

on the suits fast and furious," says the client, "the more suits the more pay." chuckles the Counsel.

"And off they Gallop with old clooty
In search of some fresh prize and booty."

What object it is supposed to be gained by this quaint suit, wherein Richard Roe is charged with having ejected John Doe out of six houses, six barns, six stables, six out-houses, six cottages, six yards, six gardens, six acres of arable land, six acres of meadow land, six acres of wood land, six acres of pasture land, six acres of land covered with water, and six acres of other land, we confess ourselves at a loss to conjecture; especially so, if this formidable array of words is intended to mean in plain sense "the Loyalist Office," which Hill voluntarily left to us, the lease of which expires on the first of May next, when we shall become sole Lessee,—and we are not to appear to this ejectment suit, until some time next June! We suppose the learned in the law can inform us; and we, exceedingly lament that we cannot avail ourselves of the abstruse and erudite reading of Mr. Kerr on this intricate question, for alas! his name again appears as "Plaintiff's Attorney."

Now, kind reader who has followed us thus far through our lamentations, what think you of this business? Is't it queer? But we had almost forgotten to tell you that *Anderson's suit* is for "Hill's grog and gambling table score," and we strongly suspect the note Hill gave him is *anti-dated*; we shall see, for we have given instructions to defend it. We have heard somewhere that the words "barraty" and "pettifogging," are actionable; so we don't apply them to any of our remarks,—"*we wish this to be distinctly understood*,"—but leave our readers, who are better acquainted with these sort of things than ourselves, to form their own opinions. It may be that our ignorance has led us to take an improper view of this matter; but looking at it as we do, in the light of a *vile attempt* to crush us with a multiplicity of suits, and to trammel us at a time when our business affords little leisure to give attention to litigation; we could not, in justice to ourselves, refrain from a passing notice of these STRANGE EVENTS. We wonder if Mr. Hill still requires an indemnity against the debts of Doak and Hill? If he has the modesty to ask it, he shall have it. He has palmed himself upon us and the public quite long enough; and the time has come in which, with his own hand, he has lifted the veil, and stands exposed in all the hideousness of moral deformity. To his own fate, as he has invoked it, we leave him.

Some of our readers may be at a loss to know whether Hill has funds to carry on so many suits, or whether his Attorney has taken them up on SPEC? The only information we can afford them on this knotty point, is by stating that his Attorney (*Mr. Kerr*) holds on to the damages awarded to us in the *privilege case*, WHICH WE WERE TOLD BY HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER WAS PLACED IN HIS HANDS FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF BEING HANDED OVER TO US.

We may have occasion to call attention to those various suits as they shall progress; and when they are ended, we flatter ourselves we shall have acquired a pretty good share of legal lore, and be able to give our readers ADVICE GRATIS.

JUSTICE TRIUMPHANT!!!

VICTORY NO. 1.

We have just returned from the Court of Chancery where we gave our attendance to hear the judgement of His Honor the Master of the Rolls, in the celebrated cause of Doak, at the Suit of Hill. The want of time and space obliges us to condense our report upon this occasion. We give a part of His Honor's decision—A decision which for depth of legal ability has seldom (if ever) been equalled in this Province.

We need not say the Court was crowded to excess, a circumstance unprecedented in Chancery proceedings.—Among the audience we noticed several of the legal profession, (this being a novel case) as well as Honorable Gentlemen of both Houses of the Legislature. Suffice it to say, that His Honor decided—that an agreement by *Parol*, was properly terminated by *Parol*.—That he could not believe the affidavits of the Complainant, so contradicted, by Defendants affidavits.—That an undertaking to pay the debts of the Firm by us, was a valid consideration for the verbal assignment by Thomas Hill—that we had the right to defend our property—and that no ground had been shown for the interference of the Court.

The inference to be drawn from the concluding remarks of his honor is, that the complainant has no right in equity against the Defendant.—So ends the first Suit.

We intend giving a more full report of this judgement in our next.

