

squads marching to the rallying point, with bugles blowing and drums beating, announcing their approach; but it is regrettable now to think that so dire a necessity ever existed in our country. The different regiments took up their line of march to the outskirts of the city, and proceeded as far as the top of the Tanneries Hill, the high road to Lachine, waiting orders from the front to direct their onward course.

The alarm reached Lachine about seven o'clock. A French-Canadian loyalist, Paul Lebert, living near St. Genovieve's, brought the report of the supposed rebel advance on Lachine. Major Penner immediately gave orders to the captains of the four companies of foot of the Lachine brigade to muster their men; some of them had five miles to march in. By ten o'clock every man was in front of Laflamme's hotel, the headquarters of the brigade, representing a front of two hundred and forty bayonets and nearly sixty swordsmen, as fine a body of men as could be found in the Province. Word having been sent over to Caughnawaga, about two hundred Indian warriors crossed the river and joined the brigade.

By advice of old Colonel Wilgrea (a Peninsular veteran living at Lachine) the Lachine troop and the village company of foot (Captain Leponce's) were sent to the front, half a mile above the village, to watch and to report the rebel advance. The three other companies arrived shortly afterwards, the first of which was Captain Begley's from Lower Lachine. The writer was in that company. They came in at the double quick, and formed opposite Laflamme's, their arrival being greeted with loud cheering. Next, Captain Carmichael, with his company from Cote St. Paul, reached the village by way of the banks of the Lachine canal, and lastly Captain Charles' company, of Cote St. Pierre and the Tanneries, formed up.

The river St. Lawrence was literally covered with canoes, every warrior in Caughnawaga being on the river to join and support the Lachine Brigade, the Indian braves being enthusiastically received by the little band of 500 armed men already in the old village of Lachine.

The night passed off without any enemy putting in an appearance. There were no telegraphs in those days; all communication was made and kept up by cavalry. The Lachine troop was then overworked carrying despatches and keeping up the line of communication between the outposts and headquarters.

The next morning the old village presented the appearance of a military camp. It was a grand sight to see the Lachine troop in their bearskin helmets and the four companies of foot form line, nearly 300 men, with their old Major in front, thanking his "boys," as he called them, for having turned out so well and so loyally.

The roll was then called, and cheer after cheer went up as boys and gray-headed men answered "here" to their names. What if that roll were called to-day! Not thirty out of that 300 would be found to answer; they have long since responded to a higher roll call! Peace to their memories!

Thus ended the alarm of the 13th of December, 1837. The rebels were dispersed at St. Eustache and the trouble in Lower Canada ceased for the year 1837.

The following winter passed off quietly. Seed time came and a bountiful harvest crowned the year; but instead of the usual autumn thanksgivings of a grateful people the standard of rebellion was again raised in November, 1838. Roofless walls and ruined homes marked its desolating tracks, leaving a dark blot on the pages of our country's history.

MONTREAL, February, 1855.

The U. E. Loyalists.

BY J. B. ASHLEY.

The object of this contribution to the pages of TRUTH is not to generalize on his torical facts, but simply to offer an humble tribute to the memory of a people who, after the lapse of nearly one hundred years, are honored for the noble principles that actuated them in laying the foundation of this northern nation. The edict is more

readily made because a pretentious sentiment that a truer democracy and assumes a virtue it never knew, has attempted to ridicule the character so generally assigned to our "Pilgrim Fathers." Starting with the argument that a benighted or slavish confession of loyalty, especially as a contingent of the American rebellion of 1776, was degrading rather than ennobling, these critics of a posthumous fame refuse to give credence to anything deserving of commendation as characteristic of the Loyalists. Themselves the victims of a contracted national sentiment, they cannot understand why a people would voluntarily sacrifice so much, and endure such great privation, rather than accept the cause that resulted from the rebellion. But we know there is a life that appears, and under it in every heart a life which does not appear, and which is to the former as the depths of the sea to the waves, and the bubbles and the spray on its surface.

