out of their tutelage. He did not stop to enquire whether "laws are necessary relations arising from the nature of things;" but even seems to have adopted the converse of this hypothesis of the sage Montes-As if it were possible to remove by legislative authority, those impediments to self-government which nature, habit, manners, and education had formed; or that an act of parliament when it gave an House of Assembly to Lower Canada couldat the same time impart the only true principles of representation: namely-sufficient property to constitute a deep interest on the part of the electors and elected in the preservation of the government and integrity of the state; sufficient knowledge to guard the multitude from deception; and sufficient virtue to bind them to their duty. Without these howev. er, freedom (I mean political freedom) is little better than vice, folly, envy, jealousy and every great and every mean passion without tuition or restraint.

It was a maxim of the greatest man of modern times, that "Control ought to be strong in the direct ratio of passion as well as in the inverse of knowledge and reason." Without a controling power, sufficiently strong, placed somewhere, society cannot exist in security and repose. Whoever denies this, is referred to the history of free governments, with whose ruins the map of time is strewed, and whose temporary splendor only serves to throw a feeble light on the crimes and misery they have produced. I shall perhaps be exultingly told that Great Britain alone furnishes sufficient evidence of the fallacy of this argument. I will not content myself with answering that a single exception only proves the general rule; because it is at least demonstrable, that the democratic ingredient does not predominate, but is subordinate to the other parts of the

com of th land and s lions sand the g but o five ! at lea of th main ed in and i gove exect repre fluen subje amor unwe ce lay dow Sir F ed in suffr ic bra mass Engl rubbi tice v

> * N with 1

wrec

lions