est been nearly forgotten, it was unfair to expose him and especially since it is certain the Union has all blown over it is taunting a fallen enemy, the most ungenerous action a man can be guilty of.

The Chairman said that he must say he thought Mr. Smoothing Iron rather out of order, but as he conceived this to be a question of privilege, since the Editor had endeavoured to stigmatize their worthy member, and in doing so had misstated what he had said, some degree of latitude in debate he was willing to give——but since the evening had been far spent, he hoped gentlemen would be brief.

Mr. Lofty said, that the Editor's attempt at Philosophising was the most extraordinary he had ever read of—he says that he and the Indians are of opinion that bodily pain is the lowest pain in rank, and in his deduction, asserts that he would rather see one hundred Donybrook Fairs, than one Orange procession.—This seems very well in theory and no doubt looks mighty fine to the redoubtable Editor *upon paper*, but suppose we should apply the case—and suppose the gentleman who edits a respectable paper in the city, and whose remarks have so completely silenced the columns of the Herald lately, should give this gentleman the choice of submitting to the triumph he has obtained or of taking a broken head—which do you think Mr. Chairman would be preferred?—and if he (Mr. Lofty) was correct, Seneca himself would prefer the former—this remark they would understand was only meant to shew that the Editor might be an *Irishman* but no philosopher, which in the paragraph alluded to he attempts—Seneca says "A contumely is an indignity *below the consideration of the very law* and not worthy either of revenge or so much as a complaint, it is only the vexation of a weak mind and signifies no more to a wise and sober man than an idle dream." This remark is a case I think directly in point, and upsets all the Editor's fine words and tropes upon the Orange question.

Mr. Clod Pole then rose and said he thought he understood the whole remark alluded to except the last paragraph commencing with "we sincerely trust &c." he said he had never heard of any *acts* of that nature to enforce, and if there were, how are the *assembly* to enforce them? and he should wonder if it would make any difference in the event of a combat between some of the Editor's "Countrymen" in the forests, whether the poor affrighted Indian should "*drop* his tomahawk" or keep it in his fist! he says, he hopes the acts will be enforced "that the poor Indian may not drop his tomahawk and gaze with admiration on the more refined and accomplished torturers of the soul;" he meant to shew that a "donybrook fair" was so much more savage than the Indian practices, that they would be astonished; and notwithstanding he would rather see a hundred, than one Orange procession! what sensibility!!!

Mr. Smoothing Iron said he hoped that the Gentlemen would evince sufficient liberality to allow him to correct what he considered an error of the press—he meant the very last word "soul"; he had thought that the good sense of Mr. Clodpole would have dictated to him the propriety of reading it "*soil*", as the Editor evidently had an allusion to the proverbial dexterity of his countrymen with the *spade*; and as he had never yet heard of human beings having it in their power to torture a *soul*, (though he believed the Catholics in some countries tortured the body) he must persist in exculpating the Editor in so far at least.—(this was agreed to *nem con.*)

A series of Resolutions were then passed and sent up to the Tavern—Keeper for concurrence, but as Mr. Tickle Pitcher was not exactly *compos*, the meeting broke up without entering them in the book.

Truly extracted from the Minutes.
(Signed) CALEB CROPPY,
Secretary.

For the Upper Canada Herald.

Mr. Editor,

In the newspaper reports of the debates on the Scotch claims to the Clergy Reserves, Mr. Morris, who introduced them into the House of Assembly, is made to say, "That some honourable gentlemen would probably argue, that all denominations of protestants should be included, if any alteration took place, but he hoped *the justice and good sense* of the House would resist any such attempt to destroy the present question, for no member of the Church of England, *within that Assembly*, could lay his hand upon his heart, and declare that he wished Clergy lands to be enjoyed by all sects. *Why then profess such unbounded liberality, when no such thing was meant?* What was asked for the Church of Scotland, was a matter of right, not of favor."

The honourable member seems to have anticipated, that *some* gentlemen in the House, might possibly hold a rational argument, but expresses a hope, that the *justice and good sense* of the House *at large*, would render it unavailing.

When the honourable gentleman asserts, that no member of the Church of England within that Assembly, could lay his hand upon his heart, and declare, that he wished Clergy lands to be enjoyed by all sects, let us hope for the honor of the Assembly, that the honourable gentleman is mistaken. Let us hope there were many, who with their hands upon their hearts, could have made such a declaration; at any rate let it be our consolation to know, that if there be no members of the Church of England within that Assembly who could conscientiously wish the Clergy Reserves to be enjoyed by ALL descriptions of protestants or NONE, there are *plenty out of it*, who can discover neither justice or good sense in entertaining any other wish.

