

No. 38.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION BILL.

The public may judge of the merits of this measure by referring to the 18th page of the Statutes for 1824.—See also No. 35.

On the 23rd Dec'r, 1823, the following persons voted in favour of the bill, on motion of Mr. Jonas Jones, messrs. McLean, Gordon, Burwell, Nichol, Kerr, Shaver, Crooks, C. Jones, Morris, McMartin, P. Robinson, Jonas Jones, Bostwick, R. Hamilton, Ruttan, Attorney General, & Hagerman.

No. 39.

PUBLIC OPINION.

The opinion of Mr. McDonell, of this town, as compared with that of Mr. Burwell, in respect to duelling, is highly creditable to the former. While Mr. Burwell found it convenient to join the Attorney General and his band, in abusing and traducing Mr. Bidwell, and in justifying their pitiful and vindictive efforts to ruin a man every way their superior, merely because they felt his superiority of talent, he [Burwell] was ready to smooth over the misconduct of others; in such language as will be found below. How his old constituents will relish such doctrines we know not.

(From Heron's Gleaner, March 30th 1822.)

Mr. McDonell said, that some hon. members seemed to think it a disgrace to sit along side the sitting member from Lennox and Addington because he was indicted for misapplication of public money; but altho' he was indicted, he was not found guilty by a petty Jury---he, therefore, thought these indictments should not be attended to. There was an hon. member of the Legislative Council, who at this moment stood indicted for MURDER in the United States, and it was not thought a disqualification by the members of that hon. body. There was an Officer of this House also, who was then present, and had been indicted for MURDER, yet, they thought it no disgrace to sit in company with him; therefore, he would banish from his mind, all transactions as to moral character, which took place in the United States.

Mr. Burwell wished to know from the hon. member from Glengarry, whose opinion he always respected, if he meant to compare the situation of the sitting member with the indictments found against the hon. gentlemen alluded to, or if he meant to attach the crime of MURDER to these gentlemen, who were challenged, and killed their opponents in a fair duel!

No. 40. LAWYERS' FEES! A TERROR to the COUNTRY, and a SCOURGE to the Farmers!!

Here VICE assumes the serpent's shape; and Folly personates the ape:

Here AVARICE gripes with Harpy's hawse---there malice grins with tiger's claws, While sons of mischief, Wit, and Guile, are alligators of the Nile---Cotton.

By a reference to the 38th clause of the 1st chapter of the Statutes passed in January 1822, it will be found, that (in the act for regulating the practice of the Court of King's Bench in Upper Canada) in civil suits, before the highest tribunal in the Colony, the allowance of costs to either party; that is, to the attorneys of either party, shall be regulated by the laws and usages of England---a country where living is infinitely more expensive than in this province. And in the 45th clause of the same infamous act, the Judges of the king's bench (themselves the breath of those who raise them to that distinction) are empowered to allow the officers of the court such fees both in criminal and civil cases as they may think fit. They are also authorised to alter and amend the table of fees (from time to time, at their uncontrolled discretion,) payable to attorneys, clerks of the crown, sheriffs, counsel, officers, and other persons. Good God! what ignorant, interested, and unfeeling men they must have been, who could have allowed the lawyers, thus at will, to riot on the poverty, misery, and distress of Upper Canada. It costs a man ten times the time, trouble, and costs, to get through a law-suit here, in common cases of \$100 and under, to what it does in the United States, and all this owing to the ignorance, folly, or cupidity of the people's representatives. No great wonder the country swarms with petty village brawlers of barristers and attorneys---No wonder the Gore District can now maintain eight or ten of them in splendour; while in my memory, a few years ago, there was only one!!! One suit a piece, with the present fees, would keep an ordinarily expensive family in subsistence for a twelvemonth---but---if providence spares my health, I'll do my endeavour to thin their ranks, by suggesting measures to lessen their (often) ill-won gains; and the carrion being gone, the legal vultures will very soon fly off. In favor of this truly infamous bill, this surrendering of the lawful power of parliament, voted Messrs. Jonas Jones