mandement, Nov. 21, 1857. Cited in I. Bourget, Fioretti Vescovili, p. 96.

Then followed a gothic relation of the atrocities visited upon Christian women and children by the Mutineers. Ultramontanist that he was, Bourget could not resist a parting reminder that India had once been the glorious apostolate of St. Francis Xavier. Had only he and subsequent Catholic missionaries been accepted Indian would not presently be visited upon by so many misfortunes.

The traditionally more co-operative bishop of Quebec, Charles Baillargeon, felt no compulsion to prostrate himself before the throne as Bourget had done. Instead he dwelt solely upon the unparalleled savagery of the uprising and summoned the Lord to the cause of justice, humanity, and peace.[126] If Baillargeon's instruction to his flock was not as unorthodox as Bourget's, it was greeted with no less enthusiasm by the English community in Quebec.[127] The Morning Chronicle now abandoned its hostile posture as it united with French Roman Catholics in ideological approbation of Great Britain's cause:

> We cannot but think this Pastoral will be read with some interest in England, as a strong evidence of sympathy with the mother-country in the struggle so gallantly maintained by her loyal forces in India, and as proof of the unanimity of feeling which prevails among men of all creeds, language and origins in Canada wherever the claims of humanity or the honor of the united Empire are concerned.[128]

The similarity of this bi-racial posture with that taken during the Crimean War was further reinforced by the editor's congratulation of

---

[126] Mandement, Nov. 16, 1857.

[127] See Montreal, Gazette, Nov. 25, 1857.

[128] Quebec Morning Chronicle, Nov. 26, 1857.

the French Canadians for joining the Gallican clergy in France in their crusade upon England's behalf.

Although the public fast had little sustained effect upon public opinion in the province, it marked a positive gain for the administration. One thing Head had learned was that if the issue of military service were not pressed, Canadians might ultimately swing around to a more positive frame of mind upon the Mutiny. Once in this position, they might also find it difficult to defend their sentimental approval of Britain's cause against their adamant refusal to sanction military assistance.

Newspaper opinion gradually warmed in Britain's favour by early 1858. The coming of the New Year offered an occasion for reflection and prognostication upon the fortunes of Empire. For the first time, the editor of the Quebec Chronicle appeared to condone military assistance by his printing of a patriotic poem of the British Empire. However, the only ambiguous phrase in an otherwise unambiguous verse was that which related to a just cause for a Canadian military contribution:

> We have heroes nobly fighting
> Fighting deep in Sepoy blood
> Fiercely charge they on; no blighting
> Can destroy the English bud.
>
> We are English, we are Britons
> Though the mighty sea divides;
> We will arm her when her foe threatens
> We extol her victories wide.[129]

---

[129] Quebec Morning Chronicle, Jan. 5, 1858. Italics mine.

Brown Chamberlin's Montreal Gazette similarly welcomed the New Year with some considerable comment on the imperial feeling which had been generated in Canada upon the occasion of the rebellion. As usual the Gazette saw the issue as simply as it had viewed the Crimean conflict. The Hindoo merely replaced the Slav as the forces of darkness from which England must snatch liberty and civilization.[130]

Canadians also began to warm to the romance of war in India, whether it was the relief of Lucknow or the death of the gallant general, Henry Havelock. George Brown penned his most self-consciously romantic prose of the decade upon the approach of the Scottish bagpipers to Lucknow. Brown chose to set the atmosphere for his fantasy by first casting stones at the high priests of reason and utility --Paley and Bentham. At the same time he eulogized the spiritualism of Wordsworth and Tennyson, and of that unknown lass who first heard the skirl of the pipes at Lucknow:

> We live in a realm of romance, for our realities are romantic. This working day world is absolutely resplendent with poetry, and the ordinary occurrences of life, that seem thrown together as confused as the shreds of wafer in a kaleidoscope, are found in combinations as startling and wondrous as an Arabian tale. There is in truth, no poetry like that of nature, and no romance like the romance of reality, as to take the incident which suggested these remarks, what is there in fable equal to the story . . . of the approach of the Highlanders to Lucknow.
>
> Familiarity with danger had turned soldiers into heroes, and women into soldiers. Delicately educated ladies carried orders from battery to battery, and sat up night and day cherishing and cheering their defenders undaunted

---

[130]Montreal Gazette, Jan. 2, 1857.

> by the thirty thousand fiends that lay in arms around them, yelling for their tears and blood. Amid such excitement, however, even the strongest occasionally gave way--and among others the wife of a corporal, Jessie Brown had finally succumbed, and now lay tossing in a fever . . . All we find asserted is that Jessie persisted in the statement that she heard the music of her native hills . . . It was even so, the stricken creature was right . . . It was indeed the blast of the Scottish bagpipes cleaving the air . . . with a deadly blast to the miscreants of Cawnpore and the runaway ruffians of Delhi . . . [131]

Sir Henry Havelock's inglorious death by tropical disease could only come as an anti-climax to Jessie Brown's fever, yet the editor of the Quebec Chronicle could still wax enthusiastically on the equally glorious form of all service.[132] It was no small source of pride to Canadians that Lt. Edmond de Lotbinière Joly of Quebec had been killed in the service of Havelock. Petition was even made by Joly's family to the executors of the Havelock Memorial Fund to have his name inscribed upon the latter's monument in Trafalgar Square.[133]

The propitious moment to test the practical limits of Canadian imperial sentiment had come. The opposition which had swelled to dangerous proportions during the fall was no longer in evidence. The Governor-General quietly awaited the result of his standing order for the raising of the Prince of Wales Regiment. His proposal was finally transmitted to the Queen by the War Office on February 4, 1858, and

---

[131] Globe, Jan. 9, 1858. See also ibid., Jan. 13, 19, 26, 30; Feb. 1, 10, 16, 25, 1858.

[132] Quebec Morning Chronicle, Jan. 26, 1858. See also the poetic eulogy to Havelock, ibid., Feb. 1, 1858.

[133] See Petitions to Colonial Office, 1858, CO42/616, p. 354. Ironically, Lotbinière was late in rejoining his regiment at Lucknow; see his journal, 1857, Lotbinière Papers (microfilm), P.A.C.

letters sent out to Henry Labouchere and Lord Panmure, empowering Head to enlist soldiers.[134] Final approval came from the Queen on February 26th--the same day that Head delivered his speech from the throne to open the new session. Although Head made no suggestion of the impending royal approval of a Canadian regiment, he played upon the general sentiment which existed within the House not only for Britain's military fortunes, but also for the minor Canadian contributions to that date:

> The people of Canada, as they have sympathized with the danger and suffering of their fellow subjects will in the like manner rejoice at the vigor which has checked this rebellion, and will appreciate the steadiest courage and perseverance which have distinguished our countrymen in the East. It is a source of pride to the British colonies that with Havelock and Outram is associated the name of Inglis, and that we have sent from Canada some who fell gallantly fighting at Delhi and Lucknow.[135]

In the ensuing debate it became obvious that the House, although politely receptive to Head, was not gripped by the same intensity of imperial feeling. Only two speeches even alluded to that portion of Head's speech, and these were made by two newly-elected members, M. Talbot of Middlesex East and L. S. Morin of Terrebonne. Both chose to repeat what Head had said, except that they did so in a more

---

[134] War Office to Merivale, Feb. 4, 1858, CO42/616.

[135] Mirror of Parliament, Feb. 26, 1858. The Inglis mentioned was John Inglis (1814-62), son of Bishop J. Inglis of Nova Scotia. Inglis entered the British Army in 1833. His regiment, the Thirty-Second Foot, was transferred to India in 1846. Lt. Col. Inglis took over command at Lucknow in 1857 upon the death of Sir Henry Lawrence and served until relieved three months later.

empassioned manner, drawing considerable applause for their rhetorical efforts. The greatest reaction came exactly where Head had intended it should have come in his own speech, i.e., where reference was made to "our countrymen had mingled thier [sic] blood on the field of battle with that of British soldiers."[136]

Almost as the cheering faded away, the Governor-General received his instructions to commission the One Hundredth Regiment of Foot.[137] On March 3, he announced the opening of recruiting depots in London, Niagara, Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec.[138] Under the conditions of service which were appended to the other, commissions were available "with or without purchase" with the sole approval of the Governor-General. Since the British government was to outfit this regular regiment, a three pound bounty plus military kit was offered to all recruits. All told, the strength of the regiment was calculated to reach 1,127 men of all ranks.

Since the provincial Parliament and the people of the province were presented with a fait accompli paid for by the British government, little vocal opposition mounted to Head's manoevre. Conversely, little positive enthusiasm developed at the moment of its announcement. Both the Globe and La Minerve accepted the news as a matter of fact, and faithfully carried the news of enlistments in the ensuing

---

[136] Ibid.

[137] La Minerve, Feb. 27, 1858. Lord Panmure to C.O., Feb. 26, 1858, CO42/616, p. 329.

[138] Quebec Military Gazette, March 13, 1858.

months.[139] Of the major newspapers, only the Montreal Gazette greeted the proposal with any élan. Chamberlin even suggested that the formation of a second Canadian rifle regiment was now projected by the British government in view of the martial spirit displayed in English Canada during and after the Crimean War.[140]

Head then encountered some opposition to the recruiting of the One Hundredth. His critics were then given an ostensible cause to vent their accumulated spleen upon the Governor-General for his decision to raise a regiment in the first place. The Toronto Colonist flayed the executive for the barroom and circus mentality surrounding recruitment. Poor pay and lack of opportunity for advancement into the commissioned ranks dictated the failure of the regiment:

> If governments demand of the humbler and unknown, a devotion which will cost them much of what makes life pleasing, no niggards must the governing classes be of rewards and prizes . . . In such a case there are hundreds in the Province who would join, for never was there a more contented people, or one more linked to their nationality or prouder of their history. Then there would be a future for those who enrolled themselves, as it is, there is nothing to tempt our youth from their avocations. We therefore believe that the whole scheme will prove a failure.

The Quebec Chronicle was even more to the point in its criticism. It chose to dismiss as cavil the objections of the Colonist to recruiting techniques. The central issue which everyone seemed to be overlooking

---

[139] Globe, Mar. 15, 19, 1858; La Minerve, Feb. 27, Mar. 4, 1858.

[140] Montreal Gazette, Mar. 6, 1858. See also Mar. 27, 1858.

[141] British Colonist, Feb. 27, 1858.

was that provincial regiments were not legitimate "so long as Canada has no foreign relations, sends no recognized ambassadors abroad, has no national existence, and consequently can be embroiled in no national quarrel."[142] Why any responsible politician would seek to confound the functions of imperial and provincial legislatures in view of this clear-cut division of constitutional function, the Chronicle was at a loss to explain.

Head was also charged with racial discrimination and class favoritism in the dispensation of commissions. On the former account, Head was publicly upbraided in the House by the veteran bleu, J. E. Turcotte. He reminded Head of French Canada's loyalty and her demonstrated service of the Crown, and raised the case of Lt. Casault of Quebec who had served in the Crimea but had been refused a commission in the One Hundredth:

> Were they not equally loyal subjects of the British throne? What if the Lower Canadians had at one time indulged in a little insurrection, so had the Upper Canadians. Had not the Lower Canadians, as well as Upper Canadians, shed their blood in the Crimea? On this subject he might say that Mr. Casault of Quebec who had distinguished himself in almost every battle in the Crimea, had been passed over in giving away a commission in the army, and another had been chosen who had known no other kisses than those of his mamma. (hear)[143]

Even the anglophile Military Gazette had become so angered by the inequities of recruiting that it accused the Governor of "gratifying

---

[142] Quebec Morning Chronicle, March 3, 1858. See also March 6, 8, 1858.

[143] Mirror of Parliament, March 10, 1858.

his own personal predilection and desire of patronage" to the exclusion of capable military men of both races.[144] Head's actions were doubly unfortunate in that they indicated his determination to act upon his earlier dictum that the French Canadians were "la race inférieure." The only remedy for this inexcusable atavism, the Gazette argued, was for Head to resign.[145]

The Governor appeared to heed the mounting criticism despite the fact that all of his appointments were approved without question by the War Office.[146] The Prince of Wales Regiment soon came to reflect more faithfully the racial as well as regional composition of the Province of Canada. The French Canadians ultimately placed four lieutenants, including Casault, among the nineteen officers of the regiment.[147] The rest of the commissioned officers also appeared to represent an adequate cross-section of the local military élites of Toronto, Montreal, London and a few smaller centres.[148]

The press grudgingly yielded the executive its due for such attempts at a more equitable distribution of patronage. The regiment's

---

[144]The issue was the granting of a captaincy to Richard C. Price, son of the Quebec timber magnate, William Price. See W. S. Kirk to C. O., Quebec, March 13, 1858, CO42/616.

[145]Military Gazette, March 13, 1858 contained in CO42/616.

[146]War Office to C.O., July 5, 1858, CO42/616, p. 364.

[147]They were Duschenay (Beauce), Casault (Quebec), Carrière (Ottawa), and Bellefeuille (Montreal), La Minerve, June 5, 1858.

[148]Some of their names were Ridout and Derbyshire (Toronto), Clark and Dunn (Montreal), Brece (London), Rykert (St. Catharines), and Smyth (Brockville).

progress was henceforth reported objectively but none the less faithfully, until its very presence gnawed at the consciences of some Canadians. Upon the date of their embarcation from Quebec in June, the Morning Chronicle had become so conditioned by their presence that it expressed a genuine concern about its 1812 issue uniforms, its lack of regimental colours, plate, or band instruments.[149] The regiment was assured that despite this neglect, the Canadian people really watched their career with "lively interest."[150]

Since neither Canadians nor Britons could muster any real enthusiasm over Canada's military contribution, the task was largely left to those who had enlisted in Her Majesty's Service. Since their interest was so actively engaged, they found little cause for inhibition against their imperial sentiments. In fact, the enthusiasm of this martial poem penned aboard the 'Indian' as it headed for Liverpool might be read solely for the militant contrast it offered to the tepid reactions of Canadian politicians and journalists:

> St. Lawrence banks, Ontario's shores,
> Resound with fife and drum
> Their vanguard stands in England now,
> The cry is "Still they come."
> They come to fight for England's Queen,
> For liberty and the law,
> The new world's hearty pioneers
> The hope of Canada . . .[151]

---

[149] La Minerve, May 6, 8, 18, 1858; Globe, March 25, 1858; Montreal Gazette, March 27, 1858; Quebec Morning Chronicle, April 15, 22, May 1, 8, 1858.

[150] Quebec Morning Chronicle, June 18, 1858.

[151] "J. C. Montreal," ibid., July 21, 1858.

This warmed-over remnant from the Crimean War was badly miscast in the Indian Mutiny. The atavisms of Kipling's Gunga Din were more to the point than the romantic imperialism of Tennyson's Locksley Hall. George Brown had come dangerously close to the former in his comments on the "Hindoo," but his solitary musings into the crystal ball of British imperialism had quickly clouded over. The politics of national interest had prevented the application of racial messianism just as it had prevented the realization of romantic imperialism in the Crimean War.

French Canadians had proved apathetic to the cause in question, and had actively opposed the unilateral remedies proposed by Governor Head. They had emerged in 1858 with their loyalties suspect, but they had made their point. Nationality took clear precedence over empire in any case of conflict. English Canadians were more sympathetic to the cause, but proved equally disengaged in their interests. Trade had continued in a slump, and a career open to colonial talents was hardly in the offing for recruits to a British-sponsored regiment. Consequently there was little imperial sentiment expressed in private drives for funds, or popular petitions. Had Canadians been consulted as to their wishes on a military contribution the answer would have been more negative than in 1855. The Indian Mutiny had thus been a dress rehearsal for the defeat of the Militia Bill of 1862.

The whig imperial theory of complementary national and imperial interests had been exploded. The precarious balance between theory and reality had barely been saved by the judicious compromises of the

Crimean War, but it was not worth saving in 1857-58. The new imperialism born in 1849 had thus proven within ten years to be a shadow without substance. Durham's and Elgin's concept of empire was rhetoric alone to the politicians and still too new to have become a popular social gospel. The idea of nationality which displaced it proved highly explosive politically, but sociologically much more real.

CHAPTER V

NATIONALITY AND RACE IN MID-NINETEENTH CENTURY CANADA

The growth of Canadian Nationalism in the pre-Confederation era has often been stated in terms of martial spirit generated during the War of 1812 and patriotic democracy resurgent in the rebellions of 1837. Yet, neither this badly fought war nor these abortive revolutions have endured the test of a century and a half of historiography. Papineau and Mackenzie have been written off either as neurotic impotents or betrayers of those poor dupes who chose to follow them.[1] Those conservative worthies who emerged in shining armour from the War of 1812 to lead Upper Canadian society for the next twenty years have also tarnished in the acid of historical criticism. Bishop Strachan's vision of British North Americans as God's chosen people has been written off as "British Israelitism," and "too narrowly conceived, too deeply rooted in the defence of a dying order to catch the imagination of the people, and to provide the basis for an emergent Canadian nationalism."[2]

Until very lately the Union period has been designated a time of troubles or interregnum between the vision of the Durham Report,

---

[1] See F. Ouellet, Louis Joseph Papineau: A Divided Soul, C.H.A. Booklet, Ottawa, 1964; F. Ouellet, Histoire Economique et Sociale du Québec (Fices, 1966), ch. xiv; G. M. Craig, Upper Canada 1784-1840 (Toronto, 1963), p. 249; F. H. Armstrong, "William Lyon Mackenzie, First Mayor of Toronto: A Study of a Critic in Power, C.H.R., XLVIII (December, 1967), 309-31.

[2] S. F. Wise, "God's Peculiar Peoples," in W. L. Morton (ed.), The Shield of Achilles (Toronto, 1968), p. 59.

the achievement of responsible government, and ultimately the federal state of 1867. Recent historiography written in a new time of troubles has tended to greater sympathy with the problems of political and cultural dualism in that period. Its latest and foremost historian, J. M. S. Careless, now sees it as the crucible of Canadian nationality in which "the major features of institutional growth . . . were produced by their (English and French) joint efforts--as well as by their inability to escape the one really fundamental Canadian Fact, that they had to live together."[3]

Beyond this simple fact of dualism which underlies Canadian political nationalism in this period there lie a number of unexplored sources of nationalism such as economic thought, literature, education, and religion. Out of this welter there emerged a much more complex variation upon the original theme of dualism. Canadian nationalism admitted in fact of so many exceptions that it might also be typed plural as well as dual in character. One need only look at the giants of the fifties to witness this pluralism in operation. George Etienne Cartier could at once be the scion of the new railway age and Montreal metropolitanism, and at the same time be the most zealous defender of French Canadian territorial and religious integrity. George Brown could sound the notes of nativism, Toronto metropolitanism, Upper Canadian irridentism as well as federalism and racial co-operation. Ignace Bourget could stand at one and the same time for a reactionary

---

[3]J. M. S. Careless, The Union of the Canadas: The Growth of Canadian Institutions (Toronto, 1967), p. xii.

Ultramontane form of Catholicism, French Canadian nationalism, a new Canadian savings bank, and even temperance. Egerton Ryerson saw at once the Loyalist vision, the Canadian mosaic, and a national system of education in Canada West based upon the New York State School system.

What is significant about the development of a self-conscious nationalism in French and English Canada in the eighteen-fifties, is that English Canadians began to develop a synthetic strain of nationalism which more effectively absorbed Canada's increasing diversity. This was apparent in the political and economic spheres with the elaboration of federalism and an exploitative commercial mentality, and in the literary sphere with the germination of 'northerness' as a mythological umbrella. French Canadians on the other hand constructed a blurred self-image that did not assimilate quickly enough its increasing social diversity. By thus pouring much of their old wine into new bottles, they perpetuated a dualism from which they had previously drawn their spiritual strength. But national defensiveness did prevent French Canadians from articulating a sense of national messianism which would carry them beyond the confines of their own territorial and linguistic base.

(i) Dualism--The National Political Style

The political manifestation of a resurgent national spirit among writers and clerics was the elevation of patriotism to the noblest of political virtues. The danger of this pride in race, in culture, and in land was that it fed the fires of sectionalism which had raged during the forties, and rapidly rendered the political

structure of the Union obsolete in the fifties. Pervasive intolerance prevented the rational resolution of religious and educational tensions inherent in such issues as the separate schools question, the clergy reserves, and higher education. Even more dangerous was the intrusion of chauvinism into the sore question of political representation, which ultimately made the Union unworkable. The function of the politicians was to juggle these increasingly divergent national aspirations, and if possible to create new forms to contain their increasing virulence.

Racial exclusivism was everywhere. The Gavazzi riots in 1853 and the Corrigan murder case of 1856 were not isolated aberrations but symptoms of a racial malaise that ran deep into the fibre of Canadian society. The personal correspondence of those close to the political process reveals many a letter illustrating that racial and sectarian bitterness. The most virulent usually came from Anglo-Canadians residing in the central Canadian region along the St. Lawrence, and from British Lower Canadians.[5] The grim realities of race and political representation were outlined by the retired bleu representative for Berthier, D. M. Armstrong:

> There are very few English, (I mean by English, also Irish and Scotch) reformers in Lower Canada in the sense you would have them to be. They have been nursed up with the idea

---

[4]See A. M. Mackenzie to J. S. Macdonald, Cornwall, July 11, 1851; Sept. 27, 1854; Nov. 17, 1854; Dec. 1, 1854; Apr. 27, 1855; J. S. Macdonald Papers, vols. 1-2, P.A.C.; W. Freeland to R. Baldwin, Mar. 8, 1849, Baldwin Papers, A. 46-17, T.P.L.; W. Patton to W. H. Merritt, Apr. 18, 1854, St. Thomas, L. C., Merritt Papers, vol. 25, P.A.C., Montreal Gazette, July, 1849.

> that they are a Superior Race to the Franco-Canadians, and on all occasions put forth their pretensions: on the other hand the Franco-Canadians are the mass, and are by no means behind hand in upholding the principles of "La Belle France" un Fracais avant toutes [sic] and yet I am, and many others might be cited as a proof that they do not carry their principles to such a length as the English portion of the community. In a perfectly French Constituency I have been three times sent to Parliament--but neither in the townships in Lower Canada nor in Sandwich in Upper Canada has a Franco-Canadian ever had any chance of being elected.[5]

In his famous letter to Brown Chamberlin in 1856, Macdonald exposed with surgical precision the nature and extent of anglo-saxon domination in Canada East, by pointing out that the Lower Canadian English controlled a full half of all judicial appointments, revenue offices, and government appointments in the lower province. His advice was to take care that the French did not find out, and secondly, to cultivate their friendship assiduously. Otherwise there would be more Gavazzi riots, or a purely racial union among French Canadian political representatives.[6]

The French Canadian politicians were well aware of their subordinate status and harboured a healthy resentment for the English

---

[5]D. M. Armstrong to W. L. Mackenzie, Nov. 22, 1852, M. S. Mackenzie Papers, Ont. Archives. Mackenzie himself was hardly any better than those English Canadians that Armstrong spoke of, for he generally branded the French politicians as unmanly and ungenerous. Cartier to him was the worst: "He's good tempered, but no one in Assembly is more corrupt and venal. I have not seen his equal." Mackenzie to O'Callaghan, Quebec, Dec. 2, 1854, E. B. O'Callaghan Papers. See also J. DeWitt to Mackenzie, Montreal, Jan. 12, 1858, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O.

[6]Macdonald to Chamberlin, Toronto, Jan. 21, 1856, Chamberlin Papers, vol. 2, P.A.C.

Canadian because of it. Prominent politicians and administrators found it increasingly difficult to continue the sunny ways of Lafontaine and Cartier, and periodically referred to Upper Canadian politicians as "ces maudits de la race supérieure" and that "bande de canailles, et de la pine."[7] The stiffening resolve of French Canadians to defend their culture from nativist encroachment was reflected in the increasingly conservative and nationalist position of the rouges. Hector Fabre of Le Pays lamented in his private correspondence that anglification threatened the extinction of "la race Française (qu'il n'y a pas) un présent sans puissance, sans gloire, et sans lendemain." Together with Labrèche, Viger and Laberge he had therefore resolved to defend to the last the liberal, national, democratic, and religious principles of French Canadians.[8] Even Papineau was now alarmed with the spread of protestant nativism in North America. The threat against French Canadian Catholicism was in his opinion a frightening reality now: "Le Catholicisme est partie de notre nationalité qu'il faut avouer en tout occasion. L'opposition au Catholicisme est moins souvent indépendance de conviction ou de caractère que flagornerie pour un gouvernement protestant."[9]

---

[7] F. Evanturel to H. Langevin, Toronto, June 27, 1856, Langevin-Taché Papers, vol. 10, APQ; same to same, Mar. 8, 1857; J. B. Meilleur to Bois, Apr. 14, 1856.

[8] H. Fabre to E. B. O'Callaghan, Montreal, Nov. 11, 1855, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.

[9] L. J. Papineau to his Amedée, Sept. 7, 1852, Papineau Bourassa Coll., APQ, vol. 328.

The acute tension between English and French was perhaps best reflected in the electricity generated by Sir Edmund Head's adverse comments upon French Canada during a speech at Hamilton in mid October of 1855.[10] No doubt inspired by the successes of the British armies at Sébastopol, Head injudiciously commented upon the apparent differences between the material progress of Upper and Lower Canada. Although the text did not survive there were reports of it in the Globe and Hamilton Spectator which were by turn scurrilous and innocuous in tone. Head's real sentiments are in less doubt since he penned in the wake of the storm his unrepentant feelings upon French Canada:

> The condition of the country and the growth of the towns is perfectly astounding . . . In so much as I had heard of the prosperity of Western Canada I have been surprised at the visible evidence of it. There everything seems to have been asleep through the French Revolutions--(laws and all) and now the state of society among the 'habitants' is a sort of reflection of what it was in France at the time of the Regency.[11]

Reaction to the speech was mixed because of the obvious political uses to which it could be put. Those bleu journals like La Minerve who had a vested interest in preserving good race relations advanced a generous interpretation of what was said: "Ceux qui ne peuvent souffrir que des compliments soient ainsi faits à une race sans y voir insulte offerte aux autres, se montrent d'une susceptibilité puérile et même offensante."[12] On the other hand, the editors of L'Avenir saw

---

[10] Hamilton Gazette, Oct. 15, 1855.

[11] Head to Sir G. Lewis, Dundurn, Hamilton, Oct. 20, 1855; E. Head Correspondence, vol. 4, P.A.C.

[12] La Minerve, Oct. 20, 1855.

it as an obvious slur upon their race, and typical of the kind of treatment they regularly suffered from British governors.[13] Somewhere between these two extremes lay the curious response of the liberal journal, Le Pays.[14] As a man of culture and who had spent a few years in France, Head was regarded as incapable of these vicious racial notions. Rather, it was his advisers who were at fault. Especially guilty were the French Canadian ministers like Cartier, Cauchon, and Lemieux who abandoned the defence of their race to anglophilia and political expediency: "Ils aimeraient mieux passer pour appartenir à une race inférieure, occuper un rang sécondaire dans l'ordre de la création que de répousser comme il conviendrait une pareille insulte, et cela parce que ca pourrait compromettre leur portfeuille."

When Toronto journals like the Leader took this as an occasion to affirm the world-wide ascendancy of the anglo-saxon over the latin,[15] Head decided to qualify his remarks at his next public speech in Toronto on November second. Professing not to remember his misunderstood comments in Hamilton, he went on the disclaim any racist tendencies and to apply generous salve to the wounds created by his earlier remarks: "Providence has given to different nations different qualities, and it should be your business to combine in the future national character of Canada the chivalrous courage and graceful

---

[13] L'Avenir, Jan. 4, 1856. See also L. A. Dessaulles to James Leslie, Feb. 7, 1850, St. Hyacinthe. Annexation Addresses, Prov. Secy's Corresp., P.A.C.

[14] Oct. 18, 1855. [15] Toronto Leader, Oct. 27, 1855.

courtesy of the French, with the stubborn love of freedom and deep respect for law which have ever characterized old England."[16] What thus amounted to a public retraction by a governor who remained unshaken in his private views indicated the depth to which racial antagonism ran. The new governor confessed his surprise at finding such a "small and powerful" minority in French Canada, and was henceforth resigned to their undying determination "to be opposed to everything English."[17] It is significant that Head never again made such egregious blunders when dealing with the delicate problems of race, politics, and religion. From then on he became the traditional broker of interests in a long tradition which stretched from Murray through to Elgin.

Another vital indicator of political and racial malaise was the increasing discussion of alternatives to imminent sectional deadlock. As always there were the numerous proponents of the status quo, that is, political compromise within the current institutional structure of the Union. On the other side were the politicians of the fringe in each section who advocated either painless separation or a modified constitutional structure incorporating the double majority. Somewhere between these increasingly disparate approaches grew a considerable body of federalist opinion drawing its ideological sustenance mainly from the first group. The neo-federalists like the literary

---

[16] Head to Labouchere, Toronto, Dec. 22, 1855, CO42/599, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[17] Head to Lewis, Nov. 11, 1855, Toronto, E. Head Correspondence, P.A.C.

nationalists saw an opportunity to swallow schismatics by substituting forms but retaining content. By doing so they could not be accused of reaction, but could rather pose as the scions of a new age.

It might generally be said that the proponents of dissolution of the Union were generally members of minority parties without hope of political power and the temporarily 'disappointed' members of the centrist parties. The first prophets of dissolution or repeal were the tories of the British American League and the rouge advocates of annexation. Their first premise from which all other panaceas flowed naturally was that the Union was an unhappy political arrangement which stultified the national aspirations of both peoples. Papineau spoke of the Province of Canada as a hopeless polyglot of institutions, laws, manners, language made solely for the purpose of destroying the French Canadian nationality.[18] Conversely, the tories at the League meeting in 1850 spoke of the absurdities of the legislative yoke of 1841, which was imposed against the will of the people of Upper Canada.[19]

The tories continued the severest critics of the Union in the early fifties. With the assistance of Papineau's small band, the Tories brought forward a series of extremely critical resolutions in 1851. Although discussion was gagged by a successful Reform manoeuvre,

---

[18]See "THE UNION AND NATIONALITY," cited in Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 153-54, L'Avenir, June 9, 1849.

[19]Minutes and Proc. of B.N.A. League, xlvii, (P.A.C. Pamphlet Coll.). See also Montreal Gazette, Jan. 15, 31, 1849.

their intent was sufficiently clear and damaging. Their mover, W. H. Boulton, neatly eviscerated the Act of Union as a constitutional document, concluding that its only purpose had been expediency, the original terms of which no longer applied:

> The object of the union was, nominally to identify the wishes and interests of the whole Province, and to assimilate our institutions; but it was in reality purely of a political character. Since the Union he had looked in vain for anything that would lead to the belief that an amalgamation of the people was deemed desirable or practical, or that the leading men who had advocated the Union were earnest in their endeavors to bring it about. Both parties, on the other hand, looked on the Union as temporary, and the consequences were most prejudicial to all classes. Not only had no laws brought in applicable to the whole Province, nor any attempt to extent the English language over the whole province, but, on the contrary, separate legislation had been persisted in, tending manifestly to perpetuate hostile feelings on each side . . .[20]

Certain peninsular grits were somewhat disenchanted even at this stage as the split reform vote on Boulton's resolutions would indicate.[21] The London Free Press, for example, spoke quite frankly at this time upon the potential threat of French Canadian domination to western Canadian interests. If that time ever should come, the editor suggested that both Reformers and Conservatives "should look out for an altered state of political existence."[22]

The agitation for dissolution then subsided among conservatives

---

[20]Prov. Parlt. Debates, July 7, 1851; Montreal Pilot, July 12, 1851.

[21]Price, Merritt, Hincks, Notman and H. J. Boulton voted with Boulton, ibid.

[22]Sept. 11, 1851.

as their prospects of co-operation with French Canadian politicians improved. With the temporary disappearance of the rouge newspaper L'Avenir in the early fifties, there was only the lone voice of William Lyon Mackenzie to carry on the cry of disunion. Frustrated by the apportionment of revenues for 1853, Mackenzie called for a return to "a free parliament of our own at Toronto. This would give us the command of our own resources--free us from a perpetual waste of time discussion tenures bills and the thousand and one other Lower Canada measures which are perpetually on the carpet."[23] The Gavazzi riots of June 6th merely confirmed Mackenzie in his resolution, for in this sectarian violence he saw the possible end of liberty, free speech, and ultimately of the legislature itself. He ultimately despaired for ever resolving the national conflicts for which Durham so facilely prescribed remedies. Better statesmen and greater nations had foundered upon the rocks of discordant nationality: "It is difficult to blend different nationalities into one system, and to 'reconcile in one harmonious whole the federal and central principles of government.' Napoleon failed. England has not succeeded in Ireland. The Americans have been but partially successful."[24]

The political realignment of 1854 changed the whole course of the repeal movement, which had been essentially dead for three years. When the cracks began to appear in the reform coalition in late 1853,

---

[23] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, June 9, 1853.

[24] Ibid., June 16, 1853, Aug. 25, 1853.

whispers of disunion immediately began to spread through the Upper Canadian reform ranks. The Toronto Leader warned the faithful that such tendencies would soon result in an electoral defeat to the Tories, but even worse would result in disappointment on the part of the extremely well-organized Lower Canadian Reformers. The defeat of 1844 would be repeated, and along with it would come talk of double majorities from that section, and repeal from Upper Canada.[25] Then William Lyon Mackenzie was soon joined by the Examiner, and some peninsular reform journals in the advocacy of repeal.[26] In the House he was joined by a sprinkling of moderates and radicals including Munro, Frazer, and Hartman.[27] In Canada East the agitation for repeal came from the newly revived journal, L'Avenir, and the new liberal-nationalist newspaper, Le Pays.[28]

The Unionists carried the day easily, for they not only had the support of the Lower Canadian ministerial press and the tory press of Upper Canada, but also the support of influential moderates and ultra-reformers like George Brown, Josiah Blackburn, and Charles Clarke. Brown certainly led the way, although his motivation was somewhat unclear at this stage. Perhaps because of business considerations, or

---

[25]Toronto Leader, Oct. 13, 1853.

[26]Toronto Examiner, July 15, 1855; Mackenzie's speech in the House, Mirror, April 22, 1856; Haldimand Petition for Dissolution, Head to Labouchere, Jan. 22, 1856, CO42/603.

[27]See Leader, Aug. 13, 1855. A society entitled, "The Repeal Association" was set up with Toronto as its central headquarters.

[28]Le Pays, April 1, 1856; L'Avenir, Apr. 4, 1856; May 30, 1856.

even a desire to remain consistent with his earlier pronouncements upon the Union,[29] he came out strongly against repeal. If measured solely by what he said, Brown was undoubtedly motivated by racial considerations. At a reform gathering in Peel he fixed his eye firmly upon the anglo-saxon millenium in which there were no room for backward habitants:

> For one, sir, I will never be a party to such a transaction (dissolution) until every other remedy has failed. But a few years will have passed over us, and the evil we now labour under will have been swept away by the influx of immigration already flowing in upon the Western Province. I do think there is a deep responsibility resting on the people of Upper Canada as to the future condition of British America--and I cannot think it would be discharging that responsibility rightly, if we did not strive to elevate Lower Canada from its present condition; much less if we consented to hand it over hopelessly to those who held it for past ages in ignorance and sloth. No sir, Canada is now one Province, and I hope it will remain so. I trust that the energy and intelligence of the west, combining with the social virtues of eastern fellow countrymen will yet people the whole of this land with a race worthy to possess it.[30]

What was alarming about Brown's statements as well as some of the other reformers who supported him was that instead of advocating separatism, they had cleverly turned Unionism into imperialism. As the Leader put it, "To satisfy the leader of the regular opposition, Parliament must resolve itself into a Presbyterian Missionary Association with Mr. Brown as President."[31]

---

[29] Globe, Feb. 19, 1852, Nov. 16, 1854.

[30] Cited in Leader, Aug. 13, 1855; see also Globe, Aug. 20, 1855.

[31] Ibid.

