

HISTORICAL REVIEW 8

1989 - 1990



COBOURG AND DISTRICT
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

EXECUTIVE 1989-1990

| | |
|-------------------------|------------------|
| Past President | Moira Hayes |
| President | David Flindall |
| Vice-President | Elizabeth Parken |
| Treasurer | Tom Hawke |
| Recording Secretary | Dennis Clarke |
| Corresponding Secretary | David Lester |

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Archives | Marion Hagen |
| Programmes/ Historical Review | Jim Leonard |
| Membership | Jane Greathead |
| Publicity | Doug Gear |
| Newsletter | Charlotte Cockerill |
| Cultural Centre Liaison | Peter Delanty |

Cover Illustration:

"Glebe Lawn", 195 Queen St, Cobourg, as it appeared in the late 1850's. This residence was built by Doctor James Auston and was later the home of Captain Walker. The Auston family are standing in front. (courtesy, Robert Mikel Collection).

Cobourg & District Historical Society
P.O. Box 911
Cobourg, Ontario
K9A 4W4

© Copyright, Cobourg & District Historical Society, 1990

HISTORICAL SOCIETY PROGRAMME 1989-1990

May 30, 1989 - Annual Banquet

SPEAKER: Professor Donald Swainson
*"Hon. James Cockburn & The Politics
of Confederation"*

Page 1

September 26, 1989

SPEAKER: David Blanchard
"The Peter Robinson Settlement"

Page 16

October 24, 1989 - Film Night

"Paul Kane Goes West"

"Europa Nostra"

November 28, 1989

SPEAKER: Christopher Creighton
*"William Rider-Rider - Panoramic Photographer
From the Great War"*

Page 26

January 23, 1990

SPEAKER: Lawrence Kavanagh
"The Restoration of Barnum House, Grafton"

Page 31

February 27, 1990

SPEAKER: Robert Mikel
"More Photos, More Families, and More Houses"

Page 38

March 27, 1990: Ross Johnson
EVENT: *"Sesqui Video Presentation"*

April 24, 1990

SPEAKER: Catherine Milne
"The Story of John McCarty (1788-1877)"

Page 40

Contributors

Page 53

Hon. James Cockburn And The Politics Of Confederation

Donald Swainson

Introduction

The years of the mid 1960's were exciting: Parliament gave us a new flag; Pierre Elliott Trudeau provided "Trudeaumania" and a new generation of leadership. "Expo 67" generated a pride and confidence amongst Canadians never before matched. And, of course, 1967 was the centenary of Confederation. That hundredth birthday of Canada, and the anticipation of it, inspired the greatest interest in Canadian history that had ever existed.

Much that is tangible was produced as a result. Between 1963 and 1989 The Canadian Centenary Series was produced. This magnificent nineteen volume work was a direct product of the centenary. Volumes in the series were written by some of our finest historians, including Gerald Craig, Marcel Trudel, J.M.S. Careless, Tryggvi Oleson, W.L. Morton, Fernand Ouellet, Donald Creighton and W.J. Eccles. The Canadian Centenary Series is our finest history.

In Prince Edward Island, the centenary of the Charlottetown Conference inspired the foundation of the Confederation Centre of the Arts. This fine establishment is best known for its annual and excellent production of "Anne of Green Gables", but it is also (and remains) a shrine to the Fathers of Confederation. As a result, it was initially built and is still funded by the Federal Government and several Provinces, including Prince Edward Island, (as a matter of course) Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and (on occasion) Quebec. The Dictionary of Canadian Biography, the most important work of co-operative scholarship in Canadian history, received decisive funding as a result of centennial enthusiasm. Volume XII of the DCB will be published shortly. Those twelve volumes will include well over 6,000 biographies.

And of course, the centenary inspired great interest in local history. One statistic will illustrate this point. In the twenty-five years after 1967 the

three Praire Provinces - Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta - produced over 5,000 local histories.

And we were exhorted to do more about history, to seek it out, to understand it, to publish it. In 1965, Alan Wilson, a historian at Trent University, published a famous article entitled: "Forgotten Men of Canadian History" (today of course it would be "forgotten persons" or somesuch). Wilson wanted more biographies of businessmen, industrialists, intellectuals, journalists, artists and secondary political leaders (the Dictionary of Canadian Biography has no doubt since given him more than he ever really wanted!). Professor Wilson saw in the production of numerous biographies, important purposes. He said, "we seek universal traits as well as national character and we will find them in seeking out more of the forgotten men of Canadian history".

At about the same time, a journalist named Oliver Clausen leapt aboard the heritage bandwagon with his Globe Magazine article, "Here Lies a Neglected Father". Clausen quoted Joseph Howe, one of the most important opponents of Confederation (an anti- father, so to speak) as follows: "a wise nation preserves its records, gathers up its muniments, decorates the tombs of its illustrious dead...". Clausen then proceeded to show how we have neglected our heritage by ignoring the grave sites of the Fathers of Confederation. "Forgotten graves", he complained, "were left to crumble away -- a symbol, Howe might have said, of the nation wrought by the men in them. Some are still crumbling. In Toronto's St James Cemetery lies James Cockburn, first Speaker of the House of Commons, but you might never know it..".

I gave this extended introduction to illustrate the somewhat enthusiastic and optimistic approach that characterized much of our thinking about the Canadian past when I started work on a Ph.D. thesis that included ninety biographical studies and when a little later, I agreed to write a dozen and a half biographies for Volume IX, X and XI of the Dictionary of Canadian Biography. I was a young historian anxious to assist in the process of resurrecting some of our "forgotten" worthies. One of my subjects was the Hon. James Cockburn, Father of Confederation and first Speaker of the House of Commons. I collected material on Cockburn (along with

numerous other persons from the same era) over a period of several years. This research on Cockburn produced a portion of my Ph.D. thesis, an article in Ontario History, a note in each of the two editions of the Canadian Encyclopedia and a brief biography in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Volume XI.

What I want to do this evening is outline, in abbreviated form, the life and career of James Cockburn -- who has certainly received some attention from several writers but has nonetheless been, until recently, a more or less neglected and forgotten Canadian.

His Business and Professional Activities

James Cockburn was born in Berwick-on-Tweed, England, 13 February 1819. His mother was Sarah Turnbull; his father, James Cockburn Sr., was a merchant. James Sr. with his family, emigrated to Canada in 1832 - a year of disaster. Canada was in the grip of a cholera epidemic: James Sr. was infected and promptly died.

The widowed Sarah was clearly not destitute. She moved her family to Toronto where young James attended Upper Canada College for a brief period. In 1861 he commenced the study of law in Toronto. He was qualified to practice in 1845 and immediately moved to Cobourg where his "card" was published on 15 July:

"The business heretofore carried on at Cobourg by D.E. Boulton, Esq., Barrister, Solicitor in Chancery, Bankruptcy, etc., will for the future be conducted in the names of the undersigned.

D.E. Boulton

James Cockburn."

The Boulton/Cockburn partnership soon broke up but Cockburn, sometimes alone and sometimes with a partner, practised law in the Northumberland area during the pre-Confederation years. Like many nineteenth century lawyers, he involved himself in a variety of activities:

dam construction, land speculation, rental property, insurance. He also worked as a mortgage agent for the Kingston aristocrat Richard Cartwright.

These were also Cockburn's family years. He married Isabella Susan Patterson in 1854; they had three children. Cockburn had been brought up a Presbyterian, but by 1861 he had joined the Anglican Church. His wife died from consumption in 1862 and Cockburn never remarried.

James Cockburn was active and prominent in his district, but he was never a business or professional success. In 1864 he asked Richard Cartwright to lend him \$3,000 on the security of a house and several lots that he owned in Cobourg. However J.H. Dumble, Cockburn's own law partner, pointed out to Cartwright in 1866 that "at present property is absolutely worthless in Cobourg...". By this point Cockburn was broke and could not pay his bills. He was forced to explain to Cartwright: "I have just got home and am sorry to find that your bill of \$324 is due. I must have a little time to cook up my matters, do draw again and I will be better prepared next time". His financial position never recovered. By December 1869 he was thoroughly depressed by his financial and professional prospects: "for myself," he wrote to Cartwright, "I do not know what is before me. I have come to grief and have been made to feel very poor and very penniless... I am trying to work up my professional practice again, but it needs time, and time though it may heal will also kill."

Union Politics

Cockburn's political career was more successful. After service as a Cobourg town councillor in 1855-1856 he entered the political arena of the Province of Canada, a jurisdiction that had existed since 1861 and that was normally referred to as "The Union". In 1861 some 350 West Northumberland constituents petitioned Cockburn to contest the seat in the general election "as a candidate in opposition to the Policy of the present Administration...". Cockburn agreed to run and to oppose the Cartier-Macdonald government, which, he explained, had "forfeited their confidence...". "If elected," he continued, "my vote shall be given unhesitatingly against them on every question involving confidence." He pledged to support representation-by-population, the great rallying cry of

the Upper Canadian Reformers or Liberals (as they became). James Cockburn was solidly Reform, explaining that he wanted:

"all parties in Upper Canada united by one common bond of interest and sympathy. It is self evident to all, that so long as Lower Canada remains as she is -- united, and we divided needlessly into parties having really no divided interests, that we should be so weak and unable to accomplish the objects we frequently desire...Let our watchword be justice to Upper Canada."

Not only did Cockburn run in 1861 as a Reformer, but he ran against one Sidney Smith - a Tory cabinet minister. This clearly irritated John A. Macdonald, who campaigned for Smith and who knew that earlier Cockburn had been a Tory. Hence John A.'s crack:

"Why, he understood, in fact he knew beyond a doubt, " said the leader of Upper Canadian conservatism, "that Mr. Cockburn had been a Conservative, and not only that, but a Tory of the old school. In fact, he might say he belonged to the old fossil party -- a Tory of the old Family Compact."

Cockburn nonetheless defeated Postmaster-General Smith and became MP for West Northumberland.

Cockburn's political affiliation merits a closer look. He was certainly elected in 1861 as an opponent of the regime led by George-Etienne Cartier and John A. Macdonald, and his statements during the election campaign were very much those of a Reform follower of George Brown. Yet in the seventh Union Parliament (1861-1863) he emerged as a Conservative, and he won re-election in 1863 by acclamation. In 1864 he entered the short-lived regime of E.P. Tache and John A. Macdonald as Solicitor-General. This appointment necessitated a by-election campaign which Cockburn easily won. During the by-election campaign he was accused of deserting the Reform cause. He blandly dismissed the accusation: "it was said that in joining the present government he had abandoned the reform party, he replied that he had not, because he had never belonged to that party." When the Confederation coalition was formed in June 1864, Cockburn, as a

straight Conservative member of the regime, retained his cabinet post. His affiliation was never again in doubt.

Hon. James Cockburn, like all other Canadian cabinet ministers, was a delegate to the Quebec Conference in 1864. Because of this unusual application of cabinet solidarity he is enshrined in Canadian history as a Father of Confederation.

