

London 27<sup>th</sup> March 1838.

Dear Sir, It has not been in my power to answer your letter before to day.

M<sup>r</sup> Papineau & Sir W. Molesworth are equally unreasonable. They would not be satisfied with all that a Liberal Government could do for them - but must break their heads against walls which they could not pull down - & then in despair call upon the Tories, to raise still more insurmountable barriers to the accomplishment of their own purposes. So it has been with the extreme gamesters in Paris, & the sect called "Loco foco" in America. These prudent Statesmen, may at last succeed, in alarming all moderate men, & in rallying them throughout the world in support of more oligarchical - & restricted institutions, as threatening less danger to the peace & well-being of society, than weaker, & more popular ones.

If M<sup>r</sup> Papineau had followed my advice, & been satisfied with other Concessions, without insisting upon an elective Council which he was told the Government had not the power to carry in Parliament, (even if it had been recommended by Lord Bessford & the Commissioners) this crisis would ~~not~~<sup>not</sup> have taken place. We must now start from a different point; & you must not expect (whatever may be our wishes or opinions) ~~mutually~~ that the changes consequent upon the crisis, will be of the description or of the tendency of those contended for by M<sup>r</sup> Papineau, & his followers. They have failed in the means, to which they thought proper to have recourse, to enforce their demands; & altho' there is every disposition, & every efforts will be made, to protect them from the consequences of their indiscretion, still they cannot expect to be replaced in publick confidence & estimation, in the position they occupied before this unhappy revolt. I have no objection to the elective principle in the Council on account of its democratic tendencies, & would have acquiesced in the wishes of the people of Upper Canada to introduce it as an amendment to the Archives de la Ville de Montreal upon



upon reflection, & time given for consideration, they had finally considered it, for their advantage. But the question assumed a different shape in L. Canada. The difficulties there, arose from a difference of Race. The constitution was intended for the equal security of both classes, & without entering upon the point of how far the wishes of the majority of one class, should preponderate in ~~propositions for~~ changes in the constitution, this Government could neither safely, or with justice enforce such changes against the general opposition of the English Colonists; or without extreme danger, to the connection with this Country. <sup>this opinion</sup> I stated in Parliament. It was as impossible, to govern exclusively by the French majority, as it would be unjust to govern by the English minority, which had been too long the practice. If the parties therefore, cannot agree to such modifications of the Act of 1791 as will enable this Country to govern the Province in future by the <sup>most</sup> liberal institutions, for the advantage of both - & they cannot in that case be too liberal - sufficient power must be reserved, <sup>to the Crown</sup> in the new settlement, ~~to the Crown~~, subject to the control of Parliament, to enable the executive authorities to hold the balance fairly between them, to maintain an impartial administration of Justice, & the march of a steady & liberal administration of the affairs of the Province.

Whether that can be effected by a nominative, an elective, or by no Council at all, I am perfectly indifferent. It is the only alternative, (supposing the parties cannot agree in the necessary amendments of a constitution, now admitted by both to have failed in producing satisfactory government) to a separation with the mother Country. That separation would probably be followed by a division of the Province, & the amalgamation of the separate parts with the adjoining States of America. The fortunes & institutions of my friends in Lower Canada, would scarcely be improved, even according to their own notions, by the American availing themselves of the intestine division of the Colony, to take the St. Lawrence for their southern frontier; & dividing the Canadian Territory on the Southern bank from St. Regis to the Sea, between the States of New York, Vermont, & Maine.

I write in much greater apprehensions, than hope, of any amicable or reasonable settlement. Men's passions are too much excited on both sides - their national prejudices & feelings



feelings were before too much engaged - to encourage the expectation of more reason & temper now, after the scenes which you too justly describe. ~~But~~ I beg you will keep this letter - the only one I shall write on the subject - & refer to it hereafter, if the violence of parties should now make mutual forbearance, & concession impossible, in the attempts of Lord Durham to effect a settlement of their differences. I do not know his opinions, & write without either connection, or communication with him. I am sure however, that your Country men will not repent following your advice to rely upon his humanity, & generosity, & devoted anxiety to distribute impartial & even-handed justice to all classes of the Queen's Subjects in Canada.

London 19<sup>th</sup> April 1838.

My dear Sir,

I have one moment before leaving town to answer your letter of the 17<sup>th</sup> & I must answer it, if only to relieve myself from a misinterpretation of my former letter.

+necessity wd  
compel the  
Govt to attempt  
to do

I am the advocate of no system, which should be founded on, much less admit, the inferiority of one race to another, in any country. I could not give, either my consent, or support to such a system in Canada. But in a case, where the passions of the two races are engaged in a contest for the superiority, or an ascendancy of one, over the other, I have said that regulate such a state of society; to retain sufficient power, to arbitrate between, & give equal protection to both. You tell me in your letter, that these passions are only on the surface - that they do not lie deep - & that reflecting men of all parties are anxious to put an end to differences which impede the march of liberal institutions, & the practical establishment of Reform. If that be the case then Lord Durham's mission will be an easy one. His own feelings, & principles, will second fervently the general desire for a reasonable & liberal settlement.