With continued failure to secure office, Brown became, if not the apostle of dissolution, at least its skilful manipulator. Whereas Mackenzie remained its consistent advocate right to the end of his political career,[32] Brown now used repeal as an effective bogeyman to secure the national objects of English Canadians. From 1856 to 1858 he regularly threatened drastic action if remedies were not forthcoming: "Every year we continue as we are doing, our discordancies must increase--public demoralization advance apace--and the state of the public finances grow less satisfactory. Far better give up at once the attempt to maintain the legislative Union, than permit so lamentable a state of things to continue."[33] Yet, it was perfectly obvious from Brown's statements upon diversity, that he detested it in the extreme. Among the "disastrous" political effects of the Union he noted the distinct and equal representation from both sections, the use of English and French in all public documents, and in the House of Assembly, their different judicial system, school system, municipal institutions, and literature.[34] He was a monist in outlook, one who desired efficiency at the expense of diversity, one who would also place the state and its progress before the individual. To him the Union in its ideal form would serve to "blot out entirely the absurd

---

[32] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Aug. 27, 1858.

[33] Globe, July 27, 1857. See also Feb. 13, 1858, Sept. 11, 1856, Nov. 8, 1856.

[34] Globe, Dec. 30, 1856. Brown was therefore the typical mid-Victorian Liberal-Conservative as described by G. M. Young, Victorian Essays (London, University Press, 1962), pp. 110-16.

distinction between the two sections--legislate for the whole country as for one people--place all the electors on an equal footing--abolish all state subsidies for sectarian purposes--educate the masses thoroughly--adopt a just general system of local improvement--and place stringent restrictions on the increase of the public debt."[35]

Confronted by such intolerance that they had well known during the Union and before, French Canadians drew together in defence of their nationality. Dissolution also presented little problem by itself, since it inherently posed no threat to their culture.[36] Only when it was placed in another context such as representation by population or federal union did they view it with apprehension. Faced with Brown's jeremiads, they often responded in kind:

> Upper Canada is proud of her farmers, but she cannot enter into the list against us as regards commerce and manufactures, perhaps we may add, nor as regards talent. Nature has given her the lakes of which she is so proud, but we have our St. Lawrence leading directly to the ocean . . . Let her do what she will, Upper Canada must always be tributary to us.[37]

Similarly, when George Etienne Cartier was badgered to desperation by Upper Canadian grits on the question of 'rep. by pop.', he resorted to outright sectionalism to drive home his point. In upholding the original terms of the Act of Union he claimed that Lower Canadians

---

[35] Globe, July 27, 1857. See also London Free Press, Mar. 27, 1857; Henry Taylor, On the Intention of the Imperial Govt. to Unite the Provinces of British North America (Toronto, 1858), P.A.C. Pamphlet Coll.

[36] See infra, pp. 366-67.

[37] La Patrie reported in the Toronto Leader, Aug. 13, 1855.

were preventing that province from becoming the poverty stricken backwater she was before 1841.[38] The tendency of French Canadians to rally together when under heavy fire was apparent in the remarks of J. E. Turcotte in response to Brown's desire to fuse the people of the two portions of the province:

> But how? By crushing out the language, the habits, and the religion of Lower Canada. Before submitting to that, they would dissolve the union . . . They had influence because they were united, and the hon. member for Lambton might find that in another general election the people of Lower Canada would still be more united--that the distinction of Rouge and Bleu would be obliterated and they would act together as one man.[39]

Nowhere was the closing of French Canadian ranks so apparent as upon the issue of the double majority. This tactic which had been the last resort of the embattled French Canadian in the forties, was immediately resurrected in 1856 when the clamor of sectionalism arose from Canada West. In its early phase it was only supported by a segment of the rouges in the Legislature,[40] and by the liberal-nationalist newspaper, Le Pays. While that newspaper admitted the necessity of a single majoritarian government in matters of general interest, it still demanded "la gestion des affaires de chaque section, d'après les idées, les opinions de la majorité de la partie intéressée.[41] It

---

[38] Mirror of Parlt., June 9, 1858. See also ibid., speeches of Cauchon and Chapais.

[39] Mirror of Parlt., May 22, 1856.

[40] J. B. E. Dorion, Bourassa, Darche, Jobin, Laberge, and Prévost.

[41] Le Pays, June 10, 1856. See also ibid., June 5, 1856.

appears that a few bleus would also have liked to have supported John Sandfield Macdonald's original proposal, but obviously the time had not come yet for such extremism in the eyes of Cartier and Cauchon.[42]

The Brownite threat did not however dissipate, but in fact became increasingly threatening through 1857. Late in that year, the oracle of racial reason in Lower Canada, La Minerve, suddenly demanded a repeal of the union in its present form, while at the same time suggesting the double majority as an alternative constitutional structure.[43] Cauchon then brought the constitutional issue before the House in March of 1858 by clearly outlining the alternatives to representation by population, or even federal union. A Lower Canadian vote for representation by population and against the double majority was in effect treasonous:

> As to Representation according to Population, he thought it was in Upper Canada a question not of principle but of interest, and he could not say that it was wrong, for members thus do what they could to protect the interests of their constituents; but on the same ground he thought that there would be no member from Lower Canada who on this subject would dare be a traitor . . . In his opinion, to abandon the double majority principle was to abandon the federal principle of the constitution, and to declare that there was no distinction between the two sections of the country, no difference of race, religion . . .[44]

Dialogue between the two sections had become so difficult that some

---

[42]Apart from Lafontaine's ex-lieutenant, Lewis T. Drummond, who was now a Conservative, there was only one bleu, J. C. Chapais who supported the measure. Mirror, June 3, 1856.

[43]La Minerve, Nov. 11, 14, 18, 1857; Jan. 23, Mar. 28, Apr. 3, 1858.

[44]Mirror of Parlt., Mar. 8, 1858.

members like J. C. Chapais were claiming that French Canadians had defended their boundaries in 1812 against the Americans and would be prepared to do so once again "against whomsoever might come in."[45] The effect of such powerful national rhetoric was that not a single French Canadian, including the rouges, was to be found voting for a readjustment of representation.[46]

Perhaps the only rays of hope through this dark period of racial and national polarization were provided by the political axis between conservatives and bleus, and secondly, the handful of English Canadian liberals who were even prepared to go along with the double majority. The conservative party became the natural recipients of the Baldwin political tradition after their alignment with the bleus in 1854. It is significant that Macdonald's famous letter on treating the French Canadians generously as a nation rather than a faction was written in 1856 and not in 1851.[47] Previously bigotted and sectional newspapers like the Montreal Gazette and the Kingston Whig now counselled the Conservative leaders "to govern Canada in a kind and liberal spirit."[48] The Toronto Leader reaffirmed the long-standing secret to governing Union as "a Government of moderate men--prepared to be temporarily unpopular for the attainment of a great object." That time-honoured approach of liberalism was no longer evident among Reformers, since

---

[45] Ibid., June 9, 1858. [46] Ibid., July 11, 1858.

[47] Macdonald to B. Chamberlin, Toronto, Jan. 21, 1856, Chamberlin Papers, P.A.C.

[48] The Weekly British Whig, Montreal Gazette, June 27, 1855, Sept. 7, 1855.

Brown was bent upon an obvious crusade against Lower Canadian institutions.[49]

Some Reformers like John Sandfield Macdonald and Josiah Blackburn of the London Free Press were prepared to go farther than any of the above, since they supported the double majority principle even before the desperate situation of 1858. In 1856 Sandfield Macdonald proposed the extension of the double majority principle to an incumbent administration which no longer had the confidence of Upper Canada. Just as Baldwin resigned in 1851 and Hincks in 1854 when they had obviously lost the support of that section of the province so should MacNab and John A. Macdonald.[50] The scheme's foremost supporter was the London Free Press and its new editor Josiah Blackburn. His justification for the double majority was a rare blend of sectionalism and latitudinarianism:

> There can be no doubt that the principle of double majority, by which means each section of the Cabinet exhibits the confidence the country reposes in it, has been a recognized part of constitutional practise since the Union . . . Indeed the practice of the double majority principle is essential to the preservation of the Union. Two provinces having commercial interests bearing in different directions, having populations of different origins, religion and laws, having institutions totally dissimilar in their character and effects--two such Provinces can never be successfully governed by a Ministry which does not possess the confidence of each.[51]

---

[49] Leader, Aug. 13, 1855.

[50] Mirror, June 3, 1856. See also B. W. Hodgins, "John Sandfield Macdonald and the Crisis of 1863," Canadian Historical Association Annual Report, 1965, pp. 30-45.

[51] London Free Press, June 5, 1856.

After the resignation of MacNab in 1856, and the deterioration of tory strength in Canada West in the sixth parliament, Macdonald continued to advocate the double majority to the delight of Joseph Cauchon and the bleus.[52] What was rather ironic in this situation was that Macdonald was in 1858 applying the double majority to Lower Canadian benefit in a gesture of some magnanimity. When he had applied it to Upper Canadian uses in 1856, only a handful of rouges had seen fit to support him.

What is interesting about the debate upon the double majority was the nature and source of apology. Arguing from the basis of historical precedent which proved that the double majority principle "had guided parliament ever since the introduction of responsible government," Sandfield Macdonald attempted to clothe informal political practice in quasi-constitutional respectability.[53] The bleus and tories on the other hand argued from solely political grounds. Cauchon nicely thanked Sandfield Macdonald for his speech "of a very philosophical character" and went on to say that such discussions were "tedious." What was important was the political precedent of the double majority as espoused by Lafontaine and Caron, and the increasing national and sectarian conflicts in the present. The former was therefore intended merely as a practical expedient to solve the latter.[54]

---

[52] Mirror of Parliament, May 19, 1858; see also Le Courrier-Canadien, May 31, 1858.

[53] Mirror, June 3, 1856.

[54] Ibid., May 19, 1858.

To dogmatic statements from the other side that the double majority was not in the constitution, Cauchon rhetorically replied: "But after all, what was the constitution?"[55] The objection of Conservatives like John A. Macdonald, although diametrically opposed to Cauchon on the issue, was founded upon the same premises. He chided Sandfield Macdonald for bringing up "an abstract question" which confused the question of responsible government, and the peculiar political situation of the Province, i.e., "two countries possessed, of different feelings, principles, laws, and diversity of interests."[56] Political co-operation as an exit from the nationalities problem was therefore still the most popular means of resolution since all combatants were so thoroughly committed to the political character of the Union. When historical precedent as used by poor Sandfield Macdonald was misconstrued as an 'abstraction,' the fundamentally pragmatic outlook of the antagonists was revealed. The double majority like dissolution was, in the hands of its most candid practitioners, fundamentally conservative. Their negative capacity as outlets for bigotry were high, yet both concepts accepted diversity as their first premise, and strove for co-operation as their ideal.

Directly linked to the development of the negative politics of dissolution and the double majority in the fifties, was the parallel growth of their positive alter-ego, federal union. It was often

---

[55] Mirror, Mar. 8, 1858.

[56] Mirror, June 3, 1856. See also Globe, June 4, 1856. British Whig, June 3, 1856.

mentioned in the same breath as the former, with the distinct difference that it presented a more reasonable form of whiggish compromise out of the same nationalist impasse. Unlike dissolution which was generally linked with politicians at the fringe of political power, federalism was the creature of the political centre. Like the double majority it was also the product of sectional frustration. Neo-federalism generally masqueraded in English Canada as a pan-nationalist eschatology which would deliver the province from its time of troubles. French Canadians, on the other hand, contemplated federalism, if at all, in the same pragmatic way that some of them used the double majority. Their sole concern was to ensure the survival of their nationality; hence their federal plans were by and large mired in legalism and written guarantees. English Canadian federalism was, like its new national literature aggressive, pan-racial, and transcendental in character.

The federal idea was revived in 1849 by the tories both as a symbol of their frustration with French Canadian domination, and as a loyal antidote to the poison of annexation. From its very inception in April of 1849, the British American League was dedicated to breaking the bonds of "a peculiar and exclusive nationality, which, though entitled to perfect equality with the race of Empire, is deserving of no predominance as a distinct source of political power."[57] By the July meetings of the League in Kingston there was a

---

[57]Montreal Gazette, Apr. 20, 1849.

fixed resolve to unite the British North American provinces, and hence "to lay the foundations for making this country a great nation upon a solid and enduring basis."[58] In the subsequent debate upon British North American Union in Toronto in November, it became obvious by the pronouncements of many tories that they desired a return to the Durham formula of assimilation for French Canada:

> The Canadian character would, by degrees, sink into the English without irritation, for they could never expect to acquire a paramount influence in a Legislature, of which they were only a component part; and, as the language of the Superior Legislature in its proceedings, of the Courts of Justice, and all other public business, every man wishing to attain eminence must study to acquire it.[59]

There was but little doubt that this new British North American nation would be anglo-saxon in character since its common kinship with Britons, its commercial objects, and its common political tradition were all stressed at this and subsequent meetings of the League in early 1850.[60]

From this time until the realignment of 1854 the federalist impulse came largely from the tories, and most of the vocal opposition from the Reform Alliance. French Canadians, secure in the twilight of the Baldwin-Lafontaine alliance, scarcely considered it worthy of comment. Certainly there was some political gamesmanship by French Canadians as there was upon the issue of the Main Trunk Railroad to

---

[58] Elgin-Grey Papers, I, 443.

[59] James Strachan's proposal for B.N.A. Union, Minutes and Proceedings, Nov. 1849, p. xlviii.

[60] Minutes and Proc., pp. xxxviii-xlvii passim; "Address of the Central Committee, May 1, 1850," Elgin-Grey Papers, p. 957, II.

connect with the Lower Provinces. At that juncture P. J. O. Chauveau, who spoke for the Quebec interests, criticised the Upper Canadian conservatives for not supporting a measure which would promote "the national and military purposes of Great Britain and the Union of the Provinces."[61] On the whole, however, the French Canadian position upon federation was largely reflected in their totally negative vote upon Merritt's resolutions for the Union of the British North American Provinces in July of 1851.[62] The reform press of Upper Canada was generally critical of tory proposals for federation, if only for partisan reasons of sustaining the Union and their position within it.[63] The presumptiveness of the tories in assuming that there was popular approval for such a measure galled the reformers more than any single aspect of federation.[64] Only the clear-grit North American gave the measure any sympathetic consideration. McDougall lent the scheme some support in late 1850 because it would facilitate deliverance from the Popish ascendancy of Lower Canada.[65] Yet, when the scheme first appeared, clear grittism was in its first flush of optimistic republicanism, and rejected the federal scheme as a poor substitute for annexation. The only value McDougall could see was the promotion of

---

[61] Reported in British Colonist, Aug. 29, 1851.

[62] The vote was lost 51-7 in the Assembly, Montreal Pilot, Aug. 1, 1851.

[63] Globe, Aug. 18, 1849, Nov. 7, 1850.

[64] Montreal Pilot, May 9, 1850.

[65] North American, Dec. 10, 1850.

a vague feeling of nationality, but to institutionalize that impulse would be impossible: "A separate nationality for these Provinces is one of the most preposterous ideas that can be imagined. Continued union with Great Britain or annexation with the United States are the only destinies that await them."[66]

The content of Conservative proposals for federation in the early fifties remained fundamentally unchanged in their motive and their composition from the earlier proposals of the League. Federation still represented a release from French Canadian domination.[67] Rarely did the tories even mention the French Canadians except in a negative or pejorative context. The only attempt that was made to court their favour was an offhand assurance by the Colonist that "under the Confederation they might be more independent among themselves than they are at present."[68] The major thrust of conservative apology was in the direction of the Lower Provinces whose race, language, and customs were similar enough to warrant the creation of a new nationality:

> What have we in common with the Lower Provinces? We answer, everything! Firstly, we of Anglo-Saxon origin, in Canada, are of the same race, speak the same language, and have the same religious faith, with the people of the Lower Provinces. We are in the same manner, a mixed population of Native Provincialists, Americans, and immigrants from the British Isles; and we have the same

---

[66] North American, May 24, 1850.

[67] Colonist, May 13, 1851; British Whig, Aug. 8, 1851.

[68] Colonist, Aug. 29, 1851.

> manners and customs. Secondly, our political institutions are, and have been for years, precisely alike; we all are, and have been, alike dependencies of the same empire, with our several Governments administered in almost exactly the same manner. Thirdly--our Territories are contiguous. . . . Fourthly, our products are such that we can profitably interchange some of them, and have a common interest in procuring market for the rest elsewhere . . . But we have beside this some great common wants. And first we want a higher position in the scale of nations. There is a yearning upon the part of the Provincialists here, for a recognition of our existence by the rest of the world. We like the glory of being Britons; we are proud of the name; but we wish the mother country to be proud of us, as we are of her. We desire to see a federation of states formed, fitted to become and becoming a mighty nation, yet still retaining that deference for the parent from whose loins they have sprung.[69]

While the press conjured visions of commercial and industrial greatness designed to exploit the natural resources of the new nation, the politicians who translated these into concrete proposals consciously avoided such rhetoric. It is difficult to find, for example, a note of emotionalism in Henry Sherwood's pamphlet on Federative Union of the British North American Provinces, or in Merritt's pragmatic resolutions of 1851.[70] It was one thing to give vent to national and racial bombast in the partisan press, but to garner support in a forum of debate controlled by a political alliance dedicated to racial co-operation and maintenance of the union was

---

[69] Montreal Gazette, July 7, 1851. See also Colonist, May 13, 1851, July 8, 1851, Aug. 1, 1851, Nov. 19, 1850; British Whig, Oct. 10, 1851.

[70] H. Sherwood, Federative Union of the British North American Provinces (Toronto: Lovell and Gibson, 1851), 21 pp.; Montreal Pilot, Aug. 1, 1851.

quite another. The proposals themselves were enough to disqualify them in the eyes of the French Canadians suggesting as they did a strong central government, based upon representation by population in both houses.

Federation lapsed into virtual disuse for the next five years after this uninspiring debut in 1850-51. Conservatives consigned it to limbo as they worked towards a political realignment with the bleus, and Reformers mentioned it only in passing contempt, if at all.[71] They too valued their alliance with the French Canadians so much that federation was only valid as a remote yearning after ultimate independence. Its immediate value as an exit from Lower Canadian Catholic domination was seen as despicable by the Leader:

> It might indeed obtain the approbation of these generous politicians who look upon the Lower Canadian French as a rightful prey; as obnoxious animals to be hunted down by a tyrannous majority, no matter how obtained. In their eyes a legislative union might find favour. A federal union which would dis-unite Upper and Lower Canada, would meet the approbation of those "religious" politicians who regard it as the bounden duty of the political parties of Upper Canada to unite for the purpose of converting Roman Catholics to the faith of Protestantism . . . The world saw something of this legislative conversion in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and we pray that the horrors of that system may never be witnessed on Canadian soil.[72]

The only serious consideration given to the scheme at this juncture was by George Brown.[73] Evidently driven as he was by his dislikes

---

[71] Montreal Pilot, Nov. 12, 1853.

[72] Leader, Oct. 26, 1853.

[73] See Montreal Gazette, Oct. 21, 1853 on a federal union of the two provinces alone.

rather than his likes, Brown began to chafe at Lower Canadian domination and Catholicism in general after the Gavazzi affair.[74] At the same time as he began to turn towards dissolution and federation as political remedies, he berated the Roman Catholic Church as an obstacle to improvement. Brown commented bitterly upon the Church's decided opposition to British North American federation as stated in the Papal Government's official organ: "It is not unlikely that the friends of Nuncio Bedini have selected Canada as a good site for the Papal residence; if so, the Confederation of the Provinces must be very disagreeable to the Church of Rome."[75] Almost coincidentally, Brown lent his ready support to federative proposals emanating from the Maritime provinces. Perhaps for political reasons, he avoided any negative references to Lower Canada, concentrating only upon the future commercial and cultural destiny of a union with the Lower provinces. Predating McGee's inspiring rhetoric by almost five years, Brown spoke eloquently of "aspirations after a national name, a national position, a national literature [which] will grow up in their bosoms, as soon as wealth and consequent independence reach every quarter of the country."[76] It was to be almost five years before Brown seriously considered the scheme again, but with a notable lack of the eloquence he displayed upon this occasion.

---

[74] Globe, Feb. 5, Mar. 12, May 10, June 16, July 21, Aug. 13, Sept. 15, 1853.

[75] Globe, Nov. 18, 1853, reprint of Montreal Advertiser's comments.

[76] Globe, Oct. 25, 1853.

The politics of realignment in 1854 did not immediately revive the prospects of federal union. There was no immediate resurgence of that idea on a broad scale in that year, in fact the bulk of comment was hostile to such a union. Most of the response to Nova Scotian proposals for federation, legislative union, or independence was in fact quite unsympathetic. The Montreal Gazette rejected all three of Judge T. C. Haliburton's remedies for the political and social ills of British North America (i.e. incorporation into the British Parliament, annexation to the United States, or independence), and countered with a vague proposal for union of the Colonies under "the old Union flag."[77] Francis Hincks similarly gave short shrift to Joseph Howe's proposals for an independent federation of British North America with representation in the imperial Parliament. Hincks countered with the claim that there was no room for another federation on the North American continent unless the United States should divide.[78] Although potentially popular to English Canadians because it promised ascendancy over French Canada, and to French Canadians because it would reopen negotiations on national rights, federal union would result in decentralization of authority and the ultimate devolution of independent principalities into the American orbit.[79]

---

[77] Montreal Gazette, May 19, 1855.

[78] F. Hincks, Reply to the Speech of the Hon. Joseph Howe, of Nova Scotia (London, 1855), Ridgeway, 43 pp.

[79] See F. Hincks, Reply, pp. 42-43. See also F. Hincks to Col. Bruce, Quebec, Dec. 10, Dec. 13, 1853, Francis Hincks Papers, P.A.C.

In the racial storm which followed the Governor-General's remarks upon French Canada, there was a revival of racial hostilities and ultimately of patent medicines to purge those ills. After 1855, the impulse towards federal union then continued in steadily ascending line upwards until it reached its greatest strength in 1858. The sectional pull became so strong that both English speaking reformers and conservatives throughout were attracted to it. French Canada's journalists were generally repulsed by it, because of its obvious racial bias, but her politicians were compelled to respond to the challenge or be swept away by the tide. Like the co-operative response of Lafontaine and Morin to Union in 1840, it was no less nationalistic or defensive because it gave the semblance of co-operation.

The desire for federation was inseparable from dissolution and representation by population in its ethos after 1856. The prophets of representation by population in the reform party of Upper Canada were faced with the cold reality of losing their Lower Canadian support if they persisted in their policy. Dissolution or federation were the only other alternatives to such political deadlock. By 1858, Brown had realized that his "rep. by pop." platform was in some trouble, and anxiously edged towards a federal union in a letter to Alexander Mackenzie:

> A Federal Union, it appears to me, cannot be entertained for Canada alone,--but when agitated must include all British America. We will be past caring for politics when the measure is finally achieved. I can hardly conceive of a Federal Union for Canada alone. What powers should be given to the State Legislatures and what to the Federal? . . . Our friends here are prepared to consider dispassionately any scheme that may emanate

> from your party in Lower Canada. They all feel keenly that something must be done. Their plan is Representation by Population and a fair trial for the Union in its integrity. Failing that, they are prepared to go in for dissolution, I believe, but if you can suggest a Federal or any other scheme, that could be worked, it will have our most anxious examination. Can you sketch a plan of Federation such as our friends below would agree to and could carry? If so, pray let us have it as soon as conveniently possible.[80]

Brown received his answer shortly from Luther Holton who had in the meantime canvassed the opinions of the rouges. Representation by population was impossible since the rouge felt he would not only be ruined as a public man, but "permanently ostracised as a traitor to his race." Dissolution was out of the question, even though support might be obtained for it in Lower Canada. Holton reminded Brown that the rouges had included it in their platform of 1854 but had had to tone it down, along with a number of their other "peculiar" ideas. That left only federation, which to Holton was the best means of evading present difficulties, and "the most statesmanlike scheme that can be devised for the Government of the Country."[81]

For those English Canadians who had already arrived at the conclusion that federation was the only possible resolution of national conflict, federalism was often an extreme manifestation of English Canadian nationality. Groups of irate petitioners from Canada West periodically beseeched the Governor to press for a federal union so

---

[80] G. Brown to A. Mackenzie, Jan. 29, 1858, Alex. Mackenzie Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[81] Luther Holton to G. Brown, Montreal, Jan. 22, 1858, Brown Papers, P.A.C.

that justice would be served to the inhabitants "of British origin, and who speak the English language, may have their wishes and interests honestly attended to."[82] The grand objects which would be attained would number among them the strengthening of the British connection, and the fostering of "a national feeling--such a Canadian feeling as would be an effectual counterpoise to any tendency towards separation."[83] The providential sense of destiny surrounding British North America would also be fulfilled as it became one of the great powers for progress among the nations of the earth. More than that, federation held promise of the assimilation frustrated by the Union: "Then instead of being two people as we are at present, a gradual assimilation would take place, and a few years would see us, in fact as well as in name, a united nation, possessing an identity of interest, and sharing in one common sentiment of patriotism."[84]

The politicians who spread the gospel of federalism were more apt to be tolerant towards the French Canadians than the journalists, who reflected racial and sectional bias more acutely. The two most prominent advocates of concessions in the interest of future national greatness were D'Arcy McGee and Alexander Morris. Along with them they

---

[82]Simcoe Petitioners, Oct. 19, 1855; in Head to Geo. Grey, Toronto, Dec. 1, 1855, CO42/599, P.A.C.

[83]James Anderson, petition to the Gov. General, in Head to Labouchere, Jan. 30, 1856, CO42/603, P.A.C.

[84]London Free Press, Mar. 27, 1857; see also Quebec Morning Chronicle, "OUR NATIONAL DESTINY," Aug. 5, 1858, Oct. 27, 1857; City of Kingston Petition, June 15, 1857; Head to Labouchere, CO42/611, #5898, P.A.C.

carried those moderate conservative journals like the Toronto Leader who were solidly committed to the politics of compromise as reflected in the Macdonald-Cartier coalition.[85]

Relatively early in the progress of the federal idea, McGee gave a public lecture in Bytown on the subject of "Canada's Future." In it he advocated a loose federation along American lines, which would tolerate French Canadian autonomy at the local level. It was after all a small price to pay for their vital economic and strategic position:

> With three or four Provinces carved out of Canada, is it too much for the descendants of the first inhabitants to claim one of them for their own language? For purposes of transit, and for manufacturing, the Lower Provinces must always be the most favourably situated . . . Having the keys of the Gulf, Canada East must also vigilantly guard the line, against Republican aggression. On her fields hostile tents will be pitched wherever invasion comes . . . We must remember their experience before we pronounce them too exclusive. We must take them as we find them, and while professing to consider them fellow citizens and fellow subjects, we must not dishonestly seek to undermine that which they hold dearer than life itself--their social life, their historical rank, their language, their religion, and their nationality.[86]

Alexander Morris, who was later to play an important role in the creation of the Great Coalition, took up McGee's vision of the new northern nation almost intact in his lecture to the Mercantile Association of Montreal. Singing the praises of a new Britannia upon the North American continent, Morris constructed an eloquent apology for

---

[85] Leader, Mar. 3, Sept. 22, Dec. 29, 1858.

[86] New Era, Oct. 22, 1857, from the Ottawa Tribune, Oct. 17, 1857.

national harmony based upon the premise that society was an aggregation of individual and peculiar influences. As with McGee, there was little doubt that the whole was more important than the parts, but concessions to the picayune aspects of race were necessary to realize the vision. For these reasons, Morris extolled "the chivalrous feeling and impulsiveness of France" in order to arrive at a "harmonious whole, rendered more vigorous by our northern position."[87]

John A. Macdonald had apparently become so concerned at the increasing discussion of representation by population and dissolution that he sought out the services of a ghost-writer in March of 1858 to draft for him a "view of the value of a Policy of Confederation."[88] Although there arose no occasion to implement the prolix document, it was an accurate reflection of Macdonald's intention both to prevent dissolution and the double majority by the classic modes of racial co-operation, and secondly to resort to federation if necessary. Insofar as federation was concerned, the proposal allowed for the full enjoyment by French Canada of her linguistic, legal, and religious rights. Over and above the local governments of the Union the document also provided for a veto by the general government "on any public question affecting Nationalities." Macdonald would not likely have

---

[87] A. M. Morris, Nova Britannia; or British North America, Its Extent and Future, Montreal, 1858, P.A.C.

[88] J. Gooch, "On the Policy of a Confederation of the British Provinces and Possessions in North America," May 7, 1858, M.S. Douglas Library, Queen's University. Gooch was subsequently paid forty dollars for the manuscript, Macdonald to Gooch, Apr. 6, 1858, Macdonald Papers, vol. 556, P.A.C.

gone that far, given his predilection for single majority rule and for legislative union as late as 1864. Yet the concluding sentence no doubt reflected accurately his determination to persist in the art of compromise: "We may happily agree to differ--to differ with mutual respect and profit by no means less than if they were the same people."

Though French Canadians could certainly welcome the concessions that these politicians and their cohorts could promise, they did not like being forced into a position where such concessions were even necessary. Yet upon each occasion when it was thought proper to do so, both the rouges and the bleus submitted counter-proposals for federation. In 1856 A. A. Dorion advanced resolutions favouring the establishment of a federal union of the Canadas as an antidote to disunion and to representation by population.[89] With the proper legal guarantees, such a measure would, of course, place French Canada in an even stronger position than even the double majority. Therefore, the Union which Papineau and the rouges had laboured so long and hard against from its inception,[90] suddenly became a refuge from which they would not move without caution. L. A. Dessaulles explained this paradox to his electors:

> Après l'avoir vu travailler sans relâche, pendant seize ans, à river sur nous les chaînes de l'Union; après l'avoir entendu crier sur tous les tons que l'Union nous avait sauvés!! Après l'avoir vu remercier l'Angle-

---

[89] See Leader, Apr. 26, 1856.

[90] See Le Pays, Apr. 1, 1856; L'Avenir, Apr. 4, 1856.

> terre de nous l'avoir importé, et l'avoir surpris de l'en féliciter; après l'avoir enfin entendu et souvent déclarer que le Rappel de l'Union était une chose impossible, un projet visionnarie,--il est un peu étrange, un peu irritant, qu'on me permet de le dire, de voir ce parti parler de le rappel de l'Union comme d'une de ces mesures si simples, si faciles, qu'il suffit de les indiquer pour les réaliser sans peine.[91]

When English Canadians began to taunt these same rouges for their lack of patriotism in not supporting the militia bill of 1856, their worst fears were confirmed. While the former spoke eloquently of the association between military spirit and the growth of national feeling and independence,[92] the latter argued that such organizations merely promoted the aggressive purposes of Empire and retarded the day of true independence.[93]

The determination of French Canadians to avoid constitutional revision at the hands of the Reformers is also reflected in the stiffening opposition of bleu journals like La Minerve to federation. Throughout the fall and winter of 1857-58 that newspaper criticized federal union, from whatever the source, It was seen as an impractical vision hastening into reality at the behest of a few partisan journalists and politicians.[94]

As the political crisis deepened in 1858, French Canadians had

---

[91] To the Electors of Rougement, St. Hyacinthe, Sept. 12, 1856, Le Pays, Sept. 16, 1856.

[92] Montreal Gazette, Jan. 19, 1856.

[93] Leader, Aug. 13, 1856, from Le Pays.

[94] La Minerve, Aug. 15, Nov. 11, Nov. 14, Nov. 18, 1857; Le Courrier du Canada, May 2, 1857.

little choice but to contemplate the grim alternatives posed by a revision of representation or by the unknown beyond dissolution. Under that pressure, there were some bleus like L. V. Sicotte who chose to ignore the impending reality of federalism by insisting that the Union was already federal and national in character: "It was national, because it had one legislature governing by one majority; but it was federal, because it existed under certain conditions which had been agreed upon its federal principle was to be found in that fact."[95] Once those special conditions no longer existed there was no reason to continue with the Union.[96] His conclusions differed markedly from many bleus in that he advocated a return to the pre-1849 division, whereas others recognized the impracticality of that threat. Faced by the threat of an impending alliance of English Canadian colonies, realists like Louis Turcotte conceded that "Confederation was an idea which merited discussion, at least if we entertained the desire of at one time becoming a nation."[97]

Two extremely realistic politicians, J. C. Taché and Joseph Cauchon, even devoted the pages of their respective newspapers, Le Courrier du Canada and Le Journal de Québec to federation. Rather than bury their heads in the sand, they met the threat of federalism frontally. In the words of the Courrier, the purpose of Taché's work

---

[95] Mirror, Mar. 12, 1858.

[96] See also L. Turcotte, July 7, 1858, Mirror of Parlt., La Minerve, Nov. 14, 18, 1857.

[97] Mirror of Parlt., July 7, 1858.

was to explain to those French Canadians who feared anglification and complete assimilation, "que c'est de leur avenir surtout qu'il s'agit dans la discussion de cette question."[98] Cauchon was even more direct. It was not the wish, he said, of Canadians for a federal union, but rather of the poverty-stricken Maritimes. Since there was some possibility that the Imperial government might thrust it upon them, or that it might become an election issue, French Canadians should be placed on their guard against such federative schemes.[99]

The result of Cauchon's and Taché's deliberation of the problem of federal union was two-fold. First, it served to expose literate French Canadians to the jurisdictional, legal, economic and cultural problems of federal union. Secondly, it served notice to English Canadians that Lower Canadians were going to prove formidable opponents when negotiations opened for a federal union. Cauchon's proposal in fact resembled more a balance sheet than a prospectus for a new nation. After examining twenty-three categories, Cauchon concluded that a federal union of the colonies was the lesser of the evils offered by a wider legislative union or annexation. He still harboured great doubts about the viability of Roman Catholicism under the new union, and indeed about the survival of French Canadian culture in general.[100] Taché was more explicit yet. He delegated very specific

---

[98] Le Courrier du Canada, Nov. 8, 1858.

[99] J. Cauchon, Etude Sur l'Union Projetée des Provinces Britanniques de l'Amérique du Nord (Québec, 1858, A. Coté, p. 5).

[100] Cauchon, Etude . . . , pp. 27-31.

powers to the federal government, but every thing else went to the provincial governments, "les pouvoirs du gouvernement fédéral n'étant considérés que comme une cession de droits spécialement désignés."[101] The constituent governments would similarly have to be based upon written liberties especially dear to French Canada. The federal government would be reduced to a cipher since it only shared in patronage and acted as a liaison between the local and imperial governments.[102] By thus delimiting federal power to external and co-operative functions, "Le pouvoir fédéral n'aurait rien à faire avec les nationalités, avec les intérêts particuliers des provinces, avec les divers éléments qui composent les populations."[103]

One ray of hope which augured well for confederation and the future racial relations in British North America was that the proposals were made at all. French Canadians were prepared to indulge English Canadians in their neo-national spirit provided that their culture could be secured even further by political and legal concessions under the new union. Given that, they would then consider Morris' vision of Nova Britannia "et l'étude de tout ce qui tient à la question ne peut que donner de la largeur à notre politique et inspirer de la vigueur aux aspirations des populations britanniques américaines."[104]

(ii) Pluralism - The Social Challenge

By mid-century, self-conscious national images were emerging in both sections of the Canadas. Technology was perhaps the most important

---

[101] Taché, Des Provinces ..., p. 148. [102] Ibid., pp. 242-43.

[103] Ibid., p. 182. [104] Le Courrier, Nov. 8, 1858.

catalyst to this increasing self-awareness. First, there was the very rapid expansion of journalism to keep pace with the rapid increase in literacy. By Confederation it was estimated that the total periodical output (from daily newspapers to monthlies) approached three hundred titles. Telegraphic communication was also introduced into Canada at this time, so that by 1850 all major centres in Canada and the Maritimes were interconnected. Directly linked to the communications revolution was the transportation revolution which rapidly transformed the face of central Canada in the fifties. The direct effect of this technological revolution was twofold. First, it gave increasing power to the forces of metropolitanism emanating from Montreal and Toronto. Second, it gave Canadians of both races an unparalleled sense of material progress and national destiny.[105]

It is virtually impossible to separate the churches and clerics of mid-Victorian Canada from the growth of patriotic literature in that period.[106] A purely secular national tradition had no place in a Christian society dominated by politicians reared in the Burkean

---

[105] See W. H. Kesterton, A History of Journalism in Canada (Toronto, 1967), pp. 27-64; G. P. de T. Glazebrook, A History of Transportation in Canada (Toronto, 1964), pp. 140-70; L. S. Fallis, "The Idea of Progress in the Province of Canada; A Study in the History of Ideas," in W. L. Morton (ed.), The Shield of Achilles, pp. 169-84.

