

that a treatise on the liberty of the press, and the trial by jury, had been written and published in the Hindostanee language, by a native of Bengal, in Calcutta. Here we see regions where the darkest despotism, and narrowest prejudices prevailed for ages, brightening beneath the rays of freedom and liberality which the fostering protection, and inspiring example of England, and her invaluable laws and institutions, have generated. And must it be said that the same spirit is abased and humbled in Canada, that those rays struggle yet for mastery with feeble light, against the dark clouds of arbitrary and proconsular power? But that this is too true, in my own instance, I aver, and will proceed to prove.

In the observations that have lately been made, both in the Canadian Times, and the Montreal Gazette, on the occasion of the resolution of the House of Assembly, which declared a paragraph in the former paper, to contain a false and scandalous libel on the House,* a good deal has been said on the liberty of the press, which though rather supererogatory, with respect to the matter in question, has so pointed a bearing towards the grievance of which I have had to complain, and which I conceive to be one that is much more of a public than a private nature, that I will avail of them. This I rather do, as, writing on this occasion in my own cause, and deeply feeling the injury and oppression I have sustained, I prefer to make use of the sentiments and language of others, which are to be supposed less liable to prejudice and passion than my own.

In Nos. 2 and 7 of the Free Press, will be found some desultory and historical remarks, on the law of libel, and the liberty of the press, which became firmly established in England, by the expiration, in 1694, in the reign of William and Mary, of the restrictive laws before in existence, and by which a license was required for every book before its publication. For the liberty of the press, (as the writer of the article in the Gazette,

**It was for having asserted that the majorities in both houses were completely Anti-British. Now, to salve the sores on all sides, I recommend the editors of the Times, to publish an erratum, and say, for Anti-British, read, Anti-Scotch; which is in fact both the true, and the intended, meaning; for every body knows that the word British, in Canada, always means Scotch, in contradistinction to English; and as it is quite impossible for any person in his senses to attribute Anti-English principles to the House of Assembly, who in all their proceedings, even in their very faults, are essentially English, and as essentially Anti-Scotch, that must have been the meaning of the unlucky paragraph, and I am quite sure the Assembly would consider it as an eulogium, instead of a libel, to be talked of as Anti-Scotch.*