How, one might ask, did James Cockburn earn a cabinet rank in 1864? He was not particularly successful as either a lawyer or a businessman. He was not, for example, appointed a QC until 1863. By then he had established himself as a loyal follower of John A. Macdonald, and Macdonald made such appointments. Cockburn was not elected a bencher of the law society until 1864 -when as Solicitor-General, he was a law officer of the Crown. He was in financial trouble by the mid-1860's, and thoroughly broke by the end of the decade. As an MP he tended to the patronage interests of his constituents, and represented some important local economic interests in the assembly -- including the Bank of Northumberland, the Cobourg and Peterborough Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway. He was not however, an important figure in any of these enterprises. From time to time Cockburn was active in neighbouring constituencies, but he was by no means a regional political leader like John Carling (London area) or Alexander Campbell (Kingston area). Nor was he held in high regard within his party. John Hamilton, the influential Tory senator from Hawkesbury, later expressed the view that Cockburn "must take a high rank amongst procrastinators."

Within Parliament his course was erratic and confusing. Cockburn had clearly been elected as a Reformer and initially played that role by opposing John A. Macdonald and George E. Cartier, the Tory co-premiers. But in May 1862 he supported Cartier and Macdonald in a vote that they lost. They were forced out of power and Cockburn blandly explained that his pro-government vote meant nothing: "He could assure the House," he stated, "that in voting for the second reading of the Militia Bill, he did not intend to express his confidence in the Attorney General West (John A. Macdonald)."

John Sandfield Macdonald, a Reformer and no relation to John A., became Premier in 1862 (and until 1864). Cockburn supported some of his government's actions while opposing others. At the same time he announced that "he would certainly have great pleasure in supporting them (ie the Reform government) in all their exertions in pursuance of that commendable policy (i.e. decreasing spending) giving them an independent support devoid of fear, favour or affection." In 1863 Cockburn opposed the Scott Act, a piece of legislation that remains to this day, the basis of Ontario's separate school system. This put him in opposition to the John Sandfield Macdonald Reform government and to the opposition led by Cartier and John A. In this instance, he was allied to Upper Canada's ultra-Reformers.

In May 1863 Cockburn voted against the J.S. Macdonald regime in a confidence vote. The government was defeated and responded by calling an election. The general result was very close. Cockburn won by acclamation in West Northumberland and returned to Parliament a bitter enemy of J.S. Macdonald and his tenuous government. He claimed that his motivation was John Sandfield Macdonald's abuse of the bench by appointing an opponent to the Superior Court in Lower Canada and thus getting him out of politics. "There was no instance to be found," thundered Cockburn, "of Government having stepped across and brought off a prominent member of the Opposition in this manner. A legitimate and unobjectionable use of power was for Government to appoint its own friends to such office, but an appointment of this kind could only be regarded as a corrupt act, and was the more reprehensible in this instance, being an appointment to the Bench." Poor James Cockburn! For him, patronage had to be partisan to be honest!

This was the man chosen by John A. Macdonald to serve as his junior law officer in the Tache-Macdonald government of 1864. His parliamentary career was erratic; he had no important business or professional credentials; his partisan situation was confused; he had no powerful base of support. The only plausible explanation of his appointment is that it was a product of the instability of the pre-Confederation years. Late Union politics were hard on careers; politicians went into ministries and then often lost their places because of personal defeat or new governmental

combinations. New talent -- or at least new bodies -- was a constant requirement. As a consequence, it was not very difficult for a man to obtain cabinet rank if he was sufficiently patient and/or opportunistic. This explains why James Cockburn, described by Alexander Mackenzie -- our first Liberal Prime Minister -- as "an inferior man," found himself a minister of the Crown in March 1864.

Cockburn's ministerial career was undistinguished. He handled the Solicitor-Generalship in a routine manner, and on occasion acted for Macdonald as Attorney-General. Although he was a delegate to the Quebec scheme (which was the Confederation agreement) or to the Confederation movement in general. Cockburn contributed precisely twenty words to the Confederation Debates. His contribution reads as follows: "The honourable member for North Waterloo referred to it as a means of maintaining our independence against the United States." In fact, Confederation as a policy emerged in 1864 from a Parliamentary committee chaired by George Brown. Not only was Cockburn lukewarm about Confederation, he opposed the formation of Brown's committee on narrow and partisan lines. He said that he "thought the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr Brown) acted erroneously in moving to refer this constitutional question to the consideration of a committee of the House. If hon. gentlemen were really sincere in believing that Rep. by Pop. was the remedy, they should not leave it to be disposed by others." If Brown "really believed in (rep by pop)" continued Cockburn, "he could hardly believe that he had taken the course best calculated to advance it...". George Brown, the Reformer, realized that rep-by-pop alone could not end the constitutional impasse. James Cockburn, the neophyte Tory, recognized no such reality. He voted for an amendment calling for rep-by-pop, no doubt in order to score a partisan point against George Brown.

Federal Politics

The Ontario wing of the first Federal Cabinet was a coalition of three Reformers and two Conservatives. Sir John A. Macdonald was one of the Conservatives; James Cockburn was not politically valuable enough to be the other, so lost his cabinet place. Macdonald was notoriously gentle with colleagues, and he wanted to do something for Cockburn, who had been

elected by acclamation to the first Federal Parliament. He was consequently, in spite of a protest over his unilingualism, named the first Speaker of the House of Commons. Cockburn held an elevated view of his role as Speaker; in 1871 he observed to the Prime Minister: "I have got through the speaker's duties this session with eclat and have had praises on all sides...". Although he was a good employer and zealously defended servants of the House of Commons on several occasions, he was only an adequate Speaker. He most assuredly did not receive "praise on all sides". The Toronto Globe, the most important Liberal newspaper in Canada, attacked him roundly. Cockburn, declared the Globe, was a Liberal who "was brought over by Sir John... (I) was never very certain that he would 'stay bought'. So, although he had not one single qualification for the Speakership, he was conciliated by the administration of that sop in 1867, and again in 1873. In that capacity he faithfully served the Minister to whom he owed his pay and perquisites."

Cockburn held his seat in the nasty 1872 election and was then re-elected as Speaker to preside over the scandal sessions of 1873. W.L. Morton, a very fine historian, found this to be significant: he noted that it signified an end to the Anglophone/Francophone alternation of the Union period, and was "therefore a new departure...promising to lift Canadian politics a little further from the old sectionalism." The likelihood is probably far more prosaic. Cockburn was still an MP and was still in need. The Speakership was not a great prize in patronage terms, but it provided some extra remuneration for a colleague, who, as we have seen, was impoverished.

Cockburn was broke by 1869 and, as he explained to Cartwright, was "trying to work up (his) professional practice again..." Like many nineteenth century politicians he had become dependant upon his public post. By the time Macdonald's government fell in 1873 Cockburn had been a minister or speaker for nine years. His professional contact with Cobourg had deteriorated seriously, and he had not been able to build a profitable practice in Ottawa while presiding over the House of Commons.

In 1874 his personal situation deteriorated still further when he lost West Northumberland in the general election. Both Northumberland ridings were opened later in the year because of controversial election suits. For

reasons that are obscure, Cockburn did not contest his old riding in the ensuing by-election. Instead he ran in East Northumberland, and lost again. His political chances were badly damaged by his decision to move his family to Ottawa before the by-election. As the Toronto Globe put it, he "has not even the claim of being a resident in the vicinity to help him."

Cockburn's position was desperate after his by-election defeat. Liberals governed in both Toronto and Ottawa; he could expect no patronage appointment. He had to re-establish himself professionally, so he resumed legal practice in Ottawa where, according to the Toronto Mail, he apparently built, "a good practice in the supreme court."

The evidence indicates however that the law was insufficient. Cockburn remained destitute; he needed a political career and public preferment. He was therefore anxious to contest his old seat of West Northumberland in the 1878 general election. In February 1878 he secured the Tory nomination, but his long absence from the area had contributed to his local decline. He led a divided group. H.J. Ruttan, one of John A. Macdonald's multitudinous correspondents, explained to the Tory chieftain:

"Mr Cockburn's friends gave him a majority of 39 at the Conservative Convention last Saturday. There were for S. Smith the Warden of the Counties, the Chairman... of the Conservatives Assn., the Secy. of the Assn. myself and many others, whilst Mr. Cockburn had not one leading man of influence. The contest will therefore be a close one..."

During the campaign Macdonald intervened on his old colleague's behalf, and Cockburn squeaked to victory with a majority of 88 votes.

A Sad Postlude

The residue of Cockburn's career was quite sad. What he wanted was financial security provided by the Crown. His quest for patronage antedated 1878. Even while Speaker he was on the lookout for a better place - one that paid more than the Speaker's salary of \$3,200. In 1871 Cockburn wrote an extravagant letter to Prime Minister Macdonald:

"You will soon be called upon to appoint a Governor to B.(ritish) Columbia and I ask you to send me. The appointment would be popular I know and Ontario should have the next appointment of this kind. The Maritimes have had more than their share and unless you (select) a Quebec man one from Ontario should be selected, indeed Quebec and Ontario each having provided its Governor are equal, and the larger provinces should for many reasons have the choice now. There is nothing so very inviting about it, only it would suit me exactly as I could go without the encumbrance of a family and leave my children with my sister...I am sure that my appointment on the other hand would meet with almost universal satisfaction...(T)his mark of confidence would not seem to be undeserved."

Poor Cockburn. In his regional patronage calculations he remembered Ontario, Quebec and the Maritimes, but he forgot about British Columbia! The first Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia was Sir Joseph Trutch, a veteran B.C. politician.

As soon as his seat was secure in 1878, Cockburn wrote Macdonald: "Don't forget me in connection with the Speakership..." There was some discussion of Cockburn's appointment either to the Speakership or to the Cabinet, but nothing came of these discussions and Cockburn failed to receive another major patronage post.

During the fourth Parliament, 1878-1882, Cockburn irritated Sir John publicly - a circumstance not likely to have done his patronage quest much good. In 1880, he vehemently attacked the use of the Dominion Police to interfere with sport hunting in the Ottawa River area. Also in 1880 he voted for a Liberal motion to condemn the Macdonald government for firing the Lieutenant- Governor of Quebec. Privately he harassed the Prime Minister over patronage.

Cockburn was seriously ill after 1878 and made repeated and desperate attempts to provide for his family. Sir John was obviously exasperated; hence Alexander Campbell's appeal to the Prime Minister, "Do make a point of seeing him please? I know how you are occupied and you have a patience which I never saw equalled but he is an old friend and in great pain and misery."

One of Cockburn's schemes during this period is somewhat obscure, but it illustrates the extent of the man's desperation. He formed a law partnership with one McIntyre. Because Cockburn was ill however, he was "only a nominal partner." But he was the local solicitor for the Bank of Ottawa and the Bank of Montreal. Cockburn explained to Macdonald the purpose of the partnership as follows:

"in consideration of his (i.e. McIntyre) becoming joint Solicitor to my two Banks...he was to give me a Bond that if I die before I come back to business as a full partner he was to pay my Daughters \$1000 a year for 4 years. I feel my life so insecure that this being a provision for them would be great comfort to me."