[106] See E. Chartier, "La Vie d'Esprit au Canada Francais; L'Histoire et l'Idée Nationale," Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada, 1934; D. M. Hayne, "Sur les Traces du Prémontanisme Canadien," Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa, 135-57; Goldwin French, "The Evangelical Creed in Canada," in W. L. Morton (ed.), The Shield of Achilles, pp. 29-31; J. Monet, "French Canadian Nationalism and the Challenge of Ultramontanism," C.H.A.A.R., 1966, pp. 41-55.

political tradition. The mere fact that literary nationalism flourished in the decade before confederation meant that it had to have the sanction of its conservative political and intellectual élite. If merely viewed from the single standpoint of those who determined the direction of literacy, it was unlikely that Egerton Ryerson, J. B. Meilleur, or P. J. O. Chauveau would have tolerated any purely secular literature of democratic nationalism to pollute the school systems of the Province of Canada. Such a commonwealth Burke had warned "would in a few generations crumble away, be disconnected into the dust and powder of individuality, and at length dispersed to all the winds of heaven."[107]

It is equally impossible to separate neatly the colonial literary tradition from the neo-national genre of the eighteen forties and fifties. It is claimed by one of Canada's foremost literary critics, A. J. M. Smith, that the abstract character of English Canadian poetry at mid-century still placed it solidly within the European tradition.[108] The question then arises as to what can be classified as a native literary, political, or even social tradition. The answer is, as usual, heavily determined by the nature of the question, which usually implies that an isolated cultural distinctiveness or unique national character is a desirable end. The pitfall of this outlook is that it often views the political resolution of Canadian Confederation as the

---

[107] L. I. Bredvold and R. G. Ross, The Philosophy of Edmund Burke (Ann Arbor, 1960), p. 110.

[108] A. J. M. Smith, "Colonialism and Nationalism in English Canadian Poetry Before Confederation," C.H.A.A.R., 1944, pp. 74-76.

embryo of all that is truly Canadian; e.g., a national state begat a national literature.[109]

If, on the other hand, one accepts and even welcomes the European philosophical and literary traditions, or its American offshoots, the question of colonialism largely becomes a constitutional or legal question. This latter hypothesis contains within it more flexibility as a cultural tool since it permits a generous degree of ambivalence within its pale. It becomes possible to reconcile the paradox of national literary themes in colonial society, and vice-versa. An excellent case in point is the myth of "the true north, strong and free" so forcefully exposed by Carl Berger. The first assumption which underlies that able study is that the myth of northerness was peculiar to post-Confederation English Canada, being first popularized by R. G. Haliburton of the Canada First Movement.[110] Certainly that myth reached a furious boil in the late nineteenth century, but there is ample evidence to show that northerness and anglo-saxon racism began to percolate well before Confederation.[111] Just as the vicious assumptions of anglo-saxon imperial domination did not become obvious to the world until the late nineteenth century, any French Canadian could have predicted it from Lord Durham's Report, or even from the earlier arrogance of Governor Craig, and the Montreal commercial élite.

---

[109] Mair, Roberts, Lampman, et al.

[110] See C. Berger, "The True North Strong and Free," in P. Russell, Nationalism in Canada (Toronto, 1966), p. 5.

[111] See infra, p. 400-405.

The impulse towards national literacy and literary nationalism in English Canada owed much to evangelical protestantism. To Egerton Ryerson Upper Canada's 'national system of education' had as its object the breeding of a unique Canadian intellect fortified by strains of manliness, godliness, and enterprise.[112] In reply to French Canadian clerics who accused him of nativist anglo-saxon objectives in education, Ryerson answered:

> Nor was I before aware that there was any such political platform as "nativeism" in Upper Canada, or a single journal or political man that advocated it. I know that some of my most earnest essays of past years were directed against the indulgence of any feeling or prejudice on account of national origin, birth place or education:--that the duty of all classes was to forget these accidental distinctions, and unite in one noble, patriotic feeling of Canadianism--regarding Canada as their country, their home--the home and hope of their children, and its highest advancement their highest earthly interests and glory. What I mean in referring to the introduction of a "new foreign element" into Canada, is the direct antagonist of this true Canadian feeling--not emigration from abroad--but foreign inspirations, feelings, and views, at variance with what have heretofore existed in Upper Canada--antagonistic to Canadian independence, and to the growth of Canadian intellect, liberty and prosperity.[113]

As it was, Ryerson's system of education displeased many conservatives in Canada West because it was over-run by American godlessness. A

---

[112] See J. G. Hodgins, Historical and Other Papers Illustrative of the Educational System of Ontario (Toronto, 1911), 1842-1861, V, 426-51. "Difference Between the Irish and Canadian Systems of National Education."

[113] E. Ryerson, In Reply to the Attacks of the Foreign Ecclesiastics Against the Schools and Municipalities Including the Letters of B. Charbonnel, Mr. Bruyère, and B. Pinsonneault, Toronto, Lovell and Gibson, 1857, p. 100; Ryerson to B. Pinsonneault, Feb. 27, 1857.

presbyter of Strachan's diocese in Toronto severely condemned the non-religious common school system of Canada West for producing nothing but "clever devils." True Christian patriots on the other hand believed that "righteousness exalteth a nation," and opposed with their last breath "those who would nationally train the children of their people, utterly excluding that righteousness by which alone, as the Most High Himself declares, the true glory of their land can be secured."[114] Strachan's protégés, it appears, had learned little from their mentor except the shibboleths of an earlier era which were sadly mismatched against the new national vigour of the evangelical denominations.[115]

Pre-Confederation poetry also owed its first debt to the Methodist minister, Rev. E. H. Dewart, who compiled the first anthology of mid-Victorian verse in English Canada. Dewart also acknowledge his debts to the Divine Creator who founded the well spring of poetry in man's mental constitution, in order that it be educated to "a quicker perception of the harmony, grandeur and truth disclosed in the work of the Creator."[116] He then entered an eloquent plea for a national literature which was only surpassed by D'Arcy McGee's magniloquence a

---

[114] A. Townley, Seven Letters on the Non-Religious Common School System of Canada and the United States (Toronto: Henry Rowsell, 1853), p. 11.

[115] See also John Cordner, The Foundations of Nationality, A Discourse Preached in the Unitarian Church (Montreal: Henry Rose, Nov., 1856), 1856.

[116] E. H. Dewart, Selections from Canadian Poets (Montreal: John Lovell, 1864), pp. xi-xiii.

few years before:

> A national literature is an essential element in the formation of a national character. It is not merely the record of a country's mental progress: it is the expression of its intellectual life, the bond of national unity, and the guide of national energy. It may be fairly questioned whether the whole range of history presents the spectacle of a people firmly united politically, without the subtle but powerful cement of a patriotic literature. On the other hand, it is easy to show, that, in the older countries of the world, the names of distinguished poets, enshrined in the national heart, are the watchwords of national union; and it has become a part of the patriotism of the people to honour and love their memory . . . It is to be regretted that the tendency to sectionalism and disintegration, which is the political weakness of Canada, meets no counterpoise in the literature of the country.

He then pointed out with telling accuracy that the French Canadians were well ahead of their English Canadian contemporaries in their promotion of a peculiar brand of religious nationality derived from the French ultramontanists.[117] To this purpose he then dedicated some sixty poems from reputable writers like Sangster, McLachlan, Heavysege, Kirby, and McGee, but clearly dipped into the second rank to provide the bulk of the "descriptive and national" verse.

English Canadian politicians and journalists were no less aware of Canada's deficiencies in literacy and the development of a national culture. It was generally appreciated by its intellectual élite that "the diffusion of useful knowledge," let alone the arts, had not kept pace with the material and political progress of the province.[118] In

---

[117] Dewart, ibid., p. x.

[118] Montreal Gazette, Nov. 24, 1854.

his presidential address to the Canadian Institute of Toronto, John Beverly Robinson discoursed at length upon the failure of Upper Canadians to develop any world-renowned genius in the arts and sciences. He attributed its backwardness in great part to the lack of leisure time in a society solely devoted to the labours of pioneering and primitive commercial development; yet he held out great hope for the development of wealth and leisure in its future:

> Very many of these (farmers) are in comfortable circumstances, able to appreciate and enjoy the advantages of education, and not without the ambition to improve them, and to ascend to positions among their fellow men, which, in Canada, as in other portions of the British Empire, are open to all. Our commerce, too, expanding with the rapid and enormous increase of our productions is accumulating wealth--and wealth brings leisure. We shall soon have a larger class of men among us who, having succeeded to something more than a bare competency, or having secured an independence by their own exertions, will be exempt from the daily toil which is the common lot; and some of these we may hope will be inclined to devote themselves to the pursuits of Science, and to encourage and assist the efforts of others.[119]

The extent to which such societies for the promotion of useful knowledge and the arts had become popular can be measured in part by the petition of the city of Montreal to have the permanent provincial capital located there in 1857. Among all her assets her Chairman listed trade, centrality, communications, and 'Evidences of Civilization': "Montreal lays claim to no very marked superiority over other Cities, but a large and liberal spirit pervades her Citizens, and if she cannot boast

---

[119] J. B. Robinson, The Canadian Institute, President's Address (Toronto: Thompson and Co., 1854), p. 8. See also British Colonist, Dec. 14, 1852; B. Chamberlin, Our Country and Our Duty to It: A Lecture Delivered Before the Mechanics Inst. of Montreal, Mar. 7, 1854 (Montreal: W. Salter, 1854), pp. 12-14.

of extensive literary or scientific reputation, she has certainly not been niggard in the promotion of Science and the Fine Arts in cultivating a taste for literature."[120]

Ably assisting these crusading clerics and politicians in their promotion of new national spirit were the emergent literati. In English Canada colonialism and racism were so well established as a genre, that nativism and localism only made slow progress. Poets like Charles Sangster, Alexander McLachlan, and Alexander Glendinning lamented less than earlier writers their exile from the mainstream of British culture, and wrote upon the land, local geography, and toil.[121] When Charles Sangster wrote his St. Lawrence and the Saguenay in 1856, he was immediately acclaimed by no less a patriot than William Lyon Mackenzie as a "Canadian Poet, whose poems are far above mediocrity--whose songs are of Canada--her mountains, her maidens, manners, morals, lakes, rivers, valleys, seasons, woods, forests, and aborigines, her faith and hope."[122] Bad history, steeped in whiggery and positivism, was also written either upon Canada's material ethos or such favourite patriotic themes as the War of 1812.[123]

---

[120]Petition of Montreal, R. B. Sullivan, Chairman, May 27, 1857, #6055, CO42/1857, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[121]See J. Matthews, Tradition in Exile: A Comparative Study of Social Influences on the Development of Australian and Canadian Poetry in the Nineteenth Century (University of Toronto Press, 1962), chs. iv and v.

[122]Cited in A. J. M. Smith, "Colonialism and Nationalism in Canadian Poetry before Confederation," C.H.A.A.R., p. 74.

[123]K. Windsor, "Historical Writing in Canada to 1920," in C.F. Klinck, The Literary History of Canada (Toronto, 1967), pp. 214-17.

The greatest single proponent of an English Canadian national literature was D'Arcy McGee. Not only was McGee an incurable romantic upon the subject of a national literature but a hard-headed realist as well. The major practical obstacle as he understood it was the Reciprocity Treaty which gave the Americans an advantage of some 15 per cent to 20 per cent in the Canadian market on the materiel of literature (paper, ink, type, books). The consequence was that the fledgling publishing houses of Montreal and Toronto were becoming mere outlets for the New York giants such as Harper's, Putnam's, and Appleton's. This desire to "Massachusett-ize the Canadian mind" struck McGee as little more than economic and intellectual treason on the part of Canadians who had at least three sources of culture (Britain, France, and the United States) to draw on in the creation of a distinct literature.[124] His fears were also shared by Brown Chamberlin of the Montreal Gazette, who saw the steep stamp duty on British newspapers entering Canada as intellectual default to American journals which were admitted "at a trifling postage."[125]

McGee's appeals for "a Grand Trunk of thought" to unite Canadian patriots were frankly based upon Nordic mythology. He drew attention to his readers to the efforts of the Scandinavian peoples in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Iceland towards the creation of a native literature. The causes of the national revival McGee saw as fourfold: the

---

[124] New Era, July 25, 1857.

[125] Montreal Gazette, July 30, 1855. See also New Era, Apr. 24, 1858.

growth and competition among universities like Uppsala and Copenhagen; encouragement of literature by the Reformed Churches since the eighteenth century; official patronage by monarchs and governments; and fourthly, popular applause.[126] His choice of the Nordic Renaissance was no accident, for McGee saw Canadian myths that might match the Niebelungen in power and popularity: "Cannot Newfoundland yield topics to the poet, or a new Urania to another Tycho Brahe? Cannot Canadian story supply the material for chornicles, equal in interest to those of Snorro, or to poetry as characteristic as 'Frithiol's Saga'?"[127] Canada could not but help reap the rewards of civic virtue and patriotism from such a popular literature rich in northern mythology:

> That we shall one day be a great northern nation, and develop within ourselves that best fruit of nationality, a new and lasting literature, is the firm belief, at least of those to whom this volume is mainly addressed. And here I would remind them that, of all the forms of patriotism, a wise, public-spirited patriotism in literature, is not the least admirable. It is, indeed, glorious to die in battle in defence of our homes or altars; but not less glorious is it to live to celebrate the virtues of our heroic countrymen, to adorn the history, or to preserve the traditions of our country. From Homer's age to that of Scott, Moore, and Béranger, patriotism has been the passion of the noblest succession of sweet singers the world ever saw--and the civic virtue they celebrated has, in turn, immortalized their own names.[128]

Strachan's concept of the established Anglican Church as the sole source

---

[126] New Era, Jan. 26, 1858.

[127] New Era, June 17, 1857. See also July 25, 1857.

[128] T. D. McGee, Canadian Ballads and Occasional Verses (Montreal: J. Lovell, 1858), p. 1.

of civic virtue and national allegiance had therefore yielded to the evangelical concept of nationalism promoted by Ryerson and Dewart on the one hand, and the Nordic racism of D'Arcy McGee on the other.

Although French Canadians were divided between the secular nationality of the rouges and the religious concept of patrie held by bleus and the priests, the church itself was not nearly as divided as were the Protestant denominations of Canada West. Never were Archbishop Turgeon of Quebec and Bishop Bourget of Montreal so close as they were in upholding the cultural integrity of French Canda. In his dedication of Laval University in 1853, Turgeon delivered a classic homily on the traditional role of the Catholic Church since the invasion of the Goths in safeguarding the eternal flame of knowledge against civil and political disorders on the one hand and paganism and false philosophies on the other. Laval's contribution to the future of French Canadian nationality was measured in familiar terms: "Il rend encore à la cause de la religion et de la patrie; sa démarche actuelle est une suite bien naturelle des efforts constants qu'il a faits, pour répandre parmi les Canadiens les bienfaits d'une instruction supérieure, basée sur les principes de la saine morale."[129] No less important than the educational function of the Church was its role in counteracting the rationalistic liberal ideas promoted by the rouge journals like L'Avenir and Le Pays. In his famous pastoral

---

[129]"Lettre Pastorale Annoncant l'Erection de l'Université Laval," 1853, pp. 8-9. Printed Copy, Séminaire de Trois-Rivières. See also J. B. Meilleur to M. Bois, Oct. 7, 1858. J. B. Meilleur Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm).

letter against wicked newspapers in 1858, Ignace Bourget made clear that any attack upon the Church was an attack upon the French Canadian nation:

> La Patriotisme religieux est l'amour tendre, fort et désintéressé, que la religion seule peut inspirer pour la patrie. Ceux qui sont animés de ce patriotisme ont pour principe que leur âme est à Dieu, et leur corps à leur pays. Ils vivent donc de le même vie, en ne vivant que pour la religion et la patrie. Voilà pourquoi ils sont en même temps bons chrétiens et bons citoyens.[130]

In order to combat the seditious influence of these newspapers and the libraries of the Institut Canadien, Archbishops Signay and Turgeon had suggested the creation of parish libraries throughout Canada East and an English language Catholic newspaper in Montreal to serve the Irish Canadian population there.[131]

The lower clergy and laity actively promoted the 'religious patriotism' the hierarchy pleaded for in their eloquent circulars. In order to combat the influence of the Institut Canadien in Montreal, there was dedicated a parish lecture hall through the combined efforts of the Minister of Education, the superior of the Sulpican Seminary, the parish clergy, and prominent members of the laity.[132] On the occasion of the first address therein, L. W. Marchand addressed the

---

[130] I. Bourget, Mandements, Lettres, Pastorales, Circulaires et Autres Documents, Montreal, Chapleau Frères, 1869, III, p. 401.

[131] See Signay, Circular letter of May 11, 1850; Turgeon, Circular Letter of June 4, 1854; H. Têtu and C. O. Gagnon, Mandements ... des Evêques de Québec, III, pp. 571-73; IV, pp. 162-68. An example of the kind of lecture given at the parish lecture halls: "La Langue Française, par F. G. de la Ponterie," La Minerve, May 9, 1857.

[132] La Minerve, Mar. 24, 1857.

assemblage on the leavening influence of such institutions on the spirit of nationality. Visions of imperial Rome were even conjured by Marchand to quicken the patriotic pulse of his audiences:

> C'est par le moyen d'institutions comme le cabinet de lecture, qui parlent à la fois à notre intelligence, de la religion et de l'industrie, des intérêts spirituels et temporels, qu'il est possible de rendre le peuple meilleur. C'est ici qu'il viendra développer ce sentiment de nationalité si profondément gravé dans le coeur de nos pères. C'est en fréquentant cette bibliothèque, c'est en se nourrissant des livres qu'elle continient, que notre jeunesse deviendra laborieuse, et acquerra cette confiance en sa force, qui fait seule les grandes nations. On ne mesure pas les peuples à la taille. Quand Romulus traca l'enceinte de Rome, Rémus sauta à pieds joints par-dessus ses fossés. Et cependant Rome conquit jadis le monde entier par la puissance de ses armes, et elle le gouvernera toujours par la croix ... Notre belle patrie marchera rapidement vers des destinés glorieuses, et les mânes de nos ancêtres qui ont succombé en défendant notre nationalité, tressailliront dans leur tombeaux, quand ils entendront la brise du St. Laurent murmurer ces mots magiques:
>
> "Les Institutions, la langue et les lois de Canada sont respectées au loin."[133]

During the founding phase of the Institut Canadien in Quebec there was a brief struggle on the part of the conservatives to infiltrate that library by a donation of thirty-six volumes of Annales de la Philosophie Chrétien so that French Canada could avoid "des doctrines qui ont perdu l'Europe" by returning "la science à sa mère, la foi."[134] A founding member of the Institut very crisply responded, claiming that its purpose had never been to advance the fortunes of Catholicism or any other religion. Moreover, the Annales were of less

---

[133] La Minerve, Mar. 24, 1857.

[134] Journal de Québec, UN AMI DES SAINES LETTRES, Mar. 22, 1849.

intrinsic literary worth than the Encyclopédie and the works of Hume![135]

The liberal intellectuals and rouge politicians supporting the Instituts were no less concerned than the conservatives with the cultural survival of French Canada. The patriotism that they demanded of youth was no less than a secular religion demanding life as its ultimate price. The true patriot, Dorion wrote, placed his country before "intérêts de famille, relations d'amitié. ... La Patrie! c'est pour lui cet idéal d'amour qui veut pour culte le dévouement sans borne, l'abnégation de soi-même, la sacrifice de la vie."[136] Another rouge apologist, Clément Dumesnil, similarly defined patriotism as incorporating love of one's country, religion, constitution and laws. His sole objection was against those who stressed religion and morality at the expense of all the other sources of patriotism.[137]

Education and literary activity were then no less important tools for cultural survival to the liberal than they were to Bourget or the bleu. It was only by the means of universal education that nationality could be placed upon an indestructible foundation "contra lequel vient se briser dans la tempête, le vaisseau ennemi qui veut la détruire."[138] Intellectual excellence was in fact the only means

---

[135] Journal de Québec, Mar. 27, 1849.

[136] J. B. E. Dorion, Institut Canadien, (Montreal, 1852), W. H. Bowen, p. 93, P.A.C. Pamphlet Coll.

[137] C. Dumesnil, Réflexions Préliminaires Des Vrais Principes Politiques (Montreal: Les Presses de L'Avenir, 1849), pp. 35-36.

[138] L'Avenir, June 30, 1849. J. B. E. Dorion at the St. Jean Baptiste Banquet of the Montreal Institut Canadien.

French Canadians had to greatness, said François-Xavier Garneau in his presidential address to the Institut Canadien in Quebec. Comparing their insignificance in English North America to the position of the Swiss in Europe, Garneau pleaded for public support of the Institut's library and lectures:

> Les Canadiens doivent tenir à honneur d'encourager les institutions comme la nôtre par tous les moyens qui sont en leur pouvoir. Ils ne doivent pour aucune raison, rester en arrière de leurs compatriotes anglais, d'autant plus qu'ils descendent d'une race célèbre dans tout l'univers, par sa science et son esprit ... Si comparativement au reste des habitants de l'Amérique, les Canadiens-Français sont peu nombreux, ils peuvent compenser cette faiblesse par leur superiorité intellectuelle, et rien n'est plus propre à élever leur intelligence que les associations formées dans le but de se rencontrer et de s'instruire. Il ne suffirait que de citer la suisse en Europe, pour prouver ce que nous avançons ici. Ce petit peuple par ses seules lumières, se tient, dans le domaine de l'esprit, au niveau des grandes nation qui l'environnent.[139]

Another writer of the Québec Institut, like Octave Crémazie, was less grandiose in his vision, and would have contented himself if French Canadians would merely preserve their culture against assimilation. The role of the writer, as he saw him in French Canada, was essentially anti-chauvinistic: "Renonçant sans regret aux beaux rêves d'une gloire rétentissante, il doit se regarder comme amplement récompensé de ses travaux s'il peut instruire et charmer ses compatriotes, s'il peut contribuer à la conservation, sur la jeune terre d'Amérique, de la

---

[139] Journal de Québec, Feb. 10, 1853. See also Judge C. Mondelet to the Institut Canadien of Montreal, L'Avenir, Feb. 9, 1850; F. X. Garneau to H. Langevin, Apr. 13, 1855. Taché-Langevin Coll., v. 12, #1, 361, A.P.Q.

vieille nationalité française."[140] Crémazie chose rather to bask in the reflected glory of France, distinguishing himself among French Canadian writers as the frankest exponent of neo-colonialism.

Given the varied sources of apology for national literature in both sections of the province, the result was bound to be confused and diffused. English Canadian literature in this period may commonly be described as materialist, nativist, evangelical, and northern in its purest form, but there are anomalous strains of frontierism, ruralism, colonialism, and loyalism at its very core. The vestigial tail of British Israelitism inherited from the Family Compact had been shortened by the North American environment, but it had by no means disappeared. French Canadian literary nationalism could generally be designated romantic, historical and passive in outlook, yet liberalism, neo-classicism, and even colonialism lurked within its bosom. The Church and rural New France were certainly its dominant note, but self-help, materialism, and the civic virtue of ancient Rome and the Second Empire were prominent minor keys.

Pride of material possession played a prominent part in the national literature of both English and French Canada. Although certainly more prominent in English Canada, the standards of material advancement were certainly well known to French Canadians. Both English and French Canadians played a prominent part in the exhibition of Canada abroad at the Crystal Palace Exhibition, the world fair in

---

[140] O. Crémazie, Oeuvres Complètes (Montreal, 1882), Beauchemin and Valois, p. 42.

New York, and the Paris Exhibition.[141] Two prize-winning essays were suitably written for the occasion by John Sheridan Hogan and Hector Langevin to advertise the material achievements of English and French Canadians. Langevin announced defiantly that Canada and the French Canadians in particular had come to take their place at the seats of the mighty: "L'Exposition Universelle de l'Industrie doit appeler à Paris tout ce que le monde possède d'hommes éclairés et savants, il importe que le Canada qui a pris place parmi les nations libres soit bien connu et bien apprécié."[142] English Canadian poets similarly extolled the virtues of toil and industry, and it often seemed that the school-house, the Iron Horse, the toil-worn peasant and lumberman often obscured the idyllic natural scene itself.[143]

The real and vital difference in many cases between the enterprise of the Anglo-Canadian versus the French Canadian was that the positive man like Gérin-Lajoie's Jean Rivard, and P.J.O. Chauveau's Charles Guérin rarely reaped the natural rewards of his work in the overly congested liberal professions. The more frequent retreat into Rousseauian idylls in French than in English Canadian literature was

---

[141] A. Short, "Canada Exhibited, 1851-67," C.H.R., XLVIII (Dec., 1967), 353-65.

[142] H. Langevin, "Le Canada ses Institutions, Ressources, Produits, Manufactures," Québec, Lovell and Lamoureux, 1855, pp. iii-iv. See also La Minerve, May 30, 1851, Jan. 16, Feb. 3, 6, 13, 1858.

[143] See Pamela Irving's "Canada" in E. H. Dewart, Selections, pp. 103-104; C. Sangster, The St. Lawrence and the Saguenay and Other Poems (New York, 1856), Miller and Mulligan, p. 48.

almost sociologically predetermined. Although English Canadian literature of the period was not devoid of pastoralism,[144] the pioneer phase, naturalism and ruralism were all regarded as transitional by the English Canadian man of letters, whereas they were seen as a permanent romantic refuge by Chauveau, Gérin-Lajoie, and Aubert de Gaspé.[145] One has only to recall the titles of two McLachlan poems to be reminded of the great difference in social mobility and its attendant attitudes: "Acres of His Own," "The Man Who Rose from Nothing," and "Young Canada, or Jack's as Good's His Master."[146]

French Canadian politicians, both rouge and bleu were generally less defeatist than either the priests or literati when confronted with the lack of social mobility. The rouges felt that there was more room even in the supposedly overcrowded liberal professions, but even more important, in general commerce. In an attempt to attract more young French Canadians into trade, Joseph Doutre suggested that moral and monetary rewards be increased; "c'est-à-dire la gloire et la récompense pour le talent laborieux."[147] Such an infusion of literate

---

[144] See Susanna Moodie's "Canadian Herd Boy" cited in E. H. Dewart, Selections, pp. 172-73, and A. McLachlan, "Idylls of the Pioneers" in The Poetical Works of Alexander McLachlan (Toronto, 1900), William Briggs, pp. 209-57.

[145] P. J. O. Chauveau, Charles Guérin (Montreal, 1853), pp. 2-3.

[146] McLachlan, Poetical Works, pp. 201-207.

[147] J. B. E. Dorion, L'Institut Canadien, in 1852 (Montreal: W. H. Rowen, 1852), pp. 87-88, speech by J. Doutre, Dec. 17, 1850.

and dynamic youth from the Institut in Montreal would be enough eventually to unseat the narrow clique of lawyers and priests who now controlled the province. Even the bleu was much less inclined to nativism of the kind which riddled the Catholic Church in Lower Canada. When confronted in 1858 by a bill to reduce the residence requirement for naturalization from five to three years, George-Etienne Cartier lent his willing support on the grounds that Canada "had always been more liberal to her institutions than the United States."[148] E. P. Taché similarly welcomed the prospect of immigration of "a certain go ahead race" into French Canadian towns since the people only lacked a vigorous example: "Look at our large towns and there you will see in the learned professions in trade and especially in the mechanical arts, even in shipbuilding, the strong competition which the old inhabitants keep up against their fellow subjects recently and directly arrived from Europe."[149]

The vital difference in the nascent economic nationalism developing in both sections of the Province was the special sense of providential mission which English Canadians felt about the unoccupied lands and resources of the Northwest. The rise of the federal idea among the tories in the early fifties was perhaps less important for its political rather than its economic vision. The British American League urged provincial politicians in its manifesto "to break through

---

[148] Mirror of Parlt., May 17, 1858.

[149] E.P. Taché to William Patton, Jan. 10, 1851, Toronto, Taché-Langevin Papers, A.P.Q.

the narrow circle of local politics, and with enlarged views to contemplate the exalted position and inexhaustible resources of British America under a general confederation of all of its provinces."[150] On those rare occasions when George Brown contemplated federalism he did so in the best style of the American proponents of manifest destiny, the only difference being in the special homage he paid to British virtue as a mitigating force in expansion:

> There will be a demand for the acquisition of new territory, a longing after a wider field, for the nation as it will then exist. The natural outlet for this feeling will be a union of the Provinces, and in the absorption of territory, which now rightfully belongs to them--we mean that of the Hudson's Bay Company. A magnificent state would grow from such a confederation under British protection, having all the life and activity of the American continent, yet retaining more of the virtues of the parent state than the neighbouring union.[151]

The last and greatest prophet of economic nationalism as the maidservant of aggressive metropolitanism was D'Arcy McGee. The undoubted apostle of the English business community of Montreal,[152] McGee simple recast the old commercial empire of the St. Lawrence in larger national terms.[153] Nor was he any less reticent than Brown in popularizing the shibboleths of manifest material destiny. He went even further than Brown in lauding the prophets of western expansion, such as George

---

[150] May 1, 1850, Elgin-Grey Papers, II, 957.

[151] Globe, Oct. 25, 1856. See also L. T. Drummond, Mirror of Parlt., July 7, Mar. 27, 1856; British Whig, Oct. 10, 1851; A. T. Galt, Canada 1849 to 1859 (Quebec, 1860), Middletown and Dawson, 38 pp.

[152] R. B. Burns, D'Arcy McGee and the Economic Aspects of the New Nationality," C.H.A.A.R., 1967, p. 103.

[153] New Era, Aug. 4, 8, 1857; Globe, July 3, 1858.

Washington, Robert Fulton, and DeWitt Clinton.

Though proud of their material progress and intent on promoting its further development, French Canadians had few such expansionist aims. Insofar as G. E. Cartier and C. S. Cherrier spoke for the metropolitan interests of Montreal, there was certainly a vested interest in the old concept of commercial empire. The historical outlook of that vision which stretched back to the halcyon days of the fur trade empire was based on a theory of economic rights rather than mights. This looking-glass vision was also impaired by the simple fact that any appeal to Montreal's commercial destiny had to be cast in biracial and civic terms rather than national ones.[154]

Purely French Canadian conviction in the commercial empire of the St. Lawrence was therefore complacent rather than aggressive. When Cauchon contemplated dissolution and federal union in 1858, he was not at all concerned about the future prospects for Lower Canada since nearly all traffic had to pass through Quebec whether by land or by sea.[155] When contemplating the vast territory to the West that would be inevitably swallowed in a new federal structure, the French Canadian thought not solely in terms of exploitable resources but also in terms of its human resources.[156] It did not escape their notice that there were some 300,000 natives "l'immense majorité de

---

[154] See Cartier, Ross, and Galt on federation, London, Oct. 23, 1858, J. C. Tassé, Discours, pp. 162-64; loyalty petition of Montreal, May, 1849, CO42/558, p. 176; Montreal Petition on the Seat of Govt., May 27, 1857, CO42/609, #6055.

[155] J. Cauchon, Etude . . . , p. 26.

[156] Cited in Toronto Leader, Aug. 13, 1855.

ceux qui sont chrétiens sont catholiques."[157] More significant yet was the intention to preserve in classical French Canadian tradition the pastoral and semi-nomadic character of these people rather than converting them to anglo-saxon farmers or factory hands.[158]

If the French Canadian had an economic vision, it was a primarily defensive one. It meant survival against anglo-saxon commercial and industrial dominance by adopting the same economic tools used by their competitors. This holding action was merely incorporated into the larger national goals of the St. Jean-Baptiste Society statutes of 1853: "De promouvoir par toutes les voix légales et légitimes, les intérêts nationaux, scientifiques, industriels et sociaux, de la masse de la population du pays en général."[159] For the President of the Montreal St. Jean-Baptiste Society, George-Etienne Cartier, survival was cast in atavistic terms of territorial integrity. His oration of the death of Ludger Duvernay of La Minerve was a powerful affirmation of French Canada's determination to retain her patrimony, and a somewhat rare conviction in its expansion beyond its original limits:

> Sans la propriété, pourrait-il exister une nationalité, et une patrie? Remarquons que la même nécessité de tenir au sol à titre de propriétaire pour le maintien

---

[157] J. C. Taché, Des Provinces, p. 33.

[158] Ibid., pp. 226-27.

[159] Statuts de la Société St. Jean Baptiste de la cité de Québec (Québec, 1853), Bureau and Marcotte, 32 pp.; P.A.C.; Constitution et Règlement de l'Institut Catholique de Saint-Roche de Québec, Québec, 1852, A. Coté, 6 pp.; E. Parent, Discours Prononcé Par Etienne Parent devant la Chambre de Lecture de St. Roch, Québec, 1852, E. Frechette, 26 pp.

> de notre nationalité existe également pour les membres des sociétés-soeurs nationales. La lutte qui se doive livrer entre nous et les membres de ces sociétés pour la possession du sol, doit être une lutte de travail, d'économie, d'industrie, d'intelligence et de bonne conduite, et non pas une lutte de race, de préjugés et d'envie. Le Canada a de l'espace: il en a pour nous, il en a pour tous. Nos horizons sont sans bornes.[160]

The clergy had much less confidence than did Cartier in the continence of English Canadians. Their promotion of the colonization of the Townships derived from a defensive mission to retain not only population, but also its agricultural character.[161] The Church was so committed to this cult of ignorance that upon so unlikely an occasion as the dedication of Laval University Bishop Turgeon reminded his audience that the liberal professions were already too crowded by sinecure seekers. He then entered a plea which amounted to a request to keep all but the brilliant down on the farm. That is, at least until agricultural colleges might be established, "où, en recevant les bienfaits de l'instruction, elle acquérait des connaissances utiles de premier des arts, et conservait l'habitude du travail."[162]

The uses of historical themes to national ends was neither the special preserve of the English nor the French Canadian. While the former thrilled to the exploits of the anglo-saxon in verses such as

---

[160] La Minerve, Oct. 24, 1855. See also L. J. Papineau to G. E. Cartier, Mar. 28, 1856, A.P.Q., Papineau-Bourassa Coll.

[161] Bishop of Québec circular letter, Aug. 11, 1848, Archives Sem. de Trois Rivières.

[162] Lettre Pastoral Annoncant l'Erection de l'Université Laval, 1853, Arch. de Trois Rivières.

McLachlan's "Britannia," and the "Anglo-Saxon," and Mrs. Faulkner's "St. George's Flag," the latter drank the heady brew of Crémazie's "Vieux Soldat Canadien," "Le Drapeau de Carillon," and "Fête Nationale."[163] For historical evidence of their valour both referred to the Conquest and the War of 1812 as sources of strength. French Canadians read Garneau's History and Philippe Aubert de Gaspé's Canadiennes d'autrefois, and even the columns of La Minerve for these reassurances.[164] English Canadians on the other hand were confirmed in their superiority in reading William Kirby's "Approach to Québec," or Charles Roger's Rise of Canada from Barbarism to Wealth and Civilization (1856).

The importance which was placed upon popular history as a source of conviction in one's race by the literate elements of mid-Victorian Canada cannot be over-estimated. In the press of the period there were frequent articles on the uses of history as the muscle and fibre of patriotism. Drawing upon contradictory arguments from the Church, Voltaire, and Rousseau, the French Canadian journalists created an ideological unbrella which could tolerate both divinely inspired patriotism and the general will under its broad brim.[165] The greatest value of history lay in its obvious uses towards self-knowledge and improvement by both the individual and the nation:

---

[163] McLachlan, Works, pp. 32-34; E. H. Dewart, Selections, p. 161; O. Crémazie, Oeuvres, pp. 112-16, 128-37, 162-64.

[164] La Minerve, Dec. 10, 1857; Jan. 13, 1858; June 5, 1858.

[165] La Minerve, May 30, 1851. See also ibid., May 22, 1851; Mar. 12, 1853; Feb. 14, 1854; June 23, 1857, L'Avenir, June 30, 1849.

