CHAPTER XXV.

The finances of the province, 1821—Public functionaries—The Royal Institution, 1822—The Union Bill, 1822—Messrs. Papineau and Neilson delegated to London—Opinion of Lord Bathurst on Canada—L. J. Papineau as an orator, etc.

All the discussions of the hour seemed to revolve around that of the control of finances and of revenues, as around a central pivot. The proceedings in 1821 furnish an exact idea of the general Parliamentary business. The estimates laid on the table of the clerk of the House, 21st December, with an expression on the part of the governor that they should not be annually voted, meaning that certain sums for defraying civil administration were expected to be consented to during the life of his present most Gracious Majesty. M. Taschereau, who conducted the debate, caused the reply to be made as follows: "The sums necessary for the support of His Majesty's civil government in this province ought to be voted and appropriated annually, and not otherwise." It goes without saying that the government employees were of the same opinion as the ministers in London, and the "family compact" in Canada, in regard to the finances of the colony. They retained the patronage which should have been subject to the control of the assembly.

Towards the beginning of the nineteenth century, it would appear that the House of Commons of the United Kingdom did not check very closely that portion of the civil list which includes the salaries of public officers; but this was simply because there was no desire to bother with it, for its right, as far as this point is concerned, was incontestable. In Canada, the use and distribution of the moneys had to be established item by item, which was the only means of keeping any control over the executive power appointed by the Crown and of making sure of the assiduity and integrity of all ranks and classes of public employees.

"In time long past, when the revenues from Crown lands and other sources sufficed to pay the various officials, English kings were able to govern without much regard for the wishes of Parliament. But when (as frequently happened) they had to apply to Parliament for money, the House of Commons was able to enforce the redress of grievances, to procure dismissal of incompetent officials, or, in short, to insist on any line of public policy being followed as the price to be paid for the money. Taking advantage of the frequent necessities of the Crown, the House of Commons gradually secured complete control of the public purse. The heads of the chief departments, who formed the King's executive council or cabinet, had to be men possessing the confidence of the 'people's house'; otherwise supplies for carrying on government might be refused."*

Sir Robert Shore Milnes had ceased to be lieutenant-governor on the 28th November, 1808, but his sinecure, with a salary of £1,500 per annum, had passed to Sir Francis Nathaniel Burton, who lived in England. Upon the remonstrance of the assembly, he came to the province in 1822. The situation of the lieutenant-governor of Gaspé was identical; to this Lord Dalhousie replied that such an officer was necessary, and that, instead of cutting down his pay (£300) it should be increased, in order that he might reside within the region governed by him.

The secretary of the province, Mr. Amiot, an official of the colonial office, had never set foot in Canada; he received £400 a year and employed a deputy, M. J. Taylor, who collected the fees of his office in Quebec. In reply to a question in the assembly on that subject, the governor answered that, at the death of Mr. Amiot, care will be taken to appoint a successor who will reside in the colony. Later on, to make room for Mr. Daly, as deputy, Mr. Amiot was put on the pension list at £400 sterling per annum, so that the province was saddled with that additional sum until 1845.

It was also the opinion of the House that no salary should be allowed to any of the members of the executive council, non-resident in the province.

Even Thomas Moore, the poet, drew between £300 and £400 yearly on the pretext of a job that had been given him in Montreal, while in reality he spent only fifteen days, in all his life, in Canada, when he composed his famous "Canadian Boat Song."

*Clement: *History of Canada*, p. 186.

The offices of judge of the Vice-Admiralty and judge of the Court of King's Bench were combined in the same person, also the office of judge of King's Bench and French translator; also that of a judge of the same court and of auditor of public accounts.

As a contrast to that state of things, Mr. Neilson observed that the richest land and property owners in the province cannot calculate upon any revenue from that source exceeding £1,500 per annum; that the professional men consider they are doing very well if they get the same amount, and this income, as a rule, would only last for about ten years. The functionaries, he added, receive a higher pay than the most wealthy proprietors, and more than the individuals engaged in the most profitable branches of industry—thus they are the lords of the land, because the largest income always produces such an effect.

