

and if the 'fostering protection' of a 'paternal government' is in reality the worst of national evils—in a word, if all our American ideas and feelings, so ardently cherished and proudly maintained, are not worse than a delusion and a mockery—then are we bound to sympathize with the cause of the Canadian rebellion, with the most earnest hope that success may, with as little effusion of blood as possible—why should it flow!—crown it as a Revolution. What may be the immediate issue of the contest, none can presume to prophecy. But even though the present unprepared rising should be crushed, it is evident that the fiat of separation has gone forth beyond recall. The breach already existing, and stretching wider every day, can never again be closed and cemented. Least of all can it be rationally expected, that the fire and sword, as they are reported (we hope without truth) to have been tried at St. Charles, can effect that object. The end is at hand; and it would far better become the noble nation which would itself be the first to dare and sacrifice all in such a struggle, to resign at once, with magnanimity and mercy, an unnatural dominion which it will cost seas of human blood to attempt to retain. In fact, we look with not less deep interest to the news from England, than to the events of the contest in the Provinces. May she be true to her own best interests and highest glory!

But one more remark in connection with this subject. One of the 'signs of the times,' which must strike foreigners, and even liberal members of the anti-popular party among ourselves with surprise, is the disposition which is manifested by many citizens, and not a few respectable presses, of the United States, to frown upon the infant revolution—to disparage the efforts of the Canadians, and the character and principles of the able and respectable men, who, like the Otises, the Adams, the Henrys, and the Franklins of our own Revolution, happen to be placed, by their patriotism, and the confidence of their countrymen, in the front of affairs, as the auspicious champions of the cause of liberty and independence,—and this in the United States,—a government founded on colonial revolution, and of which the vital principle is, the right of every people to have such form of government, and such governors, as it may in its supreme discretion choose! But there is nothing in it that excites our surprise. There has always existed among us a party, respectable in numbers as well as in wealth and education, entertaining an inveterate distrust of, and dislike to, the people and popular principles. And here recurs the broad line of demarcation between our parties, which we can trace on every question that arises. We might point to several leading Whig papers, whose sympathies in every case arising, involving a collision between popular and anti-popular principles, in the affairs of foreign nations, flow, invariably because naturally, in behalf of the latter. It is in fact one of the best tests to apply to the professed republicanism of Americans,—