

Massachusetts one hundred ; and in New York ninety. Population we must have, not merely in bulk, but of all those classes necessary for a complete and independent nation, and for a full development of the resources of the country ; and capital for utilizing our vast resources.

How are we to get these ? Wait for centuries, say a modern transcendental school. You are yet young. Time is all that is wanted. But England has grown more in population and wealth in the last one hundred years, than during the previous twenty centuries ; or taking the one thousand years of her history from the establishment of the Saxon Heptarchy, she has advanced more in all the materials of national prosperity in the last one hundred years than she had in the previous nine centuries. Why then should we fold our arms and wait a thousand years. Africa, and Asia, and America, (until her settlement by Europeans) had remained what we know them to have been from time immemorial, under this *laissez faire* doctrine.

What gave Old and New England, Holland and Belgium, the power to outstrip all other people in the race of prosperity, and what is leading France, Russia, the German Zollverein, and the United States to the great development of their wealth, and what is now impoverishing Ireland, India, and Jamaica ? If England has added more to her wealth in fifty years than in the previous twenty times fifty, why may not we prosper in the same ratio ? A century and a-half ago England had a population little more than Canada has to-day. Now she has twenty millions, three-fourths of whom are occupied in manufactures, commerce, and other pursuits unconnected with the soil, giving good home markets, helping to bear the burdens and aid in the defence of the state. We are a young nation, it is said : but the people are the nation, and we are individually as old as other people, and may avail ourselves of all those agencies that have given such sudden riches to other countries. These are chiefly manufactures and