

and does so because he conceives himself to be above law, they become a subject of fair controversy; but the Jury were bound to look at the act itself, and not attribute private and improper motives. So if parties think public measures are injurious, they have a right to say so; and the result would show if they were correct. But they have no right to attack a man's character which is dearer than life, and thus commit a private injury. As to the liberty of the press, it was a mere bug-bear, held up by Editors to have an effect on the public mind, and to make an impression on Jurors; and no term had been more widely misunderstood. As had been properly observed by the Attorney General, it did not mean that a man had a right to throw slander at others; and which he would have as good a right to write as well as print. There was a time when no person in England could print, unless he were licensed; and such is still the case in many parts of the continent. But in England the law had been altered; and the press instead of being trammelled, is now left open to be exercised in the same way as other arts. It was because that obstruction had been broken down that the Press had become free; a term which had been grossly misapplied by individuals for private objects, and to give their papers a more extensive sale; as unfortunately there exists a desire among mankind to peruse that description of information, which has a tendency to excite and asperse. But he repeated, a man had no more right to print than to write slander; and with equal propriety it might be observed that he ought not to be prosecuted for a written slander that had been circulated. The same might be said of freedom of speech;—a man might say what he pleased, but he was responsible for doing so. Thus all were placed on the same footing, and it becomes an abuse of that freedom, to send forth to the world that which is malignant and unfounded, and to make the press the means of propagating slander. He could not conceive how any man could object to such wholesome restraint as was thus imposed; the object of which is to guard against the licentiousness of the press, which is the greatest curse with which a country could be damned. There could be no greater tyranny under which to live, than is imposed by such licentiousness; and which if not checked in its outset, gradually encroaches and feeds upon itself, until it finally destroys the free agency of man. For no person could exercise an unshackled judgment, if an Editor could with impunity publish to the world, that which would strike at his happiness and character. Such he said was the effect of the licentiousness of the Press; and if any one wanted proof, let him look at our neighbours in the United States; and all intelligent men of that nation, considered the press at the present day, as the most oppressive system of tyranny that could exist;—he need only look there to perceive its shameful effect upon character and domestic peace; where a man must pay, if he was correctly informed, to be secure from its attacks. And if it were permitted to proceed in the British dominions, would have a tendency to abolish that constitutional freedom that at present exists; and the Press would require to be placed under those restraints, that would destroy the benefit which a community might derive from it, when exercised under proper control. He, the Solicitor General, would be the last man who would be opposed to public enquiry, as a community would be left in the dark with reference to many public acts, if it were not allowed; but the abuse of that privilege converted a blessing into a curse; and like the fanning of a flame, proceeds to destroy. Such would be the effect here, if the public press were permitted to proceed to the unlimited and shameful extent, which led to the present complaint; and no country could be respected, in which such a course could be pursued.

The only remaining alternative on the part of the defendant, was an appeal to mercy; that in consequence of his peculiar situation, the Jury would give to the case their merciful consideration. It was true the Solicitor General said, he did not know who was the composer of the libel, but the defendant had assumed it; and therefore stood in his place. Yet they say, he had nothing to do with the paper, when it had been proved, that it was published by the defendant, and its publication in the County of York was proved by its being found in Frederickton, as well as in other parts of the Province. The paper then is found in this county, for Beck's evidence proved that it came to him, with his name on it, written as he supposed by the defendant, who usually directed it. Besides it came through the medium of Mr. Gale, to whom the papers are sent for the purpose of distribution. There could be no question therefore as to the publication, notwithstanding what his learned friend had adduced to the contrary. The paper therefore was circulated in different places; and altho' Sir John's character was well known here, yet there might be communities where it would be thought extraordinary that such a person as had been described in the publication, should be put in office, or placed at the head of the government. But the result of the prosecution would obtain equal circulation, and the proceedings and verdict would be an antidote to the bane.—It would be seen elsewhere, that the people of the Province had too much regard for the character of their governor, to permit so base a slander to go unpunished.—On the other hand, were there an acquittal notwithstanding the admission of the counsel on the other side, that the charge was unfounded, it would lead to the most pernicious results.—That however he did not expect; for if such an abominable slander went unpunished, there would be an end to all protection from similar attacks; and no character however high would be secure from aspersions, because a Jury of the country had said they would not interfere with the licentiousness of the press.