The interrogatory, "Why then profess such unbounded liberality, when no such thing was meant?" I cannot clearly comprehend. Is it addressed to such of the members of the House as the honourable gentleman supposed likely to express a wish, that the reserves should be given to all denominations of protestants, thus by anticipation charging them with insincerity? or does it mean, that the Scotch, in preferring their claim to the Reserves, meant no such liberality, as to wish other protestants to meddle with the fat stored up for the Lord?

It must be visible to every unjaundiced eye, that these Clergy Reserves (if not seasonably sold) will be a ground of perpetual strife; and no one need possess the gift of prophecy in the *superlative* degree, to foretell horrors, which it chills the blood but to think of. Every man now feels most deeply, that they are a heavy curse upon the country, and an almost insurmountable obstacle to its settlement. Men of all denominations, whether Catholics, Protestants, Jews, or Turks Priests, Rabbins, Muftes and all residing within these Provinces ought to unite in one Petition to his Majesty, most humbly, and pathetically imploring him, for the sake of Christ, and for the sake of their unborn posterity, to order an immediate sale of every Reserve in the country.

Let the public read with attention the Speech of our enlightened Governor, on dismissing the recent Parliament, there we find the following paragraph:—"Fully convinced of the necessity of some measure to counteract the evils occasioned by unoccupied and neglected lands, and acceeding entirely to the principle of the provisions which you have proposed, I have every hope that the reference for his Majesty's consideration, which has appeared to me proper, will result in the declaration of the Royal assent."—This refers to the Bill introduced into the House, entitled by Mr. Fothergill the "*wild land assessment bill*," for which the country is so highly indebted to the Attorney General. Here we have our duty pointed out to us by the Governor himself. He does not expressly say, "Why do not you petition en mass to get the Reserves disposed of"? but he candidly tells us in as strong terms as the English language can supply, that he is "FULLY CONVINCED OF THE NECESSITY OF SOME MEASURE TO COUNTERACT THE EVILS OCCASIONED BY UNOCCUPIED AND NEGLECTED LANDS." Henceforth let us never forget his Excellency in our orisons; but let him not say that he has thrown pearls to swine, that he has invited us to a feast, and we will not attend. Rouse, then, every man, woman and child, obey the kind invitation of your Governor, and sign a petition to the King, "cry unto him with a loud voice" in strains of fascinating power, to turn his Royal attention to the "*necessity of some measure to counteract the evils occasioned by unoccupied and neglected lands.*" Give your Petition to his Excellency to lay at the foot of the throne, and he will be your advocate. "*Seek and ye shall find.*" "*Knock and it shall be opened unto you.*"

His Majesty would be thunderstruck, if he were informed that the Clergy Reserves in these Provinces are at this moment worth at least four millions Sterling, and yet, that every new Church, of ever such trivial value, must be erected by the charitable subscriptions of ALL DENOMINATIONS OF PROTESTANTS. His Majesty only wants to be made acquainted with these facts, to interpose his Royal authority, to put an end to such hurtful absurdities. What a glorious prize for an American army! better than any five Spanish Galleons! and by just throwing in the Crown Reserves, perhaps as good as ten! both together, engrossing more than a quarter of the Province!

Well indeed might his Excellency be "fully convinced of the necessity of some measure to counteract the evils occasioned by unoccupied and neglected lands;" and well had it been too, if the Parliament had expressed the same deep conviction.

Now we will suppose for a moment, that the King of England, the Father and benefactor of his people, were made perfectly acquainted with the facts above mentioned, and will it not strike every man's understanding as a certainty, that the best informed, most sagacious, and accomplished King in Europe, would immediately recommend to his Parliament, the sale of the Clergy reserves, to promote the settlement of his most valuable Colony, and raise a fund sufficient to perfect its internal navigation, both, objects of the first, and last importance, not only to this country, but to the future safety and prosperity of England herself.

