

George Leonard, chamberlain; Bartholemew Crannell, common clerk. It appears from a letter written by Edward Winslow, under date Halifax, January 13th, 1785, to Ward Chipman that the position of clerk of the common council was offered to Mr. Hardy, but was declined by him. Colonel Winslow, in his characteristic style expresses his emphatic approval of the selection of Col. Ludlow as mayor, and adds: "I have never been an enthusiast for towns and cities, but I declare that if this event takes place in all its parts, and Mr. Hardy is induced to accept the other appointment, I shall expect to see Halifax evacuated by the most respectable of its inhabitants and Shelburne totally eclipsed and that immediately."

On the death of Bartholemew Crannell in 1790, Elias Hardy succeeded him as clerk of the common council and clerk of the sessions, retaining the offices till his decease in 1798. He also filled the offices of surrogate for the city and county of St. John and of clerk in the court of chancery.

As clerk of the common council his services were particularly valuable in connexion with much of the early civic legislation; for years nearly all the acts and by-laws connected with the government of the city were draughted by his hand. On the 15th April, 1797, Hardy received the sum of £80 from the council as a compensation for his past services. A correspondent of the St. John Gazette refers to this as an extraordinary donation and asks whether "the repast on Tuesday was a stipulated condition of the grant." We may, however, conclude that as the anonymous communication was placed among the advertisements and marked "paid for," the writers opinion was not considered of much importance and that the grant was simply what it professed to be, a tangible recognition on the part of the council of efficient services rendered by a civic officer.

Elias Hardy represented the county of Northumberland until the dissolution of the first house of assembly in 1792. In the ensuing general election his fellow-citizens showed their confidence in him by electing him one of the representatives of the city and county of St. John. After the expiration of the term of the second house of assembly he was again pressed to become a candidate, but declined nomination presumably on the ground of ill health.

As a member of the legislature his

services were useful and important. As a worker he was industrious and painstaking and in debate his eloquence and ability soon secured for him a foremost position.

Apart from his civic and legislative duties Mr. Hardy's time was fully occupied by the duties incident to his profession. Amongst the many important cases with which he was connected was that of Benedict Arnold versus Munson Hoyt. The action was brought by General Arnold against his former business partner for slander, Hoyt having accused Arnold of setting fire to their store in Lower Cove, which, with its contents, was entirely consumed, and on which the general had shortly before effected insurance to the amount of £5,000. The case was tried before Judge Allen at the September court in 1790. General Arnold claimed damages to the amount of £5,000—the jury awarded him but 20 shillings, which was regarded as practically a verdict for the defendant. In the trial Attorney General Bliss and Solicitor General Chipman were retained on behalf of the plaintiff, whilst Mr. Hoyt retained Elias Hardy. The St. John public apparently had no very exalted opinion of the general's integrity, and their sympathies were with the defendant.

Another celebrated case, in which Mr. Hardy was retained, and which proved a lucrative one for the lawyers employed, was that of James Simonds versus William Hazen, Leonard Jarvis and James White. The case was the outcome of business transactions between the parties, extending over a period of 20 years, a large amount of property being at stake. The case was of so intricate a character that in one form or another it was before the courts for about 25 years. Ward Chipman was retained to look after the interests of his father-in-law, William Hazen, with whom Leonard Jarvis and James White were associated in the suit, and for whom Chipman also acted. James Simonds on his part retained Elias Hardy, of whose ability he had had some practical experience as counsel for his opponent in the case of Simonds versus Davidson.

The proceedings in the Chancery suit were protracted and the documents connected therewith exceedingly voluminous. The first bill of complaint against Simonds was filed by Chipman as attorney for Hazen and Jarvis, July 19th, 1791. It is a formidable roll of parchment comprising 12,000 words. The answer of Simonds, filed by Hardy Feb,