The learned gentleman said, he felt it was unnecessary to make any further remarks; the Jury would take up the libel, read it as sensible men, and say if it would not bear the construction that he had put upon it. If they did that then they had to determine, whether the defendant was justified in publishing such an attack upon the Queen's Representative, and in aspersing the high character of Sir John Harvey. As to malice, the law said that it is implied, if a person publish a slander freely and intentionally; but if a party could show that it was done accidentally then he was exonerated. But the court would tell the Jury, that the publishing implied malice, where a person makes an attack on public or private character. He said he had made out a case, and shown that the publication which was the subject of prosecution, was a foul and unfounded libel. The defendant had shown no disposition, if he had been misled, or had published it in the hurry of the moment, to express regret for his conduct; when there would have been an end of the case. But he had braved it out; in the expectation, that a Jury of his country would not convict him. He called upon them therefore, to discharge their duty faithfully; not from any feeling that existed on the part of His Excellency or himself. The punishment to be awarded did not lie with the Jury but the Court; which would not inflict one more severe than the ends of justice required. And even should sentence be passed, His Excellency, with whom was the prerogative of mercy, would doubtless mitigate it, upon an expression of proper contrition. He left the case with the Jury. The character and well being of the country depended upon their decision; he regretted that so

much of their time had been occupied with the subject; he had done no more than he was bound to do in conducting the prosecution; and he should not have performed his duty, had he neglected to impress upon their minds, the importance of the case upon which they were called to decide.