I agree with you "qu'il faut repaire tout à neuf" but it is much more easy to say this, than to find the means



of doing it. Are you of opinion, that all men who have taken  
an active part in the Politics of the Country & who are, scarcely  
without exception, partisans on the one side, or on the other,  
are to be discarded from the new Council? and if so, how  
are these men to be satisfied, that their affairs are to  
be better managed, by those who have hitherto enjoyed  
either confidence of one party, or the other, or reputation  
for talents, or influence? It is easy to discuss abstract  
propositions, to agree upon general principles, & to write  
the best sayings, & essays on both, but more difficult  
to find the practicable solutions of <sup>complicated</sup> difficult questions, arising  
out of an anomalous state of society.

How<sup>er</sup>, my object in writing, was to disclaim the  
inference which you appear to draw from my letter,  
that I could consent to any settlement, which should  
establish ascendancy, or inferiority in any party. The  
very notion of an aristocracy in ~~Canada~~ America is  
ridiculous, beyond the natural influence of Worth,  
talents, usefulness, & property.

I see that the Upper Province is now represented  
as desiring an union, but an union on terms to esta-  
blish her ascendancy. To this I object also. Whatever  
is done in Canada, must be done on terms of equality  
to all classes, & on such conditions as will ensure  
peace and protection to the property of all. A one  
sided settlement will rest on a sandy foundation.

I have no doubts to Mr. J. de Pontreue's publishing, & sending away one or two letters

D. C. March 1860

Edw. Allen



It has not been in my power to answer your letter before to day as I was obliged to be absent of my duties

Mr Papineau's ~~proposed~~ <sup>demands</sup> are equally unreasonable. They would not be satisfied with all that a liberal Government could do for them - but must break their heads against walls which they could not pull down - & then in despair call upon the Tories, to raise still more insurmountable barriers to the accomplishment of their own purpose. So it has been with the extreme gauche in Paris, & the sect called "L'oeuf" in America. These precedent states men may at last succeed in alarming all moderate men, & in rallying them throughout the world in support of more & restictual institutions, as threatening less danger to the peace & well-being of society, than weaker, & more popular ones.

2, 1837  
written  
quels

\* told

If Mr Papineau had followed my advice & been satisfied with other concessions, without insisting upon an elective Council which he ~~was~~ <sup>thought</sup> the Government had not the power to carry in Parliament, even if it had been recommended by Lord Gosford & the Commissioners, this crisis would "not" have taken place. We ~~want~~ <sup>must</sup> now start from a different point; & you must not expect (whatever may be our wishes or opinions on the subject) that the ~~changes~~ changes consequent upon the crisis, will be of the description or of the tendency of those contended for by Mr Papineau, & his <sup>colleagues</sup> ~~followers~~. They have failed in the means to which they thought proper to have recourse to enforce their demands; & altho' there is <sup>every</sup> disposition, & <sup>every</sup> effects will be made to protect them from the consequences of their indiscretion, still they cannot expect to be replaced in public confidence & estimation, in the position they occupied before this unhappy revolt. I have no objection to the elective principle in the Council on account of its democratic tendencies, & would have acquiesced in the wishes of the people of Upper Canada to introduce it as an amendment to their constitution, if upon reflection, & time given for consideration, they had finally considered it, for their advantage. But the question assumed a different shape in L. Canada. The difficulties there arose from a difference of Pace. The constitution was intended for the equal ~~unity~~ security of both classes, & without <sup>entering</sup>



entering upon the point of how far the wishes of the  
majority of one class should preponderate in propositions for  
changes in the constitution, this Government could neither  
safely, or with justice, enforce such changes against the  
general opposition of the English Colonists, or without  
change to the connexion with the country.

estrem  
dang

They would not be satisfied with all that a liberal Govern-  
ment could do for them - but must break their heads against  
walls which they could not pull down - & then in despair  
upon the Tories to raise still more insupportable barriers  
the accomplishment of their own purpose. So it has been  
the eastern provinces in 1765 & the best called "Seven Year" in  
America. The present state was way at last success in old  
young all moderate means & in rallying them throughout the  
world in support of more  
threats of change to the peace & well being of society, than  
wishes, & more prudent ones.

of Mr. Johnson has followed my opinion, & been satisfied  
with other suggestions, without insisting upon an elective  
Council which he says that the Government has not the  
power to carry in Parliament, even if it has been  
that by Lord Bute's of the Commissioners, the crisis was  
not, have taken place. The most now state from a  
different point, & you must not expect (whatever way  
be our wishes or opinions on the subject) that the  
change consequent upon the crisis, will be of the extent  
time or of the emergency of their consent for by Mr.

