

perfectly unfettered press, are all free channels for the expression of the feelings of our citizens. Why is it that in each and all of these reflectors of the thoughts of men, we see nothing but determination to keep and develop the precious heritage we have in our own constitution so capable of any development which the people may desire. Let us hear Canadians if we wish to speak for them. These public bodies and the public press are the mouthpieces of the people's mind. Let us not say for them what they never say for themselves. It is no intentional misrepresentation, I believe, which has produced these curious examples of the fact that individual prepossessions may distort public proof. It reminds me of an interpretation once said to have been given by a bad interpreter of a speech delivered by a savage warrior, who, in a very dignified and extremely lengthy discourse, expressed the contentment of his tribe with the order and with the good which had been introduced amongst them by the law of the white man. His speech was long enough fully to impress with its meaning and its truth all who took pains to listen to him, and who could understand his language, but the interpreter had unfortunately different ideas of his own, and was displeased with his own individual treatment, when at last he was asked what the chief and his council had said in their eloquent orations, he turned round and only exclaimed:—"He dam displeased!" And what did his councillors say? "They dam displeased!" No, gentlemen, let each man in public or literary life in both nations do all that in him lies to cement their friendship so essential for their mutual welfare. But