> C'est aussi en étudiant notre histoire que nous pourrons connaître le caractère national. Nous y verrons que les Canadiens sont de leur nature bons, hospitaliers, braves, honnêtes, vertueux, Conservant avec un soin précieux la foi de leurs ancêtres et la moralité la plus pure, ils méritent d'être cités comme modéles pour leur conduite privée et leurs vertus domestiques. Mais l'histoire nous apprend aussi qu'ils manquent d'ambition et se contentent de trop peu; que l'esprit de corps, ou l'esprit public est inconnu chez eux; que leur part d'énergie est peu considérable et qu'ils sont loin d'être avancés sous le rapport de l'éducation. Mais notre siècle est un siècle de progrès, un siècle d'amélioration ... Et nous avouerons alors que nous sommes prodigeusement en arrière, et nous hâterons de crainte que le monde soit bientôt trop loin pour que nous puissions le rejoindre.[166]

When the English Canadian contemplated the lessons of history he did not cast them in such historiosophical terms, for his was already the promised land. One blithe spirit claimed that such great progress had been made since 1800, when men revelled in war, that "Englishmen now had no 'natural enemies' in 1850."[167]

English Canadian patriotism like the French Canadian hybrid was plurally derived. The Upper Canadian tory or cleric would argue from the divine origins of patriotism just as would the French Canadian conservative. The loyalist would congratulate himself upon his providential destiny during his annual pilgrimages to Queenston Heights.[168] The English Canadian cleric could confidently discourse

---

[166] La Minerve, May 30, 1851; see also ibid., May 22, 26, 1851; Mar. 12, 1853; Sept. 20, 1853; Feb. 14, 1854; June 23, 1857; L'Avenir, June 30, 1849.

[167] Rev. J. M. Cramp, A Lecture Delivered Before the Mechanic's Institute, Jan. 8, 1850, Montreal Pilot, Jan. 17, 1850.

[168] British Colonist, Oct. 23, 1849; Loyal Canadian Society Address, Jan. 7, 1853, CO42/896, P.A.C.

upon "the divine principle of building up nations in permanence and excellence," and know from this that "the nation will not only endure, but it will advance in prosperity and glory--prosperity and glory of the highest order."[169] Yet, the Montreal Pilot concentrated largely upon self-government and material progress as the yardsticks of patriotic progress. It was not morality which distinguished Canada from the United States in the liberal's eyes, it was her relatively greater social and material advancement during the Union.[170]

The negative uses of history as a source of racial or national pride were well known to both English and French Canadians. A particular source of annoyance to the former was Garneau's generation of an upstart democratic nationalism by his biased History. English Canadian reviewers labelled it as false in its method and reprehensible in its results. To them, Garneau had missed the point when he assigned racial characteristics to the English people, and had deliberately baited them by attributing all that was noble in their spirit to the Norman conquest:

> Bravery in the field and unreasoning loyalty to the Grande Monarque, seem to be, in the eyes of Mr. Garneau, the highest virtues: these features of Canadian character he places in favourable contrast with the harder, money getting, and more selfish qualities of the English colonists. We doubt whether they would be

---

[169] J. Cordner, The Foundations of Nationality, A Discourse Preached in the Unitarian Church, Nov. 1856 (Montreal: Henry Rose, 1856), p. 27. See also A. Townley, Seven Letters on the Non-Religious Common School System (Toronto: Henry Rowsell, 1853), 55 pp.

[170] Montreal Pilot, Apr. 6, 1850.

> equally well adapted to rear up a mighty nation. Mr. Garneau seems to consider that we are mainly indebted for everything that has elevated the English nation, and that has conduced to English liberty, to the infusion of Norman blood at the conquest; and hence to be disposed to believe, that in like manner the Norman blood would have sufficed to produce similar results in Canada. But here he loses sight of the fact, that in England it was not any one race, but the inter-mixture of several races, that formed the national mind; and, reasoning from analogy, it would have required some such admixture to produce men of similar calibre in America.[171]

Garneau was therefore dismissed in English Canada as an apostate to Americanism because of his democratic notions upon the origins of society, the duties of government, the liberty of citizens, and the separation of church and state. Moreover, he was un-Canadian in that his brand of patriotism undermined the state of the United Canadas: "Genuine patriotism consists in consulting and endeavouring to promote the happiness of a country; not necessarily in promoting the souvenirs and characteristics of a country foreign."[172]

French Canadian reaction to Garneau's bad press in English Canada was confined largely to the liberal-nationalist newspaper, Le Pays.[172] In response to the Montreal Commercial Advertiser's blistering attacks upon Garneau's treatment of the post-conquest

---

[171] Montreal Pilot, Dec. 23, 1852.

[172] Toronto Leader, Feb. 22, 1854. See also British Colonist, Jan. 16, 1852; Montreal Gazette, Jan. 29, Feb. 16, 1849.

[173] La Minerve for example printed an extremely critical review of Garneau, attacking him for his "unjust and ungrateful" attitude towards the Church which was French Canada's "meilleur garantie de son indépendance et de sa souveraineté." La Minerve, Feb. 14, 1854.

period, Le Pays printed a serialized rebuttal entitled "Nos Luttes Politiques Avant L'Union." Especially reprehensible to the editor of Le Pays was the attempt to mask the national struggles of that period in whig glosses upon the Quebec Act and the Constitutional Act:

> En effet les luttes de races datent de cette époque, et les désordres dont la province fut ensuite le théatre furent les fruits amers d'antipathies nationales; mais comme on peut déjà le voir par le court tableau qui vient d'être tracé, il est loin d'être exact de dire que dans ces luttes de races anglaises était poussée par un esprit de progrès et que la race française se posa comme barrière pour l'arrêter dans sa course. La lutte commenca par une attaque contre la religion, notre langue et nos lois, et le fait est que les emigrés qui vinrent des Trois-Royaumes en Canada pour s'y établir y venaient comme dans une ville prise d'assaut, et dans l'intention de traiter les anciens habitants en conséquence.[174]

As if to underline this stiffening resolve of French Canadians to set the historical record straight, Louis-Joseph Papineau wrote to the Secretary of the Saint Jean-Baptiste Society that he would refuse to participate in, or donate to a binational monument in Québec commemorating the fallen of 1760. He would gladly contribute to the memory of the French regulars and Canadian militia who defended Quebec, because it was dedicated to purposes "la plus pure des vertus sociales, l'amour désintéressé de la patrie, jusqu'à la mort" and not to "la gloire des conquérants."[175] When P.J.O. Chauveau lauded the bravery of those who had fallen at Ste. Foy on April 28, 1760 at the dedication in 1855, he therefore did so without the imprimatur of many

---

[174] Le Pays, Nov. 29, 1856. See also ibid., Dec. 4, 10, 18.

[175] L. J. Papineau, to P. J. Jolicoeur, May 1, 1854, Petite Nation, Papineau-Bourassa Coll., A.P.Q.

neo-nationalist intellectuals and the die-hard patriotes.[176]

The paradox of such external identification with the mother races of the two founding peoples was that it could in the case of Papineau cause the most virulent form of racial antagonism, or, in the case of Chauveau, the most fruitful means of resolving racial conflict. If the mid-Victorian intellectual had a weakness in his formidable armour of romantic racism, it was his compassion for the fallen foe, or better still, the fallen ally. On the one hand, poets like Charles Sangster could pen the narrowest kind of racist pap on the subject of "THE BANNER OF OLD ENGLAND" or "THE SONG OF THE BRITISH MARINER."[177] Yet the same Sangster could ooze fraternalism upon the co-operation of the French and the English in the Crimea, or upon the bravery of Wolfe and Montcalm upon the Plains of Abraham.[178] Despite the frankly neo-colonial tenor of most of his poetry, Octave Crémazie could also sing the martial praises of "France et Albion" embattled in the Crimea:

> Pour nous, ô Canadiens! Enfants de ces deux races
> Dont l'univers entier garde les nobles traces
> Quand nos frères là-bas meurent au champ d'honneur
> Si nous ne pouvons pas, partageant de leur victoire
> Recevoir avec eux les lauriers dont la Gloire
> Couronne un front vainquer.[179]

---

[176] "Discours Pour L'Inauguration Du Monument Aux Braves," in A. Labarrère-Paulé, P.J.O. Chauveau (Montreal: Fides, 1962), pp. 85-88.

[177] C. Sangster, "St. Lawrence and the Saguenay and Other Potems," pp. 138, 202-203.

[178] Ibid., pp. 34, 200.

[179] O. Crémazie, Oeuvres, pp. 100-101.

Others like the rouge J. G. Barthe, preached a French literary renaissance in French Canada, and he also used the Crimean conflict as further proof of their essential unity "vers un avenir commun de prosperité et d'aggrandissement, sous leus auspices civilisateurs et animés d'une noble et même émulation."[180] When accused of their neo-colonial mentality by the bleu, the rouge sometimes replied by saying he admired neither the government nor the rulers of France, and that his sole affections were for Canada and the prospects it presented for fraternal co-operation: "Nous n'avons jamais déblatéré contre le sang saxon; nous avons au contraire toujours prêché la fraternité des races sur le sol canadien; car nous savons que la nation canadienne se trouve constituée d'une manière exceptionnelle."[181]

Perhaps the most insidious historical obstacle to any further resolution of the two competing national mythologies which spread throughout the Province was the emergent myth of the North in English Canada. Because of its comprehensiveness, it threatened resolution of the national ethos through trial by combat. Here was a new ideological synthesis which would magically resolve the tensions of dualism by swallowing the combatants whole. Unfortunately, there were no Bourinots nor Maheux's to promote the new myth in French Canada in this early phase, so that it became by default the sole product of the English Canadian mind.

---

[180] J. C. Barthe, Le Canada Reconquis Par La France, p. 296.

[181] Le Pays, Apr. 12, 1856.

French Canadian heroes disappeared into its maw with great rapidity. McGee soon remade Jacques Cartier from the engine of Reformation Catholicism into a Norman Viking returning to St. Malo to tell his yet untrained compatriots of the rigours of the New World:

> He told them of a region, hard, iron-bound and cold,
> Nor seas of pearl abounded, nor mines of shining gold,
> Where the wind from Thulé freezes the word upon the lip
> And the ice in spring comes sailing athwart the early ship
> He told them of the frozen scene until they thrilled with fear
> And pile fresh fuel on the hearth to make them better cheer.[182]

The voyageurs similarly became, French and Scots alike, the interior vikings of the plain mingling "strains of our Northern land with the notes of the forest choir."[183] When French Canadian writers like Garneau then tried to reclaim the names of Champlain, Perrot, and Hennepin as their own, English Canadians claimed foul on the grounds that: "Some of these are household words among us, and we venture to say that every enlightened Upper Canadian pronounces them with as much pleasure as those of Cook or any other of the galaxy of intrepid British discoverers."[184]

Northern liberty and racial homogenization were secondary variations upon the northern theme, both of which laid the ground for an incipient "melting pot" hypothesis. None of the apostles of secular or religious patriotism in French Canada found this new doctrine any more attractive than the bald statements upon assimilation made by Lord Durham. Certainly Garneau spoke of the infusion

---

[182] E. H. Dewart, Selections, p. 84.

[183] Ibid., J. F. McDonell, "The Voyageur's Song," p. 175.

of Norman blood at the conquest, much as did Bourinot and Sulte later, but his attitude was one of defiance rather than co-operation. Subtler though it was than its earlier statements 'cultural homogenization' was no more likely to win the confidence of even the conservatives in French Canada. Politically they might accept a legislative union or even a federal union with the inevitable provision of legal guarantees for their customs and laws, but almost universally they greeted the new northern historical mythology with a stony silence.

The fundamental premise of the new northern nationality was that Britain's daughters were a natural haven for the political and social refugees of Europe.[185] Canada's attractiveness lay in her "westernness" but even more so in her "northernness" which distinguished her from the great slaveholding power to the South, if only by virtue of climatic difference:

> From lands beyond the sea
> Strong men have turned, O Canada! to thee-
> Turned from their father's graves, their native shore
> Smiling to scorn the flood's tempestuous roar
> Gladly to find where broader ampler room
> Allured their steps - a happy Western home . . .
> We cannot boast those skies of milder ray,
> Neath which the orange mellows day by day;
> Where the magnolia spreads her snowy flowers,
> And nature revels in perennial bowers;
> Here winter holds his long and solemn reign
> And madly sweeps the desolated plain;

---

[184] Toronto Leader, Feb. 22, 1854.

[185] Sangster, "England and America," in St. Lawrence . . . and Other Poems, pp. 154-58.

But Health and Vigour hail the wintry strife
With all the buoyant glow of happy life.[186]

Tory anti-Americanism had had some impact upon the development of this unsubtle differentiation between Canada and the United States, but obviously little other than the impulse itself remained. Gone were the clear rationalizations of political and social cause, and left were the murky revelations and Montesquian half-truths. The new prophet of Canadian transcendentalism, D'Arcy McGee, penned the archetypal explanation of this phenomenon in his anti-rational poem, "Freedom's Journey." Freedom, as the story goes, was the true child of the North, "rock'd in the arms of stormy pines." Adventurous by nature, she wandered into promising southern climes in search of a permanent home, but became so disillusioned by its effeteness and slavery that she returned in haste to her true home where "the Polar Star burned."[187]

Well before McGee even appeared in Canada, the apostles of neo-nativism had begun to preach the gospel of 'homogenization.' While some tory journals like the Montreal Gazette continued to invite the 'backward' French Canadians into the progressive culture of the anglo-saxon,[188] other whig-inclined journals were groping towards a less restrictive social mythology. The Toronto Leader entered an eloquent plea for the disappearance of the national

---

[186] Canada, by Pamela Vining, in E. H. Dewart, Selections, pp. 101-106.

[187] T. D. McGee, Canadian Ballads, pp. 49-50. See also H. M. Johnson, "Our Native Land," E.H. Dewart, Selections, pp. 80-82.

[188] Montreal Gazette, Aug. 1, 1849; June 15, 1852.

societies like the St. Andrew's, the St. Patrick's, and the St. George's on the grounds that they merely perpetuated old world politics, and old world society:

> It is impossible to foster national prejudices among any people without rendering them the bane of society. What distracted Lower Canada for years but the hatreds that arose out of the distinct nationalities of the two races? It should be the duty of every true patriot to endeavour to fuse any nationalities in one homogenous Canadian society. In order to do this everyone must remember that his first duty is to consider himself a Canadian; to feel, to think, to act as a Canadian. He has voluntarily selected this country as his future home. He is placed in new circumstances, and under institutions somewhat new. Politically, he is no longer a distinctive Englishman, Irishman, or Scotchman, but a Canadian. National predilections or national antipathies he cannot cherish without injury to his adopted country, without repeating an entirely new scene, and under entirely different circumstances the factions which he has left behind. There can be no true Canadian feeling, no nationality, in a word, no patriotism where any considerable portion of the population deport themselves politically as Germans, or English, or Irish, or Scotch; as anything, in short, other than Canadians.[189]

The myth of Canadianization had not yet developed to where it was generally diffused through the bloodstream of patriotic prose and poetry. For one, it only stood to resolve at this stage the picayune differences of saxons and celts. Normans were only mentioned peripherally, and French Canadians if only to illustrate the general problems of indigestibility.[190] The localization of the myth to the British Isles is evident in the writings of both Alexander

---

[189] Weekly Leader, May 10, 1854. See also Weekly North American, May 10, 1854. See also the Globe, "COCKNEYISM UPON CANADA."

[190] New Era, "Canadian Nationality," Jan. 16, 1858.

McLachlan and D'Arcy McGee. In his poem "The Genius of Canada" the former dwelt at length upon the northern themes of race, climate, and liberty. He concluded with the muse exulting: "Behold, the hearts we mold in land of lakes and pines, where Shamrock blows, and English Rose, with Scottish thistle twines."[191] McGee was somewhat more eclectic in his vision in that he included the Norman within its pale; yet, his major task was still to elevate that celt to the status of the saxon: "The Saxon family have their great men and their glorious deeds, but it is a very vulgar error to suppose that they have monopolized either the intellect, the eloquence, the heroism, or the Science of Empire."[192] McGee posed as the same prophet of homogenization when he referred to the strengths of English literature. It had derived its romantic aspect from the Celts, the chivalric legacy and the poetry of love from the Normans, and common law and Baconian philosophy from their own "rocky nature."[193]

The pitfalls of eclecticism and homogenization as applied to the cultures and blood types of Canada was that Saxondom was still its dominant and universal component. Shakespeare may well have been a Norman to McGee, but he was still an Englishman to the French Canadian. For them the names Corneille, Racine, Montaigne and Pascal were similar giants of an equally great literary tradition. If

---

[191] McLachlan, Poetical Works, pp. 194-95. See also R. S. Patterson, "The Emblems of our Homes," E. H. Dewart, Selections, pp. 165-67.

[192] New Era, Feb. 16, 1858.

[193] New Era, June 17, 1857.

contributory genes were important to the French language, they were Gascognard and Provençal, not Saxon or Celt. The French Canadian intellectual élite of the fifties therefore identified with the golden age of the seventeenth century in France, and not with the feudal linguistic traditions of Normandy. Nor did they have any trouble answering rhetorical questions concerning the value of preserving that valuable literary heritage:

> Une littérature nationale est-elle légitime? En face des déclamations humanitaires, au milieu de cette immense développement de la civilisation maternelle qui fond les peuples et les races les nationalités doivent-elles chercher à effacer encore leur caractère distinctif et aller se précipitant d'elles-mêmes dans cette sorte de gouffre qui s'ouvre sous leurs pas, ou chaque groupe d'hommes a-t-il le droit de conserver sa langue comme une protestation permanente de sa race et de son sang, le patriotisme, au lieu d'être l'une des vertus de l'honnête homme, ne serait-il plus que le préjugé d'un étroit égoisme? Poser une telle question serait vous fait injure; et il semble que l'ombre de vos pères qui ont succombé dans la bataille, se lèverait sanglante sur leurs tombeaux, pour protester contre un pareil blasphème.[194]

The rise of anglo-Canadian nativism in the eighteen-fifties promised to serve well the increasingly heterogenous population of Canada West, just as the romantic revival had served French Canada well in the eighteen-forties. Relying upon the external thrust of mid-Victorian imperialism to carry it through such obvious loyalty crises as annexation, the Crimean War, and the Indian Mutiny, English Canadians sought a new internal social gospel to replace the shopworn shibboleths of old toryism. Decaying in social relevance within an

---

[194] F. G. de la Ponterie on "La Langue Française" before the Cabinet de Lecture Paroissal, La Minerve, May 9, 1857.

increasingly plural society, those sophisticated intellectualities had little force beyond the constitutional sphere. Nativism in the form of the new northern nationality held much greater promise for the future since it was gestalt, romantic, vulgar, and aggressive.

While the French Canadian had coped well with the exclusive loyalist myths in the forties by countering in similar loyal rhetoric, the new Northernism left him ideologically disorganized and somewhat unwilling to abandon the political and intellectual weapons that had served Lafontaine and Bourget so well in the forties. As the fifties progressed the intellectual élite groped fitfully towards a comprehensive secular and national ideology. But the internal dissension fostered by the ultramontanes prevented the crystallization of a powerful secular consensus, and perpetuated the dependence of French Canada upon the church for cultural survival, and upon the politicians for constitutional survival.

The uniqueness of the idea of nationality as it emerged in the eighteen-fifties was that it no longer carried a purely political value. Its definition was not pegged as it was before 1849 to an institutional view of Empire. The constitutional debate of the eighteen-forties over political sovereignty could not have incorporated nationalism because the objective, responsible government would have been jeopardized. Freed from that particular task, nationality had been allowed to define itself socially in the eighteen-fifties. Racism, romanticism, and historicism now played as vital a role in Canada as they had in the liberal-national

movements in Europe of the eighteen-thirties and forties.

The great difference in Canada was that the nationalist revival had coincided with the growth of conservatism, with the Church in French Canada, and with the sectionalist politicians of Upper Canada. The political uses of nationalism had neatly coincided with their social expression and articulation. In Europe, the advent of political realism and national consolidation had post-dated by at least three decades the development of "social romanticism" and "political messianism" in the eighteen-thirties.[195] There, a generational rhythm had been set up between fathers and sons, between dreamers and practitioners, between thesis and antithesis. In Canada, national dreams were rapidly tailored to the political realities of a particular generation. Brown, Cartier, McGee, and Dorion were the composers as well as conductors of their own scores. This enormous presumption could only have been made in a political culture without a political left or right, without a neat separation between its idealists and realists. The indistinguishable time lapse between the articulation of a concept and its use also presumed a fundamental pragmatism that was peculiarly North American in character.

---

[195] See D. O. Evans, Le Socialisme Romantique, Pierre Leroux et Ses Contemporaines (Paris: M. Riviere, 1948); J. L. Talmon, Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase (London: Secker and Warburg, 1960).

CHAPTER VI

POLITICAL AND SOCIETAL IDEALS OF THE CANADIAN POLITICAL ELITE[1]

Canadian politics during the Union were steadily becoming more homogeneous. As Professor Cornell has suggested party rivalry of the eighteen forties and fifties "did not represent any deep and fundamental division among Canadians."[2] Ministries became less and less inclined after 1849 to seek their mandates in the streets. The

---

[1]The author is in essential agreement with conservative political theorists from Edmund Burke and John Adams to Pareto and C. Wright Mills, who argued that every society is ruled by a small governing class or élite whether its class origins lay in prescriptive aristocracy, natural aristocracy, a bourgeoisie, or managerial élite. The caveat that could be raised by the liberal historian or political scientist is that there was an apparent division among the political élite of the United Province of Canada because of the proliferation of political groups in the House of Assemby and the rapid transference of power from one Ministry to another. Those objections might be answered by the Italian political scientist, Guido Dorso, who differnetiates between the "ruling class" and the active "political class" within that élite. In a middle-class democracy such as existed in the United Province, Dorso would likely argue that the political class was extremely stable and conservative because of its social homogeneity and its ready transmission of natural leaders from the ruled into the ruling class. Such a system would have no place for the pure ideologue of the right or left, because they are often unconcerned with the realities of political power. The political class in Canada were more often "integrated" rather than "alienated" members of the ruling class, the latter being characterized by oligarchical pockets or anarchistic cells at either end of the political spectrum. See C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956); James Meisel, The Myth of the Ruling Class (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958); D. Germino, Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory (New York: Harper and Row, 1967).

[2]P. Cornell, The Alignment of Political Groups in Canada, 1841-67 (University of Toronto Press, 1962), p. 83.

Metcalfe Crises and Rebellion Losses Riots gave way to the relatively sedate politics of the legislative chamber. Schools legislation, the seat of government question, the 'double shuffle,' and finally Confederation itself were decided with scarcely a reference to the popular will. The streets had become a mere safety valve for periodic outbursts of sectarian rivalry and labour unrest. Meanwhile, the bourgeois politicians of the eighteen fifties increasingly concerned themselves with the business of government, which was to serve business.

The mid-Victorian Canadian politician was generally a whig or conservative-liberal in his view of the people.[3] He was generally convinced of the limited intelligence of the masses and their capacity

---

[3]The whig has often been described as a purely political animal believing in the inevitable advance of human liberty by British parliamentary traditions. (See H. Butterfield, The Whig Interpretation of History, New York, W. W. Norton, 1965, reprint.) Whiggism and whiggery were however broader social and intellectual movements reflecting the varied political and social aspirations of Whigs from Thomas Wharton through Charles James Fox to Lords Macaulay, Melbourne, and Russell. Whiggery was naturally élitist and always associated with the aristocracy. As Donald Southgate has put it: "Whigs in every age were magnates, relatives, privileged associates or clients of magnates . . . A 'Whig democrat,' [e.g., Lord Durham] was a sport, not a genus. As politicians the Whigs were congenitally undemocratic, and Whiggery could not flourish in a democratic constitution." (D. Southgate, The Passing of the Whigs, 1832-86, London, Macmillan, 1962, pp. xv, xvi). The persistent strength of Whigs and Whiggery over two centuries of British politics lay in their ability to romanticize the political process. They covered the practice of English politics and the law with a thick veneer of moral and historical verbiage on the balanced constitution, the Glorious Revolution, and Anglo-Saxon law. For Canadian history, the association of whiggery with the advance of democracy has long been an implicit assumption reaching its peak in the centennial volume of the Canadian Historical Review dedicated to Lord Durham in 1939. Within the last two decades Canadian Whiggery has fallen into historiographical disrepute with two important articles: J. M. S. Careless, "Mid-Victorian Liberalism in Central Canadian Newspapers, 1850-67," Canadian Historical Review, XXXI, (Sept., 1950), 221-36;

to exercise the suffrage wisely.[4] Education was generally the only condition under which broader political participation would be permitted. Social reform was limited to the moral revivification of the criminal, the insane, and the poor, so that they too could be educated to a level where they would neither destroy public property nor impoverish the public exchequer.[5] Having made these severe qualifications upon popular worth, the mid-Victorian political élite was notably unrestricted in its view of bourgeois activity, whether in politics or commerce.

For the whig, commerce had never been very far from the door of politics.[6] Whereas the high tory only made a reluctant peace with commercial interests, always affirming his 'disinterestedness' in a negative way, the whig had confidently integrated commercial with political morality. He accepted the influence of interest groups in politics, and attempted to reconcile them by the universal principles of 'honesty' and 'purity.' This increasing confidence in the essential compatibility of business with politics was reflected in the fact that an old tory like MacNab could now confidently proclaim to the world that railways were his politics.

J. McConica, "Kingsford and Whiggery in Canadian History," Canadian Historical Review, XL, (June, 1959), 108-20.

[4]See B. W. Hodgins, "Attitudes Towards Democracy in the Pre-Confederation Decade" (unpublished M.A. Thesis, Queen's University, 1955).

[5]See supra, ch. 4, pp. 12-42.

[6]See C. Hill, The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution (Oxford University Press, 1965).

This rough consensus on societal objectives certainly lent stability to the potentially chaotic politics of the Union. But other passions of nationalism and denominationalism, and fear of incipient class hostility had to be muted upon reaching the Legislative Chamber. One means of doing so was by pure political expediency. Political collaboration between sectional leaders was certainly the way of the coalitions of the early eighteen forties. But pure opportunism soon separated the second-rank politicians from the giants. Baldwin and Lafontaine were so successful because they had a working ideal in responsible government, and secondly because they had agreed to the whig gospel of tolerance, which stood to reconcile any set of hostile 'prejudiced' or class interests. Moderate tories like Macdonald were quick to learn the secrets of whiggery. He too was insisting by the mid-eighteen fifties that politics was "a great game requiring coolness and an utter abnegation of prejudice and personal feeling," and that the principals must generously "agree to differ."[7] This whig political ideal, standing as it did between the trenchant convictions of old toryism and the evangelical and sectional cast of emergent liberalism remained for the time-being the most effective means of governing the province of Canada.

The whig ideal carried further into the heart of the political process. Politics now represented a career open to legal talents,

---

[7] J. A. Macdonald to S. S. Smith, Oct. 13, 1860, S. S. Smith Papers, P. A. C. (transcripts).

with the promise of the inevitable judicial appointment upon retirement. Divine law, which had been the tory's hedge against excessive wealth and power, had now given way to the whig's conscience--statute and common law. Attorney-General and judges had superseded, or at least challenged in the case of French Canada, the primacy of the Bishop in political and economic affairs.

Competitive political parties had also become generally acceptable and even desirable to Canadian politicians, including the tories. They increasingly regarded their function as a broad persuasive one, and less as an amalgam of local élites, or as an open expression of class-consciousness.[8] The whiggish and liberal arts of rational persuasion gradually supplemented the use of patronage as a permanent means of maintaining morale. The proliferation of newspapers, especially in the western portion of the province, indicated a broad consensus between tory, reformer, and radical upon the political value of a free and partisan press. Political banquets and demonstrations became yet another means by which reformers especially maintained the party faithful in their allegiance. The lecture hall, in the form of a Mechanics' Institute, an Institut Canadien, or a Cabinet de Lecture Paroissal was gradually challenging the pulpit as a means of moral suasion. Although that persuasion was often apolitical it still served to spread an equally whiggish

---

[8] For the former theme see S. F. Wise, "Kingston Elections and Upper Canadian Politics, 1820-36," Ontario History, LVII, Dec., 1965, pp. 205-25; for the latter see D. Creghton, The Empire of the St. Lawrence (Toronto: Macmillan, 1956), Ch. X, pp. 255-87.

gospel of material progress and improvement.[9]

It was that simple message of materialism which provided the strongest appeal for a change in the French Canadian outlook. The new bleus like Cartier, and the rouges like A. A. Dorion had much more in common with Macdonald and Brown, than with Lafontaine or Papineau. Although the new politicians also appreciated the political dictates of French Canadian national survival, they had accepted the criticisms of Lord Durham against their "backward race." The eighteen fifties witnessed the full assimilation of whig capitalism and bourgeois liberalism as economic programmes. With a self-confidence induced by prosperity, the French Canadian politicians appeared to relish the style, although not the reality, of political dialogue. As a group they were still capable of closing ranks where their national survival was at stake, but they now gave an appearance of dialogue and ideological conflict.

Whiggery thus provided an effective gospel of social and political change in mid-nineteenth century Canada. It placed few restraints upon commercial captialism, as old toryism had, and as emergent liberalism threatened to do. It was élitist, yet it did provide an impulse towards popular political persuasion in the form of political parties and the partisan press. It placed a premium on the middle class and directly fostered the growth of popular nationalism and even racism,[10] yet it stood to mute the effect of

---

[9] See supra, Ch. 5. pp. 382-89.

[10] See supra, Ch. 5.

racial and class rivalry upon political institutions. Its functional beauty was that it gave the appearance of diversity, without sacrificing much to stability. It could tolerate two nations, many religions, more political groups, and yet could by an acute sense of class consciousness and common behavioural norms prevent chaos.

(i) Political and Societal Ethics--Pragmatism, Progress, and Patrician Virtue

The Mid-Victorian Canadian like the Puritan needed a moral justification for his worldly enterprise. As R. H. Tawney has acutely observed in his classic work on the relation between religion and capitalism: "The philosophy which would keep economic interests and ethical idealism locked up in their separate compartments finds that each of the prisoners is increasingly restive."[11] Because of the heavy involvement of the Canadian state in economic enterprise and the religious diversity of the Province of Canada, the secular ethics of the politicians rather than the social teachings of the Christian churches must assume prior importance.[12] The ethical idealism of the mid-century politician often took the form of rationalization, as ethics often do. On the one hand he sought

---

[11] R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York: Mentor Books, 1958), p. 11. See also A. A. Rogow, H. D. Lasswell, Power, Corruption, and Rectitude (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1963).

[12] See H. G. Aitken, The State and Economic Growth (New York: Social Sc. Res. Cl, 1959), pp. 79-114.

an ideal which would justify the current release of entrepreneurial energy in society. But, on the other, he needed an ethic of restraint which would prevent that same energy from tearing the political fabric apart.

A native strain of whig capitalism had established itself as the counsel of rapid economic change. Because mid-century Canada was not yet advanced enough economically to risk the iron laws of laisser-faire, and yet too advanced politically to accept colonial status and petty colonial oligarchies, she needed a psychological halfway house. Canadian toryism as a political ideology was too constricting because of its anti-commercial bent, and overly scrupulous concern for 'disinterestedness.' Economic liberalism on the other hand did not apply to the Canadian experience, and British Liberalism was already too concerned by mid-century about monopoly to be of immediate relevance to Canadians.[13] Whig capitalism, in contrast to both, revelled in material progress and political self-determination, was statist or mercantilist in outlook and welcomed big business. The economic ethics of whig capitalism were equally ambivalent. Progress--but not too fast, and not too far. Pragmatism and expediency--but not corruption.

The politics and economy of the fifties moved so rapidly that expediency became an accepted way of life. Pragmatic and 'common sense' politics had become the order of the day. Tories as well as

---

[13] John Vincent, The Formation of the Liberal Party 1857-68 (New York: Scribner, 1967).

reformers were rapidly losing their sense of veneration for the time honoured dicta of Burke. "Reason and experience" had now given way to "common sense"--a word that had blown a chill wind into the hearts of the eighteenth century tory. Rare indeed was the tory who could still affirm as did Judge J. G. Bowes to John A. Macdonald, that "it suits the age best whatever it may be thought by our fathers and grandfathers. Tempora mutant, et nos in illis mutantur[14] occasionally a gracious compromise with the new era of materialism was also made by patricians like E. P. Taché. He wrote to Macdonald in 1858 of the necessities of "a practical spirit" and of "common sense," couching his appeal in an eloquent discourse upon duty--to party, nation, and state: "Il faut donc dans l'intérêt du parti moderée, dans l'intérêt du pays en général que vous n'abandonniez la barque de l'état qu'a la dernière extremité . . . et je compte beaucoup sur l'esprit pratique de vos amis politiques aussi bien que sur le common sense des habitants du Haut Canada."[15]

Such glosses upon political expediency were much rarer from the cruder hands among the tories and reformers. More typical of the eighteen fifties was the artful dodger who wrote to Macdonald in high spirits at the return of prosperity in 1859, for this now meant that "theoretical politicians" were now at a discount, and at a premium,

---

[14] J. G. Bowes to John A. Macdonald, Jan. 2, 1855, Toronto, Macdonald Papers, P. A. C., Vol. 336, part 1.

[15] E. P. Taché to J. A. Macdonald, Jan. 18, 1858, Macdonald Papers, P. A. C., Vol. 273.

"the men who weather the storm."[16] The publicans were also invading the Reform temple. Baldwin had seen little wrong with "practical, common sense politicians" to fill his party, but was equally concerned that they should show a conviction for certain well-defined principles.[17] But the Hincksite Pilot was prepared to throw principles to the wolves in search of practical expedients: "Theories may be beautiful and principles may look well on paper; but the question is--How will they work? We want practical men and practical measures in Canada--men who understand the state and requirements of the province--and measure adapted to its circumstances, as well as to the declared wishes of the people."[18]

More surprising than the advent of utilitarian ethics among moderate tories and reformers, was the general espousal of pragmatism by the radicals. When faced by a choice between utilitarian measures and democratic principles, they invariably chose the former. William Lyon Mackenzie certainly had little use any more for "the plausible theories" held out in the American constitution.[19] His conservative disposition was most apparent in his lengthy quotation from Lammenais' Modern Slavery on the superiority of utilitarian ethics over intellec-

---

[16] N. Spence to J. A. Macdonald, Oct. 14, 1859, Toronto, Macdonald Papers, P. A. C., Vol. 336.

[17] See R. Baldwin to W. H. Merritt, Feb. 4, 1848, Merritt Papers, P. A. C.; R. Baldwin to J. S. Macdonald, Feb. 1, 1848, J. S. Macdonald Papers, P. A. C.

[18] Montreal Pilot, May 3, 1849.

[19] Mackenzie's Weekly Message, Dec. 7, 1855.

tual nostrums:

> There is nothing more pernicious than systems purely intellectual, especially if they exhibit a thoroughly uncompromising character than the cries which are contested, however unjustly, or are repugnant to the greater number, than economical or philosophical speculations which are not applicable at the moment. Their effect is to frighten and keep in a state of deplorable inertness the best disposed men, whose aid would be most useful, sometimes indispensable.[20]

Mackenzie's followers were similarly possessed by an admiration of whiggish over democratic ethics. Robert Baldwin's adherence to "moderate, constitutional, popular measures, carried out with vigor and in good faith" was now seen as the correct path of "usefulness and power in a politician."[21]

The clear-grits were no less possessed with notions of utility and expediency. Even when clear-grittism was in its most pristine form in 1850, William McDougall urged an abandonment of theoretical narrowness and "the impracticable schemes of visionary men."[22] 'Democracy' and 'common sense' took on curious value in clear-grit rhetoric. It was apparent that "common sense democracy" had more affinity with whig constitutionalism than with republicanism to a politically embattled McDougall:

> All the ridings of York are ripe for the new platform . . . When the ball is fairly set going it will roll the country down to the level of common sense democracy . . . The party is not so seriously divided as its enemies desire.

---

[20] Ibid., Dec. 1, 1855.

[21] A. Davidson to W. L. Mackenzie, July 5, 1851, Niagara, P. O., Mackenzie Papers, P. A. O.

[22] North American, Aug. 30, 1850.

> The Praise God Barebone's Party of which Leslie is the secret and ardent abettor--is not yet in the ascendancy. Progressive measures--not mere red tape formalities and sectarian legislation dressed up in Andrew Marvel sighs and puritannical lamentations--are favorites with the leading intellects of the Province.[23]

The final demise of even these internecine quarrels over the semantics of reform principle came when McDougall called for a united Reform Party in 1854 on the grounds of "a moderate quantum of sense" and "enlightened expediency."[24]

The rouges manifested perhaps the strongest aversion to practical politics and politicians, but they rapidly learned that strict adherence to democratic principle would perpetually exclude them from office. In the early ideological stage of the rouge movement, both Papineau and Joseph Doutre expressed a disgust for practical politicians like Lafontaine. They were variously described as "l'homme de sens; l'homme pratique, [qui] a arreté devant un obstacle infranchisable" and the politician who "toujours se restreindra dans le mécanisme des causes et des effets présents."[25]

By the elections of 1854, however, the rouges had come to appreciate as virtues those same vices they had damned as political

---

[23] W. McDougall to C. Clarke, Aug. 22, 1850, Clarke Papers, P. A. C., microfilm.

