

to a patron or protector. And, just as in personal relations, this feeling is only justified where services are rendered by the stronger to the weaker which the latter is unable to render to himself; so, between countries, an occasion for loyalty only arises when the stronger community does that for the weaker which the weaker is unable to do for itself. In such a case the stronger country has a right to expect that the weaker will show a due appreciation of the benefits it derives from the connection, and will brave perils rather than forsake its protector in an hour of trial. We must, however, assume that the services rendered by the stronger power are rendered disinterestedly. If a state plants a colony in some distant land, and there seeks to control its commerce in its own interest, without regard to the interests of the new settlement, I fail to see that it can justly claim the loyalty of the latter. I do not think that any loyalty was due from Ireland to England in the days when England was oppressing, in every possible way, Irish trade and industry. The loyalty of the American colonies survived, as it seems to me, by many years any equitable claim of the Mother Country to such a feeling on their part. There are those, no doubt, who admire a loyalty that no injustice can quench; but there are others again who see in loyalty carried to such a length only a servile lack of self-respect, and who would rather have in their veins the blood of 'some village Hampden' than that of a 'loyalist' who offered in vain 'the most abject submission' as the price of remaining in a country that, *without his aid*, had vindicated its liberty.

If, therefore, Canada is now 'loyal' to England what are the circumstances, what are the facts, that give significance, that give *raison d'être*, to its loyalty? Is it that Canada is dependent upon England, and being dependent ought to be at once humble and faithful? This cannot be admitted,

for not only is the idea of Canada's dependence upon England disowned by very many here in Canada, but it has been distinctly disowned by representative Englishmen, and by none more distinctly or emphatically than by the present Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone. In proof of this I would refer to the discussion that took place in the British House of Commons on the 28th March, 1867, upon the application of the Canadian Government for a guarantee of a loan of £3,000,000 stg. for the building of the Intercolonial Railway. Upon that occasion we find the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. (now Sir Charles) Adderley, who moved the resolution proposing the guarantee, making an almost abject apology for doing so. Here I must be permitted to quote (Hansard, Vol. 186, page 736):—'Mr. Adderley said that, in moving the Resolution of which he had given notice, not one word would fall from him approving in the abstract of guarantees of Colonial Loans. He had always thought that they were a feature of the worst possible relations between this country and the Colonies, bad enough for this country, but still worse for the Colonies. He sincerely hoped that this Colonial guarantee would be the last proposed to Parliament, or, if proposed the last that Parliament would be disposed to grant. \* \* \* The only way (page 739) of making the new Confederation independent of the United States was to construct this important railway (the Intercolonial) which would enable Canada to develop itself, and *rely entirely upon her own resources*. \* \* \* The Confederation (page 743) would take away the *languor of dependence upon England* which had hitherto paralysed the divided governments.'

Mr. Adderley spoke as member of a Conservative Government; but he was followed by Mr. Aytoun, the Liberal member for a Scotch borough, who moved the rejection of the guarantee as unsound in principle and