

of the House, not a plea to the merits or an assertion of the morality of his client's conduct. And if the Attorney-General (Sir John Thompson) had, as some assert, previously prepared or agreed to a report favourable to Mr. Rykert, it must have been of the same nature as M. Macdougall's defence, and not an approval of what Mr. R. did. As to the question whether an offender can lawfully retain effects obtained by his offence, and whether the law affords means of compelling him to give them up, the answer on moral grounds is pretty clearly given in one of your late numbers, by Hamlet's uncle, that he cannot lawfully retain them; and the said uncle says further:—

"In the corrupted currents of this world,
Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice;
And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
Buys out the law. But 'tis not so above—
There is no shuffling there."

In the case before us is there no way of obtaining the rescission of the grant by which \$200,000 worth of property are said to have been obtained for \$500? Is there no mistake as to the property, no concealment of knowledge of its value by the grantee, no *fraud* which vitiates everything? The Roman law held lesion to the extent of half the value to be sufficient, and though our modern law, founded more on trading principles, does not go so far, I think it still says that very gross inadequacy may afford evidence of the existence of fraud. Is \$200,000 obtained in the manner reported by the committee for \$500 sufficiently gross inadequacy? If English law affords no remedy in such a case, or it exists and our lawyers cannot find it, so much the worse for the