

the Queen, and of their unalterable desire for the happy perpetuation of British connection; but if His Excellency accepts their gushing protestations of loyalty as an expression of popular feeling, then he does not know what kind of stuff mayors and aldermen are made of in this Canada of ours. The young men of Canada have outgrown the colonial apron strings; they are tired of a mock Court and a sham House of Lords; they want a simpler form of government—a system more in keeping with the resources of the country and the requirements of the population. To them Canadian loyalty has but one meaning—"devotion to the land of their birth, respect for its laws and institutions, and faith in its future."

Mr. Le Sueur's exposition of "The True Idea of Canadian Loyalty" was called forth by an article from the pen of Mr. Todd on the question, "Is Canadian Loyalty a Sentiment or a Principle?" By Canadian Loyalty he meant the loyalty of Canada to the Parent State, which, whether sentiment or principle, Mr. Le Sueur considers, "the march of events has, for years past, been more and more rendering obsolete."

He then proceeds to demolish Mr. Todd's argument, and show that he did not place before the readers of the *Canadian Monthly* a true idea of Canadian Loyalty:—

"According to him it consists in a strong desire and determination to preserve the present colonial status of Canada. To be loyal as a Canadian is to wish to maintain Canada's present relation to Great Britain and to the British Empire as a whole. To be disloyal, therefore, would be to wish to disturb that relation, either by making Canada entirely independent or by attaching her to some other political system. Loyalty is a duty and a virtue; it is something which no one can reputably disown; therefore it is the duty of every Canadian to strive to maintain the existing connection between Canada and the Mother Country. Only those who either are indifferently so duty, or who have very mistaken ideas of duty, can countenance any effort or scheme to disturb the *status quo*."

Now these I respectfully submit, are not self-evident propositions; and yet, strange to say, the able writer whose name has been mentioned makes no effort to prove them. He thinks it sufficient to try and give an historical explanation of what he takes to be the dominant, and all but universal, feeling of Canadians towards the political system under which they are living. He assumes an abounding loyalty of the type above described—a loyalty to Great Britain—and then sets to work to show how the feeling was developed. His illustrations unhappily hardly serve even the purpose for which they are intended, far as that falls short of the proper scope of any general discussion of Canadian loyalty. The chief point made is that Canada was settled in part by U. E. Loyalists, men who failed to sympathize with the resistance made by their fellow-colonists of America to the tyranny of King George the Third, and who, either voluntarily or upon compulsion, forsook their homes and sought refuge under the British flag. The force, however, of this argument is greatly weakened when we are expressly told that the great majority of these would willingly have remained in the United States, sacrificing their allegiance to Great Britain, if the odium into which

they had fallen with their neighbours had not made life there unendurable. A thousand citizens of Boston, we are assured, though opposed to the Revolution, declared that they 'would never have stirred if they thought the most abject submission would procure them peace.' One can read this over several times without being profoundly impressed by the 'loyalty' of these thousand citizens. That being compelled, in spite of their readiness for abject submission, to seek homes in another country they should have carried thither a strong aversion to the land that had cast them out, is quite conceivable; the difficult thing is to suppose that they should furnish to their adopted country any very admirable type of loyalty, unless by 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 favor 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."

The United Empire Loyalists then were not such "stalwarts" after all. Had the American colonists only trusted them after the war, and given them a chance to redeem themselves, they would have whistled "Yankee Doodle" like the best of them. But, as there was no room for them on the other side, they came northward, swearing undying allegiance to the Throne, because they could not help it. And Mr. Le Sueur insinuates, that "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 favor of independence." We do not doubt it. While Mr. Todd believes that Loyalty is a sentiment and not a principle, Mr. Le Sueur contends that it is both a sentiment and a principle, and that there is no contradiction between the two. "It is a sentiment in its essential nature, and a principle as being a source and rule of action." This is the correct idea, and is beautifully elaborated by Dr. Brownson, who says: "Loyalty is not simply an amiable sentiment, but a duty, a moral virtue * * * The American people have been chary of the word loyalty, perhaps because they regard it as the correlative of royalty; but loyalty is