

described; but far from being so, that individual who having failed in that nefarious practice, finding himself ruined both in fortune and character becomes desperate. The losses he has sustained whilst single-handed might be recovered by a partnership with sufferers like him, and he becomes the associate of a regular band of desperadoes, who arm themselves to recover by violence, that which they had lost by the superior vigilance and activity of those to whom that branch of administration is intrusted. Thus setting at defiance the laws of their Country, they proceed from murder to treason and rebellion. Such are the natural and inevitable consequence of a practice which was looked upon in the beginning as fair play and merely a trial of ingenuity.

The word *smuggling* is no less applicable to the evasion of the laws relative to licences. Selling without licence, if it does not inevitably lead to that climax of crimes, participates of the nature of smuggling in so much as it injures the revenue, the community at large and individually, and the fair trader who complies with the necessary regulations. It is therefore the interest of the public at large as well as that of every member of society and more especially of those who, respecting the laws of their Country, submit to their regulations, to see those laws duly enforced and their transgressions justly punished. The character of what is termed an *Informer* is too generally held in contempt. That name or appellation is commonly applied to any individual who takes upon himself the prosecution of public offences. Under this point of view even Grand Juries are informers; the officers of the Crown are ex-officio informers; every police officer is bound to produce before the tribunals every one guilty of a breach of the laws. Are they thereby entitled to the odium attached to informers? Certainly not; on the contrary they deserve the gratitude of every well thinking man. But it will be said the contempt attaches only to him who derives a benefit or lucre from the injuries he causes to others. Here again we protest against the injustice. The laws, for wise purposes we may suppose, enacts that he who prosecutes for the benefit of the public shall be intitled to a certain specified reward, and that reward constitutes the just remuneration for public service as well as the principal means of support of the public officers. That it serves often the base and mean purposes of degraded beings, is but too true. But where do we find human institutions not liable to some objection? It is not therefore the reward that must stigmatise the public prosecutor, but the motives that prompts him. If, in order to get at it, a fellow of that description lays snares to entrap an unwary victim of his avarice, if he is guided by motives of hatred or revenge, may he become not only an object of contempt but also of execration: he is deserving of both. But that public officer who being required to enter a prosecution against a public offender, obeys, as in duty bound, to