"Mr. Papineau, speaker of the assembly, was shortly after the beginning of the session (1821) called to a seat in the executive council, as were also Mr. Hale, a member of the legislative council, and Lieut.-Colonel Ready, civil secretary to the governor-in-chief, a gentleman who had come to the province with the Duke of Richmond and served in that capacity under him."

"As Mr. Papineau, the speaker of the assembly, was the most influential leader amongst the Canadians, the colonial office, recalling the advice given by Sir John C. Sherbrooke, in 1816, sought, apparently, to win him over. Orders were given to Lord Dalhousie to appoint him to the executive council. Mr. Papineau, being convinced that alone he could exercise no influence upon that legislative body, never made his appearance there; and, in 1823, the advantages which the government had expected to gain by the presence of the speaker of the House at its deliberations, not being realized, he was discharged therefrom."†

The fact is that Mr. Papineau attended two or three sittings of the executive council soon after his appointment there, but ceased after that, probably for the reason mentioned by Garneau.‡

*Christie, II., 352.
†Garneau, III., 232.
‡Note of Mr. F. J. Audet, office of the Secretary of State, Ottawa.

The House of Assembly, at that period, possessed several men whose talents were of the highest order; and, although the Quebec *Mercury,* and the official circles affected a great disdain for the *illiterate habitants,* yet the British government was well aware that these so-called ignorant people, were, most frequently, persons of great worth, of perfectly dignified manners and unwavering patriotism, and that their leaders, far from being demagogues, would have been worthy to occupy seats in the House of Commons. The honourable John Richardson, a member of the legislative council and a merchant of high standing declared at a sitting of that body that all these talents and energies were displayed with a view to bring about a revolution, a *coup d'Etat,* and remove the governor in order to make place for one of them. This brought against Mr. Papineau the accusation of looking for the dictature of the country. It may not have been believed in Canada, but it was in England!

The Royal Institution was created (1801) as the nucleus of a scheme of education for the province, ignoring the Catholic colleges and schools already in existence. It is true these were not supported by the state, nevertheless they had done very well for years and were full of promise for the future.

A bill was passed, 1814, amending the Royal Institution Act of 1801. It provided, among other things, that if a majority of fifty landholders in a parish or township wished to establish a school, they should serve a notarial act upon a resident militia officer highest in rank, who should then call a meeting for the election of five trustees, in addition to the senior magistrate, curé or minister.

In 1818 the number of schools in the province, under the Royal Institution, were 37, attended by 1,048 scholars, at a cost of £1,883 sterling.

Of the eighteen trustees of the Royal Institution appointed in 1818, four only were Roman Catholics, and of the fourteen Protestants three were prominent officials of Upper Canada. The teachers were principally from Great Britain, unacquainted with the French language and generally ignorant of the habits of the people.

In December, 1819, Chief Justice Monck, who was acting as administrator consequent upon the death of the Duke of Richmond, wrote that the

Royal Institution for the advancement of learning had ample means to effect "the execution of the law," but such means were simply expectations. The Institution only existed on paper. An attempt was made to give it an impulse, about 1820, for the following reason: Mr. James McGill, a merchant of Montreal, made a will in 1811 bequeathing the land known as Burnside and ten thousand pounds in money, to erect within ten years after his death, a college to be called McGill College. The donor's death happened in 1813, therefore, the Royal Institution wished to be put in possession of the land and funds before 1823, but the refusal of the executor to act or transfer the property postponed the matter until 1829, when the Royal Institution was no more, so that the college was begun with the means furnished by Mr. McGill and supplemented by the liberality of Mr. W. Molson, another Montreal merchant.

The number of schools under the management of the Royal Institution soon began to diminish, and in 1820, all applications for schools to be placed under its control entirely ceased.

The College of Nicolet was founded in 1804, that of Hyacinth in 1812. The older ones in Quebec and Montreal were doing well.