In other words, Cockburn wanted to utilize a couple of accounts that he could not handle himself as the wherewithal to purchase what was in effect an insurance policy for his children. Unfortunately, the scheme foundered because, as Cockburn explained, "the Bank of Ottawa has since withdrawn its Solicitorship from us, on the grounds of my continued ill health and absence...".

It is clear that the deal with McIntyre collapsed because within days of receiving the letter just quoted, the Prime Minister wrote Cockburn about another scheme. John A. proposed to set Cockburn "to work at once on the consolidation of the statutes." This proposal also involved a complication, because it meant that Cockburn would accept an office of profit under the Crown and thereby vacate his seat in the House of Commons. Macdonald was willing to circumvent the law, and he and Cockburn - both privy councillors, conspired to that end. Cockburn explained the mechanism succinctly. He wrote Macdonald on 1 April 1881:

As I understand it this will not affect my seat, unless and until I shall have agreed to act under the Commission, when issued.

But in the meantime, and until the 'Composition' of the Commission is decided upon, I should like to engage the services of a Gentleman, a barrister of the City, in every way well qualified for the work, and we would together make good progress with the work of consolidation.

I would however respectfully suggest that a sum of

money be placed at my disposal to cover the disbursements which would be rendered necessary."

The scheme was originally Macdonald's, and he quickly agreed to Cockburn's embellishments. In this way Macdonald provided a few dollars for a seriously ill colleague.

James Cockburn was indeed seriously ill in 1881. By the fall of that year he could no longer function as MP, and he resigned his seat on 15 November 1881. On the same day he was appointed to the Commission for the codification of the Dominion Statutory Law.

Cockburn lingered on for a couple of years. In 1882, when he was too ill to leave his lodgings, he again appealed to his old leader. His last letter to Sir John A. Macdonald was dolorous in the extreme:

"I am ill and laid up and cannot get to see you," reported the former MP. "Will you let me so far trespass on old friendship as to ask you to come to see me? I...get downstairs about noon.

If you could come between 2 and 4 on Tuesday (tomorrow) or Wednesday, I would get myself on the sofa to meet you - my illness threatens to last as long as I do, but with some regular office work to do, to (compensate) me (for) the (loss) of my previous professional earnings(.) *(The handwriting here is extremely difficult.)* Dr. Grant (another Tory politician) encourages me to look forward hopefully still. You see that I want to ask for help, but I think all the same that you will come to see me."

We do not know what Macdonald did, but such communications must have been very painful for the Tory leader. Sir John A. Macdonald was a great party leader, but aspects of his job were far from pleasant.

The Hon. James Cockburn finally died at Ottawa on 14 August 1883.

Some Conclusions

The story of the career of the Hon. James Cockburn is a disappointing one if the objective of the exercise is to use the biographies of "forgotten" and "neglected" Canadians to illuminate important truths about our past.

Cockburn was not an important person in law, business or politics. What his career really illustrates is one important aspect of the nineteenth century political system: in personal terms it was a harsh system; the excessively plush pension plans and fringe benefits of today did not exist even in embryo; if a politician became dependant on public life for his livelihood he had an absolute requirement for either office or patronage or both. Without those, the result was poverty and humiliation.

James Cockburn's career illustrated something else - and that is simply luck, which of course can be both good and bad. The convoluted politics of the Union gave James Cockburn cabinet rank at a crucial point in Canadian history - and, as a result, he became a Father of Confederation even though he (like many of the other "father") contributed nothing whatever to the Confederation movement. However, his status as a "father" enshrined him permanently in our history; that was the good luck. The bad luck was that same status gave him a sort of ex officio position when the name lists were drawn up for such publications as *The Canadian Encyclopedia* and the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Inclusion on such lists meant microscopic examination. Such examination has revealed the career that has been discussed in this paper.

James Cockburn was not a bad man. In fact, he was a typical nineteenth century Ontario politician. Unfortunately for him, his status as a "father" has prevented his historical enjoyment of the obscurity lavished upon his peers.

Labour Day, 1989

A Note On Sources

For full documentation concerning James Cockburn, see three items by the present writer: The Personnel of Politics: A Study of the Ontario Members of the Second Federal Parliament, Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto, 1968; "'Forgotten Men' - Some Notes on the Career of Hon. James Cockburn, a Deservedly Neglected Father of Confederation," Ontario History, December 1980; "James Cockburn", Dictionary of Canadian Biography, XI., Oliver Clausen, "Here Lies a Neglected Father", The Globe Magazine, December 3, 1966 and Alan Wilson, "Forgotten Men of Canadian History", Canadian Historical Association, Report, 1965 are mentioned in the text.

Useful in the preparation of this paper were the Canadian Parliamentary Companion, various editions; Percy L. Climo, The Honourable James Cockburn: First Speaker in Canada's House of Commons, 1966, typescript, Archives of Ontario; J. Petryshyn, "James Cockburn: Cobourg Politician", in J. Petryshyn, ed., Victorian Cobourg: A Nineteenth Century Profile (Belleville, 1976); Richard Cartwright Papers and Alexander Campbell Papers, Archives of Ontario; Alexander Mackenzie Papers and John A. Macdonald Papers, Queen's University Archives.

The Peter Robinson Settlement

David Blanchard

In 1825, under a government assisted programme, Peter Robinson brought over some 2,000 Irish to the Peterborough area. This was the second government sponsored emigration led by Robinson, the first being to the Bathurst district in 1823. Both of these emigrations were designed not so much as to populate British North America, but to help alleviate the problems of over population and poverty in Ireland.

The 1825 settlement gives Peterborough a history of settlement which is both typical of other parts of Canada and unique to the area. Before, we look at the Robinson settlement, I would like to briefly go over the earlier settlement of the area.

Precontact

The earliest remains of human habitation in the area date to the Paleolithic period, 9,000 - 5,000 B.C. Successive waves of family groupings and tribes came into the area attracted by the game found in the area. These groupings have been labelled as Laurentian Archaic (5,000 - 1,000 B.C.) and Woodland (1,000 B.C. - contact with Europeans) by archaeologists. It is later development, after about 900 A.D., during the Woodland period that Iroquoian culture develops. Around 1400, the Iroquoian culture people developed into the Huron, Neutrals, Erie, Petun and Iroquois. The original settlers in the area were Hurons. By the mid to late 1600's, Iroquoian raids and warfare destroyed the Hurons and the Iroquois moved into the area.

The Mississauga

Around 1700, the Iroquois came into contact with the Mississaugas near Sault Ste. Marie. The Mississauga were an Algonkian-speaking tribe from Northern Ontario. Attracted to the Kawarthas by fertile land and abundant game, they displaced the Iroquois after some 40 years of skirmishing. The

Mississauga fought on the side of the French against the British during the French-Indian Wars. After the war, in 1761, the British met with Mississauga and the negotiations led to the Proclamation of 1763. The proclamation of 1763, ceded all lands west of an imaginary north-south line through the Alleghany mountains to the natives. No European settler could purchase or settle on the land until the land was surrendered to the Crown.

The treaty that opened up the Peterborough area to settlement was Treaty #20, signed on 5 November, 1818, which opened up "the back parts of the New Castle District" to European settlement. According to the treaty, practically everything related to the land was given up by the Mississaugas. The rights signed away included all hunting and fishing rights as well as a number of islands in the Kawarthas. Although the Mississaugas were unable to speak, read or write English, the treaty was signed and sealed. Later official versions were printed and distributed.

Treaty #20

According to oral history, neither hunting and fishing rights were not given up, nor was the ownership of all the islands handed over. Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November, 1818, which led to the treaty supported the Oral Tradition. In the Minutes, Buckquaquet, Chief of the Eagle Tribe, states:

"We hope that we shall not be prevented from the right of fishing, the use of waters & hunting where we find game. ... The young men before you will not think it hard at their requesting that the Islands be kept for them..."

To this the Deputy Superintendent General replied:

"The request for the Islands, I shall inform him of, & have no doubt that he will accede to your wish. The Rivers are open to all and you have an equal right to hunt and fish on them."

As you can see, it would seem that they were promised the islands and hunting and fishing rights. These promises were not in the treaty.

Early Settlement

The first white settlement in the area predates the treaty. In 1793, Herkimer opened a fur trade post on Rice Lake. Herkimer was a loyalist who came up from Herkimer County, New York in 1783. He obtained a lot in the Kingston area, but soon became a fur trader.

He first operated from Smith's Creek, which is now known as Port Hope. From there he moved to his new post on Rice Lake. Herkimer was killed when the sloop on which he was travelling sank off Newcastle, and his post was taken over by Charles Anderson, his son-in-law. Charles Anderson was with the Indian department prior to his settling in the area. There was a controversy in 1818 about Anderson's claim to the land. This problem was not cleared up until the signing of Treaty #74 in 1834.

Once Treaty #20 was signed, surveying was started on the land. By the end of 1819, the original surveys of the townships of Monaghan, Otonabee and Smith were completed. The first settlers onto this newly surveyed land were English, who came from Cumberland. They paid a deposit of £10 per family and received free passage from England. Their deposit was refunded when the settlement duties were completed. Each head of a family, and all sons over 16 years of age received a grant of 100 acres. They also were allowed to purchase more land if they had the funds.

In 1818, 8 families arrived in Smith Township. They were followed by 10 more families in 1819, and a further 12 families in the next two years. To make settlement easier, they built a communal log cabin, which acted as a dispersal centre. There the new arrivals would stay until they completed cabins or shanties on their lots. Monaghan received some settlers in 1818 and 1819. Most of these were settlers who had originally settled on the lake front and were looking to increase their amount of land. In 1820, 20 families and 8 single men settled in Otonabee. In addition to the older settlers, these new arrivals included half-pay officers and other pensioners. All these new arrivals received free land and purchase rights, but no other assistance.

It was during this early period that some of the most influential men of Peterborough's history arrive in the area. In 1820, Charles Rubidge arrived in the area, while in 1822, Thomas A. Stewart and Robert Reid arrived. Rubidge was a retired naval officer, while Reid and Stewart were middle class. They are representative of the gentry who moved to Canada to maintain their way of life.

In 1820, Peterborough's first industry started with the arrival of Adam Scott. Scott built a small mill at the present day site of the corner of King and Water Streets. The mill was a frame structure of about 18 by 24 feet. It contained two small mill stones and an upright saw. Scott later added a small one vat distillery. In 1827, Scott became indebted to John Brown of Smith's Creek. He lost all his property and was forced to leave Peterborough. His influence on the early days of the settlement was such that the site was originally known as Scott's Mills or Scott's Plains.

