

their paternal king. But how is it with us? Sunday after Sunday we solemnly pray to God that Her Majesty and Her Majesty's representative may be enabled to govern us well. Let Her Majesty or Her Majesty's representative presume to do a single act of government against the wishes of the Tory Prime Minister; let either of them veto a single job or bribe, and we know what would be the result. Yet we profess to believe that God is not to be mocked. This professed devotion to an empty name is, however, not without its substantial uses. By loud protestations of loyalty to the Crown, which he knows will never cost him anything, a man absolves himself from loyalty to the commonwealth. He feels himself perfectly at liberty to cabal and conspire as much as he pleases against the public good in his own interest, or in that of some exclusive order or sectional combination, because he is loyal to a Crown divested of all its power and to the name of a connection with the mother country which he has practically reduced to a mere shadow. I do not mean to speak disrespectfully of any feeling which is genuine, however out of date, but there are not a few cases in which loyalty to the Crown is a fine name for disloyalty to the country, and loyalty to British connection is a fine name for disloyalty to Canada.

The loyalty cry is now being raised, in default of any economical argument, to deter the country from accepting the benefits of Reciprocity and to scare it into acquiescence in a policy of which commercial atrophy and the exodus are the visible and inevitable results. Here we see how, with what curious exactness, the Loyalists' virtue follows, through all their windings, the lines of interest. To exclude British goods by protective duties is perfectly loyal. It is perfectly loyal to wage what in fact is a tariff war against the mother country. But to discriminate against the mother country is disloyal in the highest degree. The very thought of it is enough almost to throw a loyal man into convul-