The bill passed in 1822 was satisfactory to the Catholics, and Mgr. Plessis approved of it because, among other things, the Catholics would cease to pay for Protestant schools.

By that time schools had been opened in several localities, and the Nicolet College was in a thriving condition, as well as the others already mentioned.

"It was Messrs. Papineau, Neilson and Cuvillier who directed the great debate on the finances which took place with the colonial office, represented here by the governor and the council. Papineau and Neilson took charge of the principles at stake, and Cuvillier of the figures and calculations. There was no imposing upon them, nor placing them in the wrong in regard to questions of taxes and finances; but the power remained with the ministers, and they made use of it to dissolve Parliament, in order to intimidate the representatives of the people. For several years, scarcely was there a single Parliament that attained to its natural term. Such an extra-

ordinary state of affairs had to come to an end, because business was checked and the minds of the people became impatient.''*

In 1822 two Acts, granting for the public service certain annual sums to the Crown had expired. The House did not renew them, despite the request made by the governor, and the treasury was thus left without any authority to meet the expenditure. By this means the executive council found itself paralyzed, exactly what the House desired in order to secure a hold of the purse-strings. In our days the executive, or the cabinet of ministers, constitutes a part of Parliament, and cannot expend a cent without the permission of the latter. In the days to which we refer, in the foregoing, the ministers, or members of the executive council, were named by the Crown, without the participation of the legislative assembly, which represents the people, and, still more, the ministers arrogated to themselves the right to dispose of the public's money according to their own judgment. The refusal of the assembly to vote the estimates otherwise than item by item, in order to ascertain exactly in what direction the money goes, obliged the executive either to remain still with folded arms, or to dig into the public chest without having secured permission.

The state of affairs was becoming serious; but neither the executive council, nor the legislative council, would give in to the Lower House. This deadlock threatened to lead to anarchy, when, all of a sudden, a change in the political temperature occurred, and without settling the budget question, for the moment, as we will soon see, it was relegated to the future.

Throughout 1821 the complaints of Upper Canada were numerous as to the proportion of duties each was to receive. For twenty years no dispute had taken place on that subject, but since the lapse of the agreement of 1817, the misunderstanding had caused great embarrassment financially to Upper Canada. The claim was for some arrears due under said agreement.

The agreement concluded, on the 1st May, 1817, between Upper and Lower Canada concerning the proportion of the customs revenue belonging to each of these provinces, had been sanctioned during the session of 1818; but had been extinct since the 1st July, 1819. Later, a commission was

*Garneau, III., 237.

formed to take up the question anew, from its inception, but it could not come to an understanding on account of the demands of Upper Canada appearing excessive.

"By the agreement of 1817 one-fifth of the whole duty raised in Lower Canada was allowed the upper province, the expenses of collection being first deducted, but a greater proportion was now claimed, besides certain arrears to the amount of £30,000, which the commissioners* of Lower Canada refused."†

The Upper Canadian legislature referred the matter for consideration to the Imperial government, and notified the authorities in Lower Canada to that effect. This step brought out in its real light the project, of the legislative union of the two provinces, hitherto discussed under cover by the party consisting of the executive council, the legislative council, the bureau of governors, the English officials and a few merchants. In a short while a bill, to this effect, was submitted to the House of Commons in London, including at the same time questions of trade, of customs, and other matters, as if it were intended that the proposed law should settle the principal difficulties between the two provinces.

The articles concerning the union were most strongly attacked, and the ministers decided to suspend their discussion until such time as the opinions of the inhabitants of each province, in this regard, should be obtained.

The bill, modified to the following extent, became law, under the title of the Canada Trade Act. It granted to Upper Canada, in a permanent form, the conditions of the agreement of 1st May, 1817, in regard to the customs; in addition, the two supply bills, mentioned above, which had been intentionally killed in the Quebec House, were revived and put in force in permanent form, but subject to modifications on the part of the Lower Canadian legislature, provided that of Upper Canada was consenting; besides, the legislature of Lower Canada would no longer be allowed to impose new duties upon goods imported from across the ocean unless with the consent of Upper Canada, or unless the bill passed for that purpose should have been laid before the Imperial Parliament and the royal assent obtained.

