

experience whatever inconveniences are felt from the laws of their own making.

He likewise remarks with disapproval the jealousy entertained in the States towards public men of talent, but I should have selected this, above all others, as the most promising symptom of the improvement of mankind. The evil has always been, that the multitude too easily followed designing men of talent, who afterwards betrayed them. The Americans appear to discriminate better; if they are shy of men of talent, it is probably because they suspect ambitious rogues. Something more than a man of talent is wanted—one who loves mankind, and not a haughty enemy, who pursues only his own aggrandisement and the interests of his order.

With respect to the selfishness and corruption of Congress (p. 309), the author must surely be aware that no form of government can eradicate the evil propensities of human nature; the whole, then, is, in fact, a question of degree, of greater or less, whether the Russian system or the American, or any intermediate one, is best adapted for checking the rapacity of man, and promoting the public good. He has paraded an instance of the extravagant expenditure of Congress (Note 14). Was he unable to find a parallel instance of lavish expenditure in the British Parliament to place alongside it?

Was it of the States that Sydney Smith penned the following remark? "Profligacy on taking office is so extreme, that we have no doubt public men may be found, who, for half a century, would postpone all remedies for a pestilence, if the preservation of their places depended on the propagation of the virus."