

IX.—*The Loyalists and Slavery in New Brunswick.*

By I. ALLEN JACK, Q.C., D.C.L., of St. John, N.B.

(Communicated by Sir J. Bourinot, and read May 28, 1898.)

Any one who studies the history of the struggle for independence by the old British Colonies in North America cannot fail to wonder why no serious effort was then made to secure liberty for slaves. One would suppose that amongst those who not only protested, but fought against taxation without representation as a monstrous evil, at least some would have sought to eradicate a system which denied the semblance of freedom to a class of inoffensive beings, or would have strongly objected to the continuance of a glaring inconsistency. Perhaps, indeed, the slaves had sympathizers and friends among the revolutionists, who withheld from action, or even expression of sympathy from a fear of creating dissension among those whose strength depended on their unity. But if this was the case, how was it that these sympathizers and friends were not indeed voiceless, but nationally ineffective for so long a period after the war of independence was over? It was indeed little short of a century after the commencement of the revolution, and then rather as a matter of policy than of righteousness, that slavery was abolished in the United States.

To English-speaking people of to-day, excepting perhaps a few of those who reside in the former slave-holding states of North America, slavery generally seems to be so wholly indefensible that they find it hard to believe that it not only existed, but was approved by many of British descent within the present century.

We are disposed to regard it in the same way as we regard drunkenness and profanity in which our ancestors too often indulged, and not always privately, without public censure; to abandon any effort to fathom such anomalies; and to congratulate ourselves upon our disapproval and entire or partial renunciation of these evils.

Now those who believe that North Americans, a hundred years ago, owned and employed slaves either without or against ethical reason are in error. Without doubt many slave-owners never seriously considered the questions involved, and were content to accept the conclusions, without following the arguments of their fellows. But those who resorted to reason, although perhaps influenced by personal considerations, were supplied with arguments which had little or no semblance of being baseless, and which, if not baseless, fairly supported the maintenance of slavery.

Every student of social institutions, sooner or later, is sure to discover that, without some knowledge of the history and principal features of Roman law, he is placed at a serious disadvantage. The present Archbishop