The work so nobly performed by the United Empire Loyalists one hundred years ago cannot be ignored by honest investigators. They were the veritable Pilgrim Fathers of this part of Canada, and accomplished wonderful results under the most trying circumstances. For patriotic reasons they voluntarily exiled themselves, and faced the privations of an unexplored wilderness. Thanks to the well-accomplished labors of the late Dr. Egerton Ryerson, Dr. Wm. Canniff, and others, some of the difficulties encountered and sufferings endured by these refugees from republican tyranny have been rescued from oblivion, and given a prominent place in the annals of our country. We know from personal investigation and the testimony of well-informed persons that scant justice has been shown the patriots, even by such sympathetic writers as above referred to. There were incidents of heroic endurance and devotion to principle that have been deemed too sacred for public inspection.

In the seclusion of their pioneer homes, and often under circumstances that seemed to fill the cup of sorrow to the brim, these patriotic refugees encountered and overcame difficulties that the historian had not recorded. The very nature of their migration precluded the possibility of carrying much with them from the homes of comfort they were forced to vacate. Many of them reached the shores of the St. Lawrence river and the beautiful Bay of Quinte almost, if not entirely, destitute of the bare necessities of life. They came with brave hearts, however, and never for a moment repined, or despaired of ultimate success. For hundreds of miles away from the spot where a landing was made stretched the primeval forest, and solitude reigned supreme.

The government of Great Britain recognized the paramount claims of the Loyalists for assistance, and promptly made arrangements whereby actual destitution and helplessness were avoided. But even this prudential foresight did not entirely ward off the grim spectre of want during the "hungry year." This season of failure occurred in 1788, only four years after the first settlement was made in the Bay of Quinte district. The exact cause has been attributed to a general failure of the limited crop that could be planted, but a partial withdrawal of Government aid no doubt contributed a large share of the prevailing distress.

From the hour that they took a farewell look at the old home on the banks of the Hudson and Mohawk, or in the growing city on Manhattan Island, until the wilderness had been conquered and a new home

with comfort and plenty had been made, there were

ALMOST DAILY STRUGGLES

with formidable foes, and, of course, as frequent triumphs for the brave pioneers. It must be understood that all the U. E. L. settlers in Canada, subsequent to the declaration of American independence, were not the recipients of government bounty in the shape of free transportation and implements for beginning the work of clearing the forest. Those who accepted the very liberal offers of the home authorities immediately after the result of the struggle was known, were collected at the port of New York and shipped via the Maritime Provinces to their several places of destination. They had some advantages over their less-favored fellow loyalists, but they did not enjoy an excursion of exploration. Most of them were exposed to the severe winter at Sorel, in Lower Canada, and nearer the Atlantic coast, where they tumbled for several months, or until navigation opened in spring and they were able to proceed on their journey. The route was long and exceedingly laborious. Tramping across desolate tracts of country; dragging or carrying their scanty provisions and utensils; toiling for days with the heavily laden and clumsily equipped *batteaux* through dangerous rapids and unknown channels; suffering from imperfect protection and their inability to procure what was so much needed, these patriots of 1783 sought and found an asylum from persecution beneath the flag they loved and in the wilds of Canada. Fully one-half, if not more, found their way to the land of promise under different and much more trying circumstances. Individual efforts were made to penetrate the inhospitable region that intervened between the settled parts of New York State and Lake Ontario, and the experience of these adventurers was romantically thrilling. With improvised means of conveyance, and sometimes with destitution, sickness and an inclement season to make their burdens heavier, they undertook a task that the boldest and strongest could not regard with dismay.

AN INSTANCE

is related where a Loyalist, under similar circumstances, carried a bushel of wheat on his shoulders for many miles, and when weary or asleep would lie down in the snow with the wheat for a pillow and rest contentedly. This bushel of wheat was the first seed grain brought into the township of Hollowell, Prince Edward County, and it yielded a good return to the hardy pioneer. We could multiply similar instances to prove that "the half has not been told" about the heroic endurance and fidelity of purpose that characterized the U. E. Loyalists of Canada, but the above must suffice here. And, indeed, we consider it quite unnecessary to add any further testimony to what has been so well related by other and abler pens.