His Honor Mr. Justice PARKER said he might fairly congratulate the Jury at having arrived near the close of the long and important cause which they had been trying, and which had been commenced pursuant to an address of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly. It was proper owing to the peculiar nature of the prosecution, that every attention should be paid, and every latitude allowed which the rules of law permitted; and both sides had had the benefit of bold, talented and experienced counsel; by whom the court had been informed when in error, or confirmed when correct in its opinion with reference to the points of law that had been started; and to whom an opportunity would be afforded if they chose of being heard hereafter. His Honor also said he had derived much advantage from one of his learned brethren who had attended during the trial. The defendant he said stood charged with having published a defamatory libel. Certain topics had been discussed upon which he should make a few observations.—And first, as to the mode of proceeding by information; as had been justly observed, whatever opinion might be entertained as to the exercise of that power, still it continued to be vested in the officers of the Crown. It might be of importance that the subject should be first discussed in open court, as witnesses might not come forward who had been examined before a grand Jury; for although the proceedings of that body were secret, yet the names of the witnesses could not be concealed, and they might be interfered with. This might be the reason for proceeding by information; or the Attorney General might adopt that course for reasons which it would not be proper to state; but whatever might be the inducements to adopt such a proceeding, it was clear the assertion of innocence was not taken away; and it was for the Jury to decide whether the language used in the publication with which the defendant was charged, would bear the construction that had been put upon it. Another point that had been relied upon was the liberty of the press; where a person has a right to print what he thinks proper without submitting it to a censor. But although the censorship had been taken away still he must publish under the restraint and responsibility of law. The profession of an Editor of a newspaper his Honor observed, was an honorable and useful means of obtaining a livelihood; he had the power of doing a great deal of good—and it must be admitted he possessed the power to do much evil. He might make his Journal a useful vehicle for the publication of the proceedings of the Legislature and Courts of Justice, and observations on public men; or he might render it the channel of public and private slander; but for which he must be answerable because he was not bound to insert all that was brought him, but might reject or publish what he pleased. And a libel was certainly not the less such, because a party printed it, and thus put it into extensive circulation. Indeed his ability to do that, was often a reason why persons did not resort to courts of justice for protection, as the remedy often gave the slander additional notoriety; while it gave to the publication in which it appeared, an additional circulation and importance. Another point that had been urged, was the character of those with whom the prosecution originated. With that the Court and Jury had nothing to do; and the case came before them as constitutional judges, without deriving any weight or bearing from that cause. He would now direct their attention to the nature of the crime alleged against the defendant. He was charged with publishing a scandalous and malicious libel against His Excellency the Lieut. Governor of the Province, which his Honor quoted from the information before him. To make out this, it was necessary to prove first the publication of the libel,—then the publishing it in the County of York,—thirdly that it referred to Sir John Harvey,—and lastly that it bears a malicious meaning, as was set forth in the information: that the object of the publication was to vilify Sir John Harvey, and that the defendant published it with a malicious intention. His Honor here recapitulated the evidence for the prosecution.—That of Doak proved the printing of the paper on the day named in the information,—that of J. S. Beck proved that he received it in the usual way,—and the receipt of the papers regularly, was proved by the apprentice of Gale. And his Honor said that it did appear to him there was evidence sufficient, to authorise him to send it to the jury; unless it were rebutted by other evidence, to show that in the genuine newspaper the article complained of did not appear.—It was however a question purely for the Jury to determine. The next thing to which the Jury had to turn their attention was, Did the publication contain libellous matter, and that which was calculated to do injury? It had been said very fairly by the counsel for the defendant the question to be decided is, what is the meaning of the paper, and he had gone very fully into an explanation; and the Solicitor General had taken up much time in stating what was his view of the publication. Much of it certainly was not libellous; and the writer might express his opinion as to the constitution of the colony, the formation of the councils and the voting of money; and he might state his opinions fairly and fearlessly. The Jury however were not called upon to decide with reference to these observations, as the pith of the matter is the assertion that Sir John Harvey recommended certain changes to serve his own private ends. And if that is its meaning it is a gross libel. No man in private life should be charged with acting from impure motives; consequently the Governor of a colony should be exempt from such an aspersion; and to charge his Excellency with such conduct was libellous in the eye of the law. On the other side it was asserted that those expressions were meant to defame. Allusion was made by the writer to "a job"; and much had been said with reference to this vulgar way of speaking. The criminality however did not lie in that; but the alleged crime is where after stating the changes that had been effected, as he asserts to answer His Excellency's views; he goes on to say, that after obtaining an additional salary of £500, Sir John intended "to pocket a sly £1000 thro' Government House." In the first place it stated that all the political changes that had taken place, had been made to meet His Excellency's own personal views, and then that he intended to appropriate an additional £1000 annually to his own private purposes.

An evidence had been called to prove that Sir John Harvey has two sons; and Mr. Wetmore speaks of accounts being laid before the House of Assembly. It was unnecessary to refer to what were Mr. Wetmore's impressions as to the meaning of the publication. But having got in evidence the reference to the appropriation of money ostensibly for repairs, it would be for the Jury to consider whether it meant to impute improper motives to Sir John Harvey; and if it did, then it would be a libel. His Honor said he thought it did;—that it bore the construction given to it in the information; and he conscientiously asserted it was a libel. But it was for the Jury to take the paper with them, and to apply their own understanding, without attending to any opinion that he might have formed. Here was no nice point of law or evidence to be determined; but it was a question

for the Jury to decide according to their view of the subject. He would say further, that if from any ambiguity of language—or in mercy to the defendant, they thought it was not intended to traduce Sir John Harvey, they should then say so; and the defendant must be taken to be innocent, and His Excellency had not been defamed. But if they were of opinion the publication had that effect, then they should fearlessly declare it. There was a question as to malice with which the defendant stood charged. It was impossible to look into a man's mind; and therefore the existence of malice must be implied if a libel had a tendency to defame and injure; and taken in that view the publication implied the malice which the law requires. His Honor said he should not take up more of the time of the Jury, because the decision lay with them, as to the publication of the paper, and its being calculated to produce the effect set forth in the information; but with these observations would leave the case with them.

After an absence of four hours, the Jury came into court with a verdict of Not Guilty.

