

strength, discretion and practice; wherefore, I think the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction to deal with the objections submitted, and that their adjudications for quashing the convictions, are *coram non judice* and void. However, for the various reasons set forth in this pamphlet, especially, there being no legal authority, precedent nor reason to support the judgment of His Honor Judge WELDON for overturning the judgment of the Chief Justice in the Court of Assizes, Oyer and Terminer and jail delivery; nor any legal authority, precedent nor reason in the judgment of the Chief Justice and the majority of the Supreme Court to warrant the reversal of the judgment in the Court of Assizes, etc., and jail delivery; nor any legal authority, precedent nor reason to interfere with the Court of Assizes, Oyer and Terminer and jail delivery, as to its judgment on questions of mere discretion and practice; nor any jurisdiction in the Supreme Court to entertain the objections upon which they quashed the convictions in this case, I, therefore, think that the convictions were improperly quashed. The foregoing has really occupied more of my time than I could conveniently spare, but less than its public importance deserves. I view it as involving subjects of the highest importance to the public justice of this country, and as deserving the consideration of every body. No one, I think, felt more kindly towards the prisoners than I, considering them innocent dupes of others, and having suffered very much from a long imprisonment, and otherwise. The question, however, is not one of Governmental clemency, for which I should go very great lengths, but of judicial justice for the safety of the public here. A trial of forty days length upon a charge of the highest crime that can be committed against the public peace, ends with a verdict of guilty of murder found upon the most ample evidence, and by one of the best Juries I ever saw on a trial, six other prisoners confessing themselves guilty of manslaughter, subject to the objections taken on this trial. The objections are argued before four of the Supreme Court Judges who determine to quash all the convictions. All the prisoners are set free, public justice defeated, and the laws of peace and safety brought into public ridicule and contempt. The enquiry which the public makes is, whose fault is all this? "A mistake of the Crown Counsel," says the *Union Advocate*, "the fault of the Crown Counsel," says the *Farmer*. Not at all so, Mr. *Union Advocate*. By no means so, Mr. *Farmer*. I can speak for myself. No man could have used more care and diligence in duty than I. I could do mine, and I may truly say as much for the Hon. Attorney General, who to my mind displayed remarkable ability and prudence in the course of this trial. We carefully considered the evidence before submitting it, and were entirely guided by the judgments of the Court, which, to our minds, were according to law and the usual

discret  
samo J  
ally w  
doing  
quashi  
severa  
bring  
*Farmer*  
opinic  
have  
blame  
does  
way i  
justic  
mattu  
all in  
accur  
clusio  
and  
ques  
estab  
othe  
majo  
they  
just  
whi  
rece  
of t  
der  
con  
Cou  
the  
wh  
and  
wi  
the  
jus  
an  
as  
th  
me  
re