A FAT JOB.—It seldom falls to the lot of one man "in these degenerate days" to make such pickings out of that class of Persons yecept "Printers," as the following notice exhibits. We wish all our friends like success "in the road to wealth."

Thomas Hill vs. James Doak, (Slander) DAVID SHANK KERR, Plaintiff's Attorney.

Thomas Hill vs. Nicholas Wheeler, (Assault and Battery) DAVID SHANK KERR, Plaintiff's Attorney.

Thomas Hill vs. W. D. Hart, Esq., (Assault and Battery) DAVID SHANK KERR, Plaintiff's Attorney.

Thomas Hill vs. James Doak, (Ejectment) DAVID SHANK KERR, Plaintiff's Attorney.

Thomas Hill vs. James Doak, (Chancery Rejunction) DAVID SHANK KERR, Plaintiff's Attorney.

Alexander Mitchell vs. James Doak, impleaded with Thomas Hill, (Debt) DAVID SHANK KERR, Plaintiff's Attorney.

George Anderson vs. James Doak, impleaded with Thomas Hill, (Debt) DAVID SHANK KERR, Plaintiff's Attorney.

All these Writs are returnable next term!

Who Pays the Paper?
(To be continued.)

We have been informed by a gentleman who lately came from the upper country that the ice has run from out the Restook and Presqu' Isle Rivers, carrying with it the bridges over both those Streams.

NEWS IN ADVANCE OF THE ENGLISH MAIL.

Several of the Passengers by the steam ship *Hibernia* arrived at St. John on Sunday morning last. Willmer and Smith's European Times furnishes the following highly important news.

Sir Robert Peel has been sustained in his financial scheme by a majority of ninety-seven.

This debate is the first skirmish—the precursor of the general engagement. The House, by this majority has only pledged itself to go into committee. The details of the scheme have yet to be discussed and affirmed, or rejected, before it reached the House of Lords; there the same time-consuming process is to be repeated, and probably the spring may be far advanced, or we may have got into the summer solstice, ere legislative adjudication be complete.

ENGLAND'S COMMERCIAL POLICY.—The agitation which is now proceeding in favour of Free-trade is almost exclusively confined to the walls of Parliament. The people out of doors—the great mass of this thinking, intelligent, stirring nation, require no fillip, want no incentive, to wed them to the cause. Their love is deep and abiding. They are passive, but not indifferent spectators of the conflict. It is the nation *versus* the lords of the soil; justice and expediency on the one side—obstinacy and selfishness on the other. We have alluded below to the monster debate, and its all but monster majority—a majority too potent for the landlords to struggle against. The safety of the measure is insured; and our transatlantic readers, engaged with commerce with England, may rest satisfied that Peel's commercial policy will become the law of the land. There will be wranglings, there will be delay, but there will not, cannot be defeat. The events of the last few days show that the House of Lords will swallow the pill, with wry faces; it may be, like children taking medicine; but they will gulp it down, from a conviction of its necessity—combined probably, with a conviction equally strong, that they will be made to do so should they turn restive.

Still, it is doubtful whether the repeal of the corn laws will be immediate. On Monday night, Mr. Villiers moved, in committee, for the immediate repeal of the duties on corn, instead of the repeal three years hence, enforcing his position cleverly by proof, that the present time was the best adapted for the interests of the agriculturist; that now he could better compete with his foreign rival, when wheat was scarce and dear in all parts of the world, instead of three years hence, when it might possibly be cheap and plentiful. The debate stood adjourned until the following night, and at the time we write—on the evening of Tuesday—we are unacquainted with the result. It is just possible, if the morning papers are expressed to Liverpool to-day, that the division may arrive here an hour or two before the sailing of the packet, and thus cross the Atlantic with the *European Times*; but we are not ubiquitous, and in the absence of advices from our London representative at this late hour, we are in the dark as to the result. In all probability, however, the sense of the House will be against Mr. Villiers; as Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel think that it is impolitic, on the score of success, to depart from the scheme as originally propounded. The Minister would be delighted to be left in a minority, but the landlords, there is every reason to apprehend, making the best of what they consider a bad bargain, will hold him to his three years' term, and divide with him against the immediate repealer.

