

them and the metropolitan state. This leads me to another part of my subject, in which I will make use of a part of the expressions and reasoning, employed lately by the Courant, in an article headed "*The Brasils.*" but deducing from them, a diametrically opposite conclusion. The complete separation of Brazil from Portugal, (thus runs the article in question,) is worthy of some attention, and adds another to the many proofs already furnished by history and experience, that, in same manner, as the offspring of all animals, when arrived at maturity, and capable of maintaining themselves, leave their parents, and seek an establishment, so colonies, possessing resources, enabling them to exist unaided, invariably assume independence. Thus Great Britain, notwithstanding her maritime strength, military prowess, financial prosperity, and partizan-influence, lost an invaluable proportion of hers, in the new world. Those of Spain have nearly achieved their liberation; and now, Brazil, has, as it were, bloodlessly accomplished hers. The boy must submit to command, because he is conscious of weakness, and destitute of resource: in the youth, habit produces obedience, but improving intellect, impels him to examine the command, while the consciousness of increasing strength, half-disposes him to resist it, if unreasonable. The man, however, in the vigour of his age, boldly canvasses the acts required of, or prohibited to, him, and wholly discards parental authority, when exercised harshly. The period of maturity must arrive to colonies, as to human beings, and, as the parent state can not always have at the helm of government, men capable of managing the vessel when storms arise, colonies must, sooner or later, by grant, negotiation, or rebellion, become independent. So far we go together, but from these premises, the writer of that article draws the conclusion, that, since Canada has not an extensive maritime boundary, it can never walk alone, but must for ever remain in leading-strings. But this assumption proceeds upon the erroneous principle, that *the only essential* which can give life and existence to an independent state, is *maritime commerce*: this I deny; commerce is a great source of prosperity and wealth, of power and influence; but it is not the only, nor even the first and principal essential, necessary to obtain them: agriculture is far above it, is its parent, and will produce it, whether the state be bounded by the ocean, or by mountains and rivers: commerce, I contend, is only a secondary, and subordinate, medium of welfare and independence; nay, I am inclined to look upon it in the light of a necessary evil, certainly one we can not do without, in the present state of political relations, but also one, in the way it is now carried on, which is the source of more national and individual turpitude, and evil, than any other accident that can be predicated, as appertaining to the division of mankind into nations and tongues.