*Messrs. Papineau, Cuvillier, Neilson, Davidson, Garden, all members of the Assembly.
†Christie, II., 380.

This political stroke, which resembles a stage-transformation, defeated the plans of the Quebec House, and, at the same time, deprived it of the powers theretofore exercised by it in regard to the customs.

The last four hundred words form a very brief summary of that important event. We will now see a few details, especially in regard to the projected union, while we examine the part played by Papineau during the years 1821-22.

Jonathan Sewell, chief justice of Lower Canada from 1808 to 1838, had published in 1814 a "Plan for the Federal Union of the British provinces in North America," and in 1824 another pamphlet on the same subject.

Mr. Pitt, in explaining the bill of 1791 for the constitution of Canada into two separate provinces, states, "that his intention was to accustom the Canadians to the language, the habits, and, above all, the laws and the constitution of Great Britain." This declaration may seem strange when one looks over the history of the years subsequent to 1791, since, on the one side, it is clear that the Imperial authorities wished to leave Lower Canada to the French Canadians and to form an English province in Upper Canada. Mr. Lymburner, of Quebec, explained the illogical aspect of such a system, to Mr. Pitt, but no attention was paid to him. From the moment that it was sought to have the Canadians conform to English customs, it became necessary to bring the two provinces under one government, and to keep the mass of English-speaking colonists in Lower Canada. During thirty years all the efforts of the colonial office were exerted to make the separation absolute, and then, in 1822, when the union of the provinces was proposed, Mr. Lymburner opposed it on the ground, as he said, that it was too late and that the two Canadas were in a state of antagonism to one another.

From all this it is apparent that the union of the Canadas was in the secret thoughts of the anti-Canadian party of Montreal. "About the year 1820 the colonial office had taken up again the question of the union of the two provinces, which eventually became the reflecting glass of its Canadian policy. In consequence, the governor was not to give way to any concessions in regard to finances; it was decided to refuse agreement with any matter touching howsoever remotely upon the rights of the Crown, and,

should a crisis follow, advantage would be taken of it to unite the two Canadas. This resulted from the rivalry between the two Houses. It was only necessary to continue maintaining the legislative council in its opposition to the assembly; in refusing everything to the latter, and, soon would the crisis be pushed to a degree that would enable the ministers to prove to the Imperial Parliament that the union of the provinces was the only remedy calculated to put an end to these troubles. . . . This explains how it was that the demands of the assembly, no matter how reasonable they may have been, were, under the inspiration of Judge Sewell, rejected by the legislative council."*

"In the preparation of the measure, or bill, for the abrogation of the constitution of 1791 and the union of the two provinces in one, Mr. Ellice, the owner of the Beauharnois *seigneurie,* acted as intermediary between the merchants of Montreal and the ministers; but as he had an inveterate enemy in Mr. William Parker, his former business partner in Canada, the latter gave the alarm, so that when the measure was brought before the House of Commons, Sir James MacIntosh, and Sir Francis Burdett, who had been forewarned, opposed it. One of the ministers, Mr. Wilmot, made the admission, that if the law were not passed at once, such a number of petitions, dictated by ignorance and prejudice, would be sent in, that it would become impossible to ever adopt it."†

On the 15th July, 1822, L. J. Papineau wrote as follows, to his brother, Denis-Benjamin: "The present moment is one of cruel disquietude for all the friends of a country that is menaced with an instantaneous destruction of every means left to prevent the ruin of its establishments and the overthrowing of its laws, through the reunion of the two provinces, which would leave to Upper Canada, with its mere 120,000 inhabitants, forty representatives, and only fifty to Lower Canada, with its 550,000 of a population. We are assured that this unjust law was to be introduced about the middle of May, but it had not been on the 5th June, as I learned from Mr. Caldwell, who has just returned from England; at the same time we are assured that it was on the point of being introduced by the ministers, and that it would pass without any opposition; and the only motive advanced is that

*Garneau, III., 229, 239.
†P. J. O. Chauveau: *Garneau et ses Oeuvres,* CLXXIII.

it is easier to govern one colony than two; that Lower Canada must be Anglified; that if the people are satisfied therewith they would be in a better condition to defend themselves in case of attack; that if they are dissatisfied it does not much matter, because the colonies are a load to carry when economy is the order of the day."

