

right and justice, although not strictly in accordance with the existing constitution.

As the German settlers were deeply religious and generally industrious no serious cases of dispute arose. They had trial by jury, with sheriff and judge, and Mr. Croil in "Dundas" says that Mr. Richard Loucks, in whose tavern the court was held, had an account not only against the grand jury for liquor used in the court room, but also against the judge for brandy furnished for a supper given by him to the jurymen. Notwithstanding the congeniality of judge and jury, some penalties were inflicted for misdemeanors. Minor offences were atoned for in the pillory, which adjoined the inn of Loucks. Extreme offences were punished by banishment to the United States! This, of course, was considered unusually severe and ranked next to the sentence of death.

Although the geniality and generosity of the judge were unbounded, it will be readily understood that the sturdy Loyalists, familiar as they were with representative institutions in the colony of New York, would soon strive for a more substantial form of government than that dispensed by a military officer, however efficient he might be.

Just here allow me to correct an impression that many, even in Canada, have regarding the U. E. Loyalists. Their detractors say, because they risked their lives and all their worldly belongings for the sake of British connection and British supremacy, that they approved all the acts of George III. in relation to America, that their loyalty was a blind fidelity to flag and sovereign. This is one of the calumnies under which they labored. But if the descendants of their bitterest enemies have not wholly vindicated the Loyalists' action, they have materially softened their imputations. Among the Loyalists were many men, men of high ideals, of liberal culture and of the highest character who were the bitterest opponents of the oppressive and unwise acts of George III. Although they deplored the actions of the king they did not consider rebellion the proper means to rectify any existing error that the British had made with respect to them. This was the noble distinction between the Loyalists and the rebels. The Loyalists believed that constitutional means would furnish a more meritorious and more lasting method for redress of grievances than a resort to arms. There is no one but will admit that it required more courage to take up arms in defence of a government whose acts you cannot approve than to be a rebel. In a little more than fifty years in their new home the Loyalists had to face similar difficulties and similar oppression, and I am proud to say that they then resisted a resort to arms as strongly as when they had taken up arms in a righteous cause, that by the fortunes of war was destined to drive them from their comfortable homes to seek new ones in the unbroken wilderness.

True to those principles of constitutional redress of grievances,