ERRATA.

Having been at St. John when the first side of the paper was worked off, there are a few inaccuracies, three or four of which we think it necessary to rectify.

In the second column of the first page, 57th line from the top for "returned" read retained.—31st line lower down, for "road" read word.—Third column 19th line from the bottom for "abused" read observed; 6th line from the bottom for "entrammelled" read untrammelled. Fourth column, 9th line from the top for "it" read he. Fifth column, last line but one of the first paragraph, for "truth" read breath. Eighth line from the bottom of the column, for "and" read but.

In copying the report of the trial our contemporaries will have the goodness to make these corrections.

FOR THE SENTINEL.

MR. EDMUND WARD.—Sir, through the medium of your valuable paper, I wish to enquire the reason that Newspapers are so badly delivered on the road between Fredericton and Woodstock. A week or two before the trial between His Excellency and the Editor of the Chronicle, you promised to give the full details of the same, therefore causing considerable anxiety to know the result. But the paper printed on Saturday before last, has not come to hand yet; and last Saturday's paper was left miles from the usual place with a private man. Now Sir, knowing the general conduct of the Mail Carriers, I wonder why they hold that situation, for I think the Mail ought to be carried by responsible persons.

OBSERVER.

York County, Nov. 10, 1840.

IN COUNCIL, November 2, 1840.

The undermentioned applicants for the purchase of Crown Lands, may have the tracts applied for by them on the following terms, if payment be made before the 12th day of January next, and five shillings additional will be charged on each purchase, for postage, &c.

GLOUCESTER.
Thomas Doke, 3s. per acre, down.
Benjamin Sullivan, do. do.
R. Richardson, 2. 6d. per acre, down.
NORTHUMBERLAND.
Joseph Beck, Jun. 100 acres at 3s. per acre, down, and the remaining 24 acres at Auction.
Patrick Johnson, 3s. per acre, down.
James M'Cormick, do. do.
Thomas Monaghan, do. do.

KENT.
S. Richard, 5s. per acre, down.
WESTMORLAND.
Francis Matthews, 3s. per acre, down.
SAINT JOHN.
Isaac Cadman, 3s. per acre, down.
Hugh Moore, do. do.

CHARLOTTE.
Thomas M'Guire, 3s. per acre, down.
KING'S.
John Williamson, 3s. per acre, down.
John Harmer, do. do.
Thomas Leeper, do. do.
William Gray, Jun. do. do.
William Gray, do. do.

QUEEN'S.
E. Welton, 3s. per acre, down.
YORK.
A. W. Cockburn, 3s. per acre, down.
David Little, do. do.
Isaac Little, do. do.
William Little, do. do.
Matthew Little, do. do.

CARLETON.
Samuel Young, 3s. per acre, down.
William Kilburn, do. do.
George Susey, do. do.
John Street, do. do. with 60 Rods front.

William Hay, 3s. per acre, down.
George Sweet, do. do.
The lands applied for by the undermentioned persons, will be sold at Public Auction at this Office on Monday the 4th day of January next, (see advertisement.)

William Hopper.
Charles Colpitts.
John Allen.
Patrick Foley.
J. Oliver Arnold, Jun.

The Tract of Land on the new St. Andrew's Road, near the Hanwell Lake, applied for by the undermentioned Persons, will be immediately Surveyed into Lots on a new arrangement and will be offered in separate Lots at Public Auction at this Office on Monday the 4th day of January next. Upset price, 3s. per acre, beside the expense of survey. As soon as the return of survey is received, an advertisement stating the number and contents of each Lot will be published.

John Johnston.
Thomas Giffin.
David Esansa.
Michael Holland.
E. W. Rainsford.
Thomas Nesbit.
Samuel Hunter.
Hugh Ward.
Wm. Cockburn.