At this point petitions were being signed in the two Canadas, some in favour of the bill, others against it, and still others that asked to have the details of the project made known to the public of the interested provinces before being submitted to the British Parliament. It was evident to all that it was a stroke planned by a few quasi-idealists, or by men acting purely in their own private interests.

The North-West Company, which enjoyed considerable influence in London, wished for the union. Its directors in Canada were Messrs. Richardson and McGill, two extremist leaders of the English party.

Ellice had been a clerk in their house; he subsequently went to the West Indies, where he married a daughter of Earl Grey—who became, later, the strongest man in the Whig party. Ellice, being owner of the Beauharnois *seigneurie,* preserved an attachment for Canada (his father had been a large trader in this country), and sought to upset the plans of Pitt. It was he who caused the ministry (in 1822) to present the Union Act.

The bill gave Lower Canada a much weaker representation than to Upper Canada. It gave the councillors, not elected by the people, the right to take part in the debates of the assembly. It abolished the official use of the French language, and put restrictions upon the religious freedom and the rights of the Catholic Church. It also curtailed the rights of representatives in regard to the appropriation of the taxes. That law seemed to have been dictated by a most retrogressive and hostile spirit.

The Act afforded facilities for voluntary commutation of lands *en seigneurie,* by making provisions for replacing the *quints* which would be lost to the colonial treasury thereby, and for obviating the necessity of holding the "clergy reserves" out of any part of the regranted lands.

It was evident that all this had been prepared in Lower Canada; for we can scarcely suppose that the British Parliament and ministry would

have put a hand to such scheme were it not that they were guided therein by their confidence in the colonial government. The greater number of English-speaking people in Lower Canada claimed to favour the union, but they all disapproved of the bill as being both badly conceived and full of crying injustices. In Upper Canada vigorous petitions against the bill were signed. In the legislative assembly there were only three votes in favour of the union; in the council there were six. Public opinion evidently exercised an influence upon both Houses.

Mr. Ryland wrote, in October, 1822, proposing a system that would remedy, he thought, the difficulties of the moment: "Either unite the legislatures of Upper and Lower Canada, or, by giving a fair representation to the townships, secure an English influence in the house of assembly. Perfect the constitution by creating a hereditary aristocracy (for which the Crown Reserves were originally set apart) and make your legislative council so *respectable* as to render a seat therein an object of ambition to every man of character and talent. Exercise exclusively the patronage of the Romish Church, and give the Romish Bishop clearly to understand that the slightest opposition on his part to this regulation will put an end to his allowance of £1,500 sterling per annum. Admit no more co-adjutors."

The great meeting at Montreal, in regard to this question was held the 7th October, 1822, and the one at Quebec the 14th of the same month. The legislative council was intimidated by these public demonstrations, and it pronounced against the union. Like the Lower House, it sent its address to Papineau and Neilson to have it brought before the King, the Lords and the Commons. In the council, Richardson, Ryland, Grant, Irvine, Roderick, Mackenzie, Fellow had fought against the adoption of the address.

Mr. Samuel Gale, a native of Florida, was a landowner in the townships, and, morever, president of the Court of Quarter Sessions for the city and district of Montreal. It was he who undertook to forward to London the petitions in favour of the union. Mr. James Stuart separated from the Canadian party, became the unionist champion, and thereby reached the Attorney-Generalship (1825).

Messrs. Papineau and Neilson were appointed to carry to the home government the petitions bearing sixty thousand signatures, but they reached London only to find that the ministry would not support the bill.