[24] North American, May 3, 1854.

[25] L. J. Papineau to Dr. E. B. O'Callaghan, March 27, 1848, O'Callaghan Papers, P. A. C.; L'Avenir, July 14, 1849.

neophytes. Their candidates now stood before their electors espousing the majority ethics--whiggery and commerce. A. A. Dorion affirmed his support in both the elections of 1854 and 1857 that he stood for the "progressive Reform party, the party that has always proclaimed the most conciliating views with regard to Union between those of different origin; the most liberal, as regards civil, political, and religious liberty."[26] Other minor rouges promised their electors that they would support any ministry that came before Parliament with "un programme libéral, et [qui] conforme au exigences de l'époque."[27] The crowning irony was the appearance of the former annexationist L. A. Dessaulles before the electors of Rougemont in 1856 as a candidate for the new elective legislative council. The erstwhile tribune of democracy now stood for "réformes utiles" and "progrès sage et pratique."[28]

The single phrase "progrès sage et pratique" summed up yet another ethical premise of mid-century Canadian thought. The current belief in progress was like pragmatism regarded almost as a natural

---

[26]To the Electors of Montreal, Dec. 3, 1857, reprinted in New Era, Dec. 8, 1857.

[27]A. D. Bondy to the Electors of Berthier, July 7, 1854, La Minerve, July 11, 1854.

[28]Le Pays, Sept. 16, 1856. See also L. Holton to the Electors of Montreal, Dec. 4, 1857, New Era, Dec. 8, 1857; J. Young to the Electors of Montreal, La Minerve, July 13, 1854.

law of economic growth.[29] Both were ethics of material liberation. Yet positivism as a belief in the inevitability of material progress never really caught hold in Canada. Nor did the democratic or evangelical belief in the moral improvement of man. The theme was rather one of deliverance from the moral restrictions that had previously operated upon material and entrepreneurial pursuits. If a belief in moral purification did obtain it was largely in the internalized goals of evangelical protestantism or its Roman Catholic counterpart, ultramontanism. There was no broad social gospel of ferment in Canada of the dimension or the depth that swept the United States in the eighteen forties.[30] Abolitionism was a brush-fire in Canada. Temperance, penal reform, and societies for the moral improvement of everybody and everything were never more than pale imitations of the American original. Progress was measured in Canada not in moral absolutes like 'saved,' 'reformed,' or 'free,' but in terms of statistics.

Although progress always had a price attached to it, Canadian politicians gamely insisted that their progress was "wise" or "good" by comparison to the United States. This sense of righteousness had a false ring about it, yet it was understandable. Canada's economic growth was by comparison to its American neighbour, arithmetic as

---

[29] For a somewhat uncritical examination of this theme, see L. S. Fallis, "The Idea of Progress in the Province of Canada," (University of Michigan, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1965).

[30] See A. F. Tyler, Freedom's Ferment (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

opposed to geometric. That invidious comparison was so obvious that it begged an answer. Anti-Americanism was a favorite form of social reprisal. Nebulous norms of 'quality' were another. Canadian growth became better because it was slower. There was less social dislocation, and hence less social cost. Since utopian ideas of progress were then at best doubtful in their results, they were best cut off at their root.[31]

Even the tory heirs of Burke now indulged in a materialistic idea of progress. Gone were the severe restrictions that the Compact Tories had placed upon commerce, and the consequent restraints they had placed upon the merchants who served the St. Lawrence economy. These same conservatives still believed that a concentration upon material ends and utilitarian means would be ephemeral without an equivalent intellectual and spiritual advance. But they despaired of any immediate prospect the amelioration of public mores or intellect by democratic means: "Intellectual progress . . . entrusted to ignorant or corrupt hands is a dangerous weapon, confided to the intelligent and enlightened the greatest possible blessing."[32] French Canadian conservatives like E. P. Taché were not even convinced that English Canadian faith in improvement, however élitist, was justified: "Human nature, we must not forget, has and will for ever remain the same all over the world. Therefore in dealing with it we should not imagine

---

[31] See also supra, Ch. 5, pp. 130-74.

[32] Montreal Gazette, Jan. 2, 1857. See also Anglo-American Magazine, VI, p. 464.

that it is bordering almost on perfection, but take it such as it is with all its faults and infirmities."[33]

The liberal view of progress was not appreciably more optimistic than that of the conservative. To be certain there were those liberals such as Francis Hincks, William Hamilton Merritt or David Roblin who spread the classical economist's conviction in the inevitability of material advance.[34] But often that liberal faith in the general progress of mankind was generally lost in a parochial sense of Canada's destiny as the favored child of Providence.[35] Their concept of human progress could not be confused with the eschatologies of moral improvement entertained by genuine democrats in North America or Europe. J. S. Hogan's prize-winning essay on Canada in 1855 stressed the need for a slower pace of improvement in order that Canadians might have "sufficient conservatism to guard the fruits of their industry, and sufficient democracy to insist upon their right to do so." Hogan's concept of history was more pronounced than that of the Jacksonians or even the New England Transcendentalists. Whereas an American democrat often

---

[33] E. P. Taché to Wm. Patton, Jan. 10, 1851, Toronto, Taché-Langevin Coll., APQ.

[34] J. Jones to W. H. Merritt, Saamford C. W., 1852, Merritt Papers, P. A. C., Montreal Pilot, May 3, 1849; British Whig, Aug. 1, 1851.

[35] W. H. Merritt, Lecture Delivered before the Mechanics' Institute of St. Catharine's, H. F. Leavenworth, 1857; _____, Canada a Brief Outline of the Geographical Position, Productions, Climate Capabilities, (Toronto, 1857); J. S. Hogan, Canada, an Essay, (Montreal: J. Lovell, 1855). P.A.C. Pamphlet Collection.

saw time beginning with the democratic revolutions of the late eighteenth century, Hogan and other Canadians self-righteously promulgated Burke's timeless experience of the race: "These [Canadian] children cling around their grandfather's knee. They hear his tales of his glory, and they are made manly. They drink his lessons of wisdom, and they are made good."[36]

A general suspicion existed among members of the Reform group of Canada West for the extreme exponents of the idea of progress since they were invariably the same democrats whose visionary political ideas they distrusted. A political associate of Robert Baldwin confirmed the latter's suspicion that the clear grits were proceeding too quickly upon the road to reform: "It is a fact that the ruling spirit of our Country is progress. The great difficulty lies in keeping it within bounds and directing it properly."[37] William Sutherland, the editor of the London Free Press was similarly suspicious of the universal applicability of democratic institutions. He expressed a strong conviction that the French people in 1789 had never possessed enough "intelligence or experience" for the powerful theories of democratic revolution. Man had to be gradually educated up to progress by the whig expedients of local self-government, a free press, and a public school system:

---

[36] J. S. Hogan, Canada, p. 208.

[37] A. Dickson to R. Baldwin, Perth, Nov. 2, 1850, Baldwin Papers, Toronto Public Library.

> To prepare any people for the possession of genuine political liberty, two things at least are absolutely necessary; education provided for the masses, and an early initiation into the principles of self-government. Happily, in this country both requisites are amply and wisely provided, growing with our growth and strengthening with our strength as a people. Our widely spread schools, and our equally widely diffused municipal institutions are infallible guarantees of our future political freedom and advancement . . . . Those therefore who would attempt to stem the current of enlightened public opinion in Canada, might as well attempt to stop the unceasing play of the ocean's waves, or arrest the sun in his course. The duty of the public journalist, then is to assist in guiding public opinion aright in its onward march, to resist, if necessary, the machinations of the factious; to guard against innovations that, under the guise of Reform, might strike at the best interests and liberties of the country; to establish sound principles, which when carried out, will contribute to the happiness of man, the greatness of the country, the glory of the empire.[38]

The French Canadian view of progress was no less qualified in its optimism. Reformer and radical alike were concerned with man's external rather than internal progress, his gradual advance from barbarism rather than his promise in the future. Joseph Cauchon may have been a reformer but was more of a Roman Catholic in his denunciation of the doctrines of perfectibility emanating from the eighteenth-century philosophes. He jabbed sarcastically and often at the democratic revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as "signes incontestables de la perfectibilité humaine au plein midi de la civilization et du 19e siècle."[39] There is little evidence to indicate that even the rouges were much more than whiggish gradualists

---

[38] London Free Press, 1852, n.d. See also Toronto Leader, Dec. 20, 1854.

[39] Journal de Québec, Dec. 15, 1849.

in their idea of progress. For A. A. Dorion, the triumph of human liberty "a été lent et n'a été obtenu que graduellement et après une suite de succès variables. Chaque periode de cette longue lutte de '89 à 1848 qui est marqué par la chute d'un gouvernement ou le changement d'un dynastie, a vu grandir le peuple . . . dans la conquête d'un droit ou dans un liberté de plus."[40] This rear-view idea of progress did not stop in the eighteenth century but extended in an unbroken chain from republican Rome and the city states of Greece.[41] Nowhere in evidence was the telltale sign of the true democrat, a basic conviction in the moral perfectibility of man. When the rouges looked to the United States they were less concerned with the vivifying effect of republicanism upon the human spirit than with the material progress that society had made. One of the great signs of progress in the United States as they saw it was the rapid advance that had been made in the private ownership of property, since the Revolution.[42]

The intrinsic worth of republican virtue played even less part in the English radical outlook. Progress was not a natural law, it was an hypothesis predetermined by utilitarian and empirical priorities. Rare indeed was the appearance of the genuine doctrine. Only one rural Cassandra dared to parade her faith in humanity, and the inner forces of virtue and natural law over pragmatism and artifice:

---

[40] L'Avenir, June 30, 1849. Report of a speech to the St. Jean Baptiste Banquet at the Institut Canadien.

[41] L'Avenir, Sept. 15, 1857, June 5, 1849.

[42] L'Avenir, April 27, 1849.

> We can only judge right or wrong; of expediency or inexpediency. In principles only; or in other words accordance or discordance with natural laws. But I shall perhaps be told, that the idea of philosophical legislation is Utopian. It may be so but I have more faith in humanity. The present artificial state of things cannot always last. As sure as the mind, the internal moulds the external world, and progression is the destiny of mankind, so that all that is artificial and unnatural, must perish. All our institutions, which are not founded on the nature of things are doomed; and, even though their fall be a stormy one, and their graves be baptized in blood; who that knows the sins and misery of the present can dread the future.[43]

This democratic myth of destruction and rebirth won few allies from among the clear-grits. The editor of the Elora Backwoodsman defined progress as reform, and neither as negative forces: "We do not call that reform which is satisfied with exhausting itself in the work of mere destruction of social institutions or political establishments, we do not call that progress which can only carp at wrongs existent, and suggest no remedy for their removal."[44] Even Marcus Gunn, the transcendentalist pundit of the St. Thomas Observer, could never rise much above the prosaic empiricism displayed by that twentieth century apostle of the occult, Mackenzie King. Progress to Gunn was predetermined by a methodical empiricism--a knowledge of human psychology. He announced in the prospectus of the Observer that he considered the study and knowledge of humanity "as it is, as essential to ascertain human necessity, and hence, ensure the improvement of the general

---

[43]Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, April 28, 1855. Letter to the Editor from Mrs. Thomas, Brooklin, C. W.

[44]Prospectus, April 3, 1852, original in Ontario Archives.

social system. [The editor] will therefore deem it of importance to consider human nature under the regimen of circumstances."[45]

Misanthropy in the form of William Lyon Mackenzie cast a pall of gloom over the radical idea of progress. He warned a reform colleague in 1854 not to trust in the people, or "he may share a fate as hard as mine has been . . . and I have toiled for them 30 long years with scarce a thank ye."[46] He was no longer convinced that mankind would progress, but was merely hopeful that it would. In his prospectus for the Weekly Gazette in 1852 he appeared more surprised than convinced that mankind had progressed, and confined that progress to technology: "Since the writer was an infant in the cradle, how remarkable have been the changes, discoveries, and inventions highly favorable to human happiness!"[47] The moral conscience of that technical progress now lay in conservatism, and less in destructive radicalism which sought to destroy laws and institutions "instead of amending them."[48]

The radical's qualified view of progress thus differed little from that of his conservative contemporaries. Both were behavioural when they dealt with man's moral advance, and empirical when measuring

---

[45]Prospectus for the St. Thomas Observer in Marcus Gunn Papers, P.A.C.

[46]Wm. Lyon Mackenzie to Wm. Carrol, Toronto, March 27, 1854, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O.

[47]Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Dec. 25, 1852.

[48]Ibid., April 28, 1853.

that progress. Just as Mackenzie saw specific improvements in education, law, and administrative reform, so Hugh Scobie of the Colonist witnessed social improvement in terms of sobriety, self-help, and legal reform.[49] Like Mackenzie's progress, Scobie's was rooted in the past, with limited expectations and qualified enthusiasm for the future. The former expressed "a warm enthusiastic hopefulness as to the future," as did the latter. But Scobie entered the inevitable caveat; "for much as I think of our era, I do not deem it the advent of the millenium."[50] Both the tory and the radical had thus shifted their ground to the no-man's land of whiggery. Since both despaired ultimately of the moral or intellectual improvement of the mass they had at least agreed to compromise on his gradual material improvement.

Such a qualified view of progress was a powerful source for psychological stability. But it also provided along with pragmatism and empiricism an unsettling effect on the morals of the politicians. Since the moral dangers of material progress were no longer protected by a high spiritual hedge, they needed other ethical bounds. These were increasingly provided by the barriers of élitist social attitudes, and their attendant sense of righteous behaviour. Because politicians were no longer separated by obvious differences of social class, they magnified their minor differences out of all proportion. Radicals as

---

[49] British Colonist, Jan. 4, 1851.

[50] Weekly Gazette, Dec. 25, 1852; Colonist, Jan. 4, 1851.

well as reformers and tories prided themselves on their élitist virtue. Florid declamations against "factious politicians," "base intriguers," and "levellers" became common tools of political rhetoric. In French Canada, "démagogie," and "braillards pharisaïques" became popular terms of opprobrium for both bleus and rouges. Despite the significant rural community in the province, there was nowhere in evidence the arcadian values of agrarian democracy. Tories as well as radicals, bleu as well as rouge affected the ethical norms of aristocracy. More often than not 'virtue' was equated with the person of Robert Baldwin, or at least the whiggish virtues for which he stood.

Among the politicians of the right this contempt for the low tenor of politics was best expressed by Etienne Taché and John A. Macdonald. Throughout his political career the former was the perpetual aristocrat in his disdain for the sordid demands placed upon public servants in a democratic system. Now that the system was upon him and threatening to drag him down, Taché was more determined than ever to salvage a familial legacy of personal honour and unsullied reputation:

> Quant à moi, je suis si dégouté du honteux tripotage qui se pratique sous mes yeux, de la part de personnes que je puis plus estimer, que le plus vite je me trouverai débarrassé du soin des affaires, le plus content et le plus heureux je serai. Si pour rester à la conduite de la chose publique, il faut consentir aux actes les plus mal honnêtes, à la spoliation et au vol, il est temps que ceux qui se respectent disparaissent de la scène pour faire place à ceux que les énormités les plus monstreuses n'arrêtent pas dans leur course insensée. L'avenir nous jugera, l'on pourra comparer les actes de ceux qui nous ont précedés et de ceux qui nous succéderont aux nôtres, pour ma part je ne veux pas que mes enfants rougissent de mes actes; et je suis

> certain qu'ils n'exigeront jamais de moi que je sacrifie mes convictions et ma réputation d'homme public aux avantages éphémères qu'ils pourraient retirer, si je demeurais quelques mois de plus dans une position d'où je serai chassé plus tard avec ignominie: l'honneur avant tout; et une réputation sans tache, c'est ce qu'il m'importe, avant la fortune, de léguer à mes enfants: car la fortune acquise aux dépens du droit et de la justice ne profite jamais à ceux à qui elle échoit.[51]

Despite his tarnished image, John A. Macdonald was no less severe than either Taché or Baldwin in his demands for a high intellectual and moral standard. His expression of that standard could even take a whiggish turn, as the following denunciation of John Hillyard Cameron suggests:

> I am delighted to learn that Vankoughnet is to get a requisition. He is, I think, the best choice that can be made for Toronto. His abilities are undoubted. They are not confined as Hillyard Cameron's are, to a good memory and a vicious fluency of speech. His mind is liberal and suggestive, and his constituents will be sure that their interests will never suffer for the purpose of forwarding any selfish interests of his own . . . Cameron was useful in legal matters within the House, but he lacks general intelligence, and is altogether devoid of political reading. So that he was altogether a failure as a Statesman. Lord Elgin truly called him a "presumptuous Young Gentleman"--He seeks Parliament again for selfish instincts and I would be sorry to see him represent so powerful a constituency as Toronto.[52]

Other Macdonald letters are equally clear as to his moral rectitude in

---

[51] Taché to his wife, Aug. 25, 1851, Taché Papers, Arch. de la Prov. de Québec. See also Taché to Wm. Berczy, April 25, 1858, Berczy Papers, P.A.C.; Taché to C. J. Coursol, Nov. 7, 1851, Coursol Papers, P.A.C. For the English tory view of Canada East see Quebec Observer, July 26, 1854 and Montreal Gazette, Sept. 26, 1854 and July 21, 1855.

[52] J. A. Macdonald to Capt. Strachan, Kingston, Feb. 9, 1858, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 336, pt. 1.

dispensing political office. Although he relished the perquisites of power and delighted in being called the "best political manager of his day,"[53] Macdonald could be self-righteous in dismissing the requests of office-seekers either upon the grounds of potential public outrage at nepotism, or simply because the candidate had no ulterior motive beyond self-interest.[54]

Whether the genesis of Macdonald's scruples were the 'disinterestedness' of the Compact tories, or the 'honesty' of Robert Baldwin, is a moot question. His caution to a colleague to refrain from personal recrimination because politics was "a great game requiring great coolness and an utter abnegation of prejudice and personal feeling"[55] would suggest that it was Baldwin rather than Strachan who had the greater influence. Strachan would never have admitted to suppressing a prejudice. Furthermore, he saw responsible government and political parties as an unmitigated disaster: "I am of the opinion that till we had responsible government in the Colony we knew nothing of the corruption of Government--now the ministry as they call it whether Conservative or Reform seem to have no other object than to get good places --all is party and I may say all is corruption and it matters little

---

[53] See Alexander Campbell to J. A. Macdonald, Kingston, March 8, 1855, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 194.

[54] See Macdonald to Judge Boswick, July 2, 1858, J. A. Macdonald Letterbook, P.A.C., Vol. 506, I, p. 226; J. A. Macdonald to Judge McLean, Toronto, Jan. 28, 1856, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 504; E. Thorne to J. A. Macdonald, Orono, Feb. 21, 1858, ibid., Vol. 336, pt. 2.

[55] J. A. Macdonald to S. Smith, Oct. 13, 1860, S. Smith Papers, P.A.C.

which faction is in power."[56]

Although certain high-tories like Strachan were constitutionally incapable of accepting party government, his moderate successors like W. H. Draper and Macdonald obviously were. Although they had maintained much of the high-tory's aristocratic contempt for "low intriguers" and "barefaced office-seekers," they did recognize and applaud talent when it appeared in the opposition benches. That the political struggle between moderate tories and reformers was often a sham-battle between high-minded gentlemen was apparent in Chief Justice Draper's congratulation of Lafontaine upon his appointment to the Chief Justiceship of Lower Canada. Draper's felicitations and respect for "the talents and character of a former opponent" and Lafontaine's feelings for "le plus habile et plus éloquent" of his former rivals, were reminiscent of the feelings of mutual admiration which passed between whig patricians like Adams and Jefferson, or Burke and Fox.[57] Even violently partisan tory journals like the Hamilton Gazette could appreciate the aristocratic virtues of Robert Baldwin once safely retired. In a vicious tirade against his clear-grit successors the Gazette lauded "Mr. Baldwin [who] was read in constitutional law, and venerated the authorities upon whose wisdom was

---

[56] J. Strachan to R. Gillespie, July 2, 1848, Strachan Letterbook, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[57] See W. H. Draper to L. H. Lafontaine, Toronto, Aug. 17, 1853, Lafontaine Papers, P.A.C.; L. H. Lafontaine to W. H. Draper, Aug. 26, 1853, ibid.

constructed the constitution of England."[58]

Baldwin himself was as ill-equipped as many of his tory opponents to cope with the partisan politicians within his own party. Rather than see his conservative approach to politics and political institutions undermined, he retired:

> I felt that if unable to protect measures such as the Judiciary Acts of 1849 from becoming the sport of demagog [sic] clamor before they had been 2 years in operation I could have no hope of being able to sustain any of the Institutions of the Country or procure for any measures for their improvement however deliberately framed anything approaching to a fair trial . . . If the sober mind of this country is not prepared to protect our institutions it can't be helped. It was at all events, as it appears to me, right that that sober mind, if there is such a thing of any considerable weight at present, should not be put upon its guard in the most emphatic manner that it was in my power to do against the consequences of that reckless disregard of the first principles if unchecked can lead but to widespread social disorganization with all its fearful consequences. And as deeds speak better than words my resignation seemed to me the best mode of doing this.[59]

Baldwin's reasoning for remaining aloof from the judiciary in 1854 was similarly loaded with fears of his loss of consequence in a new area of endeavour and the possible opportunities that it might offer "for demagogues to chatter upon."[60]

The distaste manifested by Baldwin and Lafontaine for the new politics was transmitted to their successors. However, the restatement

---

[58] Hamilton Gazette, March 1, 1853. See also March 4, 1852; July 8, 1852.

[59] R. Baldwin to J. Ross, June 28, 1851, Toronto, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C.

[60] R. Baldwin to J. Ross, Aug. 17, 1854, Spadina, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C.

of that sense of élitism often lost considerable eloquence in the process of translation. Joseph Cauchon, who aspired to Lafontaine's mantle of leadership, professed to the latter his repugnance towards the new breed of politician (of which he himself was the archetype). He especially lamented the gulf which had been created between leaders and the led by these "jeunes étourdis sans principe, sans notions même du gouvernement, et de la chose publique."[61] A similar persistence of political snobbery manifested itself among Robert Baldwin's protegés in Canada West. David Roblin, a somewhat obscure reformer representing Lennox and Addington, decried the necessity of the coalition between Hincks and MacNab in 1854 as the product of "a few designing men actuated by a desire to get office themselves, and by selfish motives."[62] The correspondence of more prominent moderates like John Sandfield Macdonald and William Hamilton Merritt similarly echoed Baldwin's homilies on "honest government."[63] Rarely did the moderate reformers or their correspondents indicate a fundamental difference on principle

---

[61]Cauchon to Lafontaine, Toronto, Aug. 13, 1851, P.A.C., Lafontaine Papers.

[62]D. P. Roblin to D. B. Stevenson, Quebec, Sept. 12, 1854, Lennox and Addington Hist. Soc. Coll., microfilm, P.A.C. See also E. Perry to D. Roblin, Ernestown, Sept. 12, 1854, ibid. See also Toronto Leader, Jan. 4, 1854 and April 3, 1856.

[63]J. Jones to W. H. Merritt, Stamford, C. W., Aug. 17, 1854, Merritt Papers, P.A.C. See also D. E. McIntyre to J. S. Macdonald, Cornwall, April 22, 1853 and Sept. 24, 1854, J. S. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.; A. M. Mackenzie to J. S. Macdonald, Sept. 22, 1854, Cornwall, ibid., Vol. 1; G. Alexander to J. S. Macdonald, Woodstock, March 16, 1853, ibid., Vol. 1; R. Smiley to J. S. Macdonald, Hamilton, Feb. 27, 1853, ibid., Vol. 1.

over political issues as genuine ideologues often do. The bulk of their correspondence was rather expended in paranoid exercises of puritannical rectitude. Such declamation against "Canadian Talleyrands" and "shaving-shop politicians" no doubt accounted for the dismal public image which politics enjoyed in the eighteen-fifties. According to the London Free Press politics and politicians had by their own hand lost not only self-respect, but also respect of the general populace: "I am sick of politicians," says one, "there's not a soul of them to be trusted," says another, "I'm done with politics forever," says a third.[64]

The ironic aspect of mid-century political psychology was that even the politicians of the left indulged in such brahminic jeremiads upon political morality. Clear-grits and old reformers alike paraded their élitist virtue and their sense of aristocratic decadence before correspondents and public alike. Few indeed were those radicals like David Christie who affirmed a faith in democratic principles, and the innate capability of the electorate to be enlightened by political education.[65] Most were like William Lyon Mackenzie, distrustful of the people, and yet even more distrustful of their fellow politicians. But Mackenzie's disenchantment with politicians had shifted in its style from the eighteen-thirties. He cited not from Andrew Jackson or Joseph Hume but from Burke's Vindication of Natural Society:

---

[64]London Free Press, Feb. 15, 1856.

[65]See D. Christie to W. L. Mackenzie, Dec. 30, 1852, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O. See also same to same, Oct. 2, 1854, ibid.

> People often imagine that the noblest, honestest men, of course, be at the head of governments; but so far as our experience enables us to form a judgement, Burke was quite right where he said in his "Vindication of Natural Society" that,
>
> The very name of politician or statesmen is sure to cause terror and hatred; it has always connected with it the ideas of treachery, cruelty, fraud and tyranny, and those writers who have faithfully unveiled the mysteries of state freemasonry, have even been held in general detestation for knowing perfectly a theory so detestable.
>
> Cunning men climb into seats of power by pretending to patriotism they do not possess, and thus blinding the multitude; they keep their seats by treachery, fraud and corruption--often betraying the people who trusted them, and cheating and circumventing one another. Thus are nations and provinces governed.[66]

Elitism had also bitten the clear-grits. The venomous negatives of Baldwin against "demagogues" and "unprincipled politicians" were a common item in their vocabulary. Charles Clarke's homilies on public morality might even have been transposed from the diatribes of the Compact Tories against radicalism:

> I see few editors caring no more for party adhesions and success of principles than they do for an old shoe, so anxious to outstrip the ox in size--so purely selfish in all they say and do that they would willingly sink every public man, through the weight of their calumnies and vituperation, if they could thereby raise themselves another inch in the ladder of temporary popularity. . . . I see them, week after week, retailing scandal, revelling in misrepresentation, and using every effort to blast the good name of party leaders, as much their superiors in every respect, but in that one particular branch of political

---

[66] Mackenzie's Weekly Message, Oct. 6, 1853. See also W. L. Mackenzie to A. N. Buell, Washington, March 15, 1850, Buell Papers, P.A.O. In this private letter Mackenzie was considerably more blunt, calling as he did all politicians "the same cold-blooded creatures--take'em in general everywhere."

> immorality which gives the reviling gang their peculiar character, as the upright Adam was to the fallen Lucifer. . . .[67]

But the clear-grits were considerably unlike either the old or the new tories in their private sense of virtue. That clearly marked them as whigs. George Brown rationalized his defeat to Mackenzie in 1851 by first denouncing Mackenzie as a 'liar' and a 'demagogue.' He then lauded his own virtues as shamelessly as Baldwin did on his loss in 1830: "But while carelessly striving for the return of men of my own principles, I have refrained from offering for any county and have left unimproved several opportunities presented to me, from the fear that my seeking personal advancement might hurt the cause I espoused, might weaken my testimony on behalf of great principles."[68] William McDougall went even further in chastizing a fellow grit for his desertion of principle in 1860. He delivered an eloquent homily on the duties of a representative, punctuated by such pious reproofs as, "I humbly think a man's word, a man's honor, a man's duty to himself, should like the shadow of the Indian wife's husband, be always before his eyes and prevent him from seeing any other man."[69]

---

[67] Charles Clarke to Wm. McDougall, Elora, April 24, 1854, Clarke Papers, P.A.C., microfilm (originals in Ontario archives).

[68] G. Brown to A. Mackenzie, Toronto, Sept. 13, 1851, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.C., microfilm (originals at Queen's University). See also G. Brown to Peter Brown, Brantford, Jarvis, 1851, Brown Papers, P.A.C.; Chas. Robinson to G. Brown, Brantford, Feb. 3, 1853, Brown Papers, P.A.C.

[69] W. McDougall to J. R. Clark, Millbank Farm, York Mills, July 25, 1860, McDougall Papers, P.A.C.; see also Wm. McDougall to C. Clarke, Feb. 2, 1853, Clarke Papers, P.A.C., microfilm (originals, P.A.O.).

French Canadian radicals were by contrast confused in defining their political ethics. Papineau could be counted upon for self-contradiction. He combined, for example, the aristocratic disdain of the seigneur for office-seekers, yet he strongly criticized the Reform leaders for complete desertion of the democratic ideals of the patriotes.[70] In a manner common to democratic ideologues he then placed the blame for the prevalent corruption at the feet of responsible government and the colonial connection: "Je crois . . . que le désorganisation du pouvoir, est un moindre mal que son organisation, combinée de manière à généraliser la démoralisation politique dans tout le corps social, et à sanctionner et perpetuer l'arbitraire des fonctionnaires publics."[71]

Papineau's rouge compatriots on L'Avenir manifested a similar ambivalence upon élitism and political virtue. On the one hand, they evinced a haughty disdain for unprincipled behaviour among the Reform leadership. Singled out for special abuse in a rogues' gallery of the House were Baldwin, Hincks, Lafontaine, and Cauchon. L'Avenir's essential criticisms were as heavily laced with patrician romanticism as with democratic ideology:

> On ne trouvera dans ses discours l'enseignement d'aucuns des grands principes du droit public ou privé, aucune considération d'un ordre élevé ... Si toutes les discussions parlémentaires étaient marquées au même

---

[70] L. J. Papineau to E. B. O'Callaghan, Montreal, March 27, 1848, Papineau Papers, P.A.C.

[71] L. J. Papineau to R. Christie, Petite Nation, Nov. 9, 1854, Neilson Coll., P.A.C.

> coin assurément ce seraient un tres grand mal. On tomberait par là dans le matérialisme qui tue tous les principes, qui ne laisse voir que les besoins du moment qui ferait des intérêts matériels et exceptionnels parfois; la base de la législation; qui habiteraient les esprits à substituer toujours et partout l'expédience aux principes de justice et de morale.[72]

On the other hand, they were clearly democratic ideologues in their attacks on the vestiges of aristocratic corruption such as the upper house, which only served to debase public morals and accustom vain men to sacrifice their convictions for power.[73]

By 1851 this anti-aristocratic posture was no longer necessary to the rouges. As apostles of "l'élan progressif" they expressed little preference as to whether there should be a change in the structure of government or simply the men who ran it.[74] By 1854 and the appearance of the rouges as a significant political party, it was certain that a change of institutions was no longer an issue. The only tactical recourse was to return to the measures and men of the Liberal-Conservative coalition as a focus for public discontent. Even there the rouges showed a restraint uncommon to ideologues. L. A. Dessaulles now had little but praise for his personal opponent in an electoral contest. The aspirant legislative councillor, Major Campbell, was congratulated for his enlightened views on public morality, and was promised by Dessaulles that no acrimony would enter the campaign from his side: "De lui à moi, la lutte sera conduite avec toute la

---

[72] L'Avenir, July 14, 1849. See also July 21, 1849.

[73] Ibid., Oct. 5, 1850.

[74] Ibid., April 2, 1851.

courtoisie et la déférence qui se doivent des hommes bien élévés."[75] Clearly Dessaulles had come to view the upper house as a senate filled with virtuous gentlemen, who differed only on broad issues of public policy.

The rouges had submitted to the inexorable elimination of ideology from mid-century politics. The quasi-federal structure and sectional composition of the province had prevented any system of beliefs, whether reactionary or radical, from capturing political power. Integration of societal ideals had to function along class lines rather than horizontal or territorial lines. The bourgeois composition of the House had naturally lent itself to the pursuit of commercial objectives. Pragmatism and utility were in turn natural psychological rationalizations for those material goals.

The more interesting problem had come with the moral restraints which should hedge economic action. Since neither Calvinism, high Anglicanism, nor Roman Catholicism could apply in a total sense, the middle class politicians were in the ironic position of having to find class restraints to their own class drives. For that reason, élitist prescriptions of political purity had no natural context. Without social foundations of any kind, aristocratic virtue had assumed a purely political character which operated solely within the provincial House, on the hustings, and in the partisan press. Whereas the earlier Compacts and Cliques and the major politicians of the forties often

---

[75] L. A. Dessaulles, St. Hyacinthe, Sept. 12, 1856, reported in Le Pays, Sept. 16, 1856.

aspired to the social norms of aristocracy, the politician of the fifties was more often concerned with élitism and whiggery as moral glosses for unrestrained commercialism and political flexibility.

This contradictory system of societal ethics was significant for its internal construction. Burke's dicta on aristocratic virtue no longer constrained tories from railroad speculation. Bentham's utility and Paine's Common Sense had only a vague kinship with the commercial definitions of those terms in mid-century Canada. Comte's positivism or the American idea of moral perfection had equally little to do with the material limitations placed upon Canadian progress. Societal ideals had instead been broadly defined by the psychological and social dictates of Canadian society. That had been much less true of the colonial societies of Upper and Lower Canada where Blackstone and Burke, Voltaire and Locke had served to divide rather than unite because of their contextual irrelevance.

(ii) The Idea of Political Party

If one listened to the principals themselves, the great political debate of the eighteen-fifties was ostensibly between 'measures' and 'men.' If rhetoric were one's only guide, one might have been transposed to the age of Burke, Fox, Jefferson, and Adams. Mid-nineteenth century politicians in Canada had espoused the whig theory of party formation as loose alliances of men united upon some "particular

principle" or "controversial view."[76] Just as British politics of the period witnessed the great friendship of Burke and Fox, and American politics the great collaboration between Madison and Jefferson, so Canadian politics had its great teams--Lafontaine and Baldwin, Macdonald and Cartier, and its great causes--the Great Ministry, the Great Coalition. Even the "third party whigs" and "the tertium quid" had their parallel in the 'loose-fish' of Canadian politics.[77] With the return of radicalism in 1850, the whig parallel was complete. The ideologues of the revolution, the rouges, clear-grits, and 'old reformers' had returned like Jefferson and Fox to haunt and perhaps even overthrow conservatives like Adams and Pitt.

So much at least for the rhetorical parallel. Yet political reality provides another dimension as indispensable as Burke's desertion of Fox, or Jefferson's abilities as a political organizer.[78] If there had indeed been significant differences of 'principle' between Canadian politicians in the eighteen-fifties, then their political actions would have, by the simple laws of probability, exhibited as significant a deviation towards independent action as to united action.

---

[76] See J. Carswell, The Old Cause, p. 344; L. I. Bredvold and R. G. Ross, The Philosophy of Edmund Burke (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960), p. 134; Montreal Gazette, September 3, 1851, and October 21, 1852.

[77] See F. O'Gorman, The Whig Party and the French Revolution (London: Macmillan, 1967), pp. 122-39; N. Cunningham, "Who were the Quids?", Miss. Vall. Hist. Review (September, 1963), pp. 252-64.

[78] See F. O'Gorman, The Whig Party, p. 239; N. Cunningham, The Jeffersonian Republicans--The Formation of a Party Organization, 1789-1801 (Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press, 1963).

As Professor Cornell has amply demonstrated in his fruitless search for 'loose-fish', the politicians of the fifties showed a high degree of consistency in their voting behaviour.[79] After the realignment of 1854, there followed a period of resettling as coalition reformers and an occasional apostate like Alexander Galt found their way into the ruling coalition. Singularly lacking were those men of 'principle' who would cross over into a minority party. Independents like Robert Christie, Colonel Prince, and even Papineau either disappeared, or like Mackenzie were swallowed up by a major political group.

The politics of the Union period could hardly have been otherwise. Distinct principles or divisive ideology had little place in a quasi-federal system. It had even less place in a precarious culture like French Canada. The rout of the rouges in the annexation crisis established that fact very firmly. The rouges had either to come to terms with the realities of national survival or perish themselves. The symbol of their choice for the first alternative was the death of L'Avenir in 1852 as an ideological journal, and its rebirth in 1856 as a narrowly partisan, nationalist newspaper. Somewhere between the two dates, the differences between rouge and bleu had been muted to the point where they were merely arbitrary ones of style and nomenclature.