However fondly a particular few may cherish the idea of establishing a Church Dominant in this country, they may be assured it will turn out a gross illusion, and how much more grossly illusory, and chimerical, is the hope of such infatuated men, as would seek to establish TWO CHURCHES DOMINANT! Blessings on the man (whatever was his motive) who by his vote in the Council rejected the Resolutions of the House of Assembly for the Scotch Kirk to get a share of the Reserves! Just view the dilemma we should be in, were the Scotch Kirk to succeed! Instead of having to contend alone with the scattered votaries of the Church of England, we should have also to contend with the more sturdy, numerous, and zealous devotees of the Kirk; then, God only knows where the business would end.

It is as impossible to force upon this country a National Church Establishment, as it is for a man to create another Universe; and most happy it is for the inhabitants, that it is impossible. Neither the interests of the country, or of true Religion, require a national establishment; on the contrary it would be highly injurious to both. If Christianity be to be preserved on earth, it must be by the fervent zeal of the sectarians, who are never in want of pious and enlightened ministers, and those ministers are never in want of a comfortable and genteel livelihood, though they be without Governmental provision.

If we are commanded in Scripture, not to muzzle the Ox which treadeth out our corn we are not commanded to gorge him, so as to render him incapable of treading out any more. Which disgusting state I believe is typical of most of the established Churches in the world, at least of their high dignitaries, who are choking with repletion, while their inferior grades are pining in starvation. Such are the blessings of an established Church; of a national provision for the Clergy, and such are in embryo for the embryotic Hierarchy of Canada.

It is a vain fear to suppose, that Religion would suffer in the slightest degree from withholding Governmental pecuniary aid to its teachers. Man being as instinctively inclined to seek rest for his soul, as for his body, has not at this day to learn, that it is in Religion alone it can be found; and accordingly we see, that in countries where no provision for the Clergy is established by Law, that that useful and necessary class is more equally and justly provided for, by the voluntary contributions of the people, than where it is absurdly endowed with rich possessions for the carnal gratification of a few, (making their kingdom of this world) the envy of such as are not immediately within the pale of Governmental patronage, and the destruction among all, of every active desire to promote the cause of true Religion. It is in the nature of things, that from their congregations alone, should Clergymen of merit find deserved favor.

But suppose for a moment, that we must have an established Religion, does it follow that it must be the Religion of the Church of England? Though I prefer that Religion myself, I can think of no cogent reason why it should be a matter of course. It would be a crying injustice on the part of England, to force a Religion upon us, to which certainly not a fifth of the population assent, OR EVEN WILL. It would be like one, chusing a wife for another man, and forcing him to have her, than which nothing can be conceived more repugnant to human feeling. If we must of necessity have a Religion established by Law, as our unerring guide to Heaven, it should be chosen by the general voice of the People, who I think it will be admitted, are far too Godly a race to be satisfied with the temperate zeal of the teachers and followers of the Church of England.

So much does the prosperity of christianity depend upon perpetual controversy, that every genuine friend of Christ, ought devoutly to rejoice, as often as he sees his Cross erected as the standard of a newly stricken sect. Let all the followers of Christ on earth be amalgamated into one community of christians, and they would soon settle down into a community of idolators. As flame will die without a constant supply of ignitible matter, so will christianity without a constant renewal of zeal.

Now, with my right hand upon my heart, my left hand stretched in supplication towards Heaven, and with a pleading tear in each uplifted eye, I ejaculate to the great disposer of events, a fervent prayer, that he in his wisdom and goodness, may be pleased so to enlighten the understandings of our Rulers, as to make them see the "JUSTICE AND GOOD SENSE" of bestowing the Clergy Reserves on ALL denominations of his devout followers, or on NONE. I hear four fifths of the country responding, *AMEN.*

A CHURCH-OF-ENGLAND-MAN.

Kingston, Upper Canada,
January 28, 1824.

For the Herald.

MR. THOMSON,

Sir,—The Public have sorely to lament, that the debates in our Provincial Parliament are not given day by day as they occur. The arguments used by honorable members are never known till long after the subject of debate is settled Thus, however wrong headed a member may prove, his constituents have no opportunity of setting him right through the medium of the Press. The debates on the address upon the Scotch Claims, I have reason to think, would have been held in a different strain, if the arguments used by its advocates on its first introduction, could have appeared before the public in seasonable time for fair and wholesome comment.

