

tion, to so extravagant a length, as to treat with contempt those mixed establishments which allow any share whatever of legislative influence to the representatives of the people. On the one hand, the evidence of this system appeared to its partizans so complete and irresistible, that they flattered themselves monarchs would soon see, with an intuitive conviction, the identity of their own interests with those of the nations they are called to govern; and on the other hand, they contended that it is only under the strong and steady government of a race of hereditary Princes, undistracted by the prejudices and local interests which warp the deliberations of popular assemblies, that a gradual and systematic approach can be made to the perfection of law and policy. The very first of Quesnai's maxims states, as a fundamental principle, that sovereign authority unrestrained by any constitutional checks or balances, should be lodged in the hands of a single person; and the same doctrine is maintained by all his followers: by none of them more explicitly than by Mercier de la Riviere, whose Treatise on "*The Natural and Essential order of Political Societies*," might have been expected to attract some notice in this country, from the praise which Mr. Smith has bestowed on the perspicuity of his style, and the distinctness of his arrangements." And M. Dupont in his work *Sur L'Origine et Progrès d'une Nouvelle Science*, goes all lengths in expressing his distrust of popular institutions.

And a more fatal national delusion never existed, than that of England having been led to place faith in the doctrines of Adam Smith and the political economists; and this delusion we are sorry to say, has been caused by the deepest deception having been practised by the press and popular literature of the day. Indeed the actual degradation or helplessness of the public mind on this subject in England, is greater than a philanthropic writer some time ago gave great offence by indicating as possible; we allude to *Allison on Population*, who says:—

"It may be relied on, that if the bulk of the people become corrupted, either from the selfishness of repose, the enjoyments of pleasure, the passions of power, or the luxuries of opulence, the press will become the most fatal instrument that ever was devised for destroying the liberties of mankind; for it will throw its enervating spell over their minds, and deprive them even of the wish to regain their freedom."

The foregoing assertion, however startling, we will prove, and the proof shall be derived from the leading economists themselves, they having been under the necessity of admitting that the true characters of the main branches of the science of Social Economy have not been discovered by them, although with the assistance of Peel, Cobden and the Free Traders in the British Parliament, with the aid of a cosmopolitan press, they deceived the public into this fatal supposition.

The proof which we will adduce first, is derived from the writings of Mr. M'Culloch, who, himself being a disciple of Adam Smith, and acknowledging him as his leader and master, has, nevertheless, admitted in a passage in the introductory part of his own work, that his master was very deficient. The following is the passage:—

"However excellent in many respects, still it cannot be denied that there are errors, and those too of no slight importance, in '*The Wealth of Nations*.' Dr. Smith does not say that, in prosecuting such branches of industry as are