The Petitions of the undermentioned persons are deferred for want of survey.
John Lawlor.
John M'Lean.
W. Letson.
P. Lynch.
J. Nowsorthy.
James Nugent.
J. McNamara.
Martin Fox.
Thomas Scott.
Beloni Johnson.
Martin Flanagan.
Thomas M'Graw.
The answers to the Petitions of the undermentioned Persons are as follows:—

Paul Niles, and John Niles, referred to the Surveyor General.
Thomas Earls, not complied with, the Land having been previously applied for for settlement.
Laurence O'Leary, may have a Grant of the Land applied for, on payment of 2s. 6d. an acre, down.

Patrick Colter.
P. Grieve.
Andrew Lata.
Daniel Mooney.
John Grieve.
Matthew Stevenson.
A. Stevenson.
John Thomas.

The purchase money will now be received from Frederick and John Steeves on their applications for Land on Coverdale River.
John M'Bean, not complied with.
Clement Thiebaud and Hypolite Vantour, are allowed to lease the Land formerly approved of to them at the reduced price of 2s. 6d. per acre, down.
Nehemiah Merritt, complied with.
Thomas Trueman, not complied with, the Land applied for having been reserved to the Church as a Glebe.
Robert K. Trueman, not complied with, the Land applied for being considered as a part of the School Lot.
John Marshall may have his Grant on payment of £3 1s. 3d.
John M'Lean, deferred for further consideration.

Hugh M'Carthy, complied with.
Joseph Cunard's application, No. 1,216, Black River, not complied with.
C. McPherson, Ordered, That the 5 year licence be cancelled, but not to have credit for the £24.
F. Dailley and A. S. Carman, referred to the Surveyor General for decision.
James Tibbitts, ordered to stand over until the 1st of January.
Messrs. Crookshanks & Walker, complied with.
S. P. Estabrooks, not complied with.
Daniel Hill, referred to the Surveyor General.
James A. Phillips complied with, provided Petitioner gives satisfactory security.
John M'Bean, not complied with.
John Rider, to have permission to remove 200 tons Timber cut by him last winter, on paying the expenses of Mr. Arnold, the Seizing Officer.
Pier Morrison, complied with, on paying the duty on 30 tons.
John M'Millan, to have a Mill reserve on his describing a particular tract according to Mr. Layton's survey of Blocks in 1838.
Joseph Barton and William Brown, allowed Mill reserves, 5,000 each on their paying the expense of survey.
William E. Perley, complied with.
John Maxwell, not complied with.
Stephen Burpe, cannot be entertained.
John S. Taylor, complied with, subject to the Seizing Officer's dues.
John L. Marsh, Ordered, That the Timber be released on payment of single duty, the amount of which will be deducted from the £95, required to be paid by the former Order in Council.

Licences to cut Timber and Logs on the Berths applied for by the undermentioned persons will be offered for competition only between the respective applicants for each Berth at this office on Monday the 4th day of January next. Sale to commence at 12 o'clock, noon. Ten per cent of the duty must be paid on the day of sale, and the remainder within 14 days after. The Berths will be set up at the usual rates of duty.

1st. A Licence to cut Logs on the Berth applied for by John Estabrooks and James Jones, north of the Maguipit Lake, 50M. Lumber.
2nd. A Licence to cut Timber or Logs on the north part of the "Douglas" Block, Sligoonoc, applied for by Isaac Kilburne, Lewis Henstis and J. H. M'Alister, provided Kilburn and M'Alister pay up their arrears.
3rd. A Licence to cut timber on the 8,000 acre, "Moore" Block, Prince William, applied for by James Taylor, and Valentine Pickard, provided Pickard pays up his arrears.
4th. A Licence to cut timber on the "Frink" Block, Palphrey, applied for by James Taylor, Lewis Henstis, and T. E. Grant.
5th. A Licence to cut timber on the "Campbell" Block, Palphrey applied for by James Taylor and William Grant.
6th. A Licence to cut logs on the "Albee" Block, Palphrey, applied for by Cumming Robertson, John Porter and James Albee.
7th. A Licence to cut timber or logs, on the "Robertson" Block, near the Hanwell Lake, (not to interfere with the lands applied for settlement,) applied for by Henry Lunt, George Morrow, James Taylor, and Abraham Long.

