

THE NEW-BRUNSWICK
ROYAL GAZETTE.

[Volume VI.]

TUESDAY, 7th NOVEMBER, 1820.

[Number 36.]

The Gazette.

By His Excellency Major-General
GEORGE STRACEY SMYTH,
(L. S.)
Lieutenant-Governor and Com-
mander in Chief of the Province
of New-Brunswick, &c. &c. &c.
G. S. SMYTH.

A Proclamation.

WHEREAS the General Assembly
of this Province stands prorogued
to the second Tuesday in October next: I
have thought fit further to prorogue the said
General Assembly; and the same is hereby
prorogued to the second Tuesday in Decem-
ber next ensuing.

Given under my Hand and Seal,
at Fredericton, the twenty-eighth
day of September, in the year of
our Lord one thousand eight
hundred and twenty, and in the
first year of His Majesty's
Reign.

By His Excellency's Command,
H. H. CARMICHAEL,
Dep. Sec.

By ALEXANDER DAVIDSON,
Esquire, one of the Justices of His
Majesty's Inferior Court of Com-
mon Pleas for the County of North-
umberland, in the Province of New-
Brunswick.

NOTICE is hereby given, that on the
application of *John Forbes*, of the
firm (of *Samuel Drinkwater* and *John
Forbes*, Copartners in Trade) of the Parish
of Chatham, in the County and Province
aforesaid, Merchants, to me duly made, pur-
suant to the directions of the Act of the
General Assembly of this Province in such
case made and provided; I have directed
all the Estate as well real as personal, of
David Tozer, late of Northesk in the County
aforesaid, Lumberer, (which said *David
Tozer* has departed from, and is without the
limits of this Province, or concealed within
the same, with intent and design to defraud
the said *John Forbes* and his said Copartner
in Trade, and the other Creditors of the
said *David Tozer*, if any there be, of their
just dues, or else to avoid being arrested by
the ordinary process of law, as has been
made to appear to my satisfaction) to be seized
and attached; and that unless the said
David Tozer do return and discharge his
debt or debts within three months from the
publication hereof, all the Estate as well real
as personal of the said *David Tozer*, within
this Province, will be sold for the payment
and satisfaction of the Creditors of the said
David Tozer.

Dated at Nelson, in the said County
of Northumberland, the fifteenth
day of August, in the year of our
Lord one thousand eight hundred
and twenty.

ALEX. DAVIDSON, J. C. P.
JOHN AMB. STREET, ANY.

By HUGH MUNRO, Esquire, one
of the Justices of His Majesty's
Inferior Court of Common Pleas
for the County of Northumberland,
in the Province of New-Brun-
swick.

NOTICE is hereby given, that on the
application of *John Cole*, of Saint
Peters, in the Parish of Saumarez and Pro-
vince aforesaid, Carpenter and Joiner, to
me duly made, pursuant to the directions of
the Act of the General Assembly of this
Province in such case made and provided; I
have directed all the Estate as well real as
personal, of *Alexander Gordon*, *James Bab-
cock*, and *John Lawrence*, Lumberers, also
late of St. Peters, in the County aforesaid,
(which said *Alexander Gordon*, *James Bab-
cock*, and *John Lawrence*, have departed

from and are without the limits of this Pro-
vince, or concealed within the same, with in-
tent and design to defraud the said *John
Cole* and other Creditors of the said *Alex-
ander Gordon*, *James Babcock*, and *John
Lawrence*, if any there be, of their just dues,
or else to avoid being arrested by the ordi-
nary process of Law, as has been made to ap-
pear to my satisfaction) to be seized and at-
tached; and that unless the said *Alexander
Gordon*, *James Babcock*, and *John Law-
rence*, do return and discharge their debt or
debts within three months from the publica-
tion hereof, all the Estate as well real as
personal, of the said *Alexander Gordon*,
James Babcock, and *John Lawrence*,
within this Province, will be sold for the
payment and satisfaction of the Creditors of
the said *Alexander Gordon*, *James Babcock*,
and *John Lawrence*.

Dated at St. Peters, in the County of
Northumberland, the twenty-first
day of September, in the Year of
our Lord one thousand eight hun-
dred and twenty.

