

A young worm spirit against Beauty's charms,  
Who feels her brightness yet denies her thrall,  
Is the best, bravest conqueror of them all."

This principle was evidently intended to guide us in the selection of a partner for life; and it alone can hallow the connubial state, and secure a permanently happy union.

When man enters on the sphere of domestic life, he has new duties to perform. His children depend on him for protection, maintenance, and education. In affording these, the duties of a parent consist; and Nature has not left this work to reason alone, but has implanted, in the human bosom, a principle of parental solicitude, which begins to operate, as soon as there is an object for its exercise. This is the most disinterested of the social affections. It is an enduring love that survives the ingratitude and misconduct of the child, and as the tide of nature ebbs and flows, it is soon through the storm of life, floating on the surface, and bulfetting the swelling billows that threaten its destruction.

A well regulated family is but a diminutive picture of a nation, governed by wholesome laws, with a kind parental monarch to superintend its interests, and promote its welfare. In this more extended sphere, we exhibit that peculiar attachment which every one possesses for the land of his birth. Ancient Historians inform us that the patriotic Brutus, under the figurative allusion of the oracle to his mother, kissed the earth, and felt that flame burn brighter in his bosom which purified his country from a despot's power. The inanimate earth was not the object of his love, but his fellow-countrymen that trod its surface, made it, in his estimation, hallowed ground. So divine is the influence of this principle of patriotism, that an elegant writer has styled it "the very image of God in the soul—diffusing its benign influence as far as its power extends, and participating in the happiness of God, and of the whole creation."

Such is a concise view of the principal Benevolent affections; a more complete enumeration is given by Stewart, in his *Outlines of Moral Philosophy*, as follows; "The parental and filial affections—the affections of Kindred—Love—Friendship—Patriotism—Universal Benevolence and Pity to the distressed. Whether these are all original parts of the constitution, or, many of them may not be resolved into some general principle which, according to circumstances, exhibits itself under different modifications, is, among authors, a subject of controversy. Thus, some maintain that love and friendship are but different gradations of the same affection, the one necessarily preceding the other, and partaking, in kind though not in degree, of similar emotions. Though we are prepared to dispute the correctness of this theory, there can be little doubt that one benevolent principle is frequently excited by the operation of another, and to this Dryden, in his beautiful Ode on the power of Music alludes:

"'Twas but a kindred sound to move,  
"For pity melts the soul to love."

Whatever be our opinion as to the number of the Benevolent affections, we cannot overlook their complete adaptation to all the circumstances of life, and to reflect how cheerless, without them, our prospects would be, not a stream or vale to relieve the ruggedness of the scenery.

From the preceding observations on the kind affections, it is evident that there are some qualities common to them as a class, others applicable only to the species. In the nature of the emotions produced by their operation, they are essentially different, though the qualities of this difference scarcely admit of explanation. By reference to our own feelings, and a consciousness of the power producing them, we shall find sufficient to warrant a logical distinction, and justify the classification already given. In the following properties, however, they agree, that every exhibition of them is attended by an agreeable feeling, and their natural tendency is the happiness of the object towards whom they are exercised. We must, however, carefully distinguish the necessary result of their exercise, from its contingent consequences. The original agreeable feeling which they produce, may by circumstances be supplanted by the most pungent distress. What, for example, are the delightful sensations of the sympathizing heart in alleviating distress, yet how is it wounded by the ingratitude of the unworthy objects of its generosity. The tender mother watches over her sleeping infant, and kisses, with the most ardent affection, from its pale and hollow cheek, the dew of death—she feels a grateful emotion in the act—but how agonizing is the thought (although suggested by parental solicitude,) that she will soon be permitted to kiss that cheek no more for ever. In these instances of joy and sorrow, we can easily distinguish the natural result of Benevolence, from its contingent consequences.

Whenever our kind affections are unappreciated,

there must be corresponding pain; but their reciprocal exercise forms the strongest pledge of human comfort and happiness. Without this mutuality of feeling, the slighted lover seeks for a place whether to bestow his broken heart, or garnering up his blighted feelings and withered hopes, as so many testimonials of human unkindness, he fortifies his spirit with the dark suggestions of misanthropy, and sees mankind through a false prism, all the brighter colours of the ray being obscured from his view. Pass through society from its lowest pillar to its very pinnacle, and observe how necessary is the exercise of our Benevolent affections, to the enjoyment of life. Enter the cottage of the peasant, and ask the cause of that perpetual smile that beams on the countenances of its inmates. Go to the haunts of the sensualist and the numerous voices that join in Bacchanalian discord, are ample testimonies of the happiness attendant on social intercourse, from the reciprocal display of the kind affections. Visit the hall of the nobleman when his friends are assembled to unite in the gay dance; and, as Byron beautifully expresses it, "a thousand hearts beat happily" and "all join merry as a marriage bell." Such is the pleasure attendant on the mutual exercise of our Benevolent principles; and so sensible have authors been of the enjoyment naturally produced by their operation, that, in all tragic compositions, they are made the principal vehicles of pleasure. Poetry, indeed, wants its principal charm, unless it is an appeal to the feelings, and makes the heart—not reason its umpire. Nature doubtless intended those agreeable emotions, as an inducement to cultivate principles, so essential to the preservation and happiness of society. They are an amiable feature in the human character and properly regulated give a dignified tone to the conduct. But though our external actions are for the most part under our power, we do not possess a perfect controul over the affections. Reason may endeavour to assert her supremacy; but she cannot always "guide the helm when passion blows the gale." We frequently fix our affections on objects without being able to assign a reason; while by a singular perversion of our faculties, faults are varnished into virtues, and imagination supplies natural defects. All our benevolent affections, therefore, cannot be said to originate in a rational perception of merit in their object, deliberate reflection being totally disconnected with their exercise. They are an inseparable part of the constitution, without which man would cease to be man.

