

Nova Scotia—after 1756—had met to de-
 practice, place the Canadian and Yankee
 nations in opposite courses of progress,
 creating in each the greatest distinctions
 of mind, race and character, the one the
 antithesis of the other. Now in regard to
 the King's prerogative in Canada, it is
 understood and guaranteed as before said
 by parliamentary acknowledgement to be
 personal. That is no London parliament
 or British ministry can stand between the
 Canadian Government and the King. This
 is the old law of Quebec, this is the de-
 claration of the Anglo-American colonists
 and of the United Empire Loyalists. It
 was acknowledged by parliament in pass-
 ing the Act of Quebec of 1774 and
 the Acts of 1778 relating to the Anglo-
 American colonies. Namely, that the
 understanding of their charters should re-
 main undisturbed in the interpretation of
 the King's government in America.

Now every one of the Anglo-American
 charters was granted by the Stuart
 Kings and before the revolution in Eng-
 land of 1688 and the Act of Settlement
 of 1689. In these charters (as in the an-
 cient French constitution of Quebec) the
 King's prerogative is personal—a thing in
 which parliament and the ministry of
 parliament (facetiously termed the King's
 ministry) has no concern. It is the
 royal prerogative as it existed under the
 Stuarts and before it was usurped by
 parliament in the revolution of 1688. As
 before said, however illegal and unconsti-
 tutional it was accomplished, the colo-
 nists had been willing to recognize the
 change of dynasty on the throne of em-
 pire, but never were they willing to ac-
 knowledge the participation of parliament
 or ministry in the royal functions over
 the Anglo-American and Canadian colo-
 nies. Parliament, convinced by the force
 of arms and circumstances, had with-
 drawn its unconstitutional proceedings in
 regard to Canada and the Anglo-American
 colonies by which action the Crown had
 secured to itself the renewed loyalty of
 the seigneurs and noblesse of Canada and
 of the Royalists in America who formed
 the United Empire Loyalists of the Cana-
 dian provinces; and Canada at least
 was preserved to the Empire, although
 the Anglo-American colonies were lost—
 lost by parliamentary usurpations. If
 Canada is ever to be lost it will be lost
 in the same manner. By the acknowledge-
 ment of this law, a plea lies already in
 the Supreme Court of Canada to chal-
 lenge the appointment of the Governor-
 General who, contrary to these ordi-
 nances and laws, and the constitution, is
 sent over from England as the Crown's

chief executive and representative in Can-
 ada by the Colonial Office—by the repre-
 sentation of a majority of the British
 democracy in the London Parliament in-
 stead of by the King, *propria persona*,
 by the advice and consent of the Cana-
 dian Parliament, for no man or body of
 men can stand between Canada and the
 King.

In Blackstone's Law Commentaries it
 reads: "The word prerogative we
 are to understand the character and pow-
 er which the Sovereign hath over and
 above other persons in right of his
 office, and which though part of
 the sovereignty of the country, is out
 of the ordinary course." Finch lays it
 down as an axiom that the prerogative is
 the law in the case of the king which
 is to be the case of the subject. "The
 King is the sole executive authority" (an
 authority which is not subject and minis-
 tral) and he is answerable by themselves
 to the people. "The prerogative of sovereign-
 ty of the king is the allegiance
 of his subjects." Every parliament
 only exists for it is sum-
 moned by his writ and the vote for a
 member of parliament is a franchise, not
 a right existing independently of his
 grant. The great offices of the state
 are appointed by the King.
 The King as Supreme head
 of the State is commander of the Army
 and Navy. This right, contested by the
 Long Parliament, was declared finally by
 12 Car. II. c. 2 to be in the King alone.
 —(Encyclopaedia Britannica Allen "Rise
 and Growth of Royal Prerogative"
 Chetty "The Prerogative of the Crown,"
 etc.) By this last clause it must be seen
 that the action of the Liberal Parlia-
 ment in Canada in questioning the King's
 prerogative over the Canadian army is
 both treasonable—a conspiracy against
 the prerogative—and unconstitutional out-
 of the orbit prescribed for parliamentary
 proceedings. Every officer and every sol-
 dier in Canada is bound by his oath of
 allegiance to obey the King and the
 King's officers, rather than the parlia-
 ment or the ministry whose legal con-
 duct can be but regulatory and financial,
 and not for giving discipline, command
 or commission.

Now the prerogative of the King of
 France was as absolute in fact as that
 of the King of England is in theory. In
 the matter of the King of England suc-
 ceeding to the prerogative of the King of
 France in Canada as described in the
 treaty of 1763 the French law prevails.
 Blackstone's Law Commentaries declare
 that when William, Duke of Normandy,