Belleville, Ont., March 4th, 1855.

Compensation to the Liquor Traffic.

BY WILLIAM BURGESS, TORONTO.

The recent debate and division in the Dominion Parliament on this question is instructive, and demands the consideration of all patriotic Canadians.

The resolution moved by Mr. Kranz was remarkable as a bold attempt to commit Parliament beforehand to a declaration in favor of compensating distillers and brewers in the event of a prohibitory law. The amendment moved by Mr. Fisher, and upon which the House divided, declared that the proper time for discussing this question was when the details of a prohibitory bill were before the House.

It is very significant that in a tolerably full House the majority against Mr. Kranz's motion was only 31, the vote being, for the amendment, 105; against it, 74; an indication that 74 members are either hopelessly wedded to the liquor party, or else that they have never thought of the unprecedented dangerous and revolutionary nature of that resolution. If by any chance those 74 members had constituted a majority of the House at the time of voting, Parliament would have been pledged to a declaration

implying that no change of public policy ought ever to be made in the public interest, without first providing for any losses that may accrue to certain persons under such change.

Such a theory as a basis of legislation would be a block to every measure of reform, and the fiscal policy of the government would come to a standstill. For it must be borne in mind that Parliament could not admit this principle of providing beforehand against the effects of certain changes to the liquor interests without applying it to any other interest affected by future changes. The cigar makers and cooperators, who formed a part of the recent deputation to the Government, were alive to this truth. They say, in effect, the Scott Act, or prohibition, will affect our business, and if compensation is to be the order of the day we come in for a share of the plunder.

And this is a perfectly logical result of such a vicious proposition as that of Mr. Kranz. What a host of claimants for compensation would be forthcoming at every legislative change. A new regulation affecting doctors or lawyers would be held to be damaging to their interests. The establishment of a free public library would be a fitting occasion for the owners of leading libraries and the booksellers to send in their claims. The passage of a new railway bill would call forth a thousand claims from stage owners, village property owners, and business people whose interests would be affected by diverting the traffic away from them, etc., etc., *ad lib.*

Then there is the effect of such a resolution on prohibition itself. Like any other reform, if scotched by such a resolution it would be indefinitely postponed.

It is of course assumed and often asserted, that all that is said on this subject from a temperance standpoint, is the utterance of mere sentiment, or, as Mr. Wells, M.P., said in the House, "a matter of conscience." Due consideration is not, however, given to the fact that all that is said by our opponents is a matter of interest. Whether the affairs of the country would be as safely conducted on the line of *conscience* as on the line of *interest*, I will leave for consideration; but it is generally forgotten that temperance people, as citizens, have at least as great a regard for the advancement of the country for justice, honor and liberty as their opponents.

I have discussed the general bearings of this subject in a pamphlet already noticed by the press, and will therefore only add that compensation is a settled question in constitutional law. No property may be confiscated; no rights may be abrogated; no contract entered into by, or on behalf of the state may be destroyed without compensation.

If the liquor makers and vendors have any claims within this meaning, such claims will assuredly be respected, and the temperance people will be among the first to concede all rights and pay for the breach of all contracts.

But let them not suppose that the public will ever consent to pay them for their "expectations," after having for many years conceded to them a monopoly at their own request. The signs of the times are plainly written in every Scott Act vote, and the majorities, which grow larger and larger, are a sufficiently distinct and definite indication of a falling market not to be mistaken by any man who is not blind by passionate selfish interest, and misled by an imaginary claim upon the public purse.

A good deal of eloquence has been wasted in quoting the British vote of twenty millions to the West India slave owners. This was a vote of money to purchase property in order to liberate it. There is not in this, or any other act of any modern government, a single precedent for such a wild-goose proposal as that of Mr. Kranz in the Dominion House of Parliament. I make this statement advisedly, and am prepared to take the platform or the press against statements to the contrary from any representative of the liquor interest. Perhaps Mr. Fullerton or Mr. Kyle will respond.