

neighbouring Republic, while freedom and intelligence, industry and virtue dwell in the humblest cottages which dot the unpropitious and mountainous States of New-Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts.

But, while I admit all this, I think that the healthful state of the material interests of a country—whatever they may be—is an essential condition of its social advancement. I do not mean that such must be the state of every City and Town, and interest in a country. Commerce and trade, and their natural attendants, comfort and wealth, forsake old and select new abodes and channels of activity, in defiance of the prescriptive rights of long possession and absolute control. There is scarcely a country in Europe, or a State in America, in which new enterprises and new facilities of communication, by canals, railroads, &c., have not caused the decline of old cities and towns, and given birth to new and flourishing ones. And as we often observe the failure of one kind of grain on a farm, while others exceed an average crop; so may one interest of a country be depressed, while others are prosperous. It may also happen, as it does to us this year, that the abundant crops in Europe reduce the demand for our productions there, and the short crops in the United States open to us an American market, of which our producers cannot take the best advantage in consequence of a hostile tariff. Had the present season witnessed abundant, instead of short crops in the United States, and short, instead of abundant crops in Canada, the present feeling of disadvantage and loss would hardly have been experienced amongst us. The special bounties of Providence upon the labours of our husbandry, have proved the occasion of much of our local discontent.

But the fact of our relations to Great Britain, or to any foreign country, being such as to deprive any class of our population of the natural and legitimate advantages of their industry and enterprise,—Providentially in other respects bestowed upon them—argues an unhealthy state of our country's material interests. Such a state of things produces social discontent, which is most unfavorable to social advancement. The mind of an individual, of a family, or of a country is not in a state favorable to improvement, intellectual, moral, or social, when agitated with the consciousness of labouring at an unreasonable disadvantage, and being unfairly cramped in its energies. With a view to our social advancement, then, our country should be placed in a position in regard to its material interests which would give us nothing to envy in the condition of any other people. Nor do I doubt but British and Canadian statesmanship and patriotism will soon attain this object.

But what is a remedy which has been proposed for a partial and temporary disadvantage, except a retrograde movement in the work of social advancement—a movement warmed into life by the fires of public incendiarism, and nourished by a class of feelings and views which are inimical to the social advancement of any country. We cannot look into the commercial history of any country for the last twenty years, without finding that one or more of its material interests have been injuriously affected by the policy of other nations. But was the remedy ever proposed of abolishing home institutions and of seeking annexation to foreign ones, in order to raise the price of wheat and reduce the price of sugar? In all past time, the Canadian farmer has had an advantage in the English market over his American neighbour of several shillings a quarter for his wheat. But did the American forget his institutions and his nationality, his allegiance and his patriotism, and forthwith claim annexation to Canada in order to obtain, not every third or fourth year, but every year, from twenty to forty cents additional price per bushel for his wheat? Nay, as highly as Americans appreciate dollars and cents, I doubt but the most mercenary of them would have blushed at so unworthy a thought. And could one man in all the United States have been found to put forth such a proposition, it would have been repelled by the universal indignation of his countrymen. The domestic interests of the Southern and Northern States have long clashed on the subject of protection and free trade—the very subject which is urged as the ground of subverting our present civil relations and government. The Southern States produce and export to Europe, Cotton and Rice and Tobacco, and have depended upon importations for nearly all their articles of manufacture, and are therefore interested in free trade. The Northern States, to a large extent, are *manufacturers*, and are therefore interested in protection. That protection is granted them by the National Congress, to the extent of from fifteen to forty per

cent. Do the Southern States then claim a dissolution of the federal union, and demand independence, in order to buy in the cheapest, as well as sell in the dearest market? No, slave-holders as they are, and each of the several States concerned, being, on an average, larger than Canada, yet national patriotism with them is stronger than sectional selfishness, and the integrity of the Union is maintained inviolate by an almost unanimous loyalty. It is true, that alternate party wailings have often been heard there, as here, of commerce destroyed, manufactures crushed, and agriculture impoverished; yet no voice has ventured there to pronounce the word *SEPARATION*; and the country in the aggregate there, as here, has continued to advance with giant strides in the amount of both its domestic productions and foreign importations.

It is an indication of mental weakness, and a means of increasing it, to abandon one's pursuit, or relation, or position, as soon as he encounters a difficulty, or meets with an offence, or is disappointed in an indulgence. We hope nothing of the boy who relinquishes his Latin Grammar when he gets entangled in the third declension of nouns; or of the religionist, who, on the first offence, or hope of gain, separates from one communion and annexes himself to another; or of the farmer, who would abandon his farm on the occurrence of the first drought; or of the patriot, who would desert his country on the first public emergency. Fickleness in a country, as well as in an individual, is the parent of littleness, and is the enemy of advancement of any kind. The social evil of such unsettledness is greatly enhanced, when it is not the impulse of a constitutional duty, resisting some unconstitutional Stamp Act, or maintaining some inherent right; but when it is the offspring of party passion, of individual speculation, of theoretical conjecture. In such a whirlpool there is no onward current. Social restlessness is not social advancement; and in such circumstances, dismemberment is not improvement, nor is revolution progress. Social amelioration should not be looked for in the dissolution of social bonds; nor should a tried foundation be exchanged for the "baseless fabric of a vision."

Nor is there wanting evidence, that the foundation of our material interests is a tried one, and requires not to be laid anew in order that we may advance with our social superstructure. I will adduce one witness, and an unexceptionable one. Last year the Reverend Dr. DIXON, as Representative of the Wesleyan Conference in England, made an official tour in the United States and Canada. He is a man of powerful intellect—an extensive reader, a profound thinker, and long distinguished as a careful observer of the progress of society, both at home and abroad. But long before he reached Canada he had adopted the theory that Canada was destined to be absorbed by the United States, and all his partialities and opinions partook of the character of his theory. Yet he was too shrewd and candid an observer not to see and state facts as he found them, however they might affect his theory. In the account which he has written of his American travels, I find two important statements,—the one referring to the District of Niagara, the other to the City of Toronto,—the one involving a testimony to Canadian agriculture, the other a testimony to Canadian commerce, and something more. After having given the most philosophical and sublime description of the Falls of Niagara that I ever read, Dr. Dixon observes, in reference to his journey through a part of the Niagara District:—"This journey afforded me an opportunity of judging of the progress of agriculture in Western Canada; and I am compelled to say, that I saw no farming in the United States equal to that of this part of the country."\* Now, without in the least disparaging the state of agriculture in the Niagara District, I think we may safely say, that Dr. DIXON could have found equal specimens of its progress in more than one-half the Districts of Upper Canada. Then in reference to Toronto, Dr. DIXON remarks:—

"Toronto is beautifully situated on Lake Ontario; the country is level, but free from swamp, and perfectly dry; the city is new, but there are many excellent buildings; and King Street is about the finest in America: the shops of this street are not stores, but finished and decorated in the English style, and, in appearance, would be no disgrace to Regent Street, if placed by its side."†

\* *Tour through part of the United States and Canada*, page 137.

† *Ibid*, page 131.