

so far as to assert that the House "was the only legal voice of the people," a doctrine that was properly reprobated by Mr. J. Jones. But what will not Mr. Nichol say, to destroy the shate which "the worthless mob of vagrants" who do not possess £500 sterling, may think they ought to have in making their own laws; he is for carrying every thing with a high hand.— Speaking of the Irish union, "The Parliament of England" says, he, "did not want to consult the people, because it was for their good, that measure was carried." So do the fathers of the inquisition tell their victims, that it is for their good that they are condemned to the flames! A mode of arguing, equally detestable in politics as in religion.

(To be continued.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FREE PRESS.

SIR,

Looking over some of your late numbers, which I had, from want of leisure, but partially perused before, I perceive one that contains an article which I consider of no little importance. Though unwilling to engage in a controversy with so able a writer as your correspondent, A FRIEND TO TRUTH appears to be, I am nevertheless led to offer a few remarks upon the subject-matter* of his communication, on account of the reasons by which they have been suggested, and with a view to call the public attention, as much as possible, to the subject on which he animadvertes in pretty strong terms. After some allusions to the appointment of sheriff at Quebec, which seems too much like tearing the scab from off an old sore,† he plants his whole artillery against the managers of the Montreal general hospital. I do not intend to advocate the cause of those gentlemen, farther than may be found consistent so to do, upon

*I take the opportunity of entering my protest against the use of this redundant double substantive, which has been for a number of years certainly, but entirely within my memory introduced into the phraseology of didactic and controversial writers and orators. It is a most ungraceful, unmeaning, & unnecessary tautology: subject or matter by itself would either be sufficient, and convey exactly the same sense; besides the impolicy of using them both at once thereby losing the opportunity of varying the expression, which is exemplified in this very letter.

L. L. M.

†Not so, it is opening the dressing of a new one, to see whether the virus has yielded to the topical remedy applied; which it, in fact, appears is not yet, and is not likely to be, the case.

L. L. M.