

loyalty we mean the mere habit of submission to arbitrary authority. If these were conspicuous 'loyalists' then perhaps their successors of to-day would be equally prepared for 'the most abject submission,' if a majority of the people of Canada were to decide in favour of independence. I do not say that they would; it is Mr. Todd who somewhat infelicitously forces upon us the suggestion that they might.

When, therefore, Mr. Todd speaks of 'our forefathers' having 'deliberately preferred the loss of property and the perils incident to their flight into the wilderness rather than forego the blessings of British supremacy and of monarchical rule,' we are compelled to remind him that, according to his own express statement, this was not the case. They were prepared to let British supremacy and monarchical rule go by the board, if only their fellow-citizens would have pardoned them their lukewarmness in the great struggle. 'Their only safety,' we are told, 'was in flight.' 'They sought refuge in Canada and Nova Scotia from the hardships to which they were exposed in the old colonies because of their fidelity to the British Crown.' We may therefore infer that had the colonists in general been a little more magnanimous or forbearing to the non-sympathizing minority, the latter would never have trodden the wilds of Canada, or furnished an argument for Canadian loyalty as understood by Mr. Todd.

When the foundation of an argument is defective the superstructure is apt to be a little shaky; and so we find it in the present case. As the loyalists did not carry into Canada so consuming a zeal for 'British supremacy and monarchical rule' as a sentence above quoted would lead us to believe, so neither did they bring into Canada or transmit to their descendants, so lively a perception as the writer of the article imagines, of the benefit of a connection between

Church and State. In the Province of Ontario, which perhaps owes most to their influence, the tendency for a long time past has been steadily away from every form of church establishment. The secularization of the Clergy Reserves—not referred to by Mr. Todd—was one signal example of this; and the withdrawal of government grants from all denominational colleges was another. The general feeling throughout the Province of Ontario is that religion needs no kind of state patronage, and that it is quite as safe—not to say safer—under the American system which Mr. Todd so much deplures as under the British or any other which gives it official recognition. As a political indication, the fact that Ontario took the lead in dispensing with a second chamber in her local legislature is not without significance.

The word loyalty calls up many ideas, but the more we examine it the more clearly we see that the largest element in it is the element of fidelity upon the part of an inferior to a superior, or of a lesser to a greater power. We do not talk of the loyalty of Great Britain to Canada. If in any relations between the two we were to speak of Great Britain having followed a 'loyal' course of conduct, the loyalty in that case would be towards some high standard of national duty conceived as equally binding upon great states and small. We speak of the 'loyal' observance of a treaty, and there again the loyalty is towards an abstract conception of right and equity, that conception ranking in our moral estimation far above the mere expediences of the hour. Canada or any other country could thus loyally fulfil an obligation, whether contracted towards an equal, a superior or an inferior power. But when loyalty to England is spoken of the idea that comes to our mind is not the loyal fulfilling of engagements, but fidelity as of a person to a person, and, it must be added, of a dependent