In Canada West, all politicians fully appreciated the political and economic facts of the Union by 1849. The irony of the eighteen-fifties was that the tories were quicker to adopt the political lessons

---

[79] P. Cornell, The Alignment of Political Groups, pp. 67-76.

taught by Robert Baldwin than were the reformers. It was the conservatives who most effectively combined the whig rhetoric of parties and combinations with the techniques of political realism. The divided reformers were on the other hand mesmerized by that same rhetoric and the confidence that the Canadians were ineluctably attracted to them. Torn by their internal troubles, they did not concern themselves with external appearances until the Reform Alliance of 1857. By that time they had lost advantage and game to the well-disciplined conservatives.

Despite its tantalizing and deceitful character whig rhetoric did serve a useful political role in the eighteen-fifties. It was the lowest common ideological denominator to which all parties had to descend if they aspired at all to political power. For French Canada this meant that the rouges had to abandon many of their pretensions to liberal-democracy, and for English Canada that the tories had to bid farewell to the Family Compact. Although their purpose in seeking political power varied widely, the politicians of all parties could only define their means in vague terms. Whiggery provided a psychological mean standing as it did between popular control and juntos, between rigid principle and patronage, between local and national interest, between 'measures' and 'men', and finally between theory and reality.

(a) Canada West

Upper Canadian Toryism had undergone a subtle transformation in the eighteen-forties. It had come to accept with the ascendancy of

MacNab and the appearance of the modern conservatives like Draper and Macdonald that political parties were a necessary instrument of political survival.[80] They had gone even further to a whig definition of parties as engines of principle, and as a necessary by-product of free political institutions.

Whiggery in effect enabled the tory to reconcile his past traditions with the present. Elitist leadership in the national or provincial interest was still their fundamental premise in politics. The tory as whig merely abandoned the junto mentality of the Compact and the Clique for a persuasive style of politics that better suited the period. Whiggery also enabled the tory to consult the people, but rarely be bound and constrained by their mandate. The whig theory of parties as men combined in common principle enabled the tory to take similar liberties even with his own party. At one time they could use it as a vehicle to united political action, and at others they could claim that principle carried them outside of their own party to a coalition. Toryism may then have abandoned its ideological moorings for a whiggish obfuscation of theory and reality, but it was a controlled kind of confusion that nearly always redounded to its political benefit.

John A. Macdonald clearly found it expedient to become an ideological whig. Much like the whig or reformer Macdonald yearned publicly at least for a neat division of politics along lines of principle, and

---

[80] See D. Beer, "The Political Career of Sir Allan MacNab" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Queen's University, 1963); G. Metcalf, "The Political Career of William Henry Draper, 1836-47" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Toronto, 1959).

even for the classic whig ideal--a two party system:

> There was scarcely any great principle left on which parties were divided. That is an unwholesome state of things where no great principle is at stake. When no great questions divide parties, politics are apt to become a personal matter--people struggle for party purposes and not for the sake of principles. I am glad that, in consequence of the late proceedings and acts performed by a large and respectable party in Canada we can again form ourselves into two parties.[81]

Macdonald's public inclination to display his fondness for liberality was evident in his statement to the electors of Brantford on the long-standing principles of the tory party: "Our connection with the British Empire, the maintenance of the freedom of speech, of the liberty of the press, and of those other rights which a free people hold dear."[82] Even Macdonald's private correspondence revealed a consciously tolerant posture on racial relations, church-state relations, indeed on politics itself.[83]

The conservative press had become equally insistent upon a whiggish style of political persuasion. Despite the fact that it represented a most obvious source of party and government patronage,[84] it

---

[81] J. A. Macdonald to the Electors of Kingston, p. 94. See also p. 85.

[82] Ibid., p. 8.

[83] See J. A. Macdonald to B. Chamberlin, January 21, 1856, B. Chamberlin Papers, P.A.C.; J. A. Macdonald to S. Smith, October 13, 1860, S. Smith Papers, P.A.C.

[84] See R. A. Hill, "A Note on Newspaper Patronage During the Late 1850's and early 1860's," C.H.R. (March, 1968), 44-59; Wm. O'Brien to J. A. Macdonald, Toronto, Colonist Office, April 25, 1860, J. A. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 337, Pt. 1; J. Macdonald to B. Chamberlin, July 19, 1859, B. Chamberlin Papers, P.A.C.; E. Thorne to J.A. Macdonald, Feb. 21, 1859, Orono, Orono Press Office, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.

could turn viciously upon Sir Allan MacNab for his statement that his politics were railroads. The Montreal Gazette lectured MacNab at some length on the nature of free institutions and party government where "men honestly differ in their opinions of the manner in which a government should be carried on, and [where] honest men range themselves under the banner of opposing parties according to their convictions . . . of what is best for the advancement of their country."[85] When the editor, Brown Chamberlin, began to define those principles for which modern conservatives stood, he was clearly concerned to cast off the penumbra of reaction that had haunted old toryism:

> The Tory as described by Hallam is a person who thinks the form of the constitution must not, in any particular, or any account be altered--that is paramount to every other consideration. Now we never knew a politician in Canada who so nearly answered this description as the 'reformer': we know none now on the political stage who answer to it. The Conservatives in Canada are much more liberal in reality than those who style themselves liberals. They have even advocated changes in the constitution which the "Liberals" have not; and thus have led in the van of progress and reform.
>
> The Conservative in Canada feels that the very constitution of the country is but an essay not remarkable for perfection, nor claiming the respect that a long established constitution would. He knows that political institutions are things which are most difficult of all others to transplant; and has long smiled at making "transcripts" of constitutions. No constitution is valuable but that which accommodates itself to the wants and intelligences of a people; and which these influences gradually mould into shape. The Conservative in this country finds it necessary, while respecting sound constitutional maxims to make experiments even in political institutions; and to advocate the progress and reforms which a young country possessing but

---

[85] Montreal Gazette, Oct. 29, 1852. See also British Colonist, Feb. 1, 1853.

> an experimental constitution demands. Canadian conservatives are, therefore, not Tories either, according to Hallam's, or any other definition of the word.[86]

There were however other clear remnants of toryism which balanced off this craving for a liberal or progressive image. One such remnant was their tolerance for an independent and often isolated expression of principle. Unlike the French Canadian conservative or even the fragmented reform parties of Canada West, the tory found some cause for redemption in ideologues like Mackenzie, Papineau, and even the early rouges. While they often despised the clear-grits for their roughness of manner and their fanatic devotion to factionalism,[87] they had a clear regard for Mackenzie. Hugh Allan was much better pleased to see Mackenzie win in Haldimand than George Brown, because of the violent partisanship of the latter.[88] The rouges were also congratulated for their devotion to "abstract political opinions contenting themselves with the moderate though firm expression of them as occasion brought them out."[89] Papineau was especially applauded for his principled stand on the representation bill of 1849. The editor of the Montreal Gazette severely reprimanded those French Canadian reformers who had hissed him in the House as "time-seeking lickspittles of an infamous faction [who] do not know what integrity is, what honesty is, what

---

[86]Montreal Gazette, Aug. 2, 1855. See also Sept. 3, 1855.

[87]Montreal Gazette, Jan. 22, 1857.

[88]H. Allan to W. Morris, Montreal, April 28, 1851, Morris Papers, P.A.C. See also Hamilton Gazette, May 30, 1853.

[89]Montreal Gazette, Aug. 28, 1854.

unbending principle is."[90] The conservatives therefore made some provision for healthy dissent within their own party. Absolute party allegiance, they argued, should be occasionally slackened for the likes of William Pitt and the Earl of Derby who challenged the dictates of "stupid red tape consistency."[91]

The tory was also much more inclined to submit to the necessities of political survival than his mid-century liberal equivalent. It is apparent that the moderate conservative, in distinct contrast to mid-century liberals and reformers, recognized the fact that philosophic conservatism could never win public support, since the general mass often voted for the men who composed the party, rather than a well reasoned philosophy or platform.[92] But it was something else again to allow popular control of the party's leadership. The tory preferred to retain a tribalistic concept of a natural leader's emergence:

> In fact a party can never make leaders; they must make themselves. A man must earn the confidence of those who coincide in his opinions, by previous service, if a party is composed of intelligent men, before confidence can be bestowed. His name must have been familiar to a certain degree, among all men of the same opinion in the country, before the party will receive him or acknowledge him as a leader. A few individuals, whatever their own standing, cannot confer command upon anyone, who has not shown himself capable of exercising it. A leader, in short, must be in a position to take his post, in spite of personal predilections of colleagues or

---

[90] Montreal Gazette, May 22, 1849.

[91] Montreal Gazette, Dec. 14, 1853.

[92] Montreal Gazette, July 31, 1856.

> opponents by virtue of the opinion of the whole party, or he cannot be leader.[93]

Macdonald, although suspicious of popular control in the party, would allow it in special circumstances. He announced his dislike of "the Yankee system of caucus as a general rule" but allowed a subordinate to use it at the local level as "the only way to avoid disunion."[94] On another occasion he announced his dislike of the convention system, but indicated that, in the interests of expediency, they might be allowed. Macdonald's liberality was only restricted by one whiggish caveat--that "a really respectable and influential body of delegates" be called together.[95] Although he adamantly resisted any form of popular plebiscite to ratify the Quebec resolutions in 1864 as "unconstitutional and anti-British," he still did allow for the whiggish expedients of public meetings and petitions to gauge the popular feeling for federation.[96] Like Baldwin, he was then prepared to consult the popular will, but was equally determined not to be constrained by its decision.

The tory view of representation also had a healthy ambivalence

---

[93]Montreal Gazette, Aug. 18, 1853. The tribalistic concept was reflected in the contemporary use of 'Chief' in reference to Macdonald; A. Morrison to John A. Macdonald, Toronto, Oct. 14, 1859, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 336, pt. 2.

[94]J. A. Macdonald to Capt. Strachan, Feb. 9, 1854, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.

[95]J. A. Macdonald to H. A. Becher, Quebec, March 15, 1862, Becher Papers, P.A.C.

[96]J. A. Macdonald to Samuel Amsden, Quebec, Dec. 1, 1864, Amsden Papers, P.A.C.

about it. It appeared as a combination of the old politics of connection with the liberal art of rational persuasion. Their objective, it appeared was to elect "well and largely connected" men to the Assembly so that office would be "no object of desire on account of its emoluments only."[97] Yet tories were equally opposed to the idea that representation should be confined exclusively to local residents, when non-residents of greater ability, influence, and experience were readily available.[98] Their most important attribute once elected was their ability to take the broad national interest into account, and to be able to persuade in a dignified hall "where great national interests are gravely weighed, worthily considered, and rationally decided upon."[99]

Coalitions were approached by the Conservatives in much the same ambivalent manner. John A. Macdonald displayed a healthy disregard for party controls in his unilateral attempts to attract opposing politicians to the tory camp. For him the candidate's connection remained the measure of his potential worth. He admitted in 1855 that Joseph Cauchon would not "set the St. Lawrence on fire," but that he was "a shrewd common sense man and understands human nature as his unlimited influence in the District of Quebec shows."[100] His subsequent attempts

---

[97] See A. MacNab to J.A. Macdonald, Dundurn, June 17, 1861, Macdonald Papers, Vol. 246, P.A.C. Hamilton Gazette, Aug. 23, 1852.

[98] Montreal Gazette, Aug. 2, 1853.

[99] Montreal Gazette, Aug. 23, 1852.

[100] J. A. Macdonald to J. Langton, Quebec, Feb. 6, 1855, Langton Papers, P.A.O. See also J. A. Macdonald to Henry Smith, Quebec, Jan. 27, 1855, Sir Henry Smith Papers, P.A.O.

to lure David Hoblin and Alexander Galt into the party in 1857 were justified with as little reference to principle. Macdonald's exhortation to Galt to abandon the rouges and become "true blue" because "it is a good standing colour and bears washing" was testimony to his pragmatic view of politics and political coalitions.[101]

Yet the tories felt publicly compelled to defend the coalition of 1854 between MacNab, Morin and Hincks in similar ideological terms to those posed by reformers. In response to those critics within his own party was accused him of "immoral combination," MacNab delivered an eloquently whiggish rebuttal. His appeal to the electors of Hamilton in 1854 revealed an aristocratic conviction in national over party interests and also a whig's concern for progress and reform:

> My political opponents charge me with deserting my principles, because I have succeeded in uniting the liberal-Conservatives, the leading moderate men of both sections of the province, and thus forming, what I trust, will prove a strong and good government for the country . . . That I shall have the honor of acting with gentlemen, with whom I have honestly differed in opinion, is most certain, but if men of honour can agree to act in concert on measures of political interest for the general good - I see no reason, and I think you will see none, for calling such a junction "an immoral combination."
>
> A distinguished English Commoner has said that "the people of England do not like coalitions." Perhaps not, yet it so happens that the "Queen's Government" is at present carried on by a coalition commanding large majorities in both houses of Parliament, and conducting successfully one of the greatest

---

101 J. A. Macdonald to A. T.Galt, Nov. 2, 1857, P.A.O. See also J. A. Macdonald to D. Roblin, Toronto, Dec. 13, 1857, Lennox and Addington Hist. Soc. Coll., P.A.C. (microfilm).

> wars the Empire has ever encountered. The existence of this remarkable coalition Ministry is regarded by the nation as marking a great epoch in its political history, in which the old barriers of party feuds have been swept away, superseded by the new and purer principles of the age of progress.
>
> Yes, Gentlemen this is an "age of progress" and I hope of continued improvement. It is necessary, however, to be careful that the machine of Government is not forced on with too great velocity--but it cannot stand still and he will prove the ablest Minister who guides the administration of the affairs of the Country with prudence, moderation and sagacity, in keeping with the spirit of the age, and in accordance with the deliberate judgement of the people.[102]

MacNab was congratulated by other members within his party for this public conversion to a more liberal variety of conservatism. John Langton, member for Peterborough and subsequently Auditor-General admitted his feeling that coalitions were "in themselves evil" but that the interests of the country demanded strong government. He therefore applauded the "breaking down of party lines to promote the progress of the country, and carry[ing] into effect the necessary legislation it demanded."[103] Once the coalition began its work of attacking the clergy reserves and seigneurial tenures issues as open questions they were congratulated even further by the Montreal Gazette for striking a decisive blow against party government.[104]

The tory's attachment to party then appeared to operate as a

---

[102] Hamilton Gazette, Oct. 12, 1854.

[103] J. Langton, speech in the House of Assembly, Sept. 15, 1854, Mirror of Parliament. See also A. Morrison to Wm. Kirby, April 13, 1855, Kirby Papers, P.A.O.

[104] Montreal Gazette, Aug. 17, 1854.

direct function of his capacity to attain or retain political power. As the party's strength flourished under Macdonald's leadership, it became more convenient for tories to be 'party' men, rather than men of pure 'principle.' But, by the early sixties and the return of political instability the latter quality assumed more importance. At that time a tory colleague of Macdonald approached a coalition reformer with the blunt statement: "The fact is the names of Reformer and Conservative are obsolete and the real name should be moderate men of all parties."[105] The pressure towards the political centre by the tories in fact became so intense that some moderate reformers like John Sandfield Macdonald considered reverting to the name "Baldwin Reformers" in order to distinguish themselves from the Grits on the one side and the tories on the other.[106] The tories with their confessedly pragmatic view of party had few of the identity problems of Sandfield Macdonald. Their idea of party, despite its recent whiggish overtones, rarely operated as anything more than an expedient rationalization of political fact.

The reformers' dilemma stemmed from an inability to reconcile personality and ideology with practical politics. Each reform faction, however small, felt that it had the key and the key-bearer to the kingdom of 'true' reform. Too few recognized that earthly political kingdoms

---

[105] H. Smith to D. Roblin, Kingston, June 5, 1863, Lennox and Addington Hist. Soc. Coll., P.A.C. (microfilm).

[106] J. S. Macdonald to J. Blackburn, Cornwall, April 2, 1860, J. A. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.

require political compromise as well as political beliefs. Francis Hincks, as the direct heir to Baldwin's vacant throne, unfortunately recognized expediency as his only guide. The minor contenders like George Brown, Sandfield Macdonald, Malcolm Cameron, and William Lyon Mackenzie were too often deficient in the arts of political compromise, although well-studied in reform ideology. At one time differences over platform and at others differences over leadership prevented unity. As in most situations of breakdown, disputes over fundamentals rapidly introduce in their train endless magnification of minor political and even social differences. The divided Reform factions were no exception with their quibbling over semantics and party nomenclature, and their heightened sense of social distinction between radicals and moderates.

The curious fact was that the reformers as a whole were not too divided in their fundamental beliefs on the political process. There was among them an essential unity of view on the origins, nature, and function of political parties. Their concept of political representation, leadership and party organization also differed little from one faction to another. Their essential ideological problem was that their system of beliefs was no longer as unique as it had once been. Whig political values were commonplace even among the tories. John Sandfield Macdonald summed up that dilemma when he wrote in 1860: "The most ultra tory calls himself nowadays not only a moderate conservative but a Moderate Reformer, the livery of which he carries only for purposes of coalescing for the sake of office."[107]

---

[107] J. Sandfield Macdonald to J. Blackburn, Cornwall, April 2, 1860, J. S. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.

Reformers generally agreed that political parties were necessary to free government. In a manner scarcely differing from the whiggish views of the moderates, William McDougall of the clear-grit North American delineated the value of political parties as barriers against political expediency, and its sure by-product despotism:

> When there is no party, the people are reduced to a state of serfdom--as in Russia, and other despotic countries. In Great Britain and the United States, party government prevails, and there are no countries in the civilized world where the rights of the people are better established and their liberties most securely protected. We like a strong party government because it has more energy, more talent, and may we add, more honesty than the milk and water porridge of men of no principle, who seek to retain office by mean tricks of political expediency, are not capable of great action for fear of offending their opponents.[108]

George Brown was no less an exponent of party government since it eliminated to a great degree political corruption and the visionary nostrums of quack politicians.[109] Like Macdonald, Brown preferred the simplicity of the two-party system because it implied a neat separation of men along lines of principle. Such division would be especially useful upon crucial issues like the church-state controversy. He did not however yearn after a return to the division between extreme tories and radical democrats since it alarmed the people to a degree where they distrusted all reformers as utopians and anarchists. His concept of a two-party state was rather reminiscent of the sedate

---

[108] North American, Feb. 1, 1853. See also June 4, 1850; Sept. 11, 1850; July 5, 1853.

[109] Globe, Oct. 17, 1850. See also March 18, 1852 and Nov. 10, 1856.

aristocratic politics of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century England. One party which maintained tradition was as necessary as the other which challenged it. All that was important was that the traditional party should gradually "assimilate themselves to the liberals of the day" so that society could progress.[110]

Brown was equally whiggish in his insistence upon principles rather than men as the basis of political organization. He refused to listen to the demands of the Brockville Recorder in the wake of the Reform Alliance of 1857 that less attention be paid to principle, and that reformers should unite under common leaders:

> When the Recorder assumes that Reformers will accept names in place of principles--men instead of measures that are necessary to secure to them their rights as members of a free community. The Recorder ought to have known that hero-worship is not an article in the creed of Reformers. They do not follow blindly any man, or set of men, whose chief merit is that their faults lean to mercy's side, and whose personal graces may have excited the love of susceptible politicians of the Recorder school.[111]

He also resisted strongly the clamor of the North American for popularly elected leaders from conventions of the party faithful.[112] Democratic conventions were innately "revolutionary and avowedly designed to overturn everything, and tinker up a new constitution."[113] The only conditions upon which he would ideally accept the mandate of a convention

---

[110] Globe, May 18, 1852 and Jan. 7, 1857.

[111] Globe, Feb. 3, 1857. See also Aug. 28, Nov. 15, 1856.

[112] North American, March 19, 1854.

[113] Globe, Oct. 7, 1850.

was upon matters of common platform, and even then he was careful to make allowances for the dissenting reformer.[114]

Despite the tendency of the moderate reformers towards coalitions of convenience, they maintained a romantic concept of a party dedicated to 'old principles.' The same Robert Baldwin who had once advocated flexible party lines wrote in disgust upon the degeneration of political ideals under Hincks' leadership. He claimed that "factious motives had now seized the party leadership, and the pursuit of political power had become the sole rationale of a once proud party."[115] Josiah Balckburn of the London Free Press similarly lamented in 1856 the passing of the old reformers like Baldwin who had steadily pursued the ideal of liberty. All that were left were the present breed of politicians who could only agree on "the negation of all principle."[116]

The "old principles of reform" often became the rhetorical standard by which moderate reformers gauged the suitability of candidates and office-seekers. The revival of pro-Bidwell sentiment in Lennox and Addington in 1857 induced David Roblin to seek out the defender of the "old cause" because of his long association with the name of Robert Baldwin.[117] At other times supplicants painfully

---

[114]Globe, Jan. 27, 1856.

[115]Baldwin to the Attorney-General, Oct. 27, 1854, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 5.

[116]London Free Press, Feb. 1, 1856.

[117]D. Roblin to M. S. Bidwell, Napanee, Aug. 20, 1857, Lennox and Addington Hist. Coll., P.A.C.

demonstrated their long-standing attachment to reform principles to curry special favours.[118] The result could often be crushing, as it was to a reform aspirant who repeated in a letter to William Hamilton Merritt his adherence to 'liberal principle' no less than five times in as many sentences. Merritt finally entered a crushing rejoinder in the margin--"What proof."[119]

The last bastion of the "old principles" was Mackenzie's small cadré of ultra-reformers. Locked in the death grip of its whiggish past, this group ressembled the small band of "old republicans" from Virginia who were a constant thorn to Jefferson, Madison, and even Jackson. Mackenzie's stature as a "principled" reformer was unquestioned by those ultras who co-operated with him in the Legislature. Michael Foley, for one, hoped that he would remain as deserving of the cowl of monastic dedication that had shrouded Mackenzie throughout his illustrious career:

> Like yourself I have nothing to conceal, I am and have been sincerely attached to the principles of the old Reform party and whether I remain long in Parliament or not, will, with God's help remain true to them--and that for their own sake, I trust I shall never be found unfaithful to my principles and never so base as to asperse at the bidding of any man the well-earned

---

[118] Thomas Parke to Robert Baldwin, Port Colborne, June 13, 1849, Baldwin Papers, T.P.L.

[119] A. Morse to the Electors of Lincoln, Smithville, Nov. 24, 1851, Merritt Papers, P.A.C.

> reputation or position of you the earliest and most steadfast of the friends of liberty and right.[120]

Mackenzie himself did little to dissuade his admirers from this Wilkesian apotheosis. He in fact encouraged it with a grossness that was untempered by age. On one occasion he immodestly chronicled his achievements as the "oldest servant of the fourth estate" in order to boost subscriptions for the faltering Gazette.[121] On yet another occasion he paraded his virtue before the editor of the Niagara Mail: "Sir, I am dependent upon no party in Canada. It would have been very unfortunate for me if I had been. I occupy as I have ever done, a position where I can speak my mind or be silent."[122]

Mackenzie's independence of mind was viewed much less sympathetically by other reformers. His individualism was seen as a reprehensible trait calculated to destroy the very essence of party government. William McDougall of the North American saw something sinister in any man who "believes all wisdom centered in himself, and cannot in opposition, agree to work with others."[123] His intemperance over the years to the political establishment was seen as irresponsible

---

[120] M. H. Foley to W. L. Mackenzie, Simcoe, Oct. 21, 1856, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O. J. S. Macdonald to W. L. Mackenzie, Feb. 7, 1852, Cornwall, ibid. D. MacLeod to Mackenzie, Sparta, April 29, 1851; B. Hindsell to W. L. Mackenzie, June 16, 1851, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O. Kingston Whig, April 17, 1851, Feb. 1, 1850. D. Christie to W. L. Mackenzie, Dec. 30, 1852, Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O.

[121] Weekly Gazette, July 7, 1853.

[122] Cited in Montreal Pilot, March 23, 1850.

[123] North American, Feb. 1, 1853.

and immoral, and calculated to destroy all decorum in government:

> His indiscriminate abuse of all classes of men has not its source in patriotism or a love of justice, but in an animal instinct, and a naturally malignant disposition. He snarls and bites as a vicious terrier does. He who is capable of applying the same vituperative language when speaking of Bishop Strachan, Chief Justice Robinson, W. B. Robinson, Francis Hincks, Judge Draper, and John A. Macdonald--men, who, if not faultless, are at all events not worse than the general run of mankind--one, we say, who, in speaking of such men, makes no distinction between them and the vilest animals, is the enemy and not the friend of morality and good government. What greater benefit could be conferred upon a scoundrel than to have his name mixed up and his acts confounded with those of individuals having many claims on the respect of society.[124]

Moderate Reformers and even ultras looked instead to Baldwin's "noble and disinterested" example, and his steadfast devotion to the whig principle of liberty.[125] Even their second choice over "vulgar tricksters" like Mackenzie would have been tories, who, despite their oligarchical tendencies, still preserved the dignity of government.[126]

Mackenzie's pandering to the local constituency raised another fundamental issue with reformers. Would the sitting member of the constituency represent solely the local interests of his constituents, or would he also act as the arbiter of the provincial interest? Certainly Mackenzie and the clear-grits countenanced and even approved of local

---

[124]Montreal Pilot, May 28, 1857. See also Globe, May 31, 1848 and Dec. 12, 1853; British Whig, Sept. 19, 1851; A. N. Buell to J. O'Hare, April 17, 1851, Buell Papers, P.A.O.

[125]See J. H. Price to J. Lesslie, n.d. (1860?), Shirley, England, J. H. Price Papers, P.A.O.; D. E. McIntyre to J. S. Macdonald, Cornwall, July 1, 1851, J. S. Macdonald, P.A.C.

[126]Globe, Nov. 20, 1855, Dec. 8, 1855, and Nov. 7, 1854; Toronto Leader, April 3, 1856.

candidate's conventions, in order to bring the candidate into closer communion with the will of the local electorate.[127] But the rest of the reformers, including George Brown, resisted a restrictive interpretation of a representative's duty to his constituents. He viewed with obvious disgust election campaigns which pitted him against local favorites like Mackenzie in Haldimand. The latter's courtship of the "local sheep" Brown considered "degrading work" unworthy of a parliamentary aspirant.[128] The people, much as Baldwin had found in his loss of 1830, was a fickle beast often incapable of determining who or what was in its best interest.

Brown never wore well the strait-jacket of the local will in his capacity as the sitting member for Kent and Lambton. He announced to his colleague Alexander Mackenzie that he preferred the "right men" to confirmed Brownite partisans when the former were possessed of greater ability: "We must not forget the public interest where a man is decidedly better for the office, even the Brownies should go to the wall."[129] On another occasion he cautioned Malcolm Cameron not to run in Lambton or South Oxford unless he were prepared to campaign on a loftier plane than that of the constituency. To punctuate his point he delivered an impromptu sermon on the duties of a representative as a protector of

---

[127] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, May 22, 1857; North American, Dec. 4, 1851, s.w.

[128] G. Brown to Peter Brown, n.d., 1851, Jarvis, Brown Papers, P.A.C.

[129] G. Brown to Alexander Mackenzie, Quebec, Sept. 4, 1852, Alexander Mackenzie Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm).

national over local interests:

> Admitting that the County of Lambton owes much to your advocacy, and the fact of your having a large stake in it, we think you would be scarcely justified on such grounds only, in appealing to the Constituency, and that would be to take a very narrow view of the duties of a representative in Parliament. We admit that the special wants of a constituency should never be overlooked or disregarded, when they do not conflict with the public interests, but we are of opinion that the general interests of the Province should ever be the master motive that should influence public men in seeking parliamentary honors from any constituency whatever.[130]

Despite the overt difference he created in the pages of the Globe between the Reformers as the party of the people, and the tories as a private cabal, there was then little essential difference between Brown and Macdonald on the nature of political representation.

The bulk of the moderate reformers were equally élitist in their exalted view of a representative's political and social function. William Notman, the old reformer from Middlesex, in fact confided to Brown his disgust as the popular preference for residents over non-residents: "The old prejudices against "Lawyer," "Non-Resident," "Borrowed Timber" exist as strong as ever--and it is hard to overcome them. The people themselves have taken no action--no agreeing upon anyone--no requisition--no evidence of determined unity of action--a consent to be put in nomination involves one in a contest."[131] Although the moderates were publicly more condescending to the virtues

---

[130] G. Brown to M. Cameron, Chatham, Nov. 26, 1857, Brown Papers, P.A.C. See also J. Rolph to the Electors of Norfolk, Simcoe, Nov. 9, 1851, Rolph Papers, P.A.C.

[131] W. Notman to G. Brown, Dundas, June 30, 1854, Brown Papers, P.A.C.

of the popular mind, and announced that "the masses never knowingly do wrong," their attitudes were no less élitist.[132] As an antidote to popular ignorance Josiah Blackburn of the London Free Press suggested a favorite aristocratic remedy--a manly dialogue between the representative and his constituents. Only in such a manner could a member of assembly persuade his electors of the necessity of serving the public as well as the local interest:

> Perhaps the whole course of the practice of British politics there is nothing so amiable as this. It indicated a proper sense of the responsibility that has been incurred in accepting the representation of an intelligent community in the legislature. It shows a consciousness of rectitude, and a willingness to accept suggestion, such as may appear consonant with the interest or political bias of the constituency. A man who has nothing to fear, who is conscious that the trust reposed in him has not been used, for the attainment of selfish ends--who has not prostituted his parliamentary position in order to find places for his friends and plums for special partizans, but who has sought the good of, just as he is supposed to represent the whole; to such an one these face to face meetings must be sources of infinite gratification.[133]

The presumption that the representative had a duty to advise his constituents seemed to lead to another more magnificant presumption, that the incumbent had a right to their political support. Even a cursory survey of the reform representation in the House reveals a number of constituencies like Essex, Glengarry, Lincoln, Haldimand, and Oxford South which returned incumbents like Col. Prince, J. S. Macdonald, W. H. Merritt, W. L. Mackenzie, and Francis Hincks with monotonous

---

[132] Toronto Leader, Jan. 25, 1854.

[133] London Free Press, Sept. 1, 1858.

regularity during the Union period. This stability of representation led one reform observer to comment smugly on the dullness of Canadian politics--

> The liberties enjoyed in Canada are so extensive, so rational, and are of so every-day a kind that they are apt to be overlooked, and the public forgetting all they have, are apt to wonder that politics are dull, forgetting the very quiescent state in which they are is an indication of the prosperity and contentment.[134]

The élitist presumptions of reform political thought dictated a general resistance to formal means of maintaining party cohesion. Most reformers viewed with distrust such democratic devices as conventions and caucuses. Although William Lyon Mackenzie was prepared to make tactical concessions towards local or township conventions, he felt constrained to rationalize them on the grounds that monarchies as well as republics had recourse to them. Just as John A. Macdonald would only consider local conventions if the proper delegates were elected, Mackenzie also stipulated that they must be "faithful, earnest, and true" to the general as well as local interest.[135] Most reformers felt instead that a partisan press, dinners, and party demonstrations were sufficient to maintain party cohesion. Their fractious attitude to common platforms or a common leadership was a political commonplace of the eighteen-fifties. The London Free Press began the decade by announcing its resistance to conventions as conspiracies against the

---

[134] London Free Press, March 30, 1857. See also ibid., Feb. 15, 1856.

[135] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette.

people and the constitution,[136] and secondly to Brown's aspirations to the leadership: "In the great Reform Party the member for Lambton is an influential item, but only an item. . . . The principles of progressive Reform cannot be submerged in the persons of one or two politicians, whoever they may be, or however talented."[137]

The inability of the reformers to meet in convention before 1857 and 1859 was evidence in itself of an unwillingness to submit to a collective decision. The evident frustration of a compromiser like William McDougall was reflected in his qualified optimism expressed on the formation of the Reform Alliance in 1857:

> The "Reform Alliance" is a decided success. I have never seen greater party unanimity as far as we have gone. The persons who have already 'put their hand to the plough' can accomplish anything politically upon which they agree. We expect to raise several thousand pounds to help the weak constituencies, not by bribery but by opening their eyes to the truth. Let us begin a new movement and forget past dissentions--remember them for warning not for reproach. For my own part, I think I have a good deal to forgive. Unjust charges, unwarranted suspicions, unmanly opposition, but I have forgiven and forgotten. I remember this only--is he for our principles and party, or against us?[138]

The Great Reform Convention of 1859 clearly marked the emergence of George Brown as the leader of an omnibus Liberal Party in Canada West.[139]

---

[136] London Free Press, July 25, 1849.

[137] Ibid., Jan. 7, 1851.

[138] William McDougall to C. Clarke, Jan. 2, 1857, Globe Offices, Clarke Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[139] See J. M. S. Careless, Brown of the Globe, The Voice of Upper Canada, 1818-59 (Toronto: Macmillan, 1959), Vol. I, pp. 321-22. A contrary interpretation is offered by E. Jones, "Ephemeral Compromise: The Great Reform Convention Revisited," Journal of Canadian Studies, III (February, 1968), 21-28.

But the victory as Brown himself admitted in a conversation to George Sheppard that "party unity, as now existing, cannot continue any longer than may be necessary to secure the recognition of the general principle of that change."[140] His admission that the Reform Party might fly apart into its component parts was not far wrong, for by 1860 Brown was having a difficult time in holding the troika of clear-grit radicalism, Brownite Liberalism, and moderate reformism in check.[141]

The reverence of the reformer for his particular 'principles' and factional leaders made him obstinate beast with his own kin, but also made him notoriously prone to co-operation outside of his own party. Errant tories were assiduously courted if they showed the slightest inclination to conversion. Robert Baldwin likely had much to do with setting a tone of sacredness to intra-party co-operation and even apostasy in his acceptance of H. J. Boulton into the Reform Party. He haughtily reminded a partisan correspondent prudence certainly dictated his acceptance, and that all converts to the holy shrine of liberalism deserved a place in their political temple:

> The adoption of a contrary course of dealing with such persons would necessarily prevent our growing in strength and numbers instead of encouraging it. And would moreover betray a narrow jealousy wholly unworthy of ourselves and our cause. For my part I believe there are

---

[140] G. Sheppard to C. Clarke, Dec. 4, 1859, cited in G. W. Brown, "The Grit Party and the Great Reform Convention of 1859," C.H.R., XVI (September, 1935), pp.

[141] See J. M. S. Careless, Brown of the Globe, Statesman of Confederation, 1860-80, II, pp. 13-15. J. Sandfield Macdonald to J. Blackburn, Cornwall, April 2, 1860, J. S. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.

> many among those who are called Conservatives with much liberality of sentiment in their hearts and who are kept from us more by the name than from there being any discoverable points of substantial difference between us. Why should we put up as it were a sign over our door with "no admittance" on it to keep such men out? I admit that we must proceed with caution necessary to avoid being the dupes of our liberality by admitting wolves in sheep's clothing. But consistently with this caution let us throw wide the portals of our political temple. Its foundations are laid upon the broad basis of British constitutional freedom. And the greater the number of votaries at the shrine the more cause of rejoicing ought it to be to those who through a long night of darkness and of storm have ever remained firm to the true faith received within its walls.[142]

Although George Brown later became a strong advocate of two-party politics, he too evinced an early taste for proselytizing. Seeing that William Kirby of the Niagara Mail was moving rapidly away from growing tory disloyalty in 1849, Brown attempted to win him into the reform fold. He assured Kirby that the time had come since responsible government for convulsive party rivalry to cease, and for tory prejudices against reformers to dissipate. Then, somewhat abruptly, he notified Kirby that "your sentiments are not those of a Tory. You are a whig."[143]

The reformer also felt compelled to justify his own extra-party dalliances in the same idealistic terms. It was not enough either privately or publicly to acknowledge expediency as one's motive as the

---

[142] R. Baldwin to Dr. A. J. Park, March 31, 1847; Dr. J. Rolph Papers, P.A.C. See also J. Keefer to W. H. Merritt, Thorold, Jan. 14, 1850, Merritt Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm).