But since the mind first became the subject of investigation, philosopher after philosopher has appeared on the great theatre of the world, and doctrines as different as their dispositions have been advocated, and left for the sober approval of posterity. The difficulties naturally attending the investigation of the mind, nay, in some measure, account for this diversity of opinion;—but other circumstances undoubtedly had their influence, in the propagation of doctrines of which error and absurdity are the principal recommendations.—*Concluded in our next.*

[FOR THE BEE.]

VISIT TO THE INDIAN PREACHER PETER JONES,  
AND HIS ENGLISH LADY.

"Dundas-Street (U.C.) Wednesday, April 8, 1835.  
—Left the City of Toronto at one o'clock p. m., took the Lake Shore, rode to the river Credit, about 15 miles. Here I struck off 2 miles to the northward to the Chippeway Indian village. I had felt anxious for some time to see Peter Jones the Indian preacher, and his English lady; and embraced the opportunity of having my curiosity gratified. The people of New York might imagine that they were more actuated by proper feeling when they indulged that sickly sentimentalism which appeared in some of their public prints, on the occasion of the marriage of this delicate fair one, with the rough and brawny son of the forest. But if they had an opportunity of inspecting the interior of their dwelling, they would not have been so ready to speak of spreading Turkey carpets on the floor of a wigwam. I found Mrs. Jones rather indisposed, reclining on a sofa. She appeared to be a very delicate lady, quite small in stature. There is nothing extraordinary about her countenance, unless it be a pair of brilliant, light-coloured eyes. The features are rather prominent. The physiognomy however *en tout ensemble* mild and pleasing. She was dressed in a d. shabille of printed cotton, of a truly Indian pattern, and made up very much in the Indian fashion, with white frilled wrist-bands, which appeared to belong to the under dress. She had on her

head a noat, though plain bobinette cap, and her hair was parted plainly to each side of the forehead. She was not so unwell but that she could occupy herself a little with her needle. She appeared perfectly at home.

But what kind of a subject is Peter himself? what attractions does he possess that could have allured her from the home of her fathers, and from all the endearments of British society, to take up her residence in this retirement in the wilds of Canada? Peter Jones, alias Kakhwaquowby is a firm set, stout man, not much under six feet high. He has a truly Indian contour of countenance, though, however, there is nothing in its expression by any means harsh or forbidding. He has the large mouth, black eyes, and coarse black hair of the true Chippeway. It is said however, that he has some European blood. Mr. Jones was well dressed. He had on when I seen him, a black frock coat, black vest and stock, and blue pantaloons. He had laid aside the *moccasins* and substituted a pair of very neat boots. Of his education I cannot say much; for the few minutes that I was with him I thought it rather impertinent to enter into such close conversation as to interrogate him respecting his scientific attainments. His knowledge of the English language is good, for he speaks it with the utmost freedom and propriety. He has made some progress in the translation of the scriptures into his native language. The gospels by Matthew and John are published, and the book of Genesis is in the course of preparation for the press. A small sketch of the grammar has been published by John Sumnerfield, alias Sahgahjwagabawoh. Jones says it is very incorrect. As yet there has no attempt worth mentioning been made to compile a dictionary of the language. Jones is one of the Wesleyan Methodists.

Mr. Jones' wigwam is one of the better sort. It is a neat frame house, painted white. On entering through a passage from the front, I was ushered into a small carpeted room which did not appear to be much used; from this I was conducted into the parlour, where I found Mrs. Jones. The room was well furnished with chairs, tables, sofa, carpet, windowhangings, &c. &c. Mrs. Jones' library occupied one part of the room. It contains, I should think, upwards of 200 volumes, apparently in the finest style of binding. An air of neatness, even elegance, pervaded the whole apartment which the pleasing and unassuming manner of Mr. J. tended much to enhance. I was treated to a glass of Port, and after staying about half an hour, not a little gratified with my interview, I departed."

## FOREIGN.

From the N. Y. Com. Advertiser.

**MOST IMPORTANT FROM FRANCE.**—We are enabled to say on the authority of one of our most respectable commercial houses, that a letter from London, dated 25th Oct., received yesterday by the Josephine, states that a formal demand had been made by our Charge d'Affairs on the French Government, for the payment of the instalments now due to the United States, as settled by the Indemnity treaty; that a long conference was in consequence held between the President of Council, the Duke de Broglie, and the Minister of Finance, M. Humann, and that on the 26th a refusal was communicated to our Charge, and a full and explicit explanation of the President's Message required.

The following paragraphs, confirming that of the Courier, are from a London paper of the 29th of October.

PARIS, Oct. 27.—On Sunday last there was a long conference between the Minister of Finance and M. de Broglie, in consequence of a visit made by the Charge d'Affairs of the United States to the President of the Council. It was said that M. Humann persisted in requir-