

tion of mountain, plain, and valley ; geometry would have gone no further than the straight, the square, and the round ; natural history accomplished no more than the division of nature into her obvious parts ; and as a natural and necessary consequence, the arts and manufactures must have been proportionally stunted and diminished.

We will not go so far as to assert that the neglect of the advancement of the sciences would be productive of any immediate evil to Canada, it being obvious that they are already adequate to the wants of a nation further advanced than we are. It is not here that we recognize the evil. It consists rather in the exhibited disposition to underrate generally their intrinsic value. A country may be in a position that calls for the most rigid economy, but if she knows and studies her *true* interests, the last way in which she will seek this will be the discouragement of scientific progress, or the neglect of the arts and manufactures, as that is precisely the procedure which would raise an insurmountable barrier to her ever becoming rich.

There is a great tendency under the pressure of national difficulties, to raise a cry in the name of economy for an indiscriminate curtailment of the public expenditure, as if Governmental extravagance were the sole evil that could be productive of national distress ; and in doing so, we lose sight of more primary influences. History does not contain a single instance in which a nation has suffered from a too profuse cultivation of the sciences, while it would not be difficult to fill volumes with the baneful consequences that have followed their neglect. We need not go back centuries to illustrate this ; we have instances surrounding us. No matter their geographical position or extent—no matter their latitude or longitude—without their philosophers and their men of science, their national character cannot stand high ; without the arts and manufactures they cannot possibly be rich.

Instead then, of continually crying for this sort of economy, which is more often the promoter of poverty than the remedy for it, let us give due consideration to those more deep-rooted and dangerous influences to this end. Let us consider if we should be more or less prosperous, and if that prosperity would be more or less lasting, if our men of science, instead of being less, were more active—if the number of our mechanics and artizans bore a greater relation to the number of our labourers—our manufacturers to our tradesmen, and even if some of us were to become philosophers. There would be a chain of influences connected with such a condition, in which, we think, would not be found the elements of poverty, even if its attainment absorbed a little extra amount from the public treasury. True economy does not consist in spending little, but in spending well ! We may spend little and be poor ! we may spend much and be rich !