

sider will chiefly benefit the English, such as cutting canals, opening roads, &c.*

(To be continued)

I resume now, from No. 33, the explanation I have long promised myself to make of my feelings and sentiments towards the Scotch, and which I consider as due to the many worthy, and excellent individuals of that nation whom I have had the pleasure of knowing, during the course of my chequered life, as well as to the numerous characters of exalted learning, valour, and talent, which adorn the annals, and grace the present times, of North Britain. The tribute of respect and praise is due to the illustrious of all nations and of all times, but we are not therefore to merge in the effulgence of their merits, the defects and follies of their country or their age, nor even be blind to the peculiarities or absurdities that may be observable in them. The Scotch, like other nations, have their merits and their demerits; and like all nations who have less recently emerged from barbarism than their neighbours, are more conspicuous in both, than those whose national character has be-

dereance in the house of assembly, which, as long as they are true to themselves, is an insurmountable barrier to the ambitious views, and rapacious designs, of the oligarchical faction; and thus, indeed, forms the only palladium of their constitution and their liberty.

*This is a most unjust and fallacious assertion. In the first place, how could the improvement of the country chiefly benefit the Scotch, (as usual English is here put for Scotch)—part of the community, who are entirely a transient, migratory set, who come here to exchange their indigence for wealth, and then to return to Europe? Can they be more interested in the improvement of the country, than the men who are born in it, who are to die in it, whose remotest posterity will be its inhabitants, whose inherited possessions will descend to their children, till time shall be no more? It is as contrary to nature, as it is contrary to fact. Not to dwell on sums voted by the house of assembly for local objects of improvement; let it be recollected, that in 1815, upwards of £ 8,000 was granted for roads, and improving the navigation of rivers; that in 1816, £ 25,000 was placed in the hands of government for canals; that in 1817, £ 55,000 was voted, for the improvement of internal communications; that in 1820, £ 10,000 more was granted for the La Chine canal, to which the former £ 25,000 was appropriated; and at the last session £ 12,000 more for the La Chine canal, and £ 50,000 for the Chamblay canal, £ 2,100 for the improvement of agriculture, &c. &c. Does this shew little interest in the promoting of improvements?