It astonishes me beyond measure, to hear the advocates of the address pouring out their panegyric upon the valour of the Scotch soldiers, to clench the claim of the Kirk to the Clergy reserves! What have the merits of the Scotch soldiers to do with the claims of the Kirk? If the 84th Regiment of Highlanders were so deserving, and were not duly rewarded, let their grand-children, and their great grand children be advertised for, and collected together, and let every Clergy reserve be given amongst them. I care not to whom they be given, whether to Scotch, Irish, English, Dutch, Americans or Germans, nor of what religious persuasion the parties may be to whom they are given, so they be disposed of; *but to give to the Scotch Clergy what the Scotch soldiers have earned, would be a novel mode indeed of rewarding merit!*

I wonder what the Duke of Wellington would have said, if to reward his important services to Great Britain, the Parliament had voted half a million of money to the Church of England instead of to himself?

Nothing can perhaps set the futility of such arguments in a stronger light, than to show the public a return of the 84th Regiment at the time spoken of, 1000 strong.

Catholics,	346
Methodists,	54
Antiburghers,	105
Burghers,	93
Cameronians,	202
Glassites,	51
Presbytery of Relief,	39
Episcopalians,	75
Kirk of Scotland,	35
	1000

If this return be correct, and I never heard it disputed, I should like to know, *if any*, which of the Protestant Churches ought to be rewarded for the sake of this brave Regiment?

No church whatever has the least shadow of a pretext to claim reward for the blood and groans of those gallant soldiers. To themselves and their posterity, the reward is due, and to none else.

If the Scotch or any other people would maintain their Church in its primitive purity, let them pray his Majesty that it may never be defiled by the impure touch of the Clergy Reserves. "The poverty of the Kirk of Scotland is its greatest safeguard." Give it riches and it will be destroyed. But if, as an honorable member has said, "there is a numerous and respectable body of Scotch dissenters in this Province, who are fully entitled to his Majesty's bounty"! why do not they petition his Majesty, that he may extend to them his bounty, by granting them as much land as they can settle? This would do them more good than petitioning for the Kirk, and I should think, that after mature reflection, every sensible Scotchman will say so, for whatever the Kirk may get, will not reward these deserving men.

It is sorrowful to see with what promptitude one honorable member, who argued against giving the Kirk a share of the Reserves, is bespattered from all quarters with the epithets "*Bigotry*"—"*Intolerance*"! Will not a little thinking on the subject, a little dispassionate turning of the matter in the mind, a little pillow cogitation show, that "Bigotry" and "Intolerance are as imputable to such honorable members, as would bestow the Reserves exclusively upon the Church of England, and the Kirk of Scotland, as to he, who would confine them to the Church of England alone? the votaries of both together not being a third of the population.

In the prediction of the honorable member alluded to, "that if any measure such as at present proposed, were ever acted on in this country, it would be attended with the most diabolical results," all history, and every experienced combination of cause and effect compel me to join. But I think I can perceive, that the reasons for the honorable member's prediction, and for my concurrence in it, are as wide asunder, as heaven from earth.

He can see no "diabolical results" but from giving the Scotch Kirk a share of what he conceives, the Church of England ought to enjoy exclusively; whereas I can foresee the "diabolical results" from confining the Clergy Reserves, either to the Church of England exclusively, or to the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland exclusively. In either case our posterity may depend on "diabolical results," but they will be of quicker consummation in the former, than the latter case.

The honorable member "would join in no address of the kind, requesting his Majesty to take away the rights of his subjects of the Established Church." As laying the hand upon the heart is now the mode, may I request the honorable member to lay his hand upon his heart, and say, what individual right he, as a subject of the Established Church, (if it be established) would have taken from him, by any particular disposition, pleasing to his Majesty, of the Clergy Reserves? And now let me request of the staunchest advocate of the Kirk to lay his hand in turn upon his heart, and say, what additional individual right he would acquire, supposing that his Majesty were pleased to bestow *all* the Clergy Reserves on the Clergy of the Kirk? I see *both* are puzzled for a reply! The fact is, that the honorable member, nor any other subject of the Church of England would lose a copper, nor any member of the Kirk gain a single bawbee.

Let the Scotch consider well what they are doing in begging for the Reserves. Such of them as have now an affection for the Kirk, may, in the event, have the sore mortification of beholding in that Kirk, "an old friend with a new face," and from principle, become Seceders from the establishment they are now advocating with all their might.

COMMON SENSE.

Kingston, January 28, 1824.

Editorial opinions relative to the Privileges of our Provincial Parliament.

