

aware that the question has been entangled with party politics, and has thus been thrown into an obscurity and doubt which do not belong to it. That emigrants can do well on wild land is proved by numerous facts that have fallen under our own observation. We speak not from report. We have seen the men, scores and hundreds of them, who went into the woods, some with nothing, the rest with very little; we have partaken of their fare, and slept in their shanties; and we know that many of them had in the fourth year of their settlement surplus produce for sale, and sent home money to bring out their relations to join them. They told us that all they wanted was churches, schools, and good roads; the rest they had won from the forest and the soil. We admit that they had endured great labour and privation, but they had the right spirit, and when we saw them in the seventh year of their settlement they were building themselves framed houses, procuring horses, having before done their work with oxen, and were rapidly advancing to a good degree of comfort. Similar events have been seen in other places:—a host of facts, then, prove that emigrants can do well on wild land. Indeed, is it not a common observation, that those who have nothing do best in the bush? And yet in the face of all this we are told that to speak of settling the surplus population of the mother country on the vacant lands of her colonies, is an imposition on the public!

But, on the other hand, there is a class of emigrants that will never do any good on wild land; they are either those who will never do well any where, or those who can do well only under favourable circumstances. In a large emigration there are many of both these kinds of people, and neither of them are at all adapted to life in the bush. This requires sobriety, industry, economy, an aptitude for turning themselves to the kind of work and mode of living their situation requires, and unconquerable perseverance. Where any of these qualities is wanting, success will be doubtful; where several of them are wanting, the man cannot succeed. Of this also there is a host of facts in evidence, some of them of a very painful nature, sufficient to make every one cautious in sending men into the bush, but not sufficient to discourage the settlement of wild land by suitable persons. The combatants on this question err by confining their attention solely to the

facts that make for their theory, just as the two knights disputed whether the shield was white or black, each looking only at his own side.—In a large emigration there will be all kinds of persons, some who will do well on wild land, others who will not. Care may be taken in selecting such as appear the best adapted for the purpose, but no degree of care can determine aright in every instance. In every settlement there will be some individuals who will not succeed without such a degree of help as could not be afforded to them. For this we must be prepared, and must not allow ourselves to be diverted from our purpose by it. It will still be found that though some may fail, others will succeed, and the difference must be manifested by trial. In this way the settlement of the province will go on, with as few interruptions as can consist with the nature of things and the nature of man. All will not prosper, but many will; and it is no argument against a great system, that there are some men so constituted that they cannot or will not benefit by it. We think that the settlement of emigrants on the vacant lands of the province, is essential to its prosperity, and that a sufficient number of them may always be found who can do that with advantage to themselves and the public.

The next point for consideration is, the plan to be adopted for settling emigrants on lands. This will have to be determined by the legislature, to whom the casual and territorial revenue is transferred in exchange for the civil list.—We apprehend, however, that the legislature will decline adopting a system of *free grants* to any great extent. They may sanction such grants in some select cases, but not as the general rule, for that would deprive the province of labourers, as they would all rush to land, if they could obtain it for nothing, with very little care for their capacity to cultivate it successfully.—It would also render the system a burden to the Province, as without sales there would be no means of paying expenses, much less of deriving any even limited revenue from the public lands. To adopt any such plan as this would be to rush from one extreme to the other, and deprive the province of those resources which will powerfully contribute to its prosperity if judiciously managed. We therefore regret to see that an idea appears to have got afloat in some quarters, that large numbers of the labouring population of the British Isles