Conditions in Ireland

After the Napoleonic Wars, the British economy went through a severe recession. Ireland was particularly hard hit. The markets dropped in textiles and agriculture, and Ireland had not developed any other industries. At the same time, coinciding with the Boom times of the Wars, the population in Ireland was expanding. In order for the landlords to survive the depressed commodities market, they were forced to rationalise their lands. This meant they had to evict tenant farmers to form larger farms. Modern farming methods were also added, and this forced many of the farm labourers out of work. The unemployed workers moved to the cities and put a great strain on the government resources.

Assisted Emigration

John Beverly Robinson, the Attorney General of Upper Canada wrote an article to suggesting that the English Government use Assisted Emigration to help alleviate the problems of overcrowding in Ireland. R. Wilmot Horton, the undersecretary for the Colonial office in England, became enthusiastic about the idea. He contacted Robinson and asked him to suggest someone who could lead the project. John Beverly Robinson

suggested his elder brother, Peter. It was felt that Peter's military and business experience gave him the necessary skills to oversee the emigrations. Peter Robinson had been a captain during the War of 1812. After the war he was in various businesses including owning mills and taverns, and the fur trade. From 1817-20, he was the representative of the East Riding of York.

A small Emigration was tried in 1823, when Robinson brought over 568 Irish from the area around Cork for settlement in the Bathurst District. These Emigrants were placed in an area of existing settlement and were granted lands of 100 acres.

The 1823 Emigration was not very popular in Ireland. Robinson was forced to work closely with the major landowners in County Cork. This association probably condemned him in the eyes of those he was trying to assist. It is not until he gained the support of the Catholic priests in the area that he is able to reach and then surpass his quota of 500.

It was the success of this settlement that brought about the 1825 Emigration. The newly settled area around Scott's Plains was suggested in order to secure the route from Lake Simcoe to Lake Ontario. Professor Brunger at Trent University has suggested that the government may have deliberately isolated the largely Roman Catholic Irish from other settlers, most of whom were English, Scottish or Ulster Protestants. [A. Brunger, "Geographical propinquity among pre-famine Catholic Irish settlers in Upper Canada", *Journal of Historical Geography*, 8, 3 (1982), p.272.] By the time of the 1825 Emigration, word has come back from the Emigrants in Canada. The people were far more enthusiastic and there are over 50,000 applications for the 2,000 positions. In the Robinson Papers at the Peterborough Centennial Museum and Archives, there is a letter from one of the 1823 Emigrants, Catharine O'Brien, dated 20 February, 1824 to her brother in Ireland. In the letter she states:

"I am now going to invite you to come. Peter Robinson Esqre is going home for more Settlers and carries this letter along with him & I beg of you Brother Peter that you will come and embrace the opportunity for you may never have the like again."

She goes on to state:

"I do not wish to encourage my brother John to come to this Country if he would not resolve to work better than he did at home. ... if he would keep from the drink he might do well, but the rum is very cheap"

Robinson once again went to the Cork area for the 1825 Emigration. The second time he met with favourable response from the people as well as the landlords. It was clear to the landlords why the Emigration was being carried out. In a letter recommending 83 families to Peter Robinson from Mount Cashell, dated 20 October, 1824, we find the following:

"... you will see that they nearly average seven in a family, they are all poor and wretched, and have most of them subsisted by tilling the soil. ... All are Roman Catholics with the exception of one family. I think they are just the sort of persons you wish to have in America, and by taking them you will rid this country of so many paupers."

From this passage, we can see some of the anomalies found with the Robinson Emigrants. The majority were poor and Catholic at a time when the "typical" Irish Emigrant was Protestant and Middle Class.

In Robinson's report of 4th May, 1827, he tells us the criteria used -- the Emigrants "... should be small Farmers, able to make good Settlers and without the means of supporting themselves in Ireland." There was one piece of criteria that Robinson himself admits that was not always followed and that was age. He notes that he did admit some farmers over the age of 45. His reason was that they are however, farmers of superior intelligence and character to the other Emigrants, and appear from their experience in agriculture, and their practical knowledge, capable of giving a good example to the other Settlers, and of contributing essentially to the making of this second experiment still more creditable than the first.

Despite Robinson's words, not all of the Emigrants were destitute farmers, or farm labourers. When the ship's lists are checked, we find that of the Emigrants at least 89 were tradesmen of some sort. Once the families were chosen, they were given an embarkation certificate, which listed the family members along with their ages. Peter Robinson kept a duplicate, and

compared the tickets and the families to the description on his ticket. The process was carried out as follows:

"The Surgeon of each Transport had orders to report as soon as he received his complement of Settlers on Board, on which I [Robinson] proceeded to the Ship and mustered them all on the Main-deck - the Hatches were then closed except for one, when in the presence of the Surgeon and the Master, I took the Original Certificates which had been given over by the head of each family to the Surgeon, at the time of his embarkation, and from these after comparing them with the duplicates in my own possession, I called over the names of each individual belonging to the different families, and made them pass before me, and when I was satisfied they were of the age and description given in by the Father, and that no imposition had been practised, they were sent between decks."

This check was not very rigorous, as some families had bought or traded for the certificates. Perhaps one of the most interesting cases was the O'Grady family. The family who came over bought the ticket from a family of the same name in their parish. The families matched almost perfectly except that the third eldest child, John, had to disguise himself as a girl, Johanna. The Emigrants embarked from Cork in May and June in 9 vessels comprising 8 ships - vessels with 3 square-rigged masts - and 1 brig - a vessel with 2 square-rigged masts, with an additional lower fore-and-aft sail on gaff and boom to mainmast.

The ships were the *Amity* (305 tons), *Brunswick* (525), *Fortitude* (444), *John Barry* (520), *Regulus* (370), *Resolution* (334) and the *Star* (485). The *Brig* was (...) the *Albion* (305 tons). These ships were chartered from the Royal Navy at a cost of L15,651, 18s. The ships themselves were chartered from private sources by the navy. Robinson claimed that the ocean voyage varied between 21 and 32 days. When the dates of their departures are compared with their arrival dates at Quebec Harbour, we find that the length of the voyages actually varied between 31 and 42 days.

The Emigrants were given naval rations, blankets, and had a surgeon on each ship. The number of deaths on the trip was 15 - 2 men, 2 women and 11 children - which equalled the number of births. The Emigrants landed at Quebec Harbour, and went to Montreal by steamship. They crossed overland to the Lachine Rapids. At Montreal, some of the families

deserted. As well, according to a letter, dated 21 July, 1825, to Peter Robinson from C. Power, Surgeon of the Elizabeth, Jeremiah Dwyer was "bound in recognizance to prosecute at the next assizes holden at Montreal ... in August."

As well on Friday 24 June, 1825 there was a small riot at L'isle de Perreau. According to John Thomson, Royal Navy:

"some of the Emigrants had broken the doors & windows of a house and severely cut two men in the head with stones, the clock was also broken... Originated in a dispute about boiling a kettle."

At Lachine, the Emigrants embarked onto St. Lawrence bateaux and went first to Prescott and then to Kingston. The trip to Prescott normally took about 8 days, while the trip from Prescott to Kingston took about 4. It took between 22 and 27 days to move all the Robinson Emigrants from Quebec to Kingston.

Robinson had not travelled with the Emigrants, having business in London, but joined the Emigrants at Kingston. There he found them:

"... as comfortable as could be reasonably expected - some of them suffering from fever and Ague, owing to the intense heat of the Weather, tho' not in a great proportion than the Inhabitants of the Province generally."

On 11 August, Robinson began to move the settlers to Cobourg. He embarked the Emigrants onto a steamship in groups of 100. The steamship dropped off the Emigrants the next day in Cobourg. This trip was made once a week. The steamship was probably the *PS Frontenac* which made a weekly trip from Kingston to York. At Cobourg, the Emigrants stayed in tents, while they recovered from their illnesses and the others caught up to them. While recovering in Cobourg, they were under the care of Dr. A. Morton, who defended them against editorial attacks by William Lyon MacKenzie. (see Appendix A)

Cobourg was the point at which the Emigrants moved inland. Robinson found that the road from Cobourg to Rice Lake was not passable, while the Otonabee was lower than it had been for years.

Before the Emigrants could travel to Rice Lake, they repair the road for waggons. The Magistrates of the District gave Robinson £50 towards repairing the road. With the money and the labour of the Emigrants, Robinson was able to improve the road. In 10 days he was able to move the provisions and baggage along with three large boats on wheels from Cobourg to Rice Lake.

At Rice Lake, Robinson found that the level of the Otonabee had dropped so much that the boats he brought were unable to make it up the river. In 8 days, they built a barge 60 feet long by 8 feet wide that could carry an immense burden but still easily be moved up the Otonabee.

The first party to go up the river consisted of 20 axemen hired locally, and 30 of the fittest male settlers. These went ahead to prepare the shanties for the other Emigrants. The other emigrants followed shortly after, and settled in wattle and daub huts in what would become Peterborough. Groups of local axemen and male settlers went out onto the lots and built log shanties of approximately 10 feet by 12 feet in size. Once a family's shanty was completed, Robinson would send them up to their lot with their supplies.

The Robinson settlers were more fortunate than other settlers to the area. Although they were subject to the same settlement duties and hardships that the other pioneers faced, the government supplied them with agricultural and cooking tools, seed corn and seed potatoes, blankets, a cow and 18 months of rations per person.

Conclusion

The Robinson Emigrants were far luckier than the Irish who came later. The later Emigrants were weakened by the cholera epidemics of the 1830s and the Great Potato Famine of the 1840s. From 1830 to about 1855, Ireland lost millions of people through emigration or death. It has been said that an entire generation of Irish disappeared - only one of three Irishmen born around 1831 died at home in Ireland of old age.

The settlement patterns of Peterborough County were fixed by the settlement of the Robinson Emigrants. These patterns give the County unique demographics. Townships which had a proportion of Irish Catholics were avoided by later Protestants immigrants, who saw such areas as "Catholic strongholds". This gave certain townships either an Irish or an English mentality. These township personalities exist even today - a legacy owed to Peter Robinson.

Appendix A

Colonial Advocate , 8 December, 1825

"Mr. Robinson's Irish Settlers - We have information which may be depended upon stating that these people have an ardent desire to go to the United States, and that they frequently desert. No less than thirty of them decamped lately in one night. To how much more useful a purpose might 30,000 have been expended, than in recruiting in Ireland for United States, soldiers by Canadian Counsellors.

