

exercised, and enjoyed alone by charter or commission from the Crown, does not lie against me. It would most assuredly be absurdity of the grossest kind to affirm a dissenting minister could not act as such, without a commission from the King; or that the King ever gave such a commission, or ever claimed a right of appointing the pastor of a dissenting church! Notwithstanding the impropriety of an information of this nature against me, I was treated in the process with oppressive informality. Instead of a summons, which is the first step in an information quo warranto, a criminal warrant was served upon me. The authorised practice will appear from the following quotations out of Comyn's Digest, vol. 6, p. 164. "The first process against the defendant in a quo warranto is summons, 1 Siderfin, 86. If he does not appear thereon, judgment shall be for seisure, 1 Sid. 86. 2 Rol. 46. So in an information in the nature of a quo warranto, the first process shall be a venire facias, (i. e. a summons,) Coke's Ent. 527, b. 1 Sid. 86. If the party does not appear the same term, he shall lose his franchise for ever. Coke 2 Inf. 282."

Instead of pursuing this method, my persecutors obtained a criminal warrant, under which I was apprehended by the sheriff, and obliged to give bail. And what could be the object of this unwarrantable procedure? Could the intention be ought else than the exposing of my character and person to shame and contempt? And what reason had they to do this, if their motives and object were worthy of Christians and honest men, if the laws of the Province, or the prerogative of the Crown sanctioned the prosecution?

When they had me a prisoner in a criminal court, they obliged me to file a special plea, refusing to try me unless I did! Does the voluminous annals of the law record a parallel proceeding? I verily believe they do not; it was left to the great Mr. Sewell, Attorney General of Lower Canada, and his honorable colleagues, to begin so *unright* a practice.

From the nature and mode of conducting the prosecution, the public may clearly perceive its object. Indeed the professed object of the quo warranto is to dispossess me of my office of a minister of the gospel, and pastor of a congregation of protestant dissenters. Now if this object could have been attained by petrifogging, law jargon, and quibbling, how easy it would have been to have driven all dissenters out of the Province, and thus profelytes to episcopalianism would have been *powerfully* made.