

before I give you a picture of the unexampled constancy of affection, and severity of suffering, with which Louisa attended upon, and cheered, the imprisoned friend of her youth, I must state that not only she, but also both Jameson and Jungle, brought actions for the false imprisonment they had undergone.

The lawyers of the island, most unaccountably to me, who do not profess to be conversant in law, beyond the rationale of it, advised the actions to be brought, not against those chief agents of the honourable the East India Company, who made themselves so dishonourably busy on the occasion, but against their understrapper, the Dutch renegado aforesaid, whom they suborned to perjure himself, as being the person upon whose false oaths, the parties were severally committed to prison. The gentlemen of the bar stated that no action would lie against those who instigated, and actually committed, the outrage, but only against their tool; because, it being an action for false *imprisonment*, it was only the person by whose immediate means the *imprisonment* took place that could be answerable. They broached likewise another doctrine, or dictum, namely; that all such actions must be brought within a year after the grievance complained of; now, besides the very gross absurdity, and acme of injustice, which such a restriction involves, because the injured party may be, (and in S—'s individual case it is actually the fact,) kept for more than a year, suffering in confinement, under the effects of the iniquity which forms the subject of complaint, and so the very excess of crime, would ensure its impunity from punishment; I say, besides that consideration, which is of itself sufficient to invalidate such a maxim, did it exist, no one lawyer has yet been able to point out, altho' several have been repeatedly desired to do so, by