[143] George Brown to Wm. Kirby, July 12, 1849, Wm. Kirby Papers, Ontario Archives. See also G. Brown to R. Baldwin, Oct. 9, 1848, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C.

tory often did. An ideological gloss was necessary. 'Advanced' Reformers like Malcolm Cameron and A. J. Fergusson justified in high dudgeon their collaboration with the Hincks-Morin ministry. At successive Reform demonstrations in Lambton and Elora they damned their critics like Brown and W. H. Boulton as "factious" and "unprincipled." Fergusson righteously announced that he had differed with the government on some points but had not given "factious opposition," because his opponents were "actuated by honest feelings in a majority of cases."[144] Clear-grit supporters also relished the possibilities of attracting to their fold 'loose-fish' from among the new conservative members elected to the House in 1852. George Thomson wrote to Charles Clarke of the potential liberals among these tories who would "support such measures as they regarded for the benefit of the Country without regard to the party by whom they are introduced."[145] Although William Lyon Mackenzie himself preserved his right to accept or reject each piece of legislation upon its own merits,[146] his followers were pushing him (rather unsuccessfully) to a more positive position. They delighted in the prospect of "old enemies" in a romantic union with "old friends," to the utilitarian purpose of a "moderate, constitutional, popular

---

[144] Reported in North American, Dec. 31, 1852, July 29, 1853.

[145] Geo. B. Thomson to C. Clarke, Quebec, Aug. 24, 1852, Clarke Papers, P.A.O.

[146] Mackenzie's Weekly Gazette, Feb. 17, 1854.

government, carried out with vigour and in good faith."[147]

Perhaps the greatest smokescreen of political rationalization produced in the eighteen-fifties was that created in 1854 by the moderate reformers over their union with the tories. Allan MacNab became and remained the toast of the moderate reform press until his retirement. His co-operation with Hincks was compared in magnanimity to Wellington's grant of Catholic Emancipation, and Peel's acceptance of free trade.[148] Further testimonials to MacNab during the course of the Hincks, Morin, MacNab ministry, congratulated him for his removal of old party and class anomosities, so that the people could now devote their time "to objects of material interest worthy of a common effort."[149] Collaboration with the tories in the House and on the hustings were all rationalized to the reform constituency as a reciprocal gesture of magnanimity. The tories had after all been converted to "liberal principle," popular sentiment demanded "a moderate dignified and firm" government, and to resist it would be "factious" in the extreme.[150]

---

[147] D. H. Loucks to W. L. Mackenzie, E. Gwilliambury, Dec. 31, 1853; Alex. Davidson to W. L. Mackenzie, Niagara, July 5, 1851, W. L. Mackenzie Papers, P.A.O.

[148] Montreal Pilot, Sept. 15, 1854.

[149] Toronto Leader, Dec. 12, 1855. See also London Free Press, Oct. 30, 1857.

[150] Toronto Leader, July 12, 1854; Norfolk Messenger in the Toronto Globe, March 20, 1854; D. E. McIntyre to J. S. Macdonald, Cornwall, Sept. 12, 1854, J. S. Macdonald Papers, P.A.C.; E. A. Dunham to D. Roblin, Napanee, June 2, 1857, Lennox and Addington Hist. Soc. Papers, P.A.C. (microfilm); D. Roblin to D. Stevenson, Quebec, Sept. 12, 1854, ibid.

Perhaps the most sensible sentiment expressed on that coalition was the sympathetic note that passed from Robert Baldwin to Hincks, giving his imprimatur to the coalition with the tories.

> For however disinclined myself to enter upon such combinations, they are unquestionably, in my opinion, under certain circumstances, not only justifiable but expedient, and even necessary. The government of the country must be carried on. It ought to be carried on with vigor. If that can be done in no other way than by mutual concessions and a coalition of parties they become necessary. And those who, under such circumstances, assume the arduous duties of becoming parties to them, so far from deserving the opprobrium that is so frequently and often too successfully heaped upon them have, in my opinion, the strongest claims upon public sympathy and support.[151]

The note stands in curious contrast to a Baldwin letter of a month later condemning Hincks' inordinate appetite for power and his "factious motives" for entering the coalition.[152] Both were typical of Baldwin's approach to politics, yet his successors like posterity chose only to honour the ideological image, rather than the pragmatic one. The rank and file within the party and even the electorate had come to expect and even demand a rationalization of political action according to the stone tablets of principle. As Arnold Toynbee has observed in another context, subsequent generations invariably "idolize the ephemeral technique" which had enabled their forebears to succeed, and in the process become blinded by the technique itself.

---

[151] R. Baldwin to F. Hincks, Sept. 22, 1854, cited in Francis Hincks, Reminiscences of His Public Life (Montreal, 1884), p. 341.

[152] R. Baldwin to Attorney General, Oct. 27, 1854, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C.

Although the decline of the Reform Alliance in the eighteen-fifties hardly paralleled the decline of the Hellenic city-state, it does present in microcosm the problem of elevating techniques to beliefs, and re-using them again as techniques.[153]

The techniques of whig realism had been passed on by Baldwin in lineal descent to Macdonald and the moderate conservatives. Although instinctively opposed to pontification, the tory had learned to dress the most common political facts in the garb of principle. With an eloquence reminiscent of Macaulay (whom he read) Macdonald could justify coalition with the French Canadians to the editor of the Montreal Gazette in the most generous of terms: "Treat them as a nation and they will act as a free people generally do--generously. Call them a faction and they become factious." That sentiment was no doubt intended for the public record. His little-quoted rationale for co-operation rather than absorption was however loaded with political realism. Reminding Brown Chamberlin that O'Connell and his 'tail' had once governed despite their small numbers, Macdonald cautioned the Lower Canadian British not to threaten French Canadians with assimilation: "At present they divide, as we do, they are split up into several sections, and are governed more less [sic] by defined principles of action. As they become smaller and feebler, so will they be more united, from a sense of self-preservation, they will act as one man

---

[153]See A. J. Toynbee, A Study of History, abridgement by D. C. Somervell (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 316-17.

and hold the balance of power."[154] These were sentiments that would have appealed privately to Baldwin and Hincks, but were lost on their sectionally minded successors of the eighteen-fifties.

(b) Canada East

The French Canadian ministerialists or bleus presented a distinct contrast to the divided Reformers of Canada West. The exigencies of survival in a political union designed to submerge them demanded a toughness of spirit in politicians like Lafontaine, Morin, Cauchon, and Cartier. Their acute appreciation of political reality rendered them immune to any division that might be created by theories of party formation and political action. Their common bond of principle or ideology was the preservation of French Canadian nationality, and political parties were never much more than means to serve that end. The French Canadian conservatives could in short enjoy the forms of élitist party politics because of their essential agreement on objectives.

The dedication of the French Canadian party to their national interest has been elaborated upon elsewhere.[155] The moral vital problem here is how that dedication affected the French Canadians' concept of party formation and action. As political realists, they could not help but be concerned with the total state of parties in the Provincial

---

[154] J. A. Macdonald to B. Chamberlin, Toronto, Jan. 21, 1856, private, Brown Chamberlin Papers, P.A.C., Vol. 2.

[155] See supra, ch. v, pp. 366-70 . See also J. Cauchon, Canada, State of Political Parties, Toronto, Mirror office, 1851, p. 7; E. P. Taché to A. Gugy, March 19, 1850, Taché Papers, A.P.Q., La Minerve, June 23, 1857.

Legislature. Often more important to the bleus than the internal state of their own party was the more parlous health of their English allies. This internal confidence was reflected in Joseph Cauchon's comment that the French Canadians were a "corps d'élite" around which at all times may be drawn up in line of battle the dispersed fragments of the liberal party of Upper Canada whenever they aim at the attainment of power."[156]

Whenever the Upper Canadian allies had difficulties keeping their house in order, storm warnings would immediately go up from the French Canadian side. Lafontaine showed great concern when the Upper Canadian reformers were about to include grits like Malcolm Cameron and John Rolph in the new ministry of 1851. Such amorphous party boundaries clearly alarmed Lafontaine:

> It is now said that Dr. Rolph is a greater conservative than you and I. In that case why has he taken up as the leader of the Clear Grits, without any word of contradiction on his part. I don't like that. I may be wrong--but yet I stick to the old rule, that "Honesty is the best policy, in the long run." I am getting too old to form a part of the school of "Chisellers" that is a bad school.[157]

A similar situation recurred with the political realignment of 1854. At that time it was George-Etienne Cartier's turn to lecture the Upper Canadians on their messy political house.[158]

Political combination was increasingly seen by French Canadians

---

[156] J. Cauchon, Canada, State of Political Parties, p. 6.

[157] L. H. Lafontaine to R. Baldwin, Montreal, Nov. 6, 1851, Baldwin Papers, P.A.C.

[158] Mirror of Parliament, Sept. 19, 1854.

as a frank expedient for self-protection, with few of the rhetorical frills that were so common among the reform apologists of combination in Canada West. That shift was apparent in the gradual demise of Joseph Cauchon before the ascendant bleus led by Cartier. Cauchon like the true whig had to give an idealistic gloss to the most expedient political arrangement. Privately he was a tough-minded pragmatist as his letters to Lafontaine suggest. He announced to the latter in 1851 that he would be prepared to put up with the clear-grits in Upper Canada if a tory alliance would not materialize: "Je ne veux pas de division, coute que coute, et si une alliance advantageuse ne nous est offerte par les tories de H. C. je supporterai le gouvernement à moins que leur politique soit niveleuse et socialiste."[159] When the first opportunity of an alliance with the tories did appear in 1852, Cauchon was equally hard-headed in his stipulation that all of the headships of the major administrative departments should be shared evenly.[160]

Publicly Cauchon felt compelled to justify along each step of the way each of these political manoevres. The abandonment of the Reform ministry in 1852 was accompanied by a great public fanfare that he was unable to abide the clear-grit 'socialists' in the ministry.[161]

---

[159] J. Cauchon to L. H. Lafontaine, Dec., 1851, Lafontaine Papers, P.A.C.

[160] J. Cauchon to L. H. Lafontaine, Jan. 19, 1852, Quebec, Lafontaine Papers, P.A.C.

[161] Le Journal de Québec, Nov. 15, 1851 and Jan. 17, 1852.

The advent of the coalition ministry in 1854 was similarly justified by a rationalization upon the diminution of party differences in the old world and the new. In England coalitions had become passé since "Robert Peel, par sa politique financière a brisée les bornes posées depuis les Stuarts entre les partis."[162] Now that party nomenclature was increasingly useless he suggested that they should return to "leur prénoms respectifs."[163]

For George-Etienne Cartier and the other ministerialists there was little such difference between their private and public position. Rationalization if it appeared at all was only in nationalistic terms. Lest English Canadians misconstrue French Canadian motives in any other but pragmatic terms, Cartier delivered to them a homily on political fundamentals:

> He contended that the word "coalition" might be applicable to the Upper Canada section of the administration, but that it was misapplied so far as the Lower Canadian section was concerned. He candidly admitted that he was not, as a general rule, an advocate of coalition ministries. He was a strong party man, and would prefer to support an administration composed of his political friends--those in whose personal characters he had confidence as well as in their measures. He would like an administration that would meet the approval not only of his reason but his feelings--but the unfortunate split among the Upper Canadian Reformers had rendered a combination of some sort necessary in order that the business of the country might be transacted, and being a friend to the material advancement of the Province, he could not refuse to give his support to that coalition. His support would be given, however, not to the men but to the measures of the administration, and only to the measures that his judgement approved.[164]

---

[162] Ibid., Sept. 12, 1854. [163] Ibid., April 20, 1854.

[164] Mirror of Parliament, Sept. 19, 1854.

Other ministerialists like E. P. Taché and J. C. Chapais were frankly concerned with retaining majority control and their jobs in the government. It was their calculation that they could still carry the day in the Assembly even if the "Tories, Brownistes, Cauchonistes, and Sicottistes" united.[165]

These calculations present a stark contrast to the frenzied concern of the reform newspaper, Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe which condemned the coalition as a desertion of the safe haven of liberalism. The tories were seen as dangerous racists, in contrast to the Upper Canadian reformers who at least professed "civil, political, and religious equality before the law, law without distinction of race or of culte."[166] What the editor failed to appreciate, however, was the increasing confidence of the French Canadians to divide and rule because of the political instability of Upper Canada. Secondly, he miscalculated the increasing public commitment of the moderate conservatives to a whig gospel of political compromise.

By comparison to their external posture on political parties, the bleu's approach to internal politics was of secondary importance. On that plane, French Canadian conservatives appeared willing to affect the general style of mid-century politics. They were by turn whiggish and élitist in their purely internal political quarrels with

---

[165]E. P. Taché to J. C. Chapais, Quebec, Aug. 25, 1854, cited in J. Barnard, Mémoires Chapais (Montreal: Fides, 1961), II, p. 111. See also La Minerve, March 25, 1852 and July 11, 1854.

[166]Cited in the Toronto Leader, May 10, 1854.

the rouges. Since they neither regarded themselves nor French Canada as a whole endangered politically by the appearance of the rouges, they basked in the luxury of two-party politics. Although that struggle resembled the classic struggle between aristocracy and democracy, it really amounted to little more than social one-upmanship.

Like his Upper Canadian brethren, the French Canadian conservative regularly denounced 'factious' politicians devoid of attachment to overriding or transcendent principle. Factious political behavior was by definition any policy which served local rather than provincial interests, or one group of self-interested politicians to the exclusion of the public good.[167] Like all arbitrary definitions of its kind it was designed to fit a particular group. In this case it was the rouges. La Minerve suggested that those rouges involved in L'Avenir had in general supported sound measures which coincided with their principles, but had little respect for the more frankly political journal, Le Pays. Its editors were reprimanded severely for proposing an irresponsible boycott of government legislation upon no other grounds than being proposed by the wrong set of men:

> Le Leader est d'avis, avec les hommes politiques des pays constitutionels, "Qu'un ministère doit tomber avec sa politique" quand sa politique est mauvaise, mais le Pays veut du nouveau, lui, il veut quelque chose qui n'pas de précédent, dans aucun pays du monde civilisé, il veut ôter les hommes qui sont aujourd'hui au pouvoir, sans condammer leur politique, sans désapprouver leur mésures, sans même les entendre!! L'Avenir disait "les mésures avant les

---

[167] La Minerve, Nov. 21, 1855; Le Journal de Québec, March 6, 1852.

> hommes," et Le Pays dit, "les hommes avant les mésures." Il a changé tout cela. Pour Le Pays, les hommes sont la question préalable.

The rouges also received regular and unwarranted flagellation from the bleu press for their supposed attachment to an international democratic and socialistic conspiracy. Their program and platform was distorted to such degree that it assumed an unreal character: "Ces fraudes demoralisatrices, auxquelles l'ultra démocratie ne manque jamais d'avoir recours pour tenter de faire réussir son programme de renversement et d'anarchie."[169]

The clear-grits received an equally unwelcome press from French Canadian conservatives. Taché's term "pharisaical brawlers" was applied indiscriminately to every variety of grit and even a few who were moderates. Because of his growing stature in Canada West, George Brown was seen as the most dangerous politically. Even before Brown had become a raving francophobe, he had raised the hackles on Joseph Cauchon's neck. The latter likened him to the machine politician par excellence of New York state, Thurlow Weed, and to other equally noxious items:

> Cet un homme malgré qu'il affirme le contraire d'une ambition démesurée, mais décu, ulceré après l'accablante défaite d'Haldimand, et voulant ce faire grand, en s'attaquant comme une sangsue à un homme public, à un

---

[168] La Minerve, Aug. 17, 1854.

[169] La Minerve, Oct. 10, 1855. See also ibid., Sept. 18, 1856; J. Cauchon to L. H. Lafontaine, Aug. 22, 1854, Langevin-Taché Coll., A.P.Q.

> ministre, excessivement habile, de l'aveu de tout le monde. Mais il aura besoin de s'étirer, malgré sa longeur nouveau prophète, procédant cette fois du petit en grand, pour étendre pleinement ses membres sur ceux du géant.[170]

Clear-gritism continued a pejorative term well into the late eighteen-fifties, but with as little substance as before. La Minerve insisted not only upon misnaming the Reform Convention of 1857 the "convention clear-grit," but also denouncing the hateful "rep. by pop." platform as "une nouvelle démonstration ultra-démocratique."[171]

The conservatives' essential objection to the political left was more one of style than content. In the aristocratic tradition, they emphasized the instinctual rather than abstract character of politics and political ideas: "Les évènements changent à chaque instant et forcent naturellement les hommes à les accepter, bon gré, malgré. La sage politique consiste à en tirer le meilleur parti possible à son avantage."[172] The bleu also conceived of a representative's role, not as that of a delegate but as a latter-day seigneur. Or as one metaphor had it, he was "un médecin du corps social" who cuts "sans inquiéter des cris, des plaintes, et des murmures."[173] Ideally speaking, the

---

[170] Journal de Québec, Sept. 18, 1851. See also ibid., Nov. 7, 1850, April 1, 1851, and March 13, 1852.

[171] La Minerve, Jan. 14, 1857.

[172] Le Journal de Québec, May 4, 1851. See also E. Taché to J.A. Macdonald, Jan. 18, 1855, Montmagny, Macdonald Papers, P.A.C., Vol.273.

[173] J. Crémazie to L. H. Lafontaine, Quebec, April 29, 1851, Lafontaine Papers, Vol. 12, P.A.C.

representative should have a great deal of latitude in discerning remedies for local needs, and then reconcile those needs with the general interest. One reform candidate stood before the electors of Huntingdon, asking for their mandate in the vaguest of terms:

> Messieurs, je me présente comme partisan des réformes, pleinement convaincu de la grande responsibilité qui pèse sur moi comme tel, mais je serai guidé par les besoins du pays plutôt que par une croyance politique. Les bonnes mésures recontrent mon appui cordial de quelque part qu'elles viennent, dans le cas contraire, je les combattrai fusent-elles supportées par des amis.[174]

The bleu made many empty gestures to the "popular" or "general" will. On such a mundane matter as the granting of a superior court in Three Rivers, Joseph Cauchon waxed in eloquent whiggish prose to Lafontaine upon the popular justification for it: "C'est à peu pres le désir général du pays; ce n'est donc plus qu'une question du temps."[175] When A. N. Morin stood before the electors of Chicoutimi in 1854, he solemnly assured them that he would never enter a coalition with the tories against "le voeu populaire."[176] Morin did however take the liberty of entering the coalition, and his subsequent resignation probably had less to do with honouring his word than with the fact that he

---

[174] La Minerve, July 11, 1854. See also J. Cauchon to E.P. Taché, Feb. 20, 1851, Taché Papers, A.P.Q.; F. Evanturel to H. Langevin, March 16, 1856, Toronto, Langevin Papers, A.P.Q.; J. Loranger, Speech, House of Assembly, June 25, 1856, Mirror of Parliament.

[175] J. Cauchon to L. H. Lafontaine, April 13, 1849, Lafontaine Papers, P.A.C. See also E.P. Taché to J.C. Chapais, Toronto, Sept. 10, 1856, Langevin Papers, A.P.Q.; J. H. Rivard to H. Langevin, April 15, 1853, ibid.

[176] La Minerve, July 11, 1854.

had been offered an attractive position on the Lower Canadian bench.

Perhaps the most notable example of the bleu's practical disregard of the popular will occurred in the cabinet shuffles of 1856. When it appeared as if Phillip Vankoughnet would be taken directly into the ministry without holding a seat in the assembly, a motion was brought forward that Vankoughnet should be required to submit to an election first. This motion received the ardent support of the new bleu member for Quebec County, François Evanturel.[177] Gamely insisting that he was not another enfant terrible and that he was unequivocally "a member of party," Evanturel had obviously made a grave faux pas by retarding the flexibility of the coalition. His embarrassment was so acute that he did not even register his dissent against his party's overwhelming defeat of the measure. In explaining his actions to Hector Langevin a short time later, Evanturel disclaimed the notion that he was seeking popularity by supporting the motion, but that he had honestly believed that the people should decide.[178] His democratic proclivities and his independence of mind left Evanturel little other choice than to throw in his lot with the rouges. His patient constituents then returned him as a rouge in 1862, and then watched him revolve another half-circle to the right and join the Sandfield Macdonald Ministry. Ever popular, Evanturel enjoyed yet another mandate from them in 1863 as independent

---

[177] See Mirror of Parliament, Feb. 20, 1856.

[178] F. Evanturel to H. Langevin, April 2, 1856, Langevin Papers, A.P.Q.

Liberal.[179]

Evanturel's chequered career spoke volumes for the French Canadian idea of party. Neither the bleus nor the rouges wanted him because of his independent views. Although he would have been at home among the ideological and purely partisan wrangling that bedeviled the reform parties of Canada West, Evanturel did not have a place to roost in French Canada. He represented a philosophical style of politics that had gone into decline since the departure of Papineau. Although the rouges purported to carry on that philosophical tradition, they had become too concerned with the pragmatic aspects of maintaining party cohesion to have much time for conscience of the individual legislator.

The new rouges were not philosophes. They would have had little patience for Papineau's eulogy to Robert Christie for his persistent independence of view over his long political career: "Vous avez été surtout indépendant dans vos votes appuyant ou opposant les mésures, d'après votre opinion de leur mérite ou démerite intrinsiquement, et non d'après vos sentimens pour ou contre les hommes dont elles procédaient."[180] No longer was there the early fascination of a philosophic liberal like L. A. Dessaulles for "loosefishisme" as opposed to the pragmatic partisanship of a Francis Hincks, "qui est trop violent

---

[179] P. Cornell, The Alignment of Political Groups in Canada, pp. 109-111.

[180] L. J. Papineau to R. Christie, Petite Nation, Sept. 13, 1854, Papineau Bourassa Collection, A.P.Q.

et trop décidé dans ses opinions pour soumettre à la diète du loose-fishisme."[181] By 1854 the rouges had abandoned those notions of flexibility for the pursuit of political power. Hector Fabre's comment the militancy of the new rouges reveals their different approach to politics:

> Les rouges ne sont pas impatiens de posséder le pouvoir, sachant que le plus ils attendront plus leurs adversaires seront faibles et plus ils seront forts. Dans le dernier Parlement il n'avait que 4 représentans par conséquent peu d'influence, aujourd'hui ils en ont une vingtaine, ont fait élire un Orateur de leur choix, chassé un Membre Ministeriel illégalement élu et fait tomber un Ministère; c'est assez pour le présent et ils peuvent attendre quelques mois et même plus pour l'occasion et le moment de monter au pouvoir. Ainsi ne soyez pas impatient de les y voir monter, et ne soyez pas surpris lorsqui'ils y montrerent.[182]

The political stability of the rouges was reflected in their consistent voting patterns. Only the question of the double majority really divided them.[183] Upon most other issues such as the dubious entry of Vankoughnet into the ministry in 1856, the divorce issue, and representation by population, there was little if no division.[184]

This dramatic shift in political posture was probably the result of a gradual de-emphasis of liberalism, and an increase in national spirit among the rouges. As early as 1849, and the formation of the

---

[181] L'Avenir, July 21, 1849.

[182] H. Fabre to E. B. O'Callaghan, Montreal, Oct. 4, 1854, O'Callaghan Papers, P.A.C.

[183] Mirror of Parliament, March 18, 1856, and June 3, 1856.

[184] Ibid., June 25, 1856, June 30, 1858, and July 18, 1858.

Club National Démocratique a shift to nationalistic premises was apparent. They did not bother much with Papineau's philosophic niceties about "l'amour désentéresée de la patrie" and its essentially compatibility with liberalism.[185] They were more concerned with political action as an expedient "à maintenir nos moeurs et nos institutions, aussi bien que l'amour et le respect dont les canadiennes s'avaient jadis entourer leur nationalité."[186] An example of their concern for traditionalism in French Canada was the importance they placed upon the public instruction of the rural cultivator.[187] In that concern for the soil as a source of nationality the rouges were not far apart from Cartier or the Saint Jean-Baptiste Society.[188] Nor for that matter were they much unlike the "back to the people" and "back to the land" movements that swept through Herder's Germany and Herzen's Russia.[189]

Even fraternalism was to the rouges a more passionate concern than liberalism and democracy. In their pleas for public instruction,

---

[185] See L. J. Papineau to P. J. Jolicoeur, May 1, 1854, Papineau Papers, A.P.Q.

[186] Manifeste du Club National Démocratique, Des Presses de L'Avenir, Montreal, 1849, p. 26.

[187] Ibid., p. 29.

[188] See Cartier's speech on the funeral of Ludger Duvernay, J.C. Tassé, Discours de George Etienne Cartier (Montreal: Seneca et Fils, 1893), pp. 65-66.

[189] See H. Kohn, The Idea of Nationalism (New York: Collier Books, 1967), pp. 429-51; E. H. Carr, The Romantic Exiles (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961).

the rouges appeared more concerned with a commonality of feeling, than with the liberalizing effect either on the mind or the individual's productive capacities. It was not Smiles' "self help" but Lamartine's "esprit d'association" which ran throughout their concept of education:

> Instruisez le jeune peuple, si vous voulez qu'il possède toutes les vertus du bon citoyen, le patriotisme, l'énergie, le courage et l'esprit public. Donnez l'éducation au peuple et vous obtiendrez l'esprit d'association le plus éclairé, le plus parfait qu'il vous soit possible de souhaiter. C'est dans l'esprit d'association qu'il excelle généralement. Voyez-vous cette grande famille qu'on appelle le peuple, voyez-la tous les jours dans ses relations ordinaires de la vie. Etudiez cet esprit dominant qui port ses membres à se secourir mutuellement. L'esprit d'association perce dans leurs actes; il y est compris et entendu, comme il ne peut l'être nulle part ailleurs.[190]

The "esprit d'association" had a profound effect upon the latter party formation of the rouges. It did not seek to reconcile conflicting ideas by a spirit of whiggish compromise. Within the association there was ideally a perfect unity of order, and uniformity of action and judgement. If but one voice sang out of tune, the association was justified in removing it from the chorus.[191]

In the formative phase of rouge liberalism, even democracy acquired a fraternal character. It was universal in its appeal, acknowledging no national boundaries or racial barriers: "La démocratie est l'abnegation de tout préjugé national et religeux; c'est

---

[190] L'Avenir, June 30, 1849.

[191] L'Avenir, June 30, 1849. See also Le Pays, Sept. 16, 1856; N. S. Robertson, "The Institut Canadien, An Essay in Cultural History," (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1965), pp. 14, 46-47.

la fraternité évangelique mise en pratique."[192] The early ideological sympathy for the clear-grits seemed to bear out this belief.[193] Philippe Papineau even suggested in a momentary outburst of fraternalism that delegates from Lower Canada be sent to the York Convention proposed by Peter Perry.[194] But as the fifties wore on and the grits became renowned for their francophobia, rouge liberalism redirected its energies to internal objectives.

It was there that liberalism in French Canada struck a false note. Early in the development of rougeisme the "old democrat" who sincerely believed in the world struggle between monarchical reaction and republicanism was a credible character.[195] But as the rouges became more nationalistic and more pragmatic in their outlook, they still retained their anti-aristocratic posture. The old battles were refought. The desertion by the moderate reformers of the spirit of '37 was relived to remind the doubting that the moderate reformers had deserted the ark. Baldwin and Lafontaine were ostracized as late as 1856 for creating a party which was nothing more than a "refuge des arrières, des apôtres de l'ancien régime, en un mot des ennemis de la démocratie et des doctrines populaires."[196] Having thus set up their

---

[192] Ibid., July 10, 1849.

[193] Ibid., Oct. 5, 1850 and Jan. 29, 1851.

[194] L'Avenir, Sept. 6, 1850.

[195] L'Avenir, Feb. 5, 1850.

[196] Le Pays, Nov. 18, 1856. See also L'Avenir, Jan. 15, 1856.

straw man they proceeded to knock him down. The constitutional Reformers were then berated for their attachment to the principles "d'un toryisme pur sang," and for their arrogance in assuming that they were the guardians of anything but mere reaction.[197] The purpose of maintaining this anachronistic controversy with a mythical aristocratic enemy was purely political. Much as the bleu affected an aristocratic manner to separate him from "l'ultra démocratie," so the rouge affected a democratic style as a means of distinction. Their exaggerated postures were in part attributable to their essential similarity in class outlook as well as goals.

The increasing devotion of the rouges to nationalistic objectives was apparent in the proportionate decline of liberal-democratic ideals over the eighteen-fifties. The rouge ideologues of L'Avenir began the decade by a commitment to a number of abstract ideals such as free trade, annexation and/or independence, elective institutions, universal suffrage, and every kind of conceivable reform ranging from education, to legislative, and judicial reform.[198] By mid-decade they had compartmentalized their objectives into broad provincial ones, and those that affected only Lower Canada. Their general goals had become whiggish, ranging equal rights and justice, to permanence of the seat of government, and fixed times for the meeting of Parliament. Universal suffrage became more vague--the extension of the elective

---

[197] Le Pays, Nov. 18, 1856; L'Avenir, Jan. 21, 1856; "L. A. Dessaulles to the Electors of Rougemont," Le Pays, Sept. 16, 1856.

[198] L'Avenir, March 19, 1851.

franchise "dans toute sa plénitude." Their special goals for Lower Canada were more specific and also less democratic: abolition of seigneurial tenure with compensation; and elective legislative council with a "rational" property franchise; educational reform; agricultural improvement; codification of the laws; judicial decentralization; and municipal reform.[199] Those electoral promises came from a rouge willing to divulge his platform to his electorate. The major lights like A. A. Dorion and Luther Holton avoided any positive platform, contenting themselves with negative declamation against the government's tariff policy, and the Grand Trunk Railway.[200] Their positive policies related not to politics at all, but to economic improvement of the St. Lawrence, and the Montreal region.

The measure of the ideological bankruptcy of the rouge movement by the late eighteen-fifties was their excessive concern for morality in government. Even when former ideologues like L. A. Dessaulles and Joseph Doutre faced the electors of Rougemont and Salaberry for election to the new Legislative Council in 1856, they resorted less to the art of rational persuasion than to demagogic declamation. In a breathless jeremiad on the government's turpitude, Dessaulles managed to cover every conceivable fault in the syllabus of human errors:

---

[199] A.D. Bondy to the Electors of Berthier, reported in La Minerve, July 11, 1854.

[200] Cited in New Era, Dec. 8, 1857.

> Toute la politique de l'Administration actuelle se resume comme suit: "Perception des salaires de ses membres; corruption; achat des consciences; soif du pouvoir; ambition déordonné; expédients au jour le jour; intrigue; faux fuyants; tripotages; petitesse; crainte de la surveillance; horreur de contrôle; aucunes vues large; aucune système approfond; rien de sensé; rien de patriotique; rien d'honorable dans les moyens comme dans le but; hostilité envers les hommes indépendants; protections aux plus malrefauteurs [sic] s'ils sont du parti; consequémment démoralisation croissante et inévitable dans toutes les classes de la société."[201]

The rouge newspapers also became preoccupied with morality and frugality in government. The revived version of L'Avenir and the new journal Le Pays printed numerous diatribes on the moral position of the ministry, corruption in government, and excessive capital and land grants to the railways.[202] The only concern which rivalled these in importance was the commercial and political interest of Montreal. Great interest was shown by both newspapers in the form the tariff would take, in the location of the permanent seat of government, and in the fact that Quebec City enjoyed far too many ministerial positions and places on the Lower Canadian Bench.[203]

The rouge had therefore become a political alter ego to the bleu by the late eighteen-fifties. He began the decade as a liberal and a democratic nationalist, and ended it a nationalist. His first priorities were now French Canadian national survival, and disciplined

---

[201] Cited in Le Pays, Sept. 16, 1856. For Doutre's speech see Ibid.

[202] L'Avenir, March 7, 1856, Oct. 15, 1857; Le Pays, June 27, 1856, July 8, 1856, and June 14, 1856.

[203] L'Avenir, March 7, 1856; Le Pays, March 29, 1856, April 8, 1856.

partisan action to secure that objective. Liberalism and democratic action were rapidly relegated to third position. They had become rhetorical symbols of a separate option for survival. Nationality, like Catholicism, was indispensable to the rouges if they were to progress politically and to apply their liberal principles. But they could be accused of the same abandonment of those principles as the Quebec separatists of the nineteen-sixties. Pierre Elliot Trudeau's quotation from Nikita Krushchev's speech to the Twentieth Party Congress applies equally well to the nineteenth century rouges as to the separatists: "We are against the leaders who are of the left and who hide behind Marxist-Leninist ideology but who make it represent chauvinism . . . They now offer a reactionary thesis founded on a union of peoples based on racism and nationalism."[204]

The treason of the rouges was a necessary one in other than purely internal terms. It served to bring that group into the mainstream of Canadian political life. The rouges could now become an interchangeable part in the mechanism of party government. They represented little threat other than a rhetorical one even to the most conservative party. As the French Canadian apostles of 'measures' they gave the appearance of difference from the bleu who preferred 'men' as the source of political combination. But there was no choice other than a rhetorical one since 'measures' like representation by

---

[204] P. E. Trudeau, "Separatist Counter-Revolutionaries," Cité Libre (Dec., 1964), cited in his Federalism and the French Canadians (Toronto: Macmillan, 1968), p. 204.

population or the divorce question were equally repugnant to rouge and bleu. 'Men' like George Brown, however suspect, were suitable and necessary allies in 1858 for A. A. Dorion, and in 1864 for George Cartier.

CONCLUSION

Canadian political attitudes in the eighteen-fifties reflected an "end of ideology" similar to that described by Daniel Bell in his book on contemporary America.[1] Much as the Marxists of the nineteen-thirties were purged by McCarthyism and white-collar materialism in the nineteen-fifties, so the old democratic left was swallowed after 1850 in Canada by a uniformly loyal and bourgeois political environment. Exiles like Papineau and Mackenzie had returned to Canada only to find democratic and aristocratic tensions as subdued as the former class tensions between farmer and merchant. English Canadian politics were typical of their British counterpart in the "age of improvement", and French Canadian public life, of the bourgeois political culture of the Third Empire.

While environmental causes such as urbanization and the transportation revolution militated against ideology, their intellectual cause was related to the decline in ideology in Western Europe.[2] With the failure of the revolutions of 1848, liberal-democracy died a dramatic death in Europe. The eighteen-fifties witnessed the triumph of positivism, nationalism, and political realism

---

[1]See D. Bell, The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties (Glencoe: Free Press, 1960). A similar phenomenon may be observed in the return to normalcy in 1815 in G. E. Dangerfield's, The Era of Good Feelings (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1952).

[2]For a fuller discussion of this theme see Dante Germino, Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), pp. 45-89.

over liberal-democratic nationalism. Lamartine and Mazzini yielded to the "blood and iron" realism and materialism of Cavour, Bismarck, and Napoleon III. Similarly in Canada, rougeisme and clear-grittism were bankrupt ideologies by the elections of 1854, which witnessed the triumph of a conservative coalition which was to dominate Canadian politics for forty years.

More important than the conservative reaction in Western Europe and Canada was the survival of romanticism. Political messianism had merely been displaced by an immanentist social messianism which manifested itself in Europe both in socialist thought and in social conservatism. Romantic liberals like Thomas Carlyle who wrote the French Revolution in 1837 were no less romantic than the Carlyle the social Darwinist who wrote The Nigger Question in 1854. The social conscience of a generation of Russian Marxists from Chernyshevsky to Lenin was no less utopist, despite their political realism, than the Hegelian visions of Bakunin and Herzen in the eighteen-forties. The general assumption upon which most post-1848 romantics operated was that society, not politics and constitutions, was the proper frame of reference for idealism. Social scientism and empiricism merely became the new means to serve the end of social romanticism. Purer societies were to be the result of purer genes, superior work ethics, superior political management, all of which were measured by a posteriori examination of their social utility.[3]

---

[3]See J. Bowle, Politics and Opinion in the Nineteenth Century (London: Cape, 1963), pp. 211-482.

Canadians shared directly in this intellectual revolution because Canada was no longer a colonial culture or literary backwater, where a few European intellectuals like Voltaire, Blackstone, Burke, and Maistre overawed its political elites. In the realm of applied Burkean theory, Brown and Macdonald were the equals of Walter Bagehot, and on Maistre, Bourget and Langevin were the peers of propagandists like Veuillot, Cortes, and Brownson. Almost before Darwin, Spencer and Buckle had formulated their eclectic social hypotheses, Canadians were groping towards an empirical and socially romantic notion of their uniqueness. The Spencerian musing of Walter Bagehot on the English character in his Physics and Politics in 1872 were antedated by both D'Arcy McGee and R. G. Haliburton's articulation of northern environmentalism.[4]

Because Canadians shared in this revolution towards social romanticism and social scientism, political and constitutional ideology gave way to politics as a behavioural science designed either to reflect social context, and reconcile social tensions. Macdonald's conservatism was not the Compact's or even William Draper's conviction in a superior British constitution, but a pragmatic exercise in reducing social tensions--a sociological safety valve.[5] Rougeisme was as much as Cartier's conservatism a reflection of a national

---

[4]See N. St. John-Stevas, Walter Bagehot (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1959), pp. 45-117.