John Neilson was a philosopher, who was compared to Franklin by those who met him in England. As a journalist he had a style, laconic, coldly and calmly cynical, that was peculiarly his own, and a special knack of bringing out, by means of quotations and comparisons, the exaggerations or the contradictions of his adversaries. Although a Protestant he was an intimate friend of Bishop Plessis and of the most eminent members of the Catholic clergy. On account of his erudition, his wisdom, and his moderation, he was, for a long time, considered as a kind of political oracle in the district of Quebec.

William Parker, who had made a fortune in Canada, lived in retirement in England. He became aware of the union bill, and went to the office on Downing Street, where he accused Ellice of several misdeeds and of roguery in this affair; but he was not listened to. He was more successful with Sir James Mackintosh and Sir Francis Burdett, as well as a few other members. An opposition was organized which stopped the bill at the second reading.

Papineau says that, in 1822, when delegated to London, he found himself in the presence of "a Tory, Conservative and absolute minister, who gave him a hearty welcome and showed him real honest respect."* And he adds: "Lord Bathurst, colonial minister,† spoke to me somewhat as follows: 'I admit that for colonial possessions, wherein the population is doubled in a few years, the system of which you complain can only be for a period of organized transition and of sickly evolutions, which must be followed by a normal organization and independence, . . . you are too far from England to properly appreciate it, and too near the United States not to be dazzled by their deceptive prosperity. All I ask of you is twenty-five years of patience and resignation, and then you will witness the transformations which you desire.'" Lord Bathurst based his view upon the then very general belief that democracy would bring about, towards 1840, divisions in the United States, and that regions neighbouring Canada would take back the British flag, which would open out a new colonial era, calculated to fulfil Papineau's desires. For example Canada was granted self-

*_La Revue du Peuple_, Paris, May, 1839.

†From 1809 to 1829.

government, with the counterbalancing weight of an hereditary House. On this point, the minister explained that if the creation of an aristocracy had not yet been attempted in Canada, it was on account of the poverty of the people—the same argument as that used by Fox against a similar project of Pitt in 1791. But, according to Lord Bathurst, they might create large and extensive landed proprietors who could become wealthy with the aid of a well-directed immigration; Mr. Papineau was inclined to similar views, and it was possibly believed in London, that there might be a way to turn him over by dangling before him the prospect of an elevation to a rank that would be entirely in accord with his nature.

The reader may not realize the place this great orator occupied in the opinion of his adversaries as well as of his admirers, it is a fact, though, that his personality attracted for many years the attention of the public in Canada, in the Maritime Provinces and even in England. Garneau says: "He was an energetic and persistent speaker, who never once deviated from his chosen path, in his long political career. He was gifted with an imposing appearance, a strong and penetrating voice, and that rugged and "Physically he was a man of tall stature, with strongly marked features, animated eloquence which stirs the masses." Chauveau says of him: but handsome and sympathetic. In his whole appearance, in his manner, there was a something of grandeur that, at first sight, impressed and prepossessed one. Until the hour of his death he retained the enjoyment of all his mental faculties. Even then his physique was still vigorous, if we except his hearing, which, for some years, had been considerably enfeebled."

"Of a lofty and elegant stature, with a splendid shape, aristocratic features, a head indicative of pride, nobility, and intelligence—something of Lafayette and Washington combined—the distinctive polish of the French united to the majestic bearing of the English, all the externals that mark a man made to command by the grandeur of his character and the superiority of his intelligence"—such, according to L. O. David, was L. J. Papineau.

Now we beg to submit our personal souvenir of the man who forms the subject of the present sketch. Mr. Papineau had a fine figure, souple, pleasant, erect; a noble carriage, and graceful action. All in him spoke of

goodness. His features in repose were a real model; but when animated they spoke to the eye, so clearly were his thoughts depicted upon them. His voice, full and well modulated, could reach a great distance, but near at hand, in conversation, it was of an ordinary tone and always agreeable. His affable ways, his energetic gesture, his polished and admirably sustained conversation nearly always tinged with playfulness, made him the idol of his surroundings. When he appeared in the House for the first time, he astonished the assembly, received a flood of congratulations and expressions of admiration, and found himself, almost at once, even though a new member, ranked amongst the veterans. Theatrical, after his own fashion, he grew animated in speaking and acted that which his words described. He regulated the enthusiasm of the masses as he would a piece of music.

