

7, because great
a verdict should
me be ruinous in
nly too well to
without good rea-
pen to describe,

ld agree on their
ant, and as some
00 to £750, and
f an agreement.
n cases in law
at I ought not
f no use—public
ne line for the
l altho' the ju-
o struggle with
oot the boasted
early 30 hours,
but they bore it
d worthy Ger-
for, who bled
head upon his
on; and the ev-
and a verdict
utherford Esq.
re let me ex-
and his com-
d their duty to
shed on a per-
form my en-
it has several
into the quiet
t be able to e-
cued me from

Small by Mr.
judges taxed
ll, and 2 guin-
he annals of
but of that I

our with the
alifications--
can scarcely
the last ass-
oned. Even
ays the same

interrogations
the rioters
e heavy on
hile the loss
ing to others.
n, one of the
et, and that
al riot and

put impertinent patriotism to the blush. I know all this now, and Canada and England too shall know it before I am done with the party.

It was a wonder to many that the Attorney General did not institute a prosecution of some kind or other, but there can be no doubt now that there was a party in the plot not then thought of.

A writer in the Kingston Herald explains my conduct very correctly as follows:

"The immediate charge of prosecuting for this as well as other offences against law belongs to the law officers of the Government. Mr. Mackenzie, the party injured, only brought his action to recover damages for the aggravated injury sustained by him. That was his proper concern; but he was not a prosecuting or informing officer. He had no more interest than any other individual in the punishment of the offence. He could not even be a witness to prove it, having been absent when it was committed. Nor did the public prosecutor, need any information from him, the riotous breach of the peace being public, and the witnesses well known. On this subject Mr. Mackenzie conducted with great propriety. He maintained his own cause, and in so doing defended the rights of his fellow-subjects; but he did not usurp the authority of the crown officers charged with and responsible for the execution of the laws for the punishment of crime and the preservation of the peace. If the Attorney General, knowing that his office was the place of rendezvous for the perpetrators of the most flagrant violation of law, that ever occurred in the Province, has indeed been their purse holder, to receive money subscribed for their relief, instead of prosecuting them by indictment, in the name of the King, for their wanton and notorious offence, what confidence can his majesty's subjects at large have in his impartiality, as the public prosecutor? I hope it will turn out that the *Freeman* was misinformed. Suppose the parties had been reversed, that the Printing Office destroyed had been the Government Press, and the rioters, persons politically opposed to the Attorney General. In such a case, would a high handed riot, committed in the face and eyes of the Government, have been suffered to pass unpunished, in evil example to others in like cases to offend, against the peace of our Lord the King, his crown and dignity? The answer may be found in the well known story of the Farmer and the Justice. It was his worship's bull that killed the Farmer's cow; and that alters the case."

The Attorney General was not the purse holder, he left that department to his Hon. colleague, Mr. Executive Counsellor Macaulay, and the only reasons I have ever heard adduced, against a criminal prosecution are taken from Judge Hagerman's speech in defence of the outrage.

"It is wondered that these gentlemen were not indicted for a riot. But the Attorney General would not do so, because if he had, it would immediately be said that it was done with intention to destroy their prospect of damages—so that it was difficult to know how to act."

GOVERNMENT SUBSCRIPTION PURSE.

Mr. Collins the editor of the *Freeman* continued from time to time to advert to the means by which it was reported that the rioters had got clear of the damages awarded against them, and in the end obtained an acknowledgment from Colonel Fitzgibbon which even his most sanguine expectation had hardly anticipated. We shall here give a few specimens of his arguments—

"*Outrage patronized and supported.*—We are informed upon good authority that the sum of £625, the amount of damages awarded by a special jury to the Proprietor of the Colonial Advocate for the destruction of his Printing-Office, has been raised by private subscription among what is called the ministerial party in this town, & that so cheerful & general were the contributions, that few even among the Conspirators themselves, were called upon to advance a larger sum than ten dollars! From