Colonial Advocate, 5 January, 1826

The Irish Emigrants
Letter from Doctor Morton
Cobourg, December 20

Dear Sir, I received your valuable paper of the 8th, which I have read with great pleasure: but there is one thing in it respecting the Irish emigrants, in which I cannot agree with your informant. I have attended the sick of the Irish settlers at Cobourg, for more than two months, and can assure you that I never heard of one of them express an interest to go to the United States. There were a few who went for the purpose of seeing their friends, but this I do not think extraordinary, as they had many relations there whom they have not seen for some years past. If they preferred the States to this country, I should think it very singular, as they have been treated with the greatest attention and kindness. I can assure you that my instructions were, to order them such things as appeared to me as necessary, such as fresh meat, wine, milk, &c. &c. and if they have not been well supplied I am to blame, which perhaps you will be pleased to let the public know by giving this an insertion in your next number and oblige your humble servant,

A. Morton To. Mr. MacKenzie

William Rider-Rider: Panoramic Photographer from the Great War

Christopher Creighton

Introduction

This exhibition commemorates several landmarks in the history of photography: 150 years ago, the French Academies of Science and Art announced Jacques Louis Mande Daguerre's invention of photography - "the mirror with a memory". Later that year, George Henry Fox Talbot presented his calotypes to the world. Fifty years afterwards, in 1889, John Connon of Elora, Ontario commercially introduced his Wonder camera into the North American market. The Wonder was the first camera capable of producing a 360 degree or full panoramic image. Although commercially unsuccessful, it served as the basis for the Kodak Cirkut, which held a prolific and lucrative position in the applied market for nearly half a century. Perhaps most importantly, 1989 marks the centenary of the birth of William Rider-Rider.

Our fascination with panoramics is understandable as few people actually understand the technological and theoretical principles required to make such images. Nevertheless, we can all share in the magic of these images. As we all know, it is impossible to be in two places simultaneously, but most of us have seen a panoramic school portrait with the same boy appearing at both ends of the group. In a very real way, panoramics cheat the principles of the interrelation of time and space. Through them, we can experience that which cannot be experienced first-hand; what better definition of image?

The Photographer

William Rider-Rider was born on 29 March 1889 in London, England. Choosing a career in journalism, he joined the London Daily Mirror in 1910 as a reporter and photographer. Although eager to join the war effort, Rider-Rider wore glasses, a condition which kept him out of the military

until standards were lowered in 1915. He then enlisted in the Suffolk Regiment, where he spent 18 months as a drill and bayonet instructor.

The Official Canadian Photographer until 1917 had been Lt Ivor Castle, an acquaintance of Rider-Rider and a fellow photographer at the Daily Mirror. To cover Castle's extended leaves from the front, during which he organized exhibitions of his photographs, Max Aitken, who oversaw the Canadian War Memorial Fund, and who became Lord Beaverbrook in 1917, had Rider-Rider called to active duty as Assistant Official Photographer. Rider-Rider hesitated at first, enjoying a moderately comfortable life as instructor, but finally accepted and begun his tour on 4 June 1917.

Although Castle was a former colleague, Rider-Rider held little respect for him after learning that scenes for his famous "Over the Top" series had been staged. In Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art and the Great War, by Maria Tippett (University of Toronto Press, 1984), Tippett gives further proof of this. In fact the Canadian War Records Office publication, went so far as to state that no "faked" pictures would be found within its pages. It is also interesting to note that at no time does Tippett make mention of William Rider-Rider's contributions to this publication or to the exhibitions.

Lt. Rider-Rider found that, as Official Photographer, he was afforded a considerable degree of autonomy. He was given advance notice of raids and attacks, and could usually arrange to be at the centre of the action. Setting up his headquarters at St. Pol, 20 miles behind the front, he was provided a staff of three men: Sgt. B.L. Hallett, darkroom technician; Cpl. Reeves of the 8th Battalion, general assistant; and Pvt. Thronton of the 19th Battalion, servant; he was also assigned the use of a chauffeur, Bailey. Ironically, Rider-Rider routinely used 2 German cameras to make his photographs: a Goerz 4 x 5 inch and a 4 3/4 x 6 1/2 inch of the same make. The camera used to the forty-four panoramic images in this exhibition was a #4 Kodak Panoram.

Rider-Rider recorded every major battle from the attack on La Coulotte in June 1917 to the Canadian entry into Mons on 11 November 1918.

Throughout his stint at the front, he continued to take photographs, seemingly impervious to the destruction surrounding him. Without the advantage of fast lenses or films, especially when using the Panoram, Rider-Rider was in constant danger from machine-gun fire, snipers, artillery shells, bombs and gas. In September 1918 he received his only (slight) wound and was gassed. Rider-Rider remained in France until February 1919. During his twenty-one months as Official Canadian Photographer, he made over 2,500 images.

The last exhibition of war photographs in England, which opened on 7 January 1919 at London's Grafton Galleries, contained 144 of Rider-Rider's images of the final 100 days of the war. The total profits from all exhibitions, exceeding \$170,000, were donated to the Canadian War Memorials Fund to pay the war artists, including A.Y. Jackson, J.W. Morrice, Maurice Cullen and Augustus John, and to purchase their paintings.

When the decision was made to transfer the original negatives of the War Records Office to Canada in 1919, Rider-Rider was chosen to accompany the shipment to Ottawa. Upon his return to England in late May, he was presented with the M.B.E. by King George V. Sir Arthur Currie, Commander of Canadian Forces, had recommended Rider-Rider for this honour because of his bravery and dedication to duty.

Returning to the London Daily Mirror upon mustering out, William Rider-Rider achieved the position of Night News Editor before retiring in 1948.

In May 1971 Rider-Rider visited Canada as the guest of the Department of National Defense, which honoured him at the *Shutter Click '71* reunion of military photographers. In 1973 he returned to Ottawa to attend the opening of *Relentless Verity: Canadian Military Photographers Since 1885*.

William Rider-Rider died on 22 November 1979 in Romford, England, aged ninety.

A Brief History of Influences and Developments in Panoramic Photography:

1822 - The Diorama, a huge panoramic painting - with added special lighting effects opened in Paris, France. The Diorama was designed and largely constructed by Jacques Louis Mande Daguerre.

1839 - The French Academies of Art and Sciences jointly announce the invention of the Daguerreotype. Essentially a silvered plate upon which an image had been fixed by light and chemistry, this "mirror with a memory" heralded the beginning of a new way in which the world would be viewed. Daguerre of The Diorama fame, was given a pension for life by the French government for his invention.

Later that year, an English gentleman, George Henry Fox Talbot, announced his discovery of the Calotype; later referred to as "photography" by Sir John Herschel. Talbot's process was the first to use the positive/negative system.

1844 - Frederich von Martens; an engraver and engineer living in Paris, constructed the first panoramic camera. Using 5 x 17 1/2 inch curved Daguerreotype plates, he made several views of Paris, encompassing a horizontal view of just over 150 degrees.

1860's - Several improvements on von Marten's design. The most notable of which was the use of collodion wet plates which allowed the production of multiple prints from each negative.

1885 - William H. Jackson - in a letter to George Eastman - described his invention of a camera capable of recording a complete and uninterrupted 360 degree view on a single paper negative.

1888 - John R. Connon of Elora, Ontario patented his Wonder panoramic camera. Manufactured by Rudolph Stirn of Berlin, the Wonder was the world's first mass produced full view panoramic camera. Although

commercially unsuccessful, it contained many features which would be found on subsequent cameras of this type.

1889 - Jacques Damoizeau of Paris introduced the Cyclographe. Similar in many ways to Connon's Wonder camera, the Cyclographe also had the novel capacity of producing 360 degree stereo images.

1891 - The Al-Vista was put on the market by the Multiscope and Film Company of Burlington, Wisconsin. Employing von Marten's swing lens concept, Al-Vista cameras varied in format from 2 1/4 x 7 to 7 x 21 inches.

1896 - The Korona (commonly referred to as the "banquet") camera was introduced by the Grundlach Optical Company of New York. The Korona was a very large format - up to 12 x 20 inches - wide angle camera developed at least initially for photographing large numbers of people at banquets and other gatherings, hence its name.

1904 - The Eastman Kodak Company brought out the first of its long line of Cirkut cameras; developed by Frederick Brehm of Rochester, New York. The Cirkut would, throughout its long production, be available in models capable of using 5,6,8,10,12 or 16 inch roll film. The largest of these - the Century Cirkut was able to make a continuous negative of over 20 feet in length. Thousands of these cameras were sold before production ceased in 1945.

1905 to Present - There were many developments in the field of panoramic photography. Coinciding roughly with the demise of the Century Cirkut came the slow waning of the genre. However, beginning in the early 1970's, panoramic photography has begun to regain popularity - especially with artists. As a result of this resurgence, there are currently more new models of panoramic cameras available today than at anytime previously.

Text courtesy, Art Gallery of Northumberland.

The Barnum House Restoration Project

Lawrence Kavanagh

The Ontario Heritage Foundation is an agency of the Ministry of Culture and Communications and is committed to the preservation, protection and promotion of Ontario's cultural, archaeological, architectural, historical and natural heritage. The Property Restoration Unit is the office responsible for all research and architectural services on the 30 historic properties held in Trust by the Foundation for the people of Ontario. The Unit is made up of architects, conservation technologists and an archaeologist. Barnum House is one of 15 properties currently undergoing research, repair and restoration.

The Barnum House located near Grafton, Ontario built by Eliakum Barnum circa 1817-1820 as his villa/farmhouse, remains representative of the finest of domestic building in Upper Canada. It was constructed of timber frame on the rubble stone foundations of the Norris house destroyed by fire circa 1814. The style of Barnum House reflects the North American Neo-Classic (known as "Loyalist" in Ontario) allied to the Federal period in the United States. With its temple front and flanking wings, the emphasis is on delicately scaled detail with well proportioned ornament.

Eliakum Barnum was a late Loyalist settler in Ontario, arriving from Vermont about 1800. He was a firm Tory supporter, a Justice of the Peace, a farmer, shop and tavern owner, and a operator of grist mills and a distillery. He married Hannah Ewing in 1812 and had four children. He died in 1877 at the age of 82. His children and their families continued to live in the house until it was sold to James Henry Prentice in 1907. Prentice's widow sold the house to Eric Arthur and the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario in 1939-40. The house was then restored by the

Conservancy and opened a "house museum", remarkable for being one of the first such projects of this kind. Public interest in the Museum, however waned during the war years. A severe fire destroyed a later

addition and damaged the east side of the main block and the east wing in the early 1950's. The charred beams and joists in the attic remain today. In 1957-58, the Township of Haldimand took over operation of this community museum and in 1982 the Barnum House was acquired by the Ontario Heritage Foundation.

Plans are now underway for the Barnum House to be reopened in the spring of 1991 as a County Museum and Resource Centre operated by Northumberland County. Beginning this fall (1989) as the first phase of restoration, the Foundation undertook exterior repairs and stabilization.

Research

Substantial research has been undertaken on the Barnum House over the years including the archaeological work highlighted in the first case study on this project, "Research and Archaeology: The Genesis of a Restoration Project". The research forms the basis for decisions made about the conservation and adaptation work required for the building. A complete set of measured drawings, completed in 1983 were used to direct an inspection of the exterior condition and internal structure of the building.

Inspection and Fault Diagnosis

Informed by inspection studies carried out in 1981, 1983 and 1984, the Foundation's architects once again reviewed the building in 1988 and 1989. A record of symptoms indicating areas of deterioration was produced with probable causes and approaches to arrest the deterioration in order to stabilize the structure and to repair and/or restore areas of damaged or missing fabric. Alan Zeegan, Consulting Structural Engineer of Toronto, was retained through a tendering process to undertake a complete review of the building, to make specific recommendations for repairs necessary during this first phase, and to work on-site with the Foundation's supervising Architect to deal with anticipated problems and revisions.