H. MUNRO, J. C. P.
JOHN AMB. STREET, ANY.

Agricultural.

From the 'Code of Agriculture.'

Reaping.

It is the opinion of experienced husband-
men, that wheat should be cut down some
days before it is fully or dead ripe. The
grain hardens well in the sheaf;—the sam-
ple is better,—and there is nothing lost in
measure, by this mode of management. The
harvest thus begins earlier, and its labours
are more equally distributed.

Barley ought likewise to be cut before it
is too ripe, otherwise the straw becomes brittle,
and that occasions much loss, by the
heads breaking off.

Though oats are reckoned a hardy grain,
yet the more early varieties, being liable to
damage from high winds, or from exposure
to much wet, ought to be cut as soon as they
are nearly ripe, in order to lessen the risks to
which they are exposed.

Beans should be cut down, as soon as the
eye has attained a deep colour, and if the
weather be dry, instantly made up into
sheaves. The straw will thus be of triple
value, and the grain of superior quality.

So much for the culture of the crops be-
fore they are cut down. The instruments
by which this operation is effected are next
to be considered.

Various plans have been devised for cut-
ting down crops of grain; as reaping by a
sickle, or reaping hook; mowing by a
scythe, and bagging. The plan of cutting
down corn by machinery, though it has
made some progress, has not yet been
brought beyond the line of occasional ex-
periment.

a. Brown's Rural Improvements, vol. ii. p.
310.—Young's Calendar, p. 420.
b. Paper from Mr. John Shirreff; Comm. vol.
iv. p. 172.

LONDON.

TRIAL OF THE QUEEN.

SEVENTEENTH DAY—SEPT. 5.

(Continued from our last.)

Is it true you came over in a Spanish
family? *It is not true.*—Did you say you
had a lawsuit against the Princess? I said I
had a lawsuit, but I meant I was in the Pro-
cess against the Princess. In saying you
had a lawsuit, instead of saying you were a
witness was it intended a *double entendre*
against the Princess to the person you spoke
it.

The Attorney General objected.
Mr. Brougham argued the right of put-
ting the question, and in support of it cited
the cross examining of *Judy Phillips* in the

Duchess of Kingston's case by Mr. Mans-
field.

The Lord Chancellor decided that the
question was relevant.

Question repeated.—Yes, I meant it as
a *double entendre*. Did you disclose to M.
Marietti in any way that you were witness
against the Princess? I told M. Marietti
after I returned from Ashton.

Did you ever apply to be taken back into
her Royal Highness's service? *Non mi
recordo.* Did you ever represent, after you
left her Royal Highness's service, that you
were in a destitute condition? Never. Did
you ever entreat any person of her Royal
Highness's household to have compassion on
your dreadful situation, after you left her
Royal Highness's service? I have never
been in a dreadful situation. Will you
swear that you never entreated one of the
suite of her Royal Highness to take pity or
have compassion on you after you left her
Royal Highness's service? *Non mi recordo.*
On what account of pity?—Answer my
question, before you put one to me. Ques-
tion repeated. It may be I did so. Did
you ever represent to any one, after you left
the Princess's service, that you taxed your-
self with ingratitude for your bad conduct to
a kind and gracious mistress.

The Attorney-General objected to Mr.
Brougham's question; he said the represen-
tation might be in writing; he might ask if
the witness told any person.

The Attorney-General said the witness
had been very ill for some days, and he
hoped the House would allow him to sit
when he was fatigued.

Interpreter.—The witness says he feels
unwell, and requests a little time to with-
draw.

Mr. Brougham contended that the objec-
tion made by the Attorney-General was not
valued, even upon the ground of the decision
to which their Lordships had come upon the
production of Dumont's letters. The
witness was not asked if he had written thus
or thus, though perhaps it might come out
afterwards that he had done so. He was
only asked if he had ever made such or such
a representation.

