

produced a deep effect upon the minds of the very intelligent and highly respectable special jury---I have room only for a brief extract.

"It is needless for me, gentlemen," said Mr. Bidwell, "to inform you, that this is a case of the highest importance---the very circumstance of your being called upon as a special jury to determine it, shows that the defendants were afraid to trust it to a petty jury---yet to them it is not a matter of the same importance that it is to the plaintiff---most of the defendants are men of independence---men of high connexions and ample means---but to the plaintiff it is a case of the most serious consideration---his business, his property, the very implements which were the means of supporting his family, have been destroyed---therefore, his all is at stake in the issue of this trial. This case, gentlemen, is of the first importance in another point of view, inasmuch as it is the first instance, in this province of an attempt by open violence to destroy a printing press, and it is to be hoped that your verdict will be such as to prevent a similar recurrence---let it be seen by your verdict, that the defendants, or any other set of men, are not to conspire together for the purpose of violating the laws of the land, without the risk of a heavy responsibility. A free press is considered, under our well-balanced government, as one of the main pillars of the constitution, the chief stay and constitutional guardian of the rights and privileges of the people---it has been considered as one of the greatest blessings under all well-regulated governments---we are all, therefore, concerned in such a case, and an attack upon the press must be to all a matter of more than ordinary interest. But in this case, not only has the freedom of the press and the majesty of the law been insulted with a high hand, but the greatest privilege of an Englishman, the privacy of his house, has been grossly violated---yes, his private house, where every British subject is protected by the strong arm of the law, free from assault and invasion, has been violated and property to a considerable amount destroyed. Are you not bound, gentlemen, in such a case to give exemplary damages, in order to show that no man, however high his rank, shall violate with impunity these sacred privileges? It is true the press, with all its blessings, is subject to some evil---as long as human nature and human passions exist, there must be some degree of alloy in every human blessing, some abuse, which is from its very nature, inseparable from it. But if the press be, at any time, licentious, the law of the land is sufficient to restrain it; and if the defendants, in this case, felt any provocation in that way, the law was open to them---yet I will not admit, nor can they prove, that such has been the case. The law is so strict with regard to licentious publications, that editors of papers are liable to punishment, even to the infamous punishment of the pillory, although they may be able to prove that they never knew any thing of the publication. If, then, gentlemen, after such ample restraint by the law, you wish violent and illegal measures to be resorted to---if you wish the sacred privacy of the dwellings of our inhabitants to be daringly violated---if you wish to encourage the destruction of private property---or if you wish to ruin, not only the plaintiff, but his family, you will give your verdict for little damages; but if you feel, as men sitting there ought to feel, for the magnitude of this outrage---if you respect the rights of the subject and the liberty of the press---if you wish to guard against the recurrence of such disgraceful proceedings, by placing a salutary restraint upon all those who may be disposed to engage in them, you will stamp upon this transaction your highest disapprobation, by a verdict for ample damages. There is one circumstance, gentlemen, which is entitled to your particular consideration, namely, the character and standing in life of the defendants. If they were ignorant men, of strong passions unrestrained by education, and stimulated by provocation, there would be some apology for them; but when we consider that they move in the first circles of society, and with all the advantages of education, chose to resort to violence and mob-law, the strong arm of the law should be raised against them. Look also to the connexions of the defendants, and you will see how much

they
make
the d
your
for th
violence
[H
proce
"I
ever c
such a
£500
glish
propo
ges. I
allow
go on
on the
traint
against
The
ployed
they d
ones,
the pa
appren
Mr. H
riment
"woul
"take
on that
ly infra
It wa
would
but I f
and the
to the
It wa
ny evid
an unfa
those to
ground
ments I
that the
forward
Niagara
das, all
business
do right
gentlem
stances
I had do
owed a f
time for
been in
pressed
now ove
devastat