

ones under English monarchy, can have no difficulty in giving the preference to those of the latter.

I shall not dwell upon the spectacle of the ermine trailed through the party mire and beholden to the bad men who pull caucus wires, for I should have to speak with some bitterness. I contend that the administration of justice in this country is not, nor can it be held above suspicion; for, it is not likely that the judge upon the bench can ignore the men who gave him his eminence; he would be more than human if he were able to forget those who can, at a stated time, give him that eminence again.

Nor would I, without a struggle, surrender the mild, I might say fictitious, kingly prerogative for that of the veto—which may be as arbitrary and capricious as the dictum of a Roman Emperor. If the veto is never arbitrary and never capricious, the man is to be thanked and not the constitution.

It would be well too, for those who contemplate the grandeur of a political brotherhood extending from the Isthmus of Panama to the land of the Esquimaux, to ponder whether or not there may not be somewhere a breaking point in national expansion.

Lastly, I do not think that our political vocabulary would gain much in elegance by the addition of such candidates as the "Mugwump" and the "Bloody Shirt."

But, whether there be any force or not in my objections, I think that I am not over bold in affirming that our people do not desire annexation and never will accept it.

Finally comes the proposal of national independence.

At the risk of shocking some of my hearers, I will state as