His temperament was sanguine and bilious. With him the heart was the principal organ which acted under the impulse of a thought or of a surprise, while his blood was visibly stirred up. This gave warmth, sympathetic and humane force to his language; everything about him was apparent to the observer, and this captivated all men of sentiment. Feeling that he was listened to he rushed onward with the spirit of a noble steed that sees ahead of him the long road over which he must career. The cold facts which he explained to his audience assumed poetic shapes; he appealed to history, to the sayings of eminent men, quoted verses, scanned his phrases with the exactness of a rhetorician, and, like unto the eloquence of the ancients, his language, by an unbroken and lyric diction well calculated to charm, astonished and captivated the people. His entirely French style never for a moment lagged; he could take up, in an instant, the different shreds of his speech and impart to them, each time, a completely fresh coloring. Having a deep respect for the language he never forgot himself to the point of introducing any vulgarisms. This left an enormous impression upon even the most obtuse minds, for it made them feel the presence of a master, or of a superior. The flame of enthusiasm once lit up, enveloped all, darted from end to end of the address, and fired the imagination of his auditors.

If, on the other hand, his bilious organization were stirred up, which frequently occurred during the detailing of certain grievances that were

looked upon as a gaping wound in the side of that wonderful man, irony, sarcasm and invective poured out in a torrent of phrases, an emphatic tone dominated all others, and, according to the custom in his day, he became biting, he stabbed right and left, twisted and turned the situation, dragged his palpitating audience from irritation to irritation, and finally left them there, aroused, bewildered, overwhelmed.

The nervous system apparently was of small consequence in his personality. He controlled it entirely. It is well known that nervous people never produce as great an effect upon the public as do those of more sanguine temperaments, and this can be readily understood since any evidence of nervousness is an indication of weakness.

Even less pliable than nervous, Papineau was all assiduity, persistence and force. It might have been expected of him that he would be gay, jovial and petulant, but he was no such thing. Rather was his expression solemn; still his amiability in conversation led him frequently into a chatty mood, when he displayed a variety of sources. A man's temperament is subordinate to his character in an organization that is properly constituted. Papineau's character was that of a calculator; not the calculation of figures, but rather that which consists in correctly measuring the consequences of an event, of a word, of a proposition. Having assumed the mission of politically educating the people, he could foresee, at long or short range, the result of any political step. He never tried to hurry that which, of necessity, would require a length of time to accomplish, while he knew how to rush whatever he believed to require immediate action. Without that calculating faculty he never could have sustained, during twenty years, a series of electoral campaigns and parliamentary debates, the like of which are rare in the history of the colonies, or even in that of the British Empire. Towards 1837 he made the mistake of not perceiving that he had let loose the lion of popular excitement, and that the animal being of a temperament both nervous and bilious, was naturally possessed of ferocity.

We have read a hundred letters, written by his hand, replete with lengthy and detailed passages concerning the members of his family and their friends. These letters were brimful of affection, of kindliness and of

care for those who belonged to him. Their tone was warm, their language gentle, their manner pleasant. They portrayed him as we have known him in subsequent years, for they were written between 1810 and 1834.

His reading was diversified. His memory, which was excellent, enabled him to draw from volumes that he had not read for years. In conversation he always kept to the level of his company. Each one had the idea that Papineau was just like "himself." Age made no difference; with the aged he was old, with youth he was young. His language suited as did his action the part that he played; his exquisite politeness was never tiresome. Such was that idol of the Canadians, and, truly, no person has ever dared scoff at that glorious and stainless popularity, for his private life was a model of purity and of wisdom.

