

and our extreme of *flunkeyism*. They have, in their best journals, designated the noblest of Englishwomen, and a model wife and mother,—a snob, our Queen has been called,—an ill-dressed dowdy. Were names ever worse misapplied? Could journalism more effectually degrade itself? They point, with affected derision, to the foibles and failings of our royal and noble families. Are we not quite as well aware of these things as they? Have we not read the dark pages of history, and watched the progress of modern events? But why all this outcry? Why this reproach of our institutions? We are brethren, why not permit us to go peaceably on our way? Why should there be strife and contumely between us? Are our cousins really anxious for our improvement, or jealous at our progress and prospective future? Will gibes and sneers lead us to sever our connection with our native country? Will they induce us to exchange our aristocratic and noble connections for that shoddyism and genuine snobocracy which the most intelligent observers admit is rife, and of rapid growth among them? Have we not the elements of self-improvement within ourselves? Our three estates serve as a check upon each other. Royalty and loyalty, since the framing of Magna Charta, have had their appropriate work. When that chimera, the Divine right of Kings, emboldened Charles I. to outrage the liberties and rights of his subjects, through an insane desire for absolute power, loyalty could not brook such treatment: "oppression makes the wise man mad." Royal injustice, lawless tribunals, such as the Star Chamber, and High Commission Court, drove the noblest sons of England to seek new homes in the wild forests of America, where men could worship the God of their fathers according to their own sincere convictions of duty, and in such a manner and form as best accorded with their own simple notions of bible truth. They loved Old England dearly! loyal hearts beat in their bosoms, and for their country those bosoms would have shed their blood in defence of the right! Hampden, Pym, and Cromwell were prepared to leave their homes, dear by association, by kindred ties, by mysterious sympathies,—they were on board the ship which was to carry them to New England, but God's providence interposed; there was a great work for them to accomplish at home; loyalty unquenchable, bravery unsurpassed, was recalled to resist tyranny, and raise and fight under the standard of sacred, civil and religious liberty, against royal dictation and oppression; and nobly they did their duty; and in doing this *loyalty* cut off the head of *royalty*.

Canadians are loyal, intensely loyal, in this respect, they surprise many of the immigrants from England, who do not understand our habits of thought and character.

As Canadians, we love the monarchical institution of England, in its limited and pure acceptation. We love our queen because of her estimable character,—because she is a law-abiding, wise, and prudent sovereign.

But we wish it to be understood, that Canadian loyalty is not a blind obedience, and that it will not submit to servile rule and gross injustice. Should royalty ever tread ruthlessly, insolently,