

all parties within the fundamental institutions of the government;—so that in some instances their different forces result in the increased velocity of administrative machinery, though in most cases in clogging its wheels, and on not a few occasions stopping its movements altogether. But the resistance and collision that would scarcely cause a jar of friction in the vastly powerful governmental machinery of an old and great country, would rend to pieces that of a young and feeble country. The differences or partizanship that would scarcely disturb a large congregation or church would scatter a small one to the four winds of heaven. But in Great Britain herself, parties are admitted to be evils in themselves, and are not, as far as I know, justified in the abstract by any authoritative writer on political science. The immensely varying majorities and minorities in both Houses of Parliament, shew how much individual judgement and independence are exercised, even where the existence of parties is acknowledged, where the great principles of government and public policy are thoroughly understood, and where the great majority of the House of Commons have avowed their preference for Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues as more competent and safe advisers of the government than Lord John Russell and his colleagues. And at this moment in England (assayed by the last arrival) it is avowed as a doctrine by the advocates of free trade on the one hand and by a large portion of the Conservatives on the other, and illustrated by the example of the press—that they will act simply with a view to *principles and measures* without regard to men. When the Minister of the Crown is aware that he holds his place upon the ground of his general ability and integrity, and that his measures will be judged of according to their merits and adaption to the country, he will be more vigilant, more circumspect, more just, and liberal, than when he grounds his strength and expectations of success upon the confederacy of party.

The history of Canada proves that party policy and party legislation have been the sources of gross and numerous extravagancies, oppressions, and evils. In any country, and more especially in a new one, for a man to lay down party policy and party legislation as a theory of government, is to lay the axe at the root of the tree of public prosperity and happiness. Such a theory is alike dangerous to the stability of the Throne and the liberty of the Subject. Nor is it less favourable to the morals of public men. No legislator can long preserve his Christian feelings and principles unimpaired while he abandons himself to the tortuous manœuvring of party. The following remarks of the Rev. T. GIBBORNE should be treasured up by every legislator in Canada. "In order to preserve this principle of a resolute and stubborn sense of duty at once pure in itself and efficacious in governing his conduct, let him resolve from the moment of his outset in public life to shun the snares of party. Let him learn

to detect the hackneyed sophism, by which he will bear the sacrifice of every upright motive palliated and recommended; that a concurrence of many is necessary to the success of every plan; and that no man can expect the aid of others without being ready to make reciprocal concessions and compliances. Let him tell those who urge it, that to co-operate is not to be a partizan; that co-operation asks no concessions but such as are consistent with morality and religion; that party requires her votary to violate, either expressly or impliedly, the dictates of both; to affirm what he believes to be false; to deny what he knows to be true; to praise what he deems reprehensible; to countenance what he judges unwise. Let him explicitly make known to those with whom he co-operates in political undertakings, that he is an independent friend, who will support them in every measure which he shall think equitable in itself, and conducive to the national welfare; not an articulated confederate, pledged to concur in proceedings which his judgement and his conscience disapproves."

In connexion with this theory of parties in the legislature and in the country, and party legislation, preparation is made for an organized opposition to the government, with a view to its embarrassment and overthrow, if possible, whatever may be its intentions and measures. And this is called "patriotism" and "love of liberty!" Rather should it be called partism and the grave of liberty. On this point I would address every legislator—nay, every honest man in Canada, not in my own feeble words, but in the resistless language of one of the most ardent and eloquent advocates of civil and religious liberty to whom England ever gave birth—the late Rev. ROBERT HALL, who so far from regarding such a doctrine and such a proceeding as patriotic and favourable to liberty, regarded it as a necessary measure of parliamentary reform, as the enemy of good government, and the death blow of liberty. In his great Essay "On a Reform of Parliament," Mr. Hall says—"Freedom is supposed by some to derive great security from the existence of a regular opposition; an expedient which is in my opinion both the offspring and the cherisher of faction. That a minister should be opposed when his measures are destructive to his country, can admit of no doubt; that a systematic opposition should be maintained against any man merely as a minister, without regard to the principles he may profess, or the measures he may propose.—Which is intended by a regular opposition appears to me a most corrupt and unprincipled maxim. When a Legislative Assembly is thus thrown into parties, distinguished by no leading principle however warm and animated their debates, it is plain they display only a struggle for the emoluments of office. This the people discern, and in consequence listen with very little attention to the representations of the minister on the one hand, or the minority on the other; being persuaded the only real difference between them is, that the one is anxious

to gain what the
a measure be g
the nation from
it be esteemed
honour not to
every obstruct
the minister fe
always flourish
to the opposit
the brink of
convened to de
how dis
tually talk of
solution to act
when, if they
to according to
their party, ha
of apologies fo
pected! Who
agree in nothin
nister, the peo
and irresolut
bate is a mere
they endeavour
better. It is
deals the co
still voice of
the disgusting
gles as the par
is doomed to c
IV. The D
remarks on t
The interests
are of course,
terests are, m
from the prev
I. In the fir
of the people
Majesty's Re
interests and
ment; there
authority; t
somewhere;
nal of ultima
pute between
gard to alleg
Canadian ex
is the supren
peal, as state
Resolutions
clare: "Tha
verment of
limits of his
of the Sover
rial authority
tion the unsu
party must
legally const
such cases.
renounce the
made it. Is
Canada to re
perial author
Sir Charles
the allegatio
ple of Canad
if commerce
nence it?
sist or sub
which the c