SYMPTOMS

- Interior staining of walls flashing and ceilings
- Differential settlement
- Sagging roof ridge
- Spalling chimney brick and mortar

DIAGNOSIS

- leaking and roofing shingles
- shifting stone foundation
- deterioration of wood sill beams
- snow loading
- previous fire damage
- inadequate structure
- rising damp
- build-up of adjacent grade
- inadequate protection

Specifying the Work

The results of the detailed inspections and recommendations for repair and replacement were then translated into drawings and specifications. The importance of these documents cannot be over stressed. The drawings became a tool for the architect to assess the relationships of deterioration and impact of repairs, to determine phasing and to explore means of repair and restoration. The specifications laid out to materials and to step by step procedures to be used by the building contractor

when performing the work. When properly detailed and integrated, the drawings and specifications allow for a competitive tendering process which the Foundation, as a provincial agency, must undertake for each of its projects.

Outline Specification

Generally, the work required for this first phase involved the following areas:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Roof | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- repoint or rebuilding existing chimneys dependant on the severity of internal deterioration, seal tops until future use is determined- reinforce existing structure determined to be extremely over stressed- replace rotted sheathing- provide for proper ventilation- replace existing asphalt shingles with cedar shingles- replace all existing flashing with flexible counter flashings at roof and wall junctures |
| Walls | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- repair deteriorated structural posts- repair damaged existing sheathing, siding and trim, reproduce trim to replace previous repairs that were poorly matched or to infill missing portions- repair and reglaze broken window glass, muntins and sash- repair existing shutters- repair and refinish existing hardware- remove all loose and flaking paint and repaint- strip all paint from front facade that was obscuring important physical characteristics |
| Foundations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- cut out and replace deteriorated wood sill beams- grout and parge existing rubble stone foundations and previous foundation repairs including poured concrete and concrete block- lower grade to improve water run-off- damp proof walls, install weeping tiles and proper backfill |

Although the work was extensively detailed, contingencies were made for concealed deterioration, failures and other on-site hazards including inclement weather.

Details, Details

Partak Ltd., General Contractor of Cobourg, Ontario was awarded the contract for the first phase and work commenced in early September 1989. Two areas of the work are highlighted to illustrate the overall approach.

A) The building structure report prepared by Alan Zeegan determined that the roof structure of 4 x 4's at three feet on centre, was grossly inadequate by today's Building Code Standards. Add to this charred remains from the fire of 1954 which burnt the east side of the building and most of the roof structure and we had a severe problem. The future use of the building as a County Museum and Resource Centre, with substantially increased visitation and almost daily occupation required that the roof structure be safe. As well, the investment of time and money to be spent on interior restoration and furnishing requires adequate protection!

The lower sheathing boards were removed (3/4 were repairs made following the fire, the remainder, presumed original, were severely rotted) in order to insert new structural joists, two between each original joist. A new ridge board was placed between all the joists in order to relieve the sagging roof peak. Sheathing was replaced with gaps between the boards. The roof is now adequately supported by today's standards yet the original structure including those elements bearing scars of the fire remain for future information and research.

The cedar shingle roof is installed directly on the board sheathing with no asphalt paper underlay. Recent research suggest that the present day lifespan of cedar shingle roofs is dramatically reduced by the introduction of water retardant papers and membranes. These do not allow the shingles to properly dry out leading to accelerated rotting. Shingle sizes have been reduced over the years leading to the introduction of sheathing paper to ensure protection from the elements. The cedar shingle roof at Barnum

House employs no underlayment and 24 inch "Royals" that provide four layers of coverage at any one point. The extra cost of these premier shingles is offset by the deletion of materials and labour for plywood sheathing and underlayment. As a result, the lifespan of the roof should be considerably enhanced.

B) Repair of the foundation sill beams became more elaborate as the work progressed. Initially, the drawings called for replacement of one length under the West wing with similar size of seasoned timber. As sections were removed, considerable deterioration was discovered, concealed by the second timber sill beam. Timbers that seemed entirely sound from the outside had severe rot in the joist pockets and suffered from insect attack at the ends. Rot had travelled from the lower beam to the upper, back along some floor joists and even up supporting corner posts. The beams were determined to be structurally unsound and splicing in repairs could not guarantee removal of all the rot. Proper temporary supports were installed to secure the structure and the beams were removed. The top of the stone foundation wall was levelled with non-shrink mortar and a damp proof course of copper fibrene flashing was laid down to prevent the transference of any ground moisture from stone to new timber beam. New(old) beams of pine from an old dismantled barn were installed in four to five foot lengths, much like underpinning with concrete, so as to ensure as little movement as possible of the house's upper structure. Joints between these timber sections were shiplapped and bolted to form a continuous rigid beam. Any remaining voids under the beam were filled with a non-shrink grout to ensure a continuous smooth base thereby avoiding any possible settlement. Once the grout dried, the temporary supports were removed and the existing structure carefully loaded back down onto the new sill beams. The repairs can be viewed from the basement side but are concealed by wood trim and face stone from the exterior.

Summary

The stabilization and repair of the Barnum House exterior is the proper first step in the building's overall restoration. The exterior is now secure against the weather in preparation for the second phase of interior

restoration and adaptation. The area consisting of most of the concealed deterioration (requiring most of the contingency dollars) is complete. Most importantly, the community can, early on in what will be a long construction process, see a visible demonstration of the building's renewed future.

*Case Study #2, Repair & Stabilization: The Barnum House Exterior
Ontario Heritage Foundation*

MORE PHOTOS, MORE FAMILIES AND MORE HOUSES

Synopsis of Slide Presentation by Robert Mikel

The February talk was given by Robert Mikel who updated the society on his continuing research into Cobourg's history, particularly the families and buildings of the town. Rob brought with him a large number images from his photographic collection of Cobourg which he has built up over the years. The first few slides were general views of the town not seen before, including a water colour rendering by Kivas Tully of Victoria Hall. The next series of slides documented recent demolitions of historic properties in Cobourg including an old photo of Sunnyside, the former Kerr house located on Queen Street between Church and Green. Mikel pointed out how such buildings have been allowed to be demolished only to have unsuitable replacement structure like the seven storey apartment that in the process of being constructed where Sunnyside was.

The bulk of the talk consisted of the history of numerous families and the houses and other buildings associated with them in the town. Among the families discussed were the Austons, Caddys, Kobolds, Winches, Walkers, Burns, Crusos, and the family of Judge Boswell. Interestingly the photographs of the Boswells in front of their house Lowwood (below) and the Auston's in front of their house (see front cover) are two of the earliest known exterior views of Cobourg both taken in the late 1850's.

Several families from the Summer Colony were also documented including the Ladds, Hesses, Bells and Tracys. Rob had a number of recently acquired pictures of the Tracys summer home, Hamilton House including several interior pictures and a few of the first Hamilton House (see below) built about 1850 by the Hon. Sidney Smith.

At the back of the room Rob had brought a chart about thirty feet long showing how all these early families were related to one another.



Lowwood, was built on Havelock Street by George Manners, about 1840. Later it was the home of Judge George M. Boswell and then the St. Joseph's Convent. The house is now demolished. (courtesy, Robert Mikel Collection)



Hamilton House on King St W circa 1895. (The house was constructed about 1860; destroyed by fire in 1898; rebuilt 1899). This earlier Hamilton House, is where Edward, Prince of Wales stayed on his visit to Cobourg, September 1860. (courtesy, Robert Mikel Collection)

THE STORY OF JOHN MCCARTY (1788-1877)

By Catherine Milne

While researching the settlement of the village of Baltimore, Ontario, my birthplace and that of both sets of grandparents, I became interested in John McCarty, the first settler in the area. He was the son of the Rev. Charles Justin McCarty, said to be the protomartyr of Methodism in Canada, a fact that had a profound effect on John's character. John McCarty, a militant Methodist and a man of strong opinions, was active in the founding of the Methodist Chapels in both Hamilton Township and Cobourg.

The following comments are paraphrased from his long and laudatory obituary in the Cobourg Sentinel, Nov.10, 1877: "John McCarty was blessed with a physical frame of unusual strength and power of endurance and when at his prime was probably the strongest man in the country. He had a shrewd, vigorous and acute mind with deep insight into character and motives and could have risen to eminence in any profession. He was active in all local election contests and his support was eagerly sought by hopeful candidates. One of the best known and for some years the oldest inhabitant of Cobourg, he was a strong advocate of total abstinence and a few weeks before his death took part in a public debate on the Dunkin Act (i.e. the Canada Temperance Act of 1864). He was a member of the Methodist Church in this town, and died as he had lived, a firm believer in the truths of that holy religion."

In 1805, when the site of Cobourg was still a cedar swamp and Hamilton Township covered with forest except for the Rice Lake Plains, seventeen-year-old John McCarty was clearing land a quarter of a mile east of what would become the village of Baltimore, Ontario. The residents of Baltimore have never known why their village was so-named. There is one tale that a drunk man wandered into the settlement, thought he was in Baltimore, Maryland, and the place from then on was named for that city. This improbable story was quoted by Letitia Youmans in her book, Campaign Echoes (1893). Mrs. Youmans was a famous temperance lecturer

and a daughter of the John Creighton for whom Creighton Heights is named.

Research indicates that John McCarty, the first settler, named the village; indeed, he always said himself that he was "the father and founder of Baltimore", according to Walter Riddell in his Historical Sketch of the Township of Hamilton (1897). Why would John McCarty have chosen the name "Baltimore"? There are two possible reasons:

(1) The first Episcopal Methodist Church, of which John McCarty was a staunch supporter, was set up in Baltimore, Maryland, the year after the American Revolution. That is the only connection to the city of Baltimore that has been discovered to date.

(2) The McCartys' ancestral roots were in Ireland and John's father may have emigrated from the small village of Baltimore, located on the south coast of County Cork, Ireland. The name "McCarthy" appears in the early history of Ireland and is still the most common name in southern County Cork.

The McCarthys in Ireland

The first known McCarthys were native Irish kings of South Munster (the ancient kingdom of Desmond), a province in the southwest of Ireland that included County Cork. They claimed descent from Eoghan, the Celtic king of South Munster, who ruled around 200 A.D. The McCarthys made the town of Cork their capital and reigned from the twelfth to the sixteenth century until they were dispossessed by the Tudor kings of England and their estates given to others.

Baltimore, Maryland, takes its name from the Baltimore estate in County Cork. During the reign of Protestant James 1st, Sir George Calvert (1580-1632), a valuable servant of the Crown, acquired an estate on the south coast of County Cork. Because he refused to give up the Catholic religion he had to resign his position in 1625, whereupon his grateful sovereign gave him an Irish peerage in reward for past services. Sir George assumed the title of Lord Baltimore, taken from the name of his Irish estate

"Baltimore", or in the Gaelic "Baile na Tighe Mor", which translated means "townland of the big house". You won't find Baltimore village on a modern map of Eire because English names have been changed back to the Gaelic and Baltimore is now "Dun na Sead".

