

his expectations was presented to him. But he either tells a falsity, or the editor of the Niagara Gleaner, (a paper, which though an unionist one, possesses a character of impartiality and independence which none other espousing that side of the question can boast of,) has published one. Mr. D. plumply asserts that the presentment was signed *only by the foreman*: in the Gleaner, the names of 22 jurors are subjoined to it, viz.—MOSES BRADY, foreman; JACOB UFFER, WILLIAM M'CLELLEN, WILLIAM PEW, sen. WILLIAM PEW, jun. WILLIAM O'REILLY, BENJAMIN FRALICK, THOMAS BROOKS, JOHN MISENER, ROBERT WILSON, JOHN M'CLELLEN, THADEUS DAVIS, JOHN STREET, JAMES BLANCHFIELD, JOHN DARING, JOHN D. COE, GEORGE MARLOT, ISAAC KELLY, ANTHONY UFFER, HIRAM SWAYZE, WILLIAM TERRY, and JOHN COUKE. It is true, Mr. Dickson qualifies this a little, when he afterwards says, "many of them, *for good reasons*, objected to its delivery into court;" therefore *some* of them did not, therefore *some* of them either signed or would have signed it; and if twelve only signed, or signified their assent to it, (and in fact the signature of the foreman is legal evidence that a majority did so,) then was it a true, legal, and valid presentment of a grand jury. Mr. Dickson does not say what these *good reasons* were, but I will; it was because when He, the Hon. Chairman &c. &c. &c. expressed his surprise and anger at it, some of them, afraid of offending the great man, said they did not mean it to be read in court, or they would not have assented to it. Yet, as for all he alleges, we have nothing but an assertion, which Mr. D. chose to make at a time when the grand jury not being in existence, he could not be contradicted by them as a body, I have reprinted these names to give an opportunity of contradicting him, and convicting him of misrepresentation, if nothing worse; so that it behoves both these gentlemen and the editor of the Gleaner, to speak out boldly, and tell the whole truth.

As to Mr. Dickson's speech, I will say nothing, until he just points out in what part of the act of the 31 Geo. III. the words, *during the continuance of this act*, are to be found. They are not in the copy of it I have, which indeed supplies with an &c. those parts which are supposed to be merely technical tautology: but if they even occur in those parts, *since the act has no limitation of time assigned to it, "DURING ITS CONTINUANCE" must imply a continuance WITHOUT LIMITATION OF TIME.*

Amongst the accusations brought against the House of Assembly, their not having past a registry act, has as much plausibility as any. I shall leave to others to inquire whether the drafts of such acts as may have been proposed, did not contain objectionable principles; as well as into the general propriety