From the Brockville Recorder Dec. 1, 1823.

We learn, through the medium of the York Weekly Register, that Mr. Thomson the Editor of the U. C. Herald has been ordered to attend at the bar of the house of Assembly, to answer for the publication of an article alleged to be a libel, in his paper of the 11th ult. bearing the following title: "*To the honorable the Commons of the Province of Upper Canada in Parliament assembled; the report of the commissioners* for unsettling the affairs of the pretended bank of Upper Canada lately established at Kingston,—Greeting &c. &c." The article appeared in Mr. Thomson's paper without a signature, and is probably the production of some person, who, dissatisfied with the commissioners for settling the affairs of the late bank at Kingston, and perhaps believing the act of the legislature relative to the bank, trenched too much upon the rights of the subject has thought proper to apply the lash of satire to the Commissioners as well as the framers of the law. We confess the step was a bold, and the result may prove it a very imprudent one. If the author considered himself aggrieved by the conduct of the commissioners, or his constitutional rights invaded by the passing of the law, the more proper course to have adopted, and certainly the most likely to have insured redress from the Legislature, would have been to have made a fair and candid representation of the matter in manly, and at the same time, respectful language. Satire is some times a useful weapon, but should rarely be applied to any affair which concerns the Government, as it tends to do away with that respect and deference on the part of the people to the constituted authorities, which is very useful to the due administration of the laws. We will not however say, that there may not be a time in which resort may be properly and profitably had to it, nor will we contend that the present is not that time; but in our judgment the occasion should not be slight to justify its use, and then its application should be guided with discretion and judgment.

We trust, however, that, on this occasion the members of the house of Assembly will be actuated by the most liberal spirit; that while they endeavor to shield themselves from insult, they will not restrict the liberty of the press to mean and narrow limits, and that they will remember, that to render the press of material benefit to society, "a considerable latitude must be allowed in the disussion of public affairs."

From the Montreal Gazette Jan. 10.

It is with feelings of considerable regret and surprise that we have perused the report of the proceedings of the House of Assembly of Upper Canada in relation to Mr. Thomson, the editor of the *Upper Canada Herald*. With surprise, because to us it is more than surprising, that any Legislative body in this country should display such eagerness in assuming rights which they can lay no claim to, either legally or constitutionally; and with regret; that Mr. Thomson, or any man of education and knowledge sufficient to qualify him for the important situation of Editor of a News-paper, should so far forget his duty to himself and to his country as to submit to the self-arrogated jurisdiction of the house of Assembly—thereby giving the authority of *precedent* at least to such assumed powers. It is perfectly astonishing, and "past finding out" how the privileges of the Legislative bodies of these Provinces have originated, but, above all, how they have become so formidable, and irresistable. We do not, however, wish to enter upon any discussion of this subject at present, but merely to enter our decided protest against its legality in any manner of way, and to warn our brother editors against permitting themselves to be the instruments of establishing a right *by prescription* in a quarter where it never did absolutely exist. No persons can possibly entertain a higher respect, or a greater veneration for the constituted powers of the country than we do; and none could more earnestly lament the possibility of bringing their actions or conduct into contempt; but, at the same time, we can see no cause for yelding up rights which they have no authority to claim of us, and which, if they actually did, could not be the means of clothing them with greater power, honour or consideration. We should therefore be extremely sorry to see the least symptoms of a growing disposition in our Legislative bodies to notice the public Press in a way even if they had the right to do so—which can never lead to any beneficial result. We certainly never wish to see the day when a struggle shall exist between both parties for their rights and privileges; but were that struggle unfortunately to arise, we should declare at once; and our efforts would be in support of that declaration. "the Press must triumph." It would triumph too, and signally, for it might as well be attempted to chain up the winds as to stop the motion of that mighty ENGINE, a free press. We are arguing, however, upon a case, happily so remote, that to discuss it further would be merely superfluous labour. But what we deprecate is a useless collision with a power which cannot be subdued, and a ready subserviency on the part of the conductors of that power which cannot be too much commended.

From the York Weekly Register, Jan. 22.