All depends upon the landlords, for the Free-traders in the House are not numerically strong enough to beat the Ministerialists, the Whigs and the Protectionists. But nothing in their previous tactics can lead us to hope that the latter will exercise a generous and dignified liberality on this occasion.

The division on Saturday presents some curious results. The House, as our readers are probably aware, consists of 656 members; of these, 227 Liberals voted with the Minister, and 112 Tories—total, 339; against him, 11 Liberals, and 231 Tories—total, 242, which make the majority of 97. There was 30 Liberals absent, and 15 Tories; 11 Liberal pairs, 13 Tory pairs; 5 vacancies, and the Speaker, 6; making up the full compliment of the House—656. Sir Robert Peel's supporters, it will thus be seen, only numbered about a sixth of the representation, and in this estimate are included 27 officials. It is clear, then, that without the aid of the Liberals he would have been *hors de combat*; in other words he would have been destroyed by those who made him.

HEALTH OF SIR ROBERT PEEL.—Rumours have been current recently unfavourable to the health of Sir Robert Peel. It is said that he had been twice cupped in the neck, to ease the pressure on the organs of the brain, under which he laboured, and that his health involved a speedy relinquishment of the cares and anxieties of office. These rumours caused much uneasiness, until at length an official contradiction appeared, which declared them unfounded—adding, that he never was in better health.

OREGON.—The turn which this vexed question has taken has excited surprise; for it was hoped that the commercial measures of the present government would have facilitated the settlement of the dispute, on terms satisfactory to both parties. The cotton market advanced on some descriptions an eighth, when the belligerent purport of the advices by the packet transpired. The peremptory refusal of the American Government to submit the question to arbitration, on the ground that it would thereby recognize the rights of the British Government to a portion of Oregon, is regarded as puerile, not to say insulting.

GREAT BATTLE IN INDIA—3,300 BRITISH AND NATIVE—TROOPS KILLED AND WOUNDED—REPORTED LOSS OF 30,000 SIKHS.—Advices from Bombay to the 17th January, furnish accounts of one of the greatest battles ever fought by the British in our Indian Empire, in which we have sustained the known loss of 3,300 of our brave soldiers, including the gallant Sir Robert Sale, Sir J. McCaskill, and Major Broadfoot. When these accounts left the scene of action from Bombay, for transmission to England, there were several Regiments from which returns had not been received, so that a further loss may be calculated upon.

An Extraordinary Gazette gives the official account of all the military operations in this struggle. The result, we are happy to say, is as glorious and decisive a victory as ever crowned the British arms, and equalled only by the field of Waterloo. The following is an outline of the battle.—On the 12th, 13th and 14th of December, the Sikh army crossed the Sutlej, with, at the lowest estimate, 80,000 men (of whom 20,000 or 30,000 were cavalry,) and about 150 pieces of cannon of the largest calibre moveable in the field, and exquisitely finished—an artillery immeasurably more powerful than was ever brought into the field by Wellington or Napoleon. It is only in morals that the Sikhs are to be ranked as barbarous. They are a race as vigorous in body, as acute in intellect, and as skilful in all the arts they cultivate, of which war is the chief, as the generality of Europeans. The place at which this formidable host passed the river may be about 40 or 50 miles from Lahore, the capital of the Punjab, and within a much less distance of Ferozepore, the most advanced of the British posts. Ferozepore is about 15 or 20 miles from the point at which the Sikhs crossed the river, if it is so much. The invaders having established themselves and organized their force on the British side of the Sutlej, made some light demonstrations of attacking Ferozepore in the interval between the 15th and 18th; but, upon the last named day, broke up, and taking the direct road to Delhi, proceeded in a southerly direction, as if they would make Ferozepore, leaving in their right

proceeded about 25 miles to a place called Moodkee, when, on the evening of the 10th, they were met by a part of the British army commanded by Sir H. Gough and the Governor General, Sir Henry Hardinge, who, as second in command, took the field in person. A fierce conflict ensued, in which the Sikhs lost the artillery attached to their division, in number 17 guns. It was in this stage of the battle that Sir Robert Sale and General McCaskill fell. The contest proceeded languidly through the 19th and 20th, the armies on both sides being occupied with the burial of their dead, and the reorganization of their armies.