Mr. Denman begged to address the
House upon the interposition (the Attorney
General has so improperly taken, and the sug-
gestion he had given to the witness that he
was not bound to answer whether he had or
had not made such a representation.—The
Learned Gentleman contended, that if he had
written document they had a right to ask him
if he had made any such representation as
that document contained, for the purpose of
trying his credit. Unless the witness was al-
lowed to be examined in the course in which
Mr. Brougham wished to proceed, it would
be impossible to develop the most wicked
conspiracy ever engendered, or to discover
the perjury of the most vile witness ever
brought into a Court of Law.

Cross examination continued.

Did you ever say to any body that your
conduct towards the Princess was liable to an
imputation of ingratitude to your generous
Benefactress? Never. Is that your hand-
writing?—(showing a letter)—It is. Is
that also your hand-writing?—(showing
another part)—It is.

The Attorney-General said he could not
see the letter.

I know it, said Mr. Brougham, and I
intended it should be so.

Did you ever go by any other name.
What is it.

(The witness said he could not answer,
and begged as a favour from the House not
to have it stated, as he might be exposed to
the fury of some persons by doing so, and
begged the House to desire that the question
and answer might not appear in the public
papers.)

Who did you come to England with? A
courier called Krous. Was he in custody

for dealing in forged notes; did Krous
come to London with you, or remain in
Paris? He came to London. Do you ex-
pect any thing? I hope my expenses will
be paid.

Re-examined by the Attorney-General.
Did her Royal Highness give you a cer-
tificate of character? Yes. Is it about
you? Yes. Have you seen her write? No.
Who gave you the certificate? Countess
Schavini. Did any conversation pass
between you and Marietti at that time,
relative to your being a Witness against the
Queen? Marietti came and told me, that
the other Marietti had said that the two Mr.
Broughams were his friends, and—

Here Mr. Brougham objected to the evi-
dence, and was interrupted by Lord Ex-
mouth.

Lord Grey said it was Mr. Brougham's
duty to do so.

Lord Holland also said the same, and was
very severe upon Lord Exmouth.

Lord Exmouth replied with some warmth
to Lord Holland.

The Lord Chancellor concurred with
Mr. Brougham, and said the answer was
irregular.

Lord Redesdale said the question was put
properly.

Re-examination continued.

What induced you to tell M. Marietti
that you were a witness against the Queen?
Marietti had already been told by somebody,
that I was a witness against the Queen, and
he asked me whether it were true; I an-
swered yes, and he told me—(Interrupted
by Mr. Brougham, who objected again to
evidence, as not at all arising out of the cross-
examination.)

The House had not adjourned when our
Reporter had closed his letter.

EIGHTEENTH DAY—SEPT. 6.

The witness, GIUSEPPI SACCHI, alias
Sacchini, was brought to the bar and re-ex-
amined by the Att'y. General.

You stated that you assumed the name of
Milani; why did you assume that name? I
took the name on account of the tumult
which had taken place; and of the danger
which I should run if I had come under my
own name—knowing that should be known.
When did you assume the name by which
you now go? Immediately after the affray,
or the affair that happened at Dover. You
have stated that you took an oath, when was
that? I do not remember exactly the day,
but it was about two months ago. On
what occasion were you sworn? The oath
was proposed to me by the advocate Powell.
For what purpose were you sworn? He
(Powell) told me that he had received a
letter from Lord Liverpool, who said it was
necessary to take this oath. Did Mr. P.
state any thing more as to the purpose for
which the deposition was to be used? He ad-
ded nothing else.

Lord Buckingham—Who is Marietti,
whom you know in London? I have known
three gentlemen in London of that name.
You have said in the course of your exami-
nation, that Marietti knew, that you were
to be a witness in this cause? I have said
that Marietti knew that I was a witness.
I told him so. Did any of the Marietti's
whom you are acquainted with in London
make any proposition to you touching the
evidence you are to give in this cause? Sig-
nor Marietti came to my lodgings one day,
and told me that he wanted to speak to me;
and he told me that he was directed by Mr.
Brougham, the brother of her Majesty's At-
torney-General, who had called upon him
in the morning, and enquired whether he
knew me, and he answered that he knew
me; and Mr. Brougham's brother asked
him if he would be enabled to learn from me
something relating to the witness. Mr.
Marietti added, as Messrs. Brougham have
done me some service while I had some trans-
actions with her Royal Highness, that I