his surrender demanded under a clause of the Ashburton Treaty providing for the extradition of slaves guilty of crimes committed in the United States. Lord Elgin, the Governor-General of Canada, in response to an appeal on behalf of Anderson, replied to the effect that "in case of a demand for John Anderson, he should require the case to be tried in their British court; and if twelve freeholders should testify that he had been a man of integrity since his arrival in their dominion, it should clear him."

The magistrate who examined the case decided that the charge against Anderson was sustained. The case was brought before the Court of Queen's Bench, Toronto, which court decided that Anderson should be given up. Intense excitement was created throughout the country by this decision. Public meetings were held and strong protests were made against the surrender of the hunted fugitive. It argued that in defending himself against recapture to bondage and to condign punishment and probably a cruel death he was exercising an inalienable right. The Court of Queen's Bench gave a decision, Justice McLean strongly dissenting, not for his surrender, but against his discharge, leaving him to be dealt with by the Government which might find sufficient reasons for not complying with the requisition from the United States. Justice McLean expressed his strong dissent in these words: "Can, then, or must, the law of slavery in Missouri be recognized by us to such an extent as to make it murder in Missouri, while it is justifiable in this province to do precisely the same act? . . . . In administering the law of a British province, I can never feel bound to recognize as law any enactment which can convert into chattels a very large number of the human race. I think that on every ground the prisoner is entitled to be discharged."

So profound was the interest in this case that after the decision in Canada became known in England, the Habeas Corpus was applied for and granted by the Court of Queen's Bench in that country. Before that could be executed, however, the prisoner had obtained a similar writ from the Court of Common Pleas in Canada. The result was that the prisoner was discharged on the grounds of informality of his committal. There can be little doubt, however, that all the legal resources of Great Britain would have been employed for the defence of this lowly black prisoner.

The present writer has a very vivid recollection of a great public meeting of sympathy with this fugitive slave, held in St. Lawrence Hall, Toronto, in which the Hon. George Brown and Dr. Daniel Wilson, President of Toronto University, took a prominent part. He was also present at the reading of the decisions of three judges before the Court of Queen's Bench at Toronto. It was an occasion