During these two days the British Commander received some reinforcements; but the invaders having fallen back upon their main body, probably 30,000 or 40,000 presented a prodigiously augmented force; when the shock of battle was renewed on the 21st at a place called Ferozeshar, about 12 miles in retreat from Moodkee. At Ferozeshar the invaders had prepared a strongly-entrenched camp, which they stood prepared to defend with 100 pieces of their huge field-artillery and 60,000 men. Imagination can scarcely depict the fury and the obstinacy of the two days' fight that must have preceded the capture of the invaders' camp with all its material and artillery, and the utter dispersion of the invading army on the 22d December. The most fortunate escaped to islands in the Sutlej, or perhaps to the Punjab bank, but the greater part were scattered in broken parties through the British territories. Their loss is variously estimated at from 25,000 to 35,000 in killed and wounded.—Our loss in killed and wounded, it is to be feared falls little short of 3,300, including 50 European officers.

IRELAND.—The affairs of Ireland are absorbed in the contemplation of the great Free-trade drama which is now being acted in England. Mr. O'Connell is in London, and the management of the Repeal Association is confided to his Lieutenant, Mr. Smith O'Brien. A Bill introduced into the House of Lords, the object of which is to render life and property more secure in the sister country, has met with a good deal of opposition, and much angry recrimination. The Bill proposes to give the Lord Lieutenant the power of declaring disturbed districts under the operation of the act; injured persons are to be compensated; the protective force is to be increased; and a tax is to be levied upon the district itself for the payment of expenses. The curfew of the Norman conqueror is to be revived—people in the proscribed part of the country are not to be out of their homes between sunset and sunrise. All this seems arbitrary, and, in the present enlightened age, barbarous; but if the brutal murders, assassinations and illegal associations, at once the bane and the opprobrium of the land can be arrested, it will go far to reconcile all honest and well-disposed people to the infliction. Happily, this coercion bill is to be accompanied by conciliatory measures of a political and agricultural kind. A bill for the improvement of land, by providing compensation to tenants; a bill amending the laws relative to the registration of voters, and another for placing the municipal franchise of England and Ireland on the same footing, are amongst the promised measures of amelioration.

We understand that the British and North American Royal Mail Company, anxious to prosecute the service which they have hitherto conducted with such vigour, have determined on immediately laying down another steamer of greater power for the conveyance of the mails between Liverpool and America.

Up to the time of our going to press, 11 o'clock last evening, the English Mail had not arrived at this city.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

(From Mr. Blatch's Reports.)

THURSDAY, March 19.

STEAM BOATS.

In Committee of the whole on Resolutions of Appropriation (Hon. Mr. Gore in the Chair,) after reading the following Resolutions:

"To Isaac & John G. Woodward, the sum of £120, to reimburse them duties paid on a steam engine and machinery, on an improved principle, for a steam-vessel, imported from the United States;"

Hon. Mr. SHORE said, he thought the time was gone by, for making such grants as this: it was all very well to do so, in the beginning of such establishments, when some encouragement was necessary, to assist in the first undertaking of a new speculation; but Steamboats had now been so long and successfully established, that he thought they might well rest on private means. He had understood, that the profits of some of the Steamers were immense; and he did not see any necessity for further grants of this nature.

