

should not be occupied with a discussion of this kind. Was it right to employ an *ignorant, unprincipled, incapable* person, to send forth to the public language that was never uttered.— By such conduct they were sanctioning the publication of libels; and acting contrary to the rules of the British Parliament. The members' speeches last year, he said, were given in the most *shameful, base, and calumnious* manner: language was attributed to members which they never uttered, and the speeches were full of bad English. Even himself, who was not in the habit of speaking ungrammatically, was ashamed to see the language that was attributed to him in those publications. He saw himself grossly libelled in one paper, in which it was stated that he proposed a clause to legalize the children of certain marriages, and make their mothers *whores*. A reporter, if employed by the House was not responsible for any misrepresentation. If they called him to the bar for an offence, wilfully or ignorantly committed, they could not punish him; he might tell the house, "I have been employed by you to give the debates; and I have given them to you in the best manner I could, and you have no right to punish me for them." After pointing out the practice of England, and inveighing against the principle of employing a reporter, he opposed the motion.

The opposition made by the colonel, however, not having been successful, and the house having voted £100 for a reporter, it is only for the purpose of exposing the odious principles of the party who wish to keep the people in ignorance of the conduct and language of their representatives; and the unfounded arguments they have recourse to, that I have selected this subject. Being likewise desirous to see a similar measure adopted by the House of Assembly of this province, which the liberality of their ideas can not fail to perceive the benefits of, I trust they will also see the futility of that objection (the main one which is made to the measure,) namely that it is not sanctioned by parliamentary usage in England. The question has several times been agitated in the House of Commons in England, whether they should have an appointed reporter of their debates or not; and has, fitly and wisely too, considering the circumstances attending it, been decided in the negative; for the state of society, and of literature, in England, has given rise to a body of intelligent men, both men of learning and acuteness, who make it a profession, and the means of a handsome maintenance, to be the reporters of the proceedings of all public bodies, for newspapers. Their general information and abilities are guarantees for the general propriety of their reports; and their number, and different parties and sentiments are checks against misrepresentations, or falsehood. Hence, it was justly argued in Parliament, that the people would receive better, and