

"Ah!" said the stranger, "he was a *Royalist*! I hear, true blue, good metal with the right ring about it. He did not believe in republican government, in *getting all you can, by any means, and giving nothing in exchange*." He wanted respect for vested rights, established institutions, royal rule, for a noble aristocracy, and an equally noble *landed gentry* of good descent, old families that have been in quiet, unquestioned possession of their estates for generations. Well, well, I honour your father's memory, and should have been glad to make his acquaintance; I hope his sons will do him credit. I think you will. I hope so. I entertain the same sentiments as your father did, and I am prepared to fight for them too. There are many good loyal hearts who do not see things in the same light that I do, but they are *loyal*, and will fight for the unity of the Empire, just as bravely as Cromwell fought for constituted law against the aggression of royal power in his day."

"Yes," said Ronald, "I know that is so, for my brother is as true and loyal in his feelings and principles, as my father was, but he cannot see things just as my father did. He heartily despises American brag, and always says, 'that American patriotism is simply a question of dollars. The Americans, as a people, remind me of a bad pie. The crust may be generous, but inside, rapacity and greed are painfully predominant.' But here we are at the house, Sir, this is our cottage."

---

\* Like Thomas Hancock and other merchants of Boston, who made themselves rich by smuggling.

Some of these merchants smuggled whole cargoes outright; while others paid the king's duty on a part, gave "hush money" to the under-officers of the customs, and run the balance. Hancock's plan was to put his tea in molasses hogsheads, and thus run it, that is, import it without payment of duties.

These merchants of Boston had dealings with Spain and her colonies, France, Portugal, Holland, the Canaries, and even with Guinea and Madagascar.

The contraband trade with these countries was enormous, and there can be little doubt that the real cause of revolt among these men was, the determination of the British Government to put a stop to their illicit traffic. Boston was the port most interested, and here, at one time, twelve ships of war, mounting no fewer than two hundred and sixty guns, were assembled for revenue service on the Atlantic coast. One-fourth of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were bred to trade, or to the command of ships, engaged in illicit commerce. (We have quoted freely but carefully, from Sabine's historical essay, to which we would refer the interested reader.) What a farce presents itself to the thoughtful reader of that famed insurgent document, the Declaration of Independence in Congress, 4th July, 1776. John Hancock's name, written in large half-text, stands the first, and very fittingly, for he "was, at the time, respondent in the Admiralty Court, in suits of the Crown, to recover nearly half a million of dollars as penalties alleged to have been incurred for violations of the Statute book." These men asserting "equal, certain, inherent and inalienable rights, &c." is a striking illustration of human inconsistency and moral perversion. Our first thought when reading that document, in the light of known historical facts, was, that it should be inferlined over the erasure following *are*, and would then consistently read,—"*inalienable rights, that among these are*,"—that he should smuggle who has the cunning, and he should pay who hasn't; for many of these signers had been violating in the most shameless manner, the laws of the parent government which had protected their commercial interests, and defended their country. We see, in the present generation, the same far-seeing, keen-dealing characteristics, the same easy, adaptable consciences possessed by the old Boston traders. In fact, these traits of character are an inheritance from their forefathers, like any other hereditary peculiarity.

Yankee *cuteness*, illustrated by wooden nutmegs and bass-wood hams, has recently developed its grasping avarice in the piracy of our fisheries, in greedily accepting compensation for the St. Alban's raid, but persistently ignoring our juster claim, and much larger, for loss by Fenian invasion,—openly organized, if not encouraged. In the present crisis, how carefully should Canadian statesmen examine the terms and bearings of the present treaty, and not permit our sacred rights to be infringed, our inalienable property to be bartered, without full and just equivalents, to an *unscrupulous, unreciprocal, grasping nation*, who, if they succeed in driving a hard bargain, will chuckle into a broad national grin over the *famous trade* with the Joint High Commission.