[5]See J. Wearing, "Pressure Group Politics in Canada West Before Confederation," C.H.A.A.R. (1967), 75-94.

denominational, and class context rather than a faith in immutable democratic ideals. Clear-grittism was similarly by the mid-eighteen fifties a sectional and social gospel, thinly disguised as agrarian liberalism.

Belief in environmentalism was also reflected in Canadian attitudes to the outside world. Europe was no longer a source of immutable principles on government and society, but a source of information or factual data which would either confirm or deny the superiority or inferiority of the Canadian environment. The American constitution was no longer, a priori, an inferior mechanism of government designed to collapse, but was only inferior where socially demonstrated to be so. Although anti-Americanism had not yet evolved into a systematic thesis in biology, there was enough empirical evidence presented to convict that society in perpetuity.

The symbols of Empire were yielding to the dictates of nativism and environmentalism. The Crown and the British Constitution were by the mid-eighteen fifties whiggish excrescences compared to the two emergent Canadian nationalisms. A social rationale for Empire had first to wait until Canadians had defined themselves in national terms. The racial messianism of French Canada was still too raw a mix when combined with anglo-saxonism and northernism to yield much to imperialism as a social idea. Another generation would have to elapse before William Kirby and Benjamin Sulte would find common racial cause to support the new imperialism. Even then the racial synthesis was so tenuous that it collapsed under the pressure of the

Boer War and World War I, giving way to a whig revival with Mackenzie King and the Commonwealth.

The impulse to social thought in Canada after 1850 was, like Marxism and social Darwinism, the manservant of social romanticism. Although social class was not recognized as a proper vehicle for this romanticism after 1848, the social romanticism of the right was. Liberal politicians especially have posed since 1850 as evangelists and social philosophers in order to dispel the impact of class upon national politics. George Brown steadfastly pursued a classless social gospel of purity, thrift and justice, and has been followed by a host of Liberal 'thinkers' from Goldwin Smith to Pierre Trudeau who have talked of a "just society." The myth of the vertically integrated society reached its evangelical zenith in Mackenzie King's Industry and Humanity. Subsequent radical politics have similarly dwelt in the realm of social romanticism. The ill-fated attempts of the social gospel to combine with agrarian class unrest in Progressivism, were subsequently offset by the expression of the evangelical general-will with Social Credit in Alberta and the C.C.F. in Saskatchewan.[6]

The romanticism of "race" and "nation" were also born of the Union period. The increasing confusion of those two terms in the eighteen-fifties marked a contrast to Reformers of the forties who preferred the term "nationality" when referring to the two founding

---

[6]R. Allen, "The Social Gospel and the Reform Tradition in Canada, 1890-1928," C.H.R., XLIX (Dec., 1968), 381-99.

peoples of Canada. During the eighteen-fifties both Cartier, Macdonald and their contemporaries referred not only to the Anglo-Saxon race in Canada, but also to "Gallicans" and the "Gallo-Canadian race."[7] These terms used so carelessly in a Canadian context betrayed the genesis of a social Darwinism in Canada as virulent as that which soon swept through the North Atlantic world. Canadians rarely take note of the inaccurate title of Andre Siegfried's book, The Race Question in Canada, or of his numerous references to "the French Canadian race." Yet, Siegfried's racial biases have been so apparent to European and American scholars that they have placed his name along side those of Gobineau, H. S. Chamberlain, Le Bon, and Madariaga![8]

The growth of romantic racism sprung from the ubiquitous whig gospel of the eighteen-forties and eighteen-fifties. Although eighteenth-century American whigs employed the ideology of 1688 to justify their revolution,[9] early nineteenth-century whigs like Lord Durham not only ascribed constitutional properties to anglo-saxon progress but social and economic ones as well. The revolutions of

---

[7]See A. W. Rasporich, "The National Awakening: Canada at Mid-Century" in J. M. Bumsted (ed.), Documentary Problems in Canadian History (Georgetown: Irwin-Dorsey Press, 1969), Vol. I, pp. 229-57.

[8]See F. Underhill, introduction to A. Siegfried, The Race Question in Canada (Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1966), p. 7. See also C. C. Berger, "Race and Liberty: The Historical Ideas of Sir John George Bourinot," C.H.A.A.R. (1965), 87-105.

[9]H. T. Colbourn, The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution (Chapel Hill: University of N.C. Press, 1965), pp. 194-98.

1848 then convinced an entire English-speaking world not only of the superiority of British political institutions, but also of the "English character." Only with the appearance of socialism in France did French Canadians contemplate that latter postulate. By the late nineteenth century a whole generation of politicians and social thinkers (Laurier, Mercier, Bourassa, Gérin, Abbé Laflêche) accepted the premise not only of British institutional superiority but also of the superior virtues of British individualism and technology at the time of the conquest.[10] That willing submission to whig historicism was less a concession to classical whiggery than to the bastardized racial theories that it had carried in its train since Lord Durham. The atavism of the Conquest, not the naturally whiggish subject of the Rebellion in Lower Canada, was the central subject of enquiry, and "racial" synthesis the central purpose.[11]

Whiggery was an emergent social gospel at mid-century. Since the tension between aristocrat and democrat, between radical and tory had been dispelled by the early fifties, the whig played a less meaningful role as a political or constitutional moderate. Reconstructed social whiggery had a great deal more to offer as a

---

[10] R. Cook, "Some French Canadian Interpretations of the Conquest," C.H.A.A.R. (1966), 72-77.

[11] Neo-whigs like Pierre Trudeau are also more concerned with backward habitants in 1760 than with the patriotes of 1837, and direct a racist and whiggish barb at their own people at the Conquest, "French Canadians are perhaps the only people in the world who 'enjoy' democracy without having to fight for it." P. Trudeau, "Some Obstacles to Democracy in Quebec," CJEPS, XXIV (Aug., 1958).

sociological via media, as a tendency to social rather than political moderation. Whiggery had come off its constitutional throne to operate as a bourgeois social ethic. In a class sense, the new whig, much like his American counterpart, had levelled his aristocratic aspirations by the eighteen-fifties. Although there was incipient class hostility in this period, bourgeois whiggery and liberalism stifled it with the myth of self-improvement and democratic capitalism.[12] Whiggery also became the democratized broker of sectional, national, and denominational tensions. It promised freely exchanged opinions and mutual tolerance at best, and mutual but manageable hostility at worst. In the eighteen-fifties, the Liberal-Conservatives posed by and large as the whig brokers of sectional or horizontal tensions, and the Reformers and Rouges as the whig apostles of vertical or class integration.

The Canadian political elites of the eighteen-fifties had thus developed a strong faith in social dialectics. Just as a generation of American politicians had an implicit faith in the nostrums of sectional compromise, so Canadian politicians like Macdonald could announce that the French Canadians, treated as a nation, "will act as a free people generally do--generously." Bolstered by such optimism in the fifties, the same statesmen of the next decade took their "leaps in the dark" towards Slave Emancipation,

---

[12]See L. Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America (New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1955), pp. 111, 203-27; A. Briggs, Victorian People: A Reassessment of Persons and Themes (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 116-39.

Reform Acts, new nations and confederations. But a succession of racial conflicts like the Civil War, the Jamaica Rebellion, the Paris Commune, and the Red River Rebellion were to shatter that confidence. By that time it was too late to call back political ideology to repair the social damage. Nationalism, racism, evangelicalism, and popular imperialism had caught the popular mind as thoroughly as they had the romantic vision of politicians and intellectuals emerging from the shadow of eighteen forty-eight.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following abbreviations will be used for the various archival sources consulted: P.A.C. (Public Archives of Canada); P.A.O. (Provincial Archives of Ontario): A.P.Q. (Archives of the Province of Quebec); T.P.L. (Toronto Public Library); S.T.R. (Seminary of Three Rivers). The collections cited only represent those collections which were of some use to the author in this thesis, and do not therefore include those papers or books which were consulted but found to be of little use for political history in the eighteen-fifties.

I. MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

(a) P.A.C.

S. Amsden Papers
R. Baldwin Papers
H. Becher Papers
R. Bellemare Papers
Bertrand Collection
G. Brown Papers
M. Cameron Papers
B. Chamberlin Papers
C. S. Cherrier Papers
C. Clarke Papers (microfilm)
C. J. Coursol Papers
T. M. Daly Papers
L. A. Dessaulles Papers
J. M. Delisle Papers
Lord Elgin Papers (microfilm)
Edward Ellice Papers
A. T. Galt Papers
O. R. Gowan Papers
M. Gunn Papers (typescripts)
Sir Edmund Head Correspondence
Sir Francis Hincks Papers
Hill Family Collection
Grey of Howick Papers (microfilm)
P. G. Joly Papers (microfilm)
J. Keefer Papers
T. M. Jones Papers
Louis Lafontaine Papers (transcripts)
Lotbinière Papers (microfilm)
Pierre Margry Coll. (microfilm)
J. Macaulay Papers
J. A. Macdonald Papers

J. S. Macdonald-Langlois Papers
Sir Allan MacNab Papers (microfilm)
William McDougall Papers
G. McGillivray Papers
K. MacPherson Papers
J. B. Meilleur Coll. (microfilm)
W. H. Merritt Papers and microfilm
A. N. Morin Papers
William Morris Papers (microfilm)
Alexander Mackenzie Papers (microfilm)
W. L. Mackenzie Papers
Neilson Collection
W. Nelson Papers
E. B. O'Callaghan Papers
O'Connor Papers
O'Gorman Papers
Papineau Papers
F. A. Quesnel Papers
C. S. Ross Papers
J. Rolph Papers
J. B. Robinson Papers (microfilm)
J. Sadlier Papers
R. Spence Papers
Saberdache-Viger Collection
Sidney Smith Papers
F. Têtu Papers
D. B. Viger Papers

(b) P.A.O.

Baby Papers
A. Byerly Papers
A. N. Buell Papers
A. N. Bethune Papers
M. C. Cameron Papers
J. Langton Papers
W. Kirby Papers
J. Macaulay Papers
W. L. Mackenzie Papers
Alexander Morris Papers
J. H. Price Papers
J. E. Small-O. R. Gowan Papers
Sir Henry Smith Papers
D. B. Stevenson Papers
J. Strachan Papers

(c) T.P.L.

Robert Baldwin Papers
J. Hillyard Cameron Papers
Jos. Lesslie Papers
Bishop H. Scadding Collection

(d) Douglas Library, Queen's University

Cartwright Family Correspondence
J. Macaulay Papers
J. A. Macdonald Papers
Alexander Mackenzie Papers
J. A. Macdonald Papers
J. Gooch M.S. on Federation (1858)

(e) A.P.Q.

C.F.X. Baby Papers
R. E. Caron Papers
E. R. Fabre Letterbook
Chapais Collection
Papineau-Bourassa Collection
Taché-Langevin Papers
Mgr. A. Taché Letterbooks

(f) S.T.R.

Vicar-General T. Cooke Papers
Dorion Family Letters
J. Doutre Letters
Col. A. Gugy Papers
Wolfred Nelson Papers
Taché-Laflêche Corresp.
J. Wurtele Papers

(g) Brome County Historical Society Collection (microfilm, P.A.C.)
Lennox and Addington Historical Society Collection (microfilm, P.A.C.)

II. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

(a) M.S.S. at P.A.C.

Colonial Office Correspondence, C.O. 42 (1849-58), microfilm of P.R.O. records.
Provincial Secretary's Correspondence, Canada West, Canada East (1848-58).
Executive Council Minutes and Submissions (1848-58).
Annexation Addresses (1849-50).
Montreal Riots (1849).
St. Grégoire Riots (1850).

(b) Published

Journals of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada.

Census of Canada, 1871 (Ottawa, 1876), Vol. IV.

Côté, J. O. Political Appointments and Elections in the Province of Canada, 1841-65. Ottawa, 1866.

Doughty, A. G. (ed.). The Elgin-Grey Papers, 1846-52. Ottawa: J. A. Patenaude, 1937. 4 vols.

_____. Canada, a Brief Outline of the Geographical Position, Production, Climate, Capabilities. Published by Authority. Toronto: C. W., 1857.

_____. Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly, Appointed to Inquire into the Causes and Importance of the Emigration which Takes Place Annually from Lower Canada into the United States. Montreal: Rollo Campbell, 1849.

III. NEWSPAPERS

L'Avenir (1848-57)
British Whig (Kingston, 1848-56)
Le Canadien (1848-50)
Le Courrier du Canada (1857-58)
Hamilton Gazette (1852-55)
Journal de Quebec (1848-56)
London Free Press (1848-58)
Mackenzie's Weekly Message (1852-58)
La Minerve (1848-58)
Mirror of Parliament (1854-58)

Montreal Gazette (1848-58)
Montreal Pilot (1848-58)
New Era (1857-58)
North American (1850-54)
Le Pays (1852-56)
Quebec Morning Chronicle (1854-58)
Toronto Examiner (1849-55)
Toronto Globe (1848-58)
Toronto Leader (1849-54)
Toronto Weekly Leader and Patriot (1854-58)

IV. PAMPHLETS

(a) P.A.C.

Armstrong, D. M. Letter to His Constituents, Berthier, Oct. 3, 1851 (n.p., n.d.).

Bethune, A. N. The Clergy Reserves Question in Canada. London: R. Clay, 1853.

Campbell, R. Two Lectures on Canada, Jan., 1857. Greenock: A. Mackenzie, 1857.

Cauchon, J. Etude Sur L'Union Projétée des Provinces Britanniques de l'Amérique du Nord. Québec: A. Côté.

Chamberlin, B. Our Country and Our Duty to It. Montreal: William Salter, 1854.

Cooper, H. The Duty of the Members of the Church of England Respecting the Clergy Reserves. Toronto: H. Rowsell, 1854.

Cordner, J. The Foundations of Nationality. Montreal: Henry Rose, 1856.

Crémazie, J. Manuel des Notions Utiles Sur les Droits Politiques le Droit Civil, la Loi Criminelle, et Municipale, Les Lois Rurales. Québec: J. & O. Crémazie, 1852.

Dorion, J. E. (Jacques Edmond). Lecture Publique, et l'Institut et l'Institut Canadien de New-York. Burlington, Vt.: Pierre Cérat, 1854.

Dumesnil, Clement. Reflexions Préliminaires des Vrais Principes Politiques. Montreal: L'Avenir Press, 1849.

_____. De L'Abolition des Droits Féodaux et Seigneuriaux au Canada. Montreal: J. Starke, 1849.

Dunkin, C. A. Address Delivered at the Bar of the Legislative Assembly . . . on Behalf of the Seigniories. Quebec: Chronicle Office, 1853.

Dunn, O. The Climax of Protection and Free Trade. Montreal: Lovell & Gibson, 1849.

Elgin, Lord. The Condition and Prospects of Canada in 1854. Quebec: S. Derbishire, 1855.

Galt, A. T. Canada, 1849 to 1859. Quebec: Middletown & Dawson, 1860.

Gérin-Lajoie, A. Cathéchisme Politique, ou Elemens de Droit Publique et Constitutionnel du Canada. Montreal: Perrault, 1851.

Gugy, Col. A. Letters Originally Published in the Quebec Gazette Addressed to His Excellency, Sir. E. Head, Bart. Quebec: E. Middleton, 1855.

Hogan, J. S. Canada: An Essay. Montreal: J. Lovell, 1855.

Hayward, Mrs. A. The Battles of the Crimea. Port Hope: J. C. Ansley, 1855.

Keefer, T. C. The Philosophy of Railroads. Toronto, 1850.

Langevin, H. Le Canada, Ses Institutions, Ses Ressources, Produits et Manufactures. Québec: Lovell & Lamoreux, 1855.

Lillie, Rev. A. Canada, Its Growth and Prospects, Two Lectures Delivered before the Mechanic's Institute, Toronto. Toronto: T. McLear, 1852.

Lemage, Gaspard. La Pléïade Rouge. Montreal: Minerve Press, 1855.

Lindsey, Charles. The Clergy Reserves: Their History and Present Position. Toronto: North American, 1851.

Macdonald, J. A. To the Electors of Kingston with Extracts of Mr. Macdonald's Speeches Delivered on Different Occasions in the Years 1860-61. (N.p.). 1851.

Mackenzie, W. L. An Almanac of Independence and Freedom for the Year 1860. Toronto: Weekly Message Office, 1860.

Merritt. Lecture Delivered Before the Mechanic's Institute of St. Catharine's. St. Catharine's: H. F. Leavenworth, 1857.

Morris, A. M. Nova Brittania, or British North America, Its Extent and Future. Montreal: J. Lovell, 1858.

_____. Canada and Her Resources, An Essay. Montreal: J. Lovell, 1855.

(Morris, William.) A Canadian Loyalist, Question Answered, Did the Ministry Intend to Pay the Rebels. 2nd ed. Montreal: Armour and Ramsay, 1849.

Mountain, G. J. Thoughts on Annexation, In Connection with the Duty and Interest of the Church of England. Quebec: T. Cary, 1849. Printed for private circulation.

Papineau, L. J. Addresse aux Electeurs de la Cité de Montréal. Petite Nation, Nov. 24, 1851.

Parent, E. Discours Prononcé Devant la Chambre de Lecture de St. Roch. Québec: E. R. Fréchette, 1852.

Robinson, J. B. The Canadian Institute, President's Address. Toronto: Thompson & Co., 1854.

Ross, D. The Seat of Government of Canada: Also, The Composition and Functions of the Legislative Council and the Double Majority of Canada. Quebec: E. R. Fréchette, 1856.

Ryerson, E. In Reply to the Attacks of Foreign Ecclesiastics. Toronto: Lovell & Gibson, 1857.

Sherwood, Henry. Federative Union of the British North American Provinces. Toronto: Lovell & Gibson, 1851.

Strachan, J. Pastoral Address to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Toronto. Toronto: (n.p.), 1852, 1854, 1855, 1856.

_____. Letter to the Rt. Hon. John Russell on the Present State of the Church in Canada. London: G. Bell, 1851.

Taché, J. C. Des Provinces de l'Amérique du Nord et D'une Unione Fédérale. Québec: J. Brousseau, 1858.

Taylor, H. On the Intention of the Imperial Government to Unite the Provinces of British North America. Toronto, 1858.

Townley, A. Seven Letters on the Non-Religious Common School System of Canada and the United States. Toronto: Henry Rowsell, 1853.

_____. Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de Feu Sir. L. H. Lafontaine. Montreal: Eusèbe Senecal, 1864.

_____. Constitution et Reglement de la Société St. Jean Baptiste, de la Cité de Québec. Québec: Bureau et Marcotte, 1853.

_____. Manifeste du Club Nationale Démocratique. Montreal: L'Avenir Press, 1849.

_____. Minutes and Proceedings of the Second Convention of Delegates of the British North American League. Toronto: Patriot Office, 1849.

_____. Report of the Proceedings for the Grand Annual Session of the Right Worshipful, The Grand Lodge of the Royal Orange Association. Toronto: J. Beaty, Patriot Office, 1856.

_____. Statuts de la Société St. Jean-Baptiste, de la Cité de Québec. Québec: Bureau et Marcotte, 1853.

_____. The Anti-Seigneurial Convention of Montreal to the People. Montreal: De Montigny, 1854.

(b) T.P.L.

Barthe, J. G. Le Canada Reconquis par la France. Paris, 1855.

Bethune, A. N. The Duty of Loyalty. Cobourg: Star Office, 1849.

Bourget, Mgr. I. Les Erreurs du Temps. Montreal: Plinguet et Laplante, 1858.

"Britannicus" (William Kirby). Counter manifesto to the Annexationists. Niagara: Mail Office, 1849.

"British Canadian Loyalty." Address to the People of Great Britain and Ireland. (N.p.): C.W., 1849.

Hill, F., et al. Britons Awake! Kingston, 1849.

_____. Canada Elections; Broadsides. Woodstock, 1851: Renfrew, 1855.

_____. French Domination. Hamilton, 1849.

_____. Loyal Orange Association Meeting. Perth, 1855; Kingston, 1857.

(c) P.A.O.

"An Old Citizen." Thoughts on the Last Election and Matters Connected Therewith. Montreal: J. Becket, 1853.

Cooper, Rev. H. The Duty of the Members of the Church of England Respecting the Clergy Reserves. Toronto: H. Rowsell, 1854.

(d) Douglas Library, Queen's U.

Macaulay, George. Canada, Its Political Past, Present and Probable Future. Montreal: Owler & Stevenson, 1858.

Sleigh, Lt. Col. Pine Forests and Hamactrack Clearings. 2nd ed. London: R. Bentley, 1853.

Wardrope, Rev. T. The Present War: A Sermon. Ottawa: Citizen Office, 1855.

V. PERIODICALS

Anglo-American Magazine (1852-55)
London Quarterly Review (1848-58)
Blackwood's (1855-58)
Edinburgh Review (1849-58)
Gentleman's Magazine (1848-58)

VI. BOOKS (TRAVEL, LITERATURE, MEMOIRS, BIOGRAPHY)

Barnard, J. Mémoires Chapais. Montreal: Fides, 1961. 3 vols.

Béchard, A. A. N. Morin. Quebec: Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe, 1885.

Bourget, I. Mandements, Lettres Pastorales, Circulaires et Autre Documents. Montreal: Chapleau Frères, 1869, II, III.

Boyd, J. Sir George Etienne Cartier, Bart. Toronto, 1914.

Careless, J. M. S. Brown of the Globe. Toronto: Macmillan, 1959-64, 2 vols.

Chiniquy, Charles. Fifty Years in the Church of Rome. London: Marshall Press, (n.d.).

_____. Forty Years in the Church of Christ. Chicago: Revell & Co., 1901.

_____. Mes Combats: Autobiography of Charles Quiniquy. Montreal: L'Aurore, 1946.

Crémazie, Octave. Oeuvres Complètes. Montreal, 1882.

Creighton, Donald. John A. Macdonald: The Young Politician. Toronto: Macmillan, 1952, I.

Day, S. P. English America: Or Pictures of Canadian Places and People. London: T. C. Newby, 1864. 2 vols.

Dent, Charles. The Last Forty Years. Toronto, 1881. 2 vols.

Dewart, E. H. Selections from Canadian Poets. Montreal, 1884.

Durand, Charles. Reminiscences. Toronto: Hunter & Rose, 1897.

Fox, W. S. The Letters of William Davies, 1854-61. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1945.

Fréchette, Louis. Mémoires Intîmes. Montreal: Fides, 1961.

Gérin-Lajoie. Dix Ans au Canada de 1840-50. Quebec: J. Demers, 1888.

Hincks, Francis. The Political History of Canada Between 1840-55. Montreal: Dawson Bros., 1877.

_____. Reminiscences of His Public Life. Montreal: Wm. Drysdale, 1884.

Kerr, D. G. G. Sir Edmund Head, A Scholarly Governor. Toronto, 1954.

Labarrère, P. P.J.O. Chauveau. Montreal: Fides, 1961.

Marion, S. Les Lettres des Canadiennes d'Autrefois. Ottawa: Ottawa University Press, 1954, III.

Pouliot, L. Mgr. Bourget et Son Temps. Montreal: Beauchemin, 1955. 2 vols.

Sangster, Charles. St. Lawrence, The Saguenay and Other Poems. Kingston, 1856.

Savaete, A. Mgr. Bourget, Sa Vie, Ses Contrairiétés, Ses Oeuvres, Voix Canadiennes Vers l'Abîme. Paris: Général Catholique, 1916.

Skelton, O. D. The Life and Times of Sir A. T. Galt. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1920.

Sylvain, R. Alessandro Gavazzi. Quebec: Le Centre Pédagogique, 1962. 2 vols.

Tasse, J. Discours de G. E. Cartier. Montreal: Seneca et Fils, 1893.

Turcotte, L. Le Canada Sous L'Union 1847-67. Quebec: J. Demers and Frère (eds.), Le Canadien, 1882.

Thompson, S. Reminiscences of a Canadian Pioneer for the Last Fifty Years. Toronto: Hunter & Rose, 1884.

Trudel, M. Chiniquy. Montreal: Editions du Bien Public, 1955.

Veith, F. Recollections of the Crimean Campaign and the Expedition to Kinburn. Montreal: J. Lovell, 1907.

Young, J. Reminiscences of the Early History of Galt and the Settlement of Dumfries. Toronto: Rose & Co., 1880.

VII: BOOKS (GENERAL)

Allin, C. D., and Jones, G. M. Annexation, Preferential Trade and Reciprocity. Toronto, 1911.

Bell, D. The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.

Billington, R. The Protestant Crusade, 1800-60. New York, 1938.

Bowle, J. Politics and Opinion in the Nineteenth Century. London: Jonathan Cape, 1954.

Butterfield, H. The Whig Interpretation of History. New York: W. W. Norton, 1965. 2nd ed.

Careless, J. M. S. The Union of the Canadas, 1841-57. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1967.

Carswell, J. The Old Cause: Three Biographical Studies in Whiggism. London: Cresset, 1954.

Cornell, P. The Alignment of Political Groups in Canada, 1841-67. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

Charlton, D. G. Secular Religion in France, 1815-70. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

_____. Positivist Thought in France, 1852-70. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Colbourn, H. T. The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution. Durham: University of N. C. Press, 1965.

Cole, G. D. H. Socialist Thought: The Forerunners 1789-1850. London: 1853.

Creighton, D. The Empire of the St. Lawrence. Toronto: Macmillan, 1956.

Duroselle, J. B. Les Débuts du Catholicisme Social en France. Paris: P. U. F., 1951.

Ekirch, A. A. The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-60. New York: 1951.

Evans, D. O. Le Socialisme Romantique: Pierre Leroux et Ses Contemporaines. Paris: M. Rivière, 1948.

Garner, J. The Franchise and Politics in British North America, 1755-1867. Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1962.

Germino, D. Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Hartz, L. The Liberal Tradition in America. New York: Harcourt & Brace, 1955.

_____, et al. The Founding of New Societies. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1964.

Herz, F. Nationality in History and Politics: A Study of the Psychology and Sociology of National Sentiment and Character. London: Kegan-Paul, 1944.

Hill, C. The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution. Oxford U. Press, 1965.

Houghton, W. E. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-70. New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1957.

Kesterton, W. H. A History of Journalism in Canada. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1967.

Klinck, C. F. The Literary History of Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Koebner, R., and Schmidt, H. D. Imperialism, The Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840-1960. Cambridge U. Press, 1965.

Kohn, H. The Idea of Nationalism. 9th ed. New York: Collier Books, 1967.

Lebrun, R. Throne and Altar: The Political and Religious Thought of Joseph de Maistre. Ottawa: U. of Ottawa Press, 1965.

Le Guillou, Louis. L'Evolution de la Pensée de Félicite Lammenais. Paris: Colin, 1966.

Lower, A. R. M. Canadians in the Making. Toronto: Longman's & Green, 1958.

Masters, D. C. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. London: Longman's & Green, 1937.

Matthews, J. Tradition in Exile. Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1962.

Moir, J. S. Church and State in Canada West, 1841-67. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959.

Morton, W. L. The Critical Years: The Union of British North America, 1857-73. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1964.

_____ (ed.). The Shield of Achilles. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1967.

Morrell, W. P. British Colonial Policy in the Age of Peel and Russell. Oxford U. Press, 1930.

Ouellet, F. Histoire Economique et Sociale du Québec, 1760-1850. Montreal: Fides, 1966.

Roe, W. G. Lammenais and England: The Reception of Lammenais' Religious Ideas in England in the Nineteenth Century. Oxford U. Press, 1966.

Rogow, A. A., and Lasswell, H. D. Power, Corruption and Rectitude. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Somervell, D. C. English Thought in the Nineteenth Century. London: Methuen, 1929.

Stacey, C. P. Canada and the British Army: A Study in Responsible Government. Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1963. 2nd ed.

Talmon, J. O. The Origins of Totalitarianism: Political Messianism, the Romantic Phase. London: Secker & Warburg, 1960.

Trudel, M. L'Influence de Voltaire au Canada. Montreal, 1945, 2 vols.

Tucker, G. N. The Canadian Commercial Revolution, 1845-51. New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1936.

Tyler, A. F. Freedom's Ferment. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. 5th printing.

Underhill, F. In Search of Canadian Liberalism. Toronto: Macmillan, 1960.

Vincent, J. The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-68. New York: Scribner, 1967.

Walker, F. A. Catholic Education and Politics in Upper Canada. Toronto, 1955.

Warner, D. F. The Idea of Continental Union, 1849-91. University of Kentucky Press, 1960.

Williams, R. Culture and Society, 1780-1950. London: Chatto & Windus, 1958.

Wilson, A. The Clergy Reserves of Upper Canada: A Canadian Mortmain. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Wise, S. F., and Brown, R. C. Canada Views the United States. Toronto: Macmillan, 1967.

Young, G. M. Victorian Essays. London: Oxford U. Press, 1962.

_____. Profiles of a Province. Toronto: Ontario Hist. Society, 1967.

VIII. ARTICLES

Audet, F. J. "Les Mondelets," Cahiers de Dix, III (1938), 191-227.

Ayearst, M. "The Parti Rouge and the Clergy," C.H.R., XV (1934).

Baillargeon, G. "A Propos de l'Abolition du Régime Seigneurial," R.H.A.F., XXII (Dec., 1968), 365-93.

_____. "La Tenure Seigneurial a-t-elle été abolie par suite des plaintes des censitaires,"XXI (June, 1967), 64-81.

Brodie, H. S. "The Diary of Augustus J. Thibodo," Pacific Northwest Quarterly, XXI (1940), 287-340.

Brown, G. W. "The Grit Party and the Great Reform Convention of 1859," C.H.R., XVI (Sept., 1935), 245-65.

Bruchesi, J. "L'Institut Canadien du Québec," Cahiers de Dix, XII (1947), 93-114.

Burns, R. "The Economic Aspects of the New Nationality," C. H. A. A. R. (1967), 95-105.

Careless, J. M. S. "The Toronto Globe and Agrarian Radicalism, 1850-67," C.H.R., XXIX (1948), 14-39.

_____. "Mid-Victorian Liberalism in Central Canadian Newspapers," C.H.R., XXXI (1950), 221-36.

Chartier, E. "La Vie de l'Esprit au Canada Français: L'Histoire et l'Idée Nationale," Mémoires de la Société Royale, XXVIII (1934),Ser. 3, Sec. 1, 99-109.

Cooper, J. I. "The Political Ideas of George Etienne Cartier," C.H.R., XXIII (Sept., 1942), 286-94.

Desilets, A. "Les Fondateurs de l'Institut Canadien," Rev. de l'Univ. Laval, II (1948), 708-12.

Dandurand, M. "Les Premiers Difficultés entre Mgr. Bourget et L'Institut Canadien de Montréal," Rev. de l'Université d'Ottawa XXV (1967), 145-65.

Hayne, David. "Sur les Traces du Préromantisme Canadien," Rev. de l'Univ. d'Ottawa, XXXI (1961), 152-69.

Hellinger, K. F. "An Essay on the Rise of Historical Pessimism in the Nineteenth Century," C.J.E.P.S., VIII (1942), 514-36.

Hill, R. A. "A Note on Newspaper Patronage in the late 1850's and earl y 1860's," XLIX (March, 1968), 44-60.

Jones, E. "Ephemeral Compromise, The Great Reform Convention Revisited," J. of Canadian Studies, III (Feb., 1968), 21-28.

Hodgins, B. W. "John Sandfield Macdonald and the Crisis of 1863," C.H.A.A.R. (1965), 30-46.

_____, and Jones, E. "A Letter on the Reform Party, 1860: Sandfield Macdonald and the London Free Press," Ontario History, LVII (March, 1965), 39-45.

Lebel, M. "P.J.O. Chauveau, Humaniste du Dix-Neuvième Siecle," Royal Soc. Proc. and Trans., sec. III, LVI, pp. 1-11.

MacDermott, T.W.L. "The Political Ideas of John A. Macdonald," C.H.R., XIV (Sept., 1933), 247-64.

Moir, J. S. "The Canadianization of the Protestant Churches," C.H.A.A.R. (1966), 56-69.

Monet, J. "French Canada and the Annexation Crisis, 1848-50," C.H.R. XLVII (Sept., 1966), 249-64.

Morin, V. "Clubs et Sociétés Notaires d'Autrefois," Cahiers de Dix, XV (1950), 186-88.

Ouellet, F. "D. B. Viger et le Problème d'Annexion," Bull. de Rech. Hist., LVII (1951), 195-206.

_____. "Etienne Parent et Le Mouvement du Catholicisme Social," Bull. de Rech. Hist., LXI (1955), 99-118.

_____. "L'Abolition du Régime Seigneurial et L'Idee de Propriete," Hermes, IV (Jan., o955), 22-36.

Pouliot, L., "Au Lendemain de l'Emeute de 1849; Une Lettre de Mgr. Bourget à Mgr. Tourgeon, Mar. 2, 1849," R.H.A.F., IX (1955-56), 117-19.

_____. "L'Institut Canadien de Montréal et L'Institut National," R.H.A.F., XIV (1961-62), 481-86.

Richard, L. "Jacob DeWitt, 1785-1859," R.H.A.F., II (1949-50), 537-56.

Saint-Pierre, A. "La Littérature Sociale Canadienne-Francais Avant La Confederation," Roy. Soc. Proc. & Trans., XLIV, Ser. 3 (1950), Sec. 1, 67-94.

Short, A. "Canada Exhibited, 1851-67," C.H.R., XLVIII (Dec., 1967), 353-65.

Smith, A.J.M. "Colonialism and Nationalism in Canadian Poetry Before Confederation," C.H.A.A.R. (1944), 74-85.

Surveyer, E. R. Fabre. "E. R. Fabre," Royal Soc. Proc. & Trans., ser. III, XXXVIII (1944), 89-113.

Sylvain, P. "Lamartine et les Catholiques de France et du Canada," R.H.A.F., IV (1950), 375-97.

_____. "Aperçu sur le Prosélytisme Protestante au Canada Français de 1760 à 1860," Roy. Soc. & Trans., LV (1961), Ser. 3, Sec. 1, 65-76.

Trepannier, L. "Les Figures de Maires," Cahiers de Dix, XX (1955), 149-79.

Wise, S. F. "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History," United Church Bulletin, (1965), No. 18, 3-19.

Wearing, J. "Pressure Group Politics in Canada West Before Confederation," C.H.A.A.R. (1967), 75-95.

IX. THESES

Beer, D. "The Political Career of Sir Allan MacNab." Unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1963.

Clarke, Dorothy P. "The Attitude of the Colonial Office to the Working of Responsible Government, 1854-68." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 1953.

Fallis, L. S., Jr. "The Idea of Progress in the Province of Canada." Unpublished dissertation, University of Michigan, 1965.

Griezic, Foster J. K. "An Uncommon Conservative: The Political Career of John Hillyard Cameron, 1846-62." Unpublished Master's thesis, Carleton University, 1965.

Hodgins, B. W. "Attitudes Towards Democracy in the Pre-Confederation Decade." Unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1955.

_____. "The Political Career of John Sandfield Macdonald to the Fall of his Administration in 1864: A Study in Canadian Politics." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1965.

Hart, Shirley E. C. "The Elective Legislative Council in Canada Under the Union." Unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1960.

Jensen, V. "Lafontaine and the Canadian Union." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1942.

Lyne, D. C. "The Irish in the Province of Canada in the Decade Leading to Confederation." Unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, 1960.

Metcalfe, G. "The Political Career of William Henry Draper, 1836-47." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1959.

McFee, D. E. "The Hon. William McDougall, C. B." Unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1948.

Mills, G. H. S. "The Annexation Crisis of 1859-50 as Seen Through the Lower Canadian Press." Unpublished Master's thesis, McGill University, 1947.

Monet, J. "The Last Cannon Shot: A Study of French Canadian Nationalism, 1837-50." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, 1964.

Murray, A. L. "Canada and the Anglo-American Slavery Movement: A Study in International Philanthropy." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1960.

Parrott, "The Rise of the Clear Grits in Canada West from 1850-60." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1947.

Robertson, Nancy S. "The Institut Canadien, An Essay in Cultural History." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1965.