His means of livelihood were never ample. The career of political leader demands an expenditure of time and money. We have seen enough papers belonging to the two Papineaus to learn that they lived in a restricted style that verged on poverty. Their seigneurie of the Petite-Nation (Montebelle), gave an easy living to Louis-Joseph only, and even that not until about 1860 when he was in his seventieth year. He and his father had worked hard, since 1804, to clear that land which was situated at the "jump-off end of creation," on the River Ottawa and amidst the primeval wilderness of two centuries past. They earned well the small amount of comfort that they enjoyed towards the close of their lives.

In his letters, as in his speeches, he adhered to the lengthy-phrased style of the eighteenth century. Nearly all his sentences are divided into four or five sections, separated from each other by semi-colons. In our age three such divisions, or members of a phrase are allowable; yet some even consider them too many.

Not any more than his contemporaries did he escape the phraseology that prevailed so largely in France from 1750 to 1850, and which left upon that space of a century an impress that is entirely peculiar in the history of the French language.

His vocabulary was that of the orator; for there are many expressions which sound well on the tongue and derived their value from the pronun-

ciation, whilst there are others that are very expressive on paper, but which have not the same value upon the lips.

He was naturally gifted with the faculty of speech, and he constantly and carefully cultivated it; that is to say, he possessed the art of constructing phrases, and above all of thinking before speaking. We have few men who give themselves the trouble to labor and to master the written language; still less numerous are they who learn how to speak in accord with the rules of art, be it before an audience or in a parlor. Papineau excelled in both styles; but when he took up his pen he rarely attained the same perfection; yet he wrote very well, if to write well means to make others grasp the ideas that you conceive. He lacked the writer's style. He was a master of the oratorical art, which utilized the voice, the gesture and the situation, while the writer has only words traced in black upon a white foundation to convey all that he wishes to express; this latter style is by far the more difficult.

Then, you will say, he had only one note in his voice and he could only make one single sound—ever repeating the same? Such was about the case; but what an artist he was! He had fallen upon a theme of the most delicate exactness and most suitable to the understanding of the masses; his aim was to develop it, to bring out all its accents, its harmonies, all the sentiments of which it was capable, and he succeeded in a masterly manner, electrifying every time his audience. Paganini picked up, in Venice, an air that no person seemed to care anything about, he clothed it with the domino of his own interpretations, rolled it into a web of fantastic variations, gave it a voice that sighed, laughed, sang, imparted most charming contradictions to its construction, and the "Carnaval de Venise" became an object of admiration for the artists and for the public. Such was exactly the case with Papineau.

"His immense oratorical power would have alone sufficed to rank him with that class of men whose names go down to posterity. The name of Papineau has long been, and will long be, throughout the country, the synonym of patriotism and of eloquence. It would be difficult, indeed, to wield more effectively than did Papineau the gift of speech. The men of his day still recall the vehement speeches which he delivered in support of

the 92 resolutions, and the terrible philippics, which, from time to time, in the House, he launched against England and her governors. His language was of the class that knows no fear and that strikes the evil full in the face, without any consideration for the marks that may be left. But, above all, it was in presence of the masses that his extraordinary talent, that fierce eloquence of the popular tribune, was revealed. He had the gift of moving and carrying away the crowds that flocked, even from distant parishes, to hear him. Often, after one of his lengthy harangues, during which his audience, magnetized by his language, had cheered in frenzy his burning words, the crowd would carry him in triumph upon their shoulders and hail him as the saviour of his country. On such occasions he resembled the great O'Connell, conjuring up before the eyes of distracted Ireland the long bead-roll of her sorrows, and thundering, with that mighty voice that nothing could silence, against the cruelty and the tyranny of the English government. The echoes of that vehement and inspired tongue were equally heard throughout the United States and in England, and Papineau could have boasted that he was known yonder as well as at home.''*

Such, then, was the man who, from 1817 to 1837, kept his place in the front rank of an agitation that resulted in the awakening of the colonial ideas of to-day. Had he never existed, it is quite probable that we would still be living under the old system, improved possibly in some way or other, but still far removed from that of self-government.

*P. J. O. Chauveau: *Journal de l'Instruction Publique*, 1871, p. 140.