The Petitions of the undermentioned persons for licence to cut timber and logs on Crown Lands, are complied with on payment of the duty before the 12th day of January next.
Joseph Cunard, Gloucester.
Joseph Cunard, N. W. Miramichi.
Joseph Cunard, Little S. W. Miramichi.
J. T. Williston, Eel River.
George Williston, Tabuclintac.
A. Rankin, Northumberland.
R. McLeod, Northumberland.
John Rider, (50 tons) New Canaan.
W. Smith, Douglas Valley.
J. Cronk, Nepcis.
C. Connell, River St. John.
Levi Clark, New Canaan.
R. Hutchinson, Bathurst Road.
R. Ritchie, Restigouche.
A. Dickson, Tobique.
O. Ward, Cocagne.
L. Halcrow, Shediac.
J. W. Buchanan, Canoose.
W. Strange, Jr. Canoose.
J. G. Hatheway, Grand River.
C. Connell, Tobique.
Thomas Little, N. W. Miramichi.
Thomas Shaw, Shugamoc.
W. Abrams, N. W. Miramichi.
W. Carr, Geary.
J. Taylor, Tobique.
J. Taylor, Carleton.
A. M'Eachern, Molus River.
W. Taylor, Richibucto.
D. Wright, Kent.
E. Lunt, Salmon River.
G. Perry, New Canaan.
R. Hutchinson, N. W. Miramichi.
G. Elkin, Salmon River.
G. Murray, Kent.
W. MacDougal, Bass River.
R. Cutler, Kent.
W. M'William, Kent.
A. Ritchie, Restigouche.
J. Noble, Shin Creek.
J. Cunard, Bartibogue.
D. Hopkins, Digdequash.
J. Hutchings, Digdequash Brook.
J. Taylor, "Stubbs" Block, Palphrey.
George Porter, Eel River.
William Lindsay, Palphrey Brook.
W. Todd, Jr. Palphrey Brook.
C. Robertson, "Pineo" Block, Palphrey.

The Petitions of the undermentioned are complied with, on payment by them of all arrears due by them.
Thomas E. Perley, Little River.
John McLean, Salmon River.
D. Small, 6 Mill Brook.
W. McLeod, Kouchibouguac.
Charles Upham, Howard Settlement.

The following tracts of vacant Crown Land will be offered at Public Auction, at this office on Monday the 4th day of January next. Sale to commence at 12 o'clock, noon.

TERMS.—10 per cent. to be paid at the time of Sale, and the remainder within 14 days after.
1st. 24 acres, Northumberland, rear part of Lot No. 49, north side S. W. Miramichi River, Blissfield. Upset price, 3s. per acre.
2nd. 200 acres, Westmorland, east of Lot No. 3, Coverdale River. Upset price, 3s. per acre.
3rd. 250 acres, Westmorland, Coverdale River, adjoining north of John Parkin. Upset price, 3s. per acre.

4th. 100 acres, Westmorland, next to E. Allen, north shore of Bay Verte. Upset price 3s. per acre.
5th. 250 acres, Kings, between R. W. Stockton and John Dobson, Smith's Creek. Upset price 3s. per acre.
6th. 100 acres, Kings, Butternut Ridge, adjoining east of T. Oliver Arnold, Jr. Upset price, 3s. per acre.

JOHN S. SAUNDERS,
Surveyor General,
Crown Land Office, November 6, 1840.

