

and a seditious libel. False the paper was not; for every fact which it set forth had been proved from the Journals of Parliament. Malicious the paper was not, for the defendants had not sought an occasion of strife, but had been placed by the Government in such a position that they must either oppose themselves to the royal will, or violate the most sacred obligations of conscience and honour. Seditious the paper was not, for it had not been scattered by the writers among the rabble, but delivered privately into the hands of the King alone; and a libel it was not, but a decent petition such as by the laws of England a subject who thinks himself aggrieved may with propriety present to the Sovereign."

In contrast to this we may refer to a speech addressed many years ago by a Canadian barrister to the Parliament of the then Province of Canada on a question of great national importance. A bill for the abolition of the seigniorial tenure in Lower Canada was before the Legislative Assembly, and Mr. Christopher Dunkin, afterwards a member of Parliament, and later a judge, appeared at the bar of the House in opposition to the measure. His speech, in which it was necessary for him to deal with a number of questions, legal, historical, and constitutional, occupied several days, though expressed in as concise a form as the nature and importance of the case permitted.

In the first instance above referred to all details and technicalities had been previously dealt with, and it only remained to present to the Court the great principles which had been arrived at from the evidence before it. The merit of Mr. Somers was that in the most effective words, and in the briefest possible terms, he said what was necessary, and did not allow himself to utter a syllable more.

The merit of Mr. Dunkin was that, having a great mass of details to lay before his audience, he so marshalled them that there was no redundancy of language, no useless repetition, and yet a thing was left out which was essential to his cause. He did not weary his hearers because they felt that they were not called upon to listen to a single statement that was useless