

believe that they will be different even if a kindly feeling, first for ourselves, and afterwards for them, should make us desire to change them. Let us rather judge from the past and from the present than take flights, unguided by experience, into the imaginary regions of the future. What do we find has been, and is, the tendency of the peoples of this continent? Does not history show, and do not modern and existing tendencies declare that the lines of cleavage among them lie along the lines of latitude? Men spread from east to west, and from east to west the political lines, which mean the lines of diversity, extend. The central spaces are, and will be yet more, the great centres of population. Can it be imagined that the vast central hives of men will allow the eastern or western seaboard people to come between them with separate empire, and shut them out in any degree from full and free intercourse with the markets of the world beyond them? Along the lines of longitude no such tendencies of division exist. The markets of the North Pole are not as yet productive, and with South America commerce is comparatively small. The safest conclusion, if conclusions are to be drawn at all, is that what has hitherto been, will, in the nature of things, continue,—that whatever separations exist will be marked by zones of latitude. For other evidence we must search in vain. Our county councils, the municipal corporations, the local provincial chambers, the central Dominion Parliament, and last, not least, a 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 proofs. 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, and 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!” (Great laughter.) And what did his councillors say? “They