

This state of things being indisputable, it is manifest that in the interest both of the creditor and of the honest debtor, the intervention of the Legislatur^e has become a matter of urgent necessity; and we trust that another session of the Provincial Parliament will not be allowed to pass over without the attention of the Executive being called to the earnest consideration of this important subject.

SHERIFF'S SALE.

By Auction, will be sold, on WEDNESDAY next, the 7th November instant, at the Printing Establishment of S. T. & Co., Printers and Stationers, St. Ursule Street:

ALL the PRESSES, with an ENGINE for working the same, together with TYPES, and other Printing materials, the whole offered under execution.

Sale at ONE o'clock.

J. RICHARD,
Sheriff's Bailiff.

QUEBEC, Nov. 1, 1860.

SALE OF PRINTING MATERIALS.

By Auction, will be sold on TUESDAY, the 6th November, at the Establishment of S. T. & Co., Printers and Stationers, St. Ursule Street:

ALL the PRESSES, with an Engine for working the same, together with the PRINTING TYPES, Paper, and other Printing Materials. Sold under execution.

Sale at TEN o'clock, A. M.

FRS. LEPAGE,
Bailiff.

Quebec, Oct. 31, 1860.

The above we clip from the "Chronicle." It shews what confusion, uncertainty, and irregularities prevail in one of the most important branches of the administration of justice, and this, we state without hesitation, in utter disregard and violation of the plainest rules of law. The well-known maxim, *saisie sur saisie ne vaut*, is founded upon principles both of private right and public convenience. The creditor who *first* attaches the property of his debtor by execution has the preference over other creditors, (unless the debtor be insolvent,) and the law does not recognize the right of any other creditor to step in and take the goods under a second seizure until the former has been withdrawn, abandoned, or determined in due course. The preference we allude to is a preference upon the proceeds, but a second seizure, pending the first, is equally irregular and invalid, whether the defendant be insolvent or not. Under the present system of judicature, goods and chattels may be sold by a Bailiff, as well as by the Sheriff, the latter only executing writs which issue from the Superior Court, which Court has jurisdiction in cases of £50 and upwards. It is evident, with reference to the case to which we draw attention, that judgments have been recovered against the defendants both in the Circuit Court and in the Superior Court, and that both the Sheriff and the Bailiff consider that they have seized; and each, no, doubt, considers himself entitled to sell. One of these officers *must* be wrong, but what is the public to do? and how does this clashing of *saisies* affect all parties, plaintiff, defendant, and creditors generally? With respect to the public, it amounts to loss of time, at least, perhaps of money in travelling or paying agents, and, clearly, a *doubtful* title, should they purchase; as to the plaintiff, *premier saisissant*, in whose suit the later day has been fixed, he finds, when that time comes, that everything has been sold off *the day before* gone for a song probably: and,—then,—he either turns away, muttering something "not loud, but deep," and wipes out the debt from his book—or he braces himself up for a long and uphill fight in Court to set the pretended sale aside, and finally comes off with a victory, glorious but—perhaps barren, as the chances are that the moveables have in the meantime become scattered, or lost, or worn out, or burnt, or—become extinct through some other fortuitous cause. In