

notwithstanding, be maintained inviolate,—have I not a right to conclude, that jealousy instead of generosity stands at the helm of our affairs?—that it is feared that no bonds of union, however strengthened, will have strength to hold us, unless we be kept down,—divided, poor, and paralyzed? In a word, have I not a right to conclude, that the keeping of the Province poor and paralyzed, distracted and dependent, *by means of the French system of British robbery and expulsion*, is part and parcel of the low-souled policy that now prevails?

But why say now prevails? Has it not all along prevailed? Perhaps not. The situation of affairs in 1791 was very different from the present. However much we may deplore the consequences of the division of the Province, that was not the original transgression. The fatal Act was that of 1774. I know it is pretended by French Lawyers and their English friends, that the Laws of England never were introduced into Lower Canada, and that the King of England never had the right to introduce them. Some persons found their opinion on the Articles of the Capitulation. Will any one among them have the goodness to point me to the part that will justify this conclusion? Mr. VIGER grounds his objection (see ante, p. 84) on the *civilized* law of nations. I think I can quote authorities and precedents against him quite as civilized as is his beautifully simple and civilized *Coûtume de Paris*. I have already quoted CHITTY (p. 58), but he is English. I have also quoted PUFFENDORF (*ibid.*), but *he* is not *French*. I had thought to appeal to GROTIUS, and for that purpose had read chapter 8 of the third book of his admirable work on the Law of War, &c. (that chapter treating on the Sovereignty acquired over the people and territory conquered) but he too, I suppose, would be rejected as anti-civil! In vain does ALEXANDER the Great inform us, in Q. CURTIUS, that “it belongs to the conqueror to give the law, and the vanquished to receive it.” Who is ALEXANDER the GREAT, compared with Mr. VIGER? Well, turn we then to MONTESQUIEU: he at least *is* French, and will hardly be rejected as *anti-liberal*. In his Spirit of Laws, l. 10, c. 3, he not only admits the right of the conqueror to give the law, but even to reduce the vanquished people to slavery, and to continue them slaves, when and so long as the preservation of the conquest shall require. In truth, the matter is so plain, the right so obvious, that one would think it needed only to be mentioned in order to