Our readers will find a very *bold* attack (including *fierce defiance*) on the *privileges* of our House of Assembly, in this number of the Register, extracted from the Montreal Gazette. We own we have a strong itching to take the matter up; but, looking on the FREEDOM of the PRESS as the main pillar of the greatness of the state of England, as we do, and knowing that the health, social, religious, and political, depends upon the unshackled operations of this engine, we are afraid of running wild and *bolting* from such narrow confines as the columns of a newspaper, if we venture on the discussion at present.—We are however, pleased to see our brother Editor so vigourous on a subject in which it is natural for *us* to take a very deep and sensitive interest.—The privileges of Parliament in England have been often under discussion, even in Courts of Law, without their true nature and extent being discovered; but whatever *they* are, it is certainly very doubtful how far they are transferable to this, or any other colony—At first sight it seems very absurd that we may freely criticise the conduct of each other, and of Candidates at an Election, and even of M. P's and their measures, when *out* of Session, and that we cannot do the same, *with impunity*, when assembled together within the walls of a house! Our House of Assembly, it must be allowed, has several times evinced an uncommon tenacity in regard to some of these assumed privileges, and never more so than on the occasion alluded to by the Montreal Gazette,—and it is not to be wondered at, that people at a distance should view with some amazement, such an act of an august Assembly, as that of making a man quit his family and affairs, and travel 400 miles through bad roads in the depth of winter, merely to tell him, as one would say to a froward child—"*You are a very naughty boy, and deserve whipping; and you must therefore consider yourself as whipped,* and go home again."—We have been told by a certain member, who has lately talked wonderfully at large on the rights and liberties of the people, a vast deal about the *omnipotence* of Parliament!—How little is it imagined by the plain, honest people of the country that, when they send one of their circle to represent them in the Assembly, they clothe him with *omnipotence*, and put a hammer in his hand, whose blow shall be ten times more destructive than that of the famous Scandinavian God THOR!—But enough now; after a while we may take this matter up in good earnest.

Provincial Parliament of Upper Canada.

[CONTINUED.]

The A. General was happy that this resolution was proposed, because the House would say whether they were ready to come to a decision upon it or not. It has been the practice for centuries in England not to allow counsel for the prisoner to address the Jury in cases of felony. A measure similar to the present was proposed in the British Parliament but it has not been adopted. With respect to the prisoner he did not know whether it would operate to his benefit or not. He (Mr. A. Gen.) never had during the 12 years he was engaged in Crown prosecutions addressed the Jury a 2d time unless the case allowed defence. It was necessary to explain to the Court and the Jury the nature of the evidence, and in doing so he confined himself to a statement of the evidence, and always laid before them every thing that he knew favorable to the prisoner. If this bill passed it would make the counsel for the prosecution exert a degree of ingenuity in addressing the Jury which is not now practised, and it might be worse for the prisoner than the continuance of the present course. He thought the House ought to wait for the change in the Imperial Parliament before they meddled with any part of the criminal code. In the United States where counsel was allowed to address a Jury in behalf of a prisoner, the counsel for the prosecution exerts all his powers to convict the prisoner. In this Province there was no anxiety on the part of the Crown prosecutor to criminate the prisoner, he stated all sides of the case, and there was no great injustice done to a prisoner so situated.

Mr. Baldwin always observed the careful and humane manner in which prosecutions were conducted by the learned gentleman employed by the crown. He thought it required a great deal of consideration and they ought not to proceed hastily in the proposed measure. The proceedings were conducted with such fairness and humanity by the learned Atty. General and his colleague in office, that the proposed alteration in the law might not prove beneficial to the prisoner; indeed it might be of more advantage to the prisoner to allow the law to continue. The manner of conducting prosecutions in England was highly honorable to the character of the country, so much so, that a foreigner who wrote upon the English jurisprudeuce, said, that it seemed as if there was a conspiracy between the Judge, the Jury, and the Counsel to acquit the prisoner. In case of treason, counsel was allowed to address the Jury, because it was impossible that the counsel for the prosecution could be free from bias on such an occasion. He would therefore under these considerations limit the bill for 10 years to try the effect of the alteration.

Mr. Wilson after paying a high and a just eulogium to the Atty. and Solicitor General for their humane conduct in the discharge of their duty moved the committee do rise.

Mr. J. Jones was opposed to the last resolution. He thought the conduct of counsel in cases of misdemeanor and high treason very different. In the latter case the ingenuity of counsel was always exerted, but it was not so where counsel was not allowed to address the Jury on the part of the prisoner. He thought the proposed alteration would be disadvantageous to prisoners, and required mature consideration before any alteration should be attempted. It was not what would be more agreeable to their feelings that they should look to, but what would be