TORONTO, Oct. 21.
Responsible Government in Nova Scotia.—It is with unminged satisfaction that we refer our readers to the article from the 'Nova Scotian' in another column, by which we learn that the first public act of Lord Falkland has been to dismiss the Executive Council in whom the House of Assembly declared their want of confidence. The Tory journals in Lower Canada are trying to let Sir Colin Campbell down gently, by assuring the public of the universal regret at his departure, horses taken from his carriage, conduct approved by both Minister and people, &c. &c. &c. The people are not to be duped by such nonsense. The facts of the case are, that the House of Assembly passes a vote of want of confidence in Sir Colin Campbell's council. His Excellency refused to dismiss them. The Assembly then solicited his recall. Their address was not even received at Downing-st., but Sir Colin has been recalled, and his successor has dismissed the obnoxious councillors, and it is further rumoured, that Messrs Howe, Huntington and Uniacke have all been summoned to the new council. This is Responsible Government in practice. The proceedings in Nova Scotia satisfy us that our interpretation of Lord J. Russell's despatch was the correct one, and that there is no doubt whatever, that the great principle for which we have long contended has been virtually conceded. We trust that this news will have the effect of invigorating the energies of the people because it will prove to them that the means of good government are now in their own hands.

THE SENTINEL.
SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1840.

We have completed our report of the trial for Libel, which we commenced last week; and believe it will be found to be a correct one.—The result we understand has created very general astonishment and remark throughout the Province; and from what we heard on our passage to and from St. John, and while there, it does not seem to have given much satisfaction in any quarter.

We observe the writers in the Chronicle of Friday week, attribute the result of the trial to a feeling against the manner in which the government of the country is conducted, and His Excellency's legal advisers; to which we have no hesitation in giving an unqualified contradiction, as we are assured that no political bias operated upon the minds of the Jury. And if any dissatisfaction at present prevails in the Province, it arises from a very different cause than that alluded to.—It is caused by the continued and very general appointment of persons to office who opposed the introduction of reform, and who supported the late government of Sir Archibald Campbell against the wishes of the people; by which means they still possess an influence, that should long since have ceased. It is in vain to attempt to propitiate these people—they will retain in their hearts the same deadly venom against a reform government and a liberal minded Governor, which they have always possessed; and there can never be any permanent tranquillity in these Provinces, until as a party their rule is annihilated.

It is unnecessary here to make any further remark with reference to the trial in question. The Speech of the Solicitor General places the subject in its proper light before the public; and as the report will be widely circulated, the character of the verdict as well as the nature of the offence, will be decided by the united suffrages of mankind.

We have reported this trial most fully.—But it was one of too much importance to be passed over slightly; and we trust our exertions in this as in other instances will procure for the Sentinel additional public patronage and support.

We observe from the Halifax papers, that the Election for that town and county, as was to have been expected, was about to be decided in favour of the reform party; Messrs. Howe and ANNAND will certainly be returned for the county, and the Hon. Mr. McNABB and Mr. FORRESTER for the town, to the discomfiture of the party which proposed Messrs. KEITH and MURDOCH. This result will strengthen the hands of the reformers generally throughout the Province; who, unless they split among themselves, must return a large majority at the next Assembly.

We have inserted a communication to-day, with reference to the non-delivery of the paper between this place and Woodstock, of which we have had repeated complaints, and which has materially interfered with the circulation of the Sentinel; but being satisfied that the entire Post Office arrangements will be shortly placed upon a proper footing, we have hitherto refrained from making any complaint on the subject. And shall now merely state, that a Commission has been appointed in Canada, at the head of which is Mr. STATNER, a zealous and active public officer, whose decision will meet the evils complained of, and in which the people of this Province may place every confidence.

LITERATURE.
We have received a copy of Mr. Laskey's New Work unbound, but not having time to notice it this week, must refer our Fredericton readers to the Author himself, who is here at present soliciting subscribers. The few pages of it over which we have looked, have induced us to have a favourable opinion of the work, which we believe will make its appearance in eight or ten days. We are pleased to learn that His Excellency Sir John Harvey has patronized the Author in an attempt, which we believe to be the first of its kind in the Province.

We cannot learn that any exception has been taken to our report of the Trial of the QUEEN vs LEWIS DURANT, which by mistake has been printed WILLIAM; but we have received a note from J. A. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was

made to Mr. STREET, Esq. complaining that in our editorial remarks, we stated that the counsel for the defence declared the libel to be unjustifiable and unfounded. Such certainly was the impression made upon our mind; and no where do we recollect, that any attempt was