Hon. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL believed that the machinery of this boat, [the "*Robert Rankin*,"] was very imperfect and inefficient; and that the boat would not answer the purposes intended; she certainly, therefore, did not improve the navigation of the country, and was not entitled to such a bounty as this.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSTON said, the Hon. Attorney General was not quite rightly informed on the matter. The only difficulty had been, that there was a want of power in the machinery; the boat was too large for the power of the engines. But that deficiency had now been entirely remedied the owners had made essential improvement in her during the winter, by enlarging the boilers, and also extending the accommodations for passengers. The machinery was on a new principle, that of "*Ericson's propeller*," which could not be obtained in this country; and he did not think it could even be got from England, without sending home plans and models; and therefore the owners were obliged to get it from the United States.—As to the emoluments of Steam-boats between St. John and Boston; he thought it was very problematic as to their having made much money; indeed he believed they had hitherto been rather a failure than otherwise. First, there was the *Royal Tar*; that boat did anything but make money; then there was the *North America*; she had never paid, having been driven off the route by American boats; and in fact, mere passenger boats would not pay on that route. The boat therefore, was built to carry a large amount of freight; and would be a material benefit to commerce; and therefore he hoped there would be no objection to this return of duties.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD expressed some doubt, as to the propriety of the grant, if the boat was inefficient; but if otherwise, it might all be very well.

Hon. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL said, that this was giving a bounty for the establishment of a Steam Boat; now this Boat was certainly an inefficient one, she did not answer the purpose; and then she would only stand in the way of some other person establishing a better boat. The owners should have taken care to build such a boat, as would fully answer all the purposes required, before they asked for a bounty. As to its having been a problem, whether other boats had made money; he thought it was no problem that they ought not to have made money; because none of the boats yet employed on the Bay of Fundy were in any way fit for the purpose. Such boats as had hitherto been in operation, had been a drawback instead of an encouragement to improvement; the manner in which they were built, the manner in which they were conducted, and everything belonging to them was as bad as could be. They only stood in the way of other persons venturing to establish more efficient boats; and if the Legislature went on in this way, by giving bounties to such boats, they would never have a really good boat at all. Then, again, what prevented the establishment of a good boat on the river St. John? Why, it

was, because there were so many bad boats on the river, competing with each other and sharing the profits, that it deterred anybody from the speculation of building a better one lest it might turn out to be a ruinous venture.—The hon. Attorney General concluded with expressing his decided opinion, that the boat now in question was the last that should be thought of for encouragement by a pecuniary grant.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSTON replied, that the Hon. Attorney General had not seen the boat as lately as he [Hon. Mr. J.] had; or he would have altered his opinion. The difficulties and deficiencies at first experienced in her, were all now entirely obviated; the boat had been greatly altered and improved; in fact, she was now quite a different boat from what she was at first; and therefore deserved encouragement.

Hon. Mr. MICHIN said a few words, which we did not hear; after which, the Committee divided on the question:—Contents:—5.—Non-contents:—6.—And so it passed in the negative.

CLOTH MANUFACTURE.

The following resolution being read:—"To Seymour Pickett, of King's County, a sum not exceeding £50., to encourage his Cloth manufactory;"

Hon. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL deprecated the system of allowing grants which had been rejected at one Session, to be thus brought up again at another. This grant had been thrown out last year; and now here it was again. It was really a mere waste of breath, to express opinions and decide on matters of this kind, if they were constantly to be tried over again in this manner.

Hon. Mr. WYER briefly supported the resolution; as he thought the object was one which ought to be encouraged.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSTON said, that last year he had opposed this grant, and also a similar one to another establishment in Charlotte County, and both were then thrown out. Both however, had now come up again; and as one of them had been passed, and the present one appeared to be the more efficient establishment of the two, he should now support it. Last year, also, he was under the impression, that this manufactory was paying remarkably well; but he had since learnt the contrary; though he did not know the cause of its want of success; whether it arose from want of encouragement or from bad management.

His honor the PRESIDENT made a few observations, which we could not hear.

Hon. Mr. CHANDLER briefly supported the resolution.