Johnson & his followers. They have failed in the means  
which they thought proper to have recourse to enforce  
their demands, & altho' there is any disposition & any effort  
will be made to protect them from the consequences of their  
insurrection, till they cannot expect to be replaced in public  
confidence & estimation, in the position they occupied before  
this unhappy event. I have no objection to the election being  
in the Council on account of its democratical temperance & modesty  
have occurred in the wishes of the people of these provinces  
to introduce it as an amendment to their constitution, if upon  
reflexion & time given for consideration, they had finally  
considered it for their advantage. But the question of forming  
a different shape in Canada. The difficulties there are  
from a difference of ideas. The constitution was introduced  
for the equal benefit of both classes, & without



as I stated in Parliament, it was as impossible to govern exclusively by the French majority, as it would be unjust to govern by the English minority, which had been too long the practice. If the parties therefore cannot agree to such modifications of the act of 1791 as will enable this country to govern the Province in future by the most liberal institutions, for the advantage of both - & they cannot in that case be too liberal - sufficient power must be reserved in the new settlement to the Crown, subject to the control of Parliament, to enable the executive authorities to hold the balance fairly between them, to maintain an impartial administration of Justice, & the want of a steady & liberal administration of the affairs of the Province.

Whether that can be effectual by a nominat<sup>ive</sup>, an elective, or by no Council at all, I am perfectly indifferent. It is the only alternative, (supposing the parties cannot agree in the necessary amendments of a constitution, now admitted by both to have failed in producing satisfactory government) to a separation with the mother country. That separation would probably be followed by a division of the Province, & the amalgamation of the separate parts with the adjoining States of America. The fortunes & institutions of my friends in Lower Canada, would scarcely be improved, even according to their own notions by the American availing themselves of the intestine division of the Colony to take the St. Lawrence for their Southern parties, & dividing the Canadian Territory on the Southern bank, from St. Regis to the sea, between the States of New York, Vermont, & Maine.

I write in much greater apprehension, than hope, of any amicable <sup>or</sup> reasonable settlement. <sup>Men's</sup> Passions are too much excited on both sides - their national prejudices & feelings were before too much engaged - to overcome the expectation of more reason & tempered men, after the scenes which you too justly describe - but I beg you will keep this letter - the only one I shall write on the subject - & refer to it hereafter, if the violence of parties should now make mutual <sup>negotiations</sup> <sup>impossible</sup>.

ville de Montréal  
conception



Concession impossible, in the attempts of Lord Durham  
to effect a settlement of their differences. I do not  
~~know~~ know his opinions, & write without either <sup>rec-</sup>ognition,  
or communication with him. I am sure however, that  
your Countrymen will not repent following your  
advice to rely upon his humanity, & generosity, &  
devoted anxiety to distribute impartial & even-handed  
justice to all classes of the Queen's subjects in Canada.

London 19<sup>th</sup> April 1808.

My dear Sir

I have one moment before leaving town  
to answer your letter of the 17<sup>th</sup> - & I must answer it,  
if only to <sup>releive</sup> myself from a misinterpretation  
of my former letter.

I am the advocate of no system, which should be  
provided or founded on, much less admit, the inferiority  
of one race to another, in any country. I could not give  
either <sup>my</sup> consent, or support to such a system in  
Canada. But in a case, where the passions of the two  
races are engaged in a contest for the superiority, or an  
ascendancy of one, over the other, I have said that  
<sup>necessity</sup> would compel the Government attempting to  
<sup>regulate</sup> ~~separate~~ such a state of society, to retain sufficient  
power to arbitrate between, & give equal protection to both.  
You tell me in your letter, that these passions are only  
on the surface - that they do not lie deep - & that reflect-  
ing <sup>men</sup> ~~even~~ of all parties are anxious to put an end to  
differences which impede the march of Liberal in-  
stitutions, & the practical establishment of Reform. If that  
be the case then Lord Durham's opinion will be an easy  
one. His own feelings, & principles, will second <sup>powerfully</sup> ~~favorably~~  
the general desire for a reasonable <sup>liberal</sup> ~~liberal~~ settlement.



I agree with you "qu'il faut réparer tout à neuf" but it is much more easy to say this, than to find the means of doing it. Are you of opinion, that all men who have taken an active part in the Politics of the Country, & who are, scarcely without exception, partisans on the one side, or on the other, are to be discarded from the new Council? and if so, how are these men to be satisfied, that their affairs are to be better managed, by those who have hitherto enjoyed neither confidence of one party, or the other, or reputation for talents, or influence? It is easy to discuss abstract propositions, to agree upon general principles, & to write the best sayings, & essays on both, but ~~more~~ difficult to find the practicable solutions of difficult questions, arising out of an anomalous state of society.

How<sup>ever</sup>, my object in writing was to disclaim the <sup>inference</sup> ~~inference~~, which you appear to draw from my Letter, that I could consent to any settlements, which should establish ascendancy, or inferiority in any party. The very notion of an Aristocracy in America is ridiculous, beyond the natural influence of Worth, talents, usefulness<sup>ness</sup>, & property.

I see that the Upper Province is now represented as desiring an Union, but an Union on terms to establish ~~her~~ <sup>her</sup> ascendancy. To this <sup>I object</sup> ~~subject~~ also. Whatever is done in Canada, ~~must be done~~ <sup>must be done</sup>, on terms of equality to all classes, & on such conditions as will ensure peace and protection to the property of all. A one sided settlement will rest on a sandy foundation.