

back, or any President, but through the man on the woolsack in this House, under these despotic rules, who can prevent the slightest interference from individual members; who can, if he will, make or unmake laws, like an emperor, hold back or give the sinews of war and salaries of peace."* As to the Speaker with us, I need hardly say that as in England, he is expected to carry impartiality to its utmost limits, and to hold the balance absolutely fair between all parties and he carefully abstains from taking part in any matter of party controversy or debate. The Speaker of the House of Commons expects to give up his rights as a member for the sake of sitting in the chair; he never votes except when a casting-vote is required, nor takes any part in the debate; custom guards him so strictly, indeed, that he is not even allowed to make political speeches outside Parliament.

I have called attention to the above facts not with any desire to disparage the people of the United States or their Constitution, but merely to bring out by way of contrast more strikingly the superior excellence of our own from the point of view of political freedom. In a recent number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, Mr. E. L. Godkin, the well-known editor of the *New York Evening Post*, says of his adopted countrymen:—"The growth of indifference to what used to be called political liberty has been curiously rapid." Certainly it seems to me that Americans who look into these things may well say in the words of Joseph Stansbury, a loyalist poet of the American Revolution, many of whose spirited lines are to be found in Mr. Coit Tyler's *Literary History of the American Revolution* recently published:—

"For freedom, indeed, we supposed we were fighting,
"But this sort of freedom's not very inviting."

For ourselves loyalty to our union with Great Britain has met with many, and will meet with more rewards. We have shared to the full in British Constitutional development, and notwithstanding Confederation, have preserved in their purity the precious forms of British liberty; so that it is impossible to-day to point to a people more free in respect to the management of their internal affairs than the Canadians.

* Ibid. p. 301.

TH
C
die
fro
A
mo
A c
han
T
upr
of t
I
Gor
acro
I
yea
mar
mar
Mas
T
ever
dwe
proa
colo
T
and
not
appe
have
garn
cond
me,
more
oblig
TH
Bost
Mass
Presi
Colon
Jo
I wa
and g
State
I wil