Hon. Mr. SAUNDERS also advocated the grant, on the broad principle, that every new enterprise in manufactures, in a young country, ought to receive encouragement from the public resources.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD thought the hon. Member who had spoken last, had not read Sir Robert Peel's late speech. The principles of the present day were quite contrary to those urged by the hon. Member; it was found, that private capital, if left to private judgment and management, would always seek the most profitable sources of investment, and would produce the most beneficial results when left to its own natural operation; but the system of giving bounties was a system of directing private individuals as to what objects they might invest their capital in, for their own peculiar benefit.—After some additional observations, in support of these principles, the hon. Member observed, that this grant had been fully discussed last year and thrown out; and unless some new facts were brought forward, to support cases which had been so disposed of, he was not disposed to sustain grants which had previously been considered and rejected.

Hon. Mr. SAUNDERS, in reply, contended, that wherever the raw material for any branch of manufacture existed in the Province, he would always encourage the importation of machinery, with which to manufacture it; and that unless such protection were afforded, artisans and mechanics would be driven out of the country, to seek employment elsewhere.—The remarks made by Sir R. Peel might be extremely well adapted to the present state of Europe, but not to new colonies; and it should be remembered, that Great Britain had risen to her present state of wealth and greatness, entirely under the operation of the protective principle.

Hon. Mr. HATCH said, that Great Britain could not be compared to this Province at all. This country was merely in an infant state, just crawling along; while Great Britain had long ago carried at maturity. He very much feared, that Sir R. Peel's principles were far more calculated to pull down the greatness of Great Britain than to advance it. The Hon. Member then, at some length, contended, that it was the protective system alone, that had built up Great Britain, and brought the United States to their present prosperous condition; and supported the present grant, on the principle that every branch of domestic manufacture should as its outset, receive public encouragement in a new country.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD, in reply, maintained, that it was now generally admitted by politicians, that Great Britain had arrived at her present state of eminence, not in consequence of protective principles, but in spite of them; and with regard to this particular grant the Hon. Member urged, that its object was not to encourage the manufacture of the substantial homespun of the country, which was good enough for general use, and which he had for years worn himself, with much comfort and pleasure; but to promote the making of fine broad cloth, for hon. Gentlemen to wear; and he really thought, that those who wished to wear such cloth, should pay for it, without the aid of Provincial bounty.—This, also, was an attempt to encourage persons to compete with the vastly superior Cloth manufactures of England; which was quite an absurdity in a Colony like this.

Hon. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL contended that the Hon. Member opposite (Hon. Mr. Hatch,) had not taken the proper distinction between restriction and bounty; and that the wealth of Great Britain had not arisen from bounties but from the restriction of importation of foreign products in competition with her own manufactures.—But with regard to the United States; they were now just beginning to retrace the steps they had so long followed, and to abandon those restrictive principles, which experience had proved to operate so injuriously to young countries. They had found, that the attempt to support their own manufactures, by high restrictive duties, so as to enable them to compete with the much cheaper fabrics of older countries, was only taxing the people at large, to an immense extent, for the benefit of the few; this was proved to be the effect of restrictions; and if they had gone further and given bounties to all sorts of new enterprises, the whole revenues of their country would have been swallowed up, in maintaining such an absurd system.—After some other additional remarks, the hon. Attorney General observed, that with regard to the question, of allowing grants to be brought up repeatedly in this manner, after they had once been disposed of by this House, he was decidedly against such a practice; and would rather establish the principle, that when a grant was once thrown out, it should never be taken up again.

Hon. Mr. SAUNDERS hoped the House would never establish any such principle; but on the contrary, that whenever a grant had been thrown out, and afterwards additional information had been received, and a better case made out, it should be properly and reasonably discussed on its merits, without reference to former circumstances.—The hon. Member then again urged the propriety of passing this grant, on the principles he had previously stated; and in reply to Hon. Mr. Botsford observed, that he wished to encourage this broad cloth manufactory, not that Honorable Gentlemen exclusively might wear such cloth, but that the people of the country generally might be able to wear good cloth, of their own manufacture.

After some few remarks, from the hon. Messrs. Chandler and Black, the Committee divided:—

Contents:—6.—Non-Contents:—5.—And so it passed in the affirmative.