Lord Baltimore's family also received a large grant in America from Charles 1st and became the proprietors, founders and planners of what is now the State of Maryland, U.S.A., and its capital is, of course, named for them. The Baltimore oriole was so-called because it sports the same colours as Lord Baltimore's coat-of-arms, black and orange. It has even been speculated that Baltimore, Ontario, may have been named for its many Baltimore orioles, also an unlikely story.

The McCarthys in America

Charles Justin McCarthy, the father of John McCarty who for some reason dropped the "h" from his name, is a controversial figure to this day and numerous articles have been written concerning his life and death; the latest in May, 1989, by Donald Jones, historian and writer for the Toronto Star.

Charles Justin McCarthy, said to be a Roman Catholic educated for the priesthood (Kingston Before the War of 1812, Richard Preston (1959)), emigrated from Ireland to New England before the American Revolution. He was converted, however, to the Calvinist Methodist faith by George Whitefield on his last tour of America. Whitefield was an eloquent evangelist who had broken away from the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Great Britain and was immensely popular in New England, where he died in 1770. Charles Justin McCarthy followed in the footsteps of his mentor and also became an itinerant evangelist. Around 1780 he married Catherine Lent, who was born in the Sleepy Hollow area of New York State made famous by Washington Irving. The McCarthys' four sons, Callaghan, David, Charles and John, were born in various places during their father's travels around New York State.

The McCarthys in Upper Canada

In 1788 the Rev. Charles Justin McCarthy, with his wife and children, emigrated to the Kingston area in Upper Canada to carry on his mission. According to Dr. Alfred Reynar, professor at Victoria College from 1868-1913, McCarthy was "a man of attractive manner and speech and his evangelistic labours were made a blessing to many". (Cobourg World, July 13, 1900).

McCarthy made a petition to the colonial government which is preserved among the records of the Ontario Historical Society. It reads:

"THE PETITION OF CHARLES JUSTIN MCCARTHY

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Lord Dorchester, Captain General Governor & Commander in Chief of the Colonies of Quebec, Nova Scotia & New Brunswick & their dependencies, Vice Admiral of the same, Captain General & Commander in chief of all his Majesty's forces in said Colonies & in the Island of Newfoundland Etc, Etc.

The Memorial of the Rev'd Charles Justin McCarthy Loyalist
Humbly Sheweth

That your Lordship's Memorialist in consequence of his friendly disposition to the British Government & constitution suffered the following punishments, hardships & afflictions in the most cruel & inhuman manner. that is To say, your Memorialist was lodged a whole year in prison at Poughkepsy & in the month of June '78 was lodged in the City of Albany twenty five days in Irons on the flat of his back by the Direction of General John Stark And at West point he was in fetters of Iron weighing thirty two Pounds for the Space of two Months then he was tried for his life and condemned to die; he was brought to the place of execution, the Grave and Coffin prepared and a Rope fixed round his Neck twice, then in the Month of August in the year 80 he was twice Whiped (sic) & several times confined at Fishkill & at Peekskill, your Memorialist suffered a Variety of punishments & hardships which he omits to mention here as being too tedious-- Your Memorialist has in the time of the war enlisted upwards of three hundred Men for the Southern and Northern Armies. And he never received the least compensation nor never before this time claimed any indulgence from Government--therefore he humbly Prays that your Lordship would consider him, & in compassion to him and helpless family consisting of a Wife and four Children, be pleased to order him such a quantity of the waste lands of the Crown as in your Lordship's

Great wisdom will seem reasonable and Just, in any place not already located in the District of Mecklenburg--

And your Memorialist Shall as in duty bound ever pray

CHARLES JUSTIN MCCARTHY
Adolphus Town Augt.10th, 1789"

The following note is inserted in brackets: "The whole petition is in the handwriting of the petitioner" and is worth mentioning because it has been said by some detractors that McCarthy was illiterate.

This petition was accompanied by a recommendation signed by forty-one residents of Adolphustown and Fredericksburg, small loyalist communities near Kingston. Among those signing was a Captain Peter Ruttan, an ancestor of Sheriff Henry Ruttan of Cobourg. The recommendation reads:

"We the subscribers do recommend the Rev'd Charles Justin McCarthy since his coming to this Town for his conduct sobriety and Honesty to be conformable to Virtue, morality, Piety and Religion. His care and Activity in Instructing and promoting Religion here and Vicinity, and as much as came to our knowledge as such we do recommend him to every well wisher of the above mentioned and promoters of Religion-- We therefore do earnestly request to have him continue with us, praying he may comply with our Request and in so doing will give us secret satisfaction."

McCarthy's claim, however, was denied by the land board at Mecklenberg (now Lennox and Addington County). McCarthy doesn't state on what charges he was arrested but Methodists were regarded as Tories in Revolutionary America until they could prove otherwise and, according to the Encyclopedia Americana, all the Methodist preachers but two, Francis Asbury and Thomas Rankin, fled the colonies. Obviously the Rev. Charles Justin McCarthy was not among those who fled. His descendants are still attempting to get a U.E.L. designation for Charles Justin McCarthy but they have been blocked by an article written in 1974 by the late Dr. H.Burleigh and deposited at Queen's University, wherein he questioned the validity of McCarthy's claims and attempts to prove he was illiterate.

There are a number of conflicting accounts about the Rev. Charles Justin McCarthy's death in Upper Canada. A.G. Meacham, author in 1832 of a book with the ponderous title of A Compendious History of the Rise and Progress of the Methodist Church both in Europe and America was the first to mention him. He wrote:

"McCarty repaired to Ernesttown ...and preached Christ to the people of the various neighbourhoods who generally attended his meetings in large numbers....a jealousy was soon excited among those who were advocates for the lifeless forms of the Church of England. Fearing that Methodism might become established they soon raised a persecution against Mr. McCarthy....the sheriff, often declared boldly, that there should be no religious worship established, but that of the Church of England."

McCarthy was arrested in 1790 as a "vagabond, imposture and disturber of the peace". Vagabonds could be punished by banishment from the country. Records of McCarthy's trial, not published until 1899, show that although there were seven witnesses who testified to McCarthy's good character (one of these John Ruttan), and only one to the contrary, he was sentenced to be deported to Oswego, N.Y. Here the accounts of subsequent events differ. Some writers said that McCarthy was landed on a desolate island in the St. Laurence where he perished; Meacham insisted that McCarthy escaped; went to Montreal with funds secured from his friend, Sir John Johnston, to get help in prosecuting his persecutors; that he never came back and a Captain Sherwood asserted he had found him stabbed to death. Meacham got his information from one Robert Perry, a former sergeant in Sir John Johnston's regiment, the King's Royal Rangers. Perry was a loyalist and one of the first settlers in Ernesttown, at whose home McCarthy was preaching when he was arrested.

McCarthy's son, John, told a later Methodist writer that Sherwood later confessed he had done away with McCarthy himself and gave John's mother his confession. It was said that Sherwood, filled with remorse for having injured an innocent man, died insane. Modern information comes from Richard A. Preston who edited Kingston Before the War of 1812, A Collection of Documents (1959). A quote from Preston's collection illustrates the feelings of the ruling hierarchy toward the first Methodist preachers to arrive in the colony. It is taken from a letter written in 1790 to

the Anglican Bishop of Nova Scotia by the Rev. John Stuart (1740-1811), Rector of St. George's, Kingston, and a member of the land board:

"Two itinerant Preachers, of the Methodist Class, are now in this Settlement,- the one is called McCarty, the Person I mentioned to you;- he is an illiterate Irishman; and a Man of an infamous private Character.- I think we will be able to banish him for Crimes of a heinous (sic) Nature.- the other is just arrived, -his name is Loosey*,- he says he has been in Nova Scotia & pretends to be acquainted with you.- He has the same Recommendation as the other; that is he has formerly been a Man of a very bad moral Character."

*The Loosey, mentioned by Stuart, was William Losee from Dutchess County, N.Y., a circuit rider. At the request of the loyalists, two years after McCarthy arrived Losee was sent to Kingston by the Episcopal Methodist Church and organized the first circuit in Upper Canada.

The mystery of McCarthy's disappearance has never been solved and the pros and cons of his persecution have been debated by various writers for the last 150 years. Religious prejudice on both sides, no doubt, played a large part and it has been suggested that some zealous persons exceeded their authority. It must be remembered that McCarthy was the first evangelist to preach in the loyalist colony and that Methodist converts soon began to outnumber the privileged members of the Church of England, who had a firm grip on the reins of government and had no intention of relinquishing them. Too, the French Revolution had taken place just the year before McCarthy's trial and those in power in Upper Canada feared that the followers of the Episcopal Methodist religion, imported from the republic to the south, might be trying to stir up a similar rebellion against Great Britain. For this reason many Methodists in Upper Canada allied themselves with the Wesleyan Methodists, the division imported from the mother country.

The McCarthys in Hamilton Township

After Charles Justin McCarthy's death, his widow, the former Catherine Lent, settled with her four sons in Ernesttown (now Bath), Lennox and

Addington County. In 1794 she married John McDougall, a United Empire loyalist. They had two children, Alan and Elizabeth, who received loyalist grants in 1820. Both John McDougall and David Lent, who was also a U.E.L. and had been a witness for his brother-in-law, McCarthy, at the Kingston trial, received grants in Hamilton Township near Port Hope (lots 34 and 35, concessions 2 and 3) and settled there around 1800. The McDougalls lived in the township until their deaths fifteen years later. David Lent became a Methodist preacher and his family settled east of the Rice Lake road in the Precious Corners area and the cemetery there is named for them. Lents' Cemetery was once the site of a Methodist Church and in early days one had to be a Lent connection to have the privilege of being buried there. The oldest McCarthy son, Callaghan, was born in the United States in 1782 and married Elizabeth Simmons, U.E.L., c. 1800 in Ernesttown. He also moved to Precious Corners, where he built one of the first houses on the Rice Lake road. This home was often a stopping place for early Methodist circuit riders. Callaghan's son, Lyman, moved to the Cold Springs area and his descendants married into the local families. It is that branch of the family who are seeking a U.E.L. designation for Charles Justin McCarthy and who have supplied a great deal of the above information. The third son, Charles Justinus, married Catherine Smith in Fredericksburg, near Kingston, but there is no record of them ever living in Hamilton township.

The McCartys in Baltimore

David, the second son of Charles Justin McCarthy, was born in America in 1783. In 1802 David bought the 200 acres of lot 7, concession 3, just east of what would later become the village of Baltimore. According to Hamilton Township assessment and census records, three years later David and his brother, John, had begun to clear the land on this lot. David married in 1810. Three years later he sold John the south hundred acres of lot 7 and moved to the Rice Lake Plains.

John, the youngest son of Charles Justin McCarthy and Catherine Lent, was born in 1788 in Poughkeepsie, N.Y, the year they came to Upper Canada. His half-sister, Elizabeth McDougall, married Henry Fisher. In 1819 Henry Fisher's brother, James, built the first sawmill on Baltimore

Creek. The previous year John McCarty, Henry and James Fisher were among the twelve residents who petitioned for a road to be built south from the proposed mill site (below present Ball's Mill) to what is now Dale Road, where the road leading north from Cobourg then terminated. (That road would now be the part of Highway #45, forming the main street of Baltimore.) Although the Fishers left the area in 1835, their sawmill on the creek became the nucleus of Baltimore village.

Anson Green, an early Episcopal Methodist circuit rider, said in his memoirs, The Life and Times of Anson Green, D.D. (1877) that he preached in Baltimore on Thursday, September 25, 1824, and even listed the text used: Matt. 7:7. Baltimore was therefore named by 1824 and probably even earlier. There had been saddle bag preachers active on the Smith's Creek Episcopal Methodist Circuit since 1805 and they would certainly have been welcomed at John McCarty's home.

John McCarty had almost half his Baltimore farm cleared by 1819 but that year he left and bought property at Hull's Corners from his uncle, the Rev. David Lent. (Hull's Corners, once located at the junction of Highways #45 and 401, was named for Edward Hull who kept tavern there in the 1830s.) The next year McCarty helped establish at Hull's Corners the first Methodist Chapel in Hamilton Township, later called the "Back Chapel" or "M'Carty's". When a number of Rice Lake Mississaugas became converted at the chapel in 1827 they expressed a desire to learn to read the Bible. John McCarty and Ebenezer Perry (later Senator) built a school for Indian children. It was staffed with Methodist teachers and located on the south shore of Rice Lake near Harwood. (Gore's Landing and The Rice Lake Plains, Martin, Milne and McGillis, 1986). In 1829 this school was included among the four common schools listed as operating in the Cobourg and Hamilton Township district. (Local History Study on Education in Cobourg, Experience '75, liaison: Harry Knapper, Cobourg Public Library, p.5)

Around 1810 John McCarty married Elizabeth ---? (1788-1874) also an emigrant from America. They had six children, three of whom died young. The three surviving were: Henry, who was born in 1812 on the Baltimore farm and married twice; he had no children. John's eldest

daughter, Elizabeth, born in 1814 at Baltimore, remained a spinster. Nancy, John's youngest daughter, was born in 1820 at Hull's Corners but her parents moved to Cobourg when she was a child. She was educated at a private ladies' school and at Upper Canada Academy. In 1844 Nancy McCarty married a Presbyterian, Dr. Jason Gilchrist, one of four doctor brothers, who left her very well off when he died in 1871. Nancy then married a wealthy Anglican widower, Angus Crawford, who built them a large brick mansion on Ontario Street. The property was called Spring Vale, but it was later known as Renwood Farm and the house has recently been designated a historic home. Crawford died six years after their marriage and the farm went to his son. After that period Nancy Crawford's name can be found holding numerous mortgages throughout the district; she was obviously quite wealthy. She was termed the philanthropist of Cobourg by Daniel McAllister, (Historical Reminiscences of the Town from its Earliest Settlement, Cobourg 1903), who wrote that Nancy Crawford gave generously to the poor, erected a public drinking fountain in front of Victoria Hall and illuminated the face of the town clock. McAllister also said that in her will Nancy left bequests to all the churches, Sunday schools and missionary societies of the town and a large sum called the "Gilchrist Relief fund" to be invested for the benefit of the poor. When the brick Methodist Church was built in 1899 in Baltimore she gave the altar furniture. Nancy Crawford had no children and left her remaining estate to a female relative. With her death John McCarty's line terminated.

John McCarty in Cobourg

Four years after the Hull's Corners Chapel was established, a frame Episcopal Methodist church was built in Cobourg on Division and Chapel Streets. In 1830, among the trustees who purchased the property, appear the names of Ebenezer Perry Esq. and John McCarty, yeoman. In 1831 John McCarty was also appointed a trustee of Upper Canada Academy (later Victoria College). He served on the building committee and was in charge of the building contributions collected from Cobourg which he reported amounted to 1000 pounds, said to be the largest from any area in the province.

In 1835 John built a frame, two-story house on the corner of James and Division Streets, Cobourg. He operated a general store there, which his son Henry, a quiet unassuming man, later took over and ran as a shoe store. The building is still standing and is now a private residence. However, the fiery John McCarty, like his father, was usually involved in controversy. In the 1840s the members of the Cobourg Episcopal Methodist Church joined with the Wesleyans and became the Cobourg Wesleyan Methodist Church, a union led by the Rev. Egerton Ryerson. Certain diehards, however, John McCarty among them, refused to join and in 1848 built their own Episcopal Methodist Church on James Street behind McCarty's store. It was a frame building capable of seating 275 persons, according to the 1861 Canada Census for Cobourg. When a new brick Episcopal Methodist church was built on King and Ball Streets in 1880, the old building was remodelled into "The Home" for the aged and helpless. It wasn't until the 1890s that all the Methodist congregations finally joined together and worshiped in the building on Division Street, now the recently restored Trinity United Church. Just after the turn of the century the brick Episcopal Methodist building on King and Ball Streets was sold to the Calvary Baptist congregation.

The Rev. Dr. Nathaniel Burwash, a tactful and careful writer, commented in his History of Victoria College (1927) p.p.121-2:

"We have heard from old inhabitants that in the market-place of the college town, John McCarty, son of the protomartyr of Canadian Methodism, who was done to death by the Church party and naturally left his orphan boy to grow up a thorough radical, might be heard from the back of a farmer's waggon denouncing Ryerson in scathing terms, because he {Ryerson} was now more moderate in his counsels than some with whom he had once been associated."

Dr. Burwash, professor at Victoria College during McCarty's Cobourg years, must have known the man personally and evidently considered him a difficult character. By a strange coincidence, twenty four years after McCarty left Baltimore, his farm was purchased by my great-grandfather, Adam Burwash. Nathaniel and his five brothers (one of whom, Stephen, was my grandfather) were brought up on this farm that remained in the Burwash family for over 100 years.

To explain Burwash's statement concerning John McCarty we have to return to the Mackenzie Rebellion of 1837. Many of the U.E.loyalists in Cobourg supported Mackenzie in principle if not in fact. Samuel Ash, a brother of the Joseph Ash involved in the Cobourg Conspiracy and a contemporary of John McCarty's, expressed their feelings when he complained to one of the electioneering Tory aristocrats: "We toiled up and dragged our luggage through miles and miles of wilderness, and we took our axes and hewed a place out of the solid wilderness for you to come to! We have made roads for you to drive your carriages over, and now you want to drive your carriage wheels over us! We are not fit to associate with! We are to be put down to the lowest grade of society because we have not had those advantages of education that the country could not afford! You want to ride roughshod over us!....No sir! I use my influence to put no such people in power!" (Cobourg 1798-1948, Edwin Guillet, p.59)

Although Mackenzie's rebellion against the Family Compact failed the Governor General of North America, Sir Charles Bagot, accepted the principle of responsible government much to the displeasure of the British government and Queen Victoria. It was during Bagot's illness, when one of his ministers took over, that the office of prime minister evolved. When Bagot died his successor, Sir Charles Metcalfe, repudiated responsible government, whereupon all his ministers but one resigned. At this period the Rev. Egerton Ryerson was president of Victoria College and although he would not allow partisan politics to be voiced in the College, feelings, both pro and con, ran high among the students. Governor-General Metcalfe visited the college in 1843 and Ryerson, loyal to the Crown although he was a supporter of moderate reform, made much of his visit and wrote a defence of Metcalfe thus arousing the ire of John McCarty.

John McCarty, along with his brothers, had served in the militia during the War of 1812. Proud of being a loyal Canadian, he was most incensed when in September 1875 the Cobourg Sentinel published a roll of 1812 veterans and left him off the list. The Sentinel apologized in its next issue.

An incident in John's colourful life is described in the Cobourg Sentinel of September 1865: Our old and respected townsman, Mr. John McCarty, met

with a rather serious accident on Thurs. 24th ult. Mr. McCarty was on the wharf whilst a lot of cattle were being shipped on board the steamer, Rochester, when one of the beasts became unruly and made a rush at some ladies who were standing by; Mr. McCarty attempted to seize the rope by which the animal had been led, when it turned on Mr. McCarty and tossed him twice off its horns before he could be rescued from his perilous situation.--Mr. McCarty fell heavily each time and received very serious contusions to the head and body. It is nothing short of wonderful that Mr. McCarty, who is now 77 years of age, should have escaped with his life. The old gentleman is fast recovering from his wounds and is able to be about town as usual.

On November 3, 1877, John McCarty died at the age of 89 after becoming chilled while walking in the rain. He and his wife, their sons and daughters, are buried at Hulls' Corners Cemetery, where they once worshiped at the first Methodist Chapel to be erected in the district.

CONTRIBUTORS:

Donald Swainson is a professor of history at Queen's University, Kingston where he has taught courses in Ontario and Canadian history. He was born in Manitoba and was educated at the University of Manitoba and University of Toronto. Professor Swainson has written and edited a number of books and articles concerning Ontario history, including: *Oliver Mowat's Ontario* (1972), *Macdonald of Kingston* (1979) and most recently, *Kingston: Building on the Past* (1988).

David Blanchard, has been curator at the Peterborough Centennial Museum and Archives in Peterborough since 1987. He has also worked at Historic Fort York in Toronto and at the Canadian Warplanes Heritage Museum near Hamilton. David has a Master's degree in Museum Studies from the University of Toronto.

Christopher Creighton, graduated with his Masters degree in fine arts from York University in 1985. He has worked for the McMichael Canadian Art Collection, developed and taught a course for the Visual Arts Department, York University and has participated in several photographic exhibitions since the mid 1970's. In 1986 Chris Creighton was awarded a major grant from the Explorations Programme of the Canada Council, to develop an exhibition/publication on applied panoramic photography in Canada. Chris is the owner of the Northern Panoramic Company in Port Hope, specializing in panoramic photography and design.

Lawrence Kavanagh, is Supervising Architect, Property Restoration Unit at the Ontario Heritage Foundation, an agency of the Ministry of Culture and Communications. Mr Kavanagh joined the OHF in 1987 as project architect for the George Brown House restoration. He is now responsible for directing the Property Restoration Unit in their work on the OHF's thirty historic properties including Barnum House, the Elgin/Winter Garden Theatres and the Ontario Heritage Centre.

Robert Mikel graduated from the University of Toronto with a degree in history and architecture. He also completed four years of graduate school. For five years he worked as a preservation officer and historian for the Toronto Historical Board. Recently he and another former staff member at the THB, established a heritage and marketing consulting firm. Rob Mikel

is a founding member of Cobourg LACAC and was chair for two years. He was also on the steering committee of the Cobourg Historical Society.

Catherine Milne, is a researcher with Hamilton Township LACAC and also co-author of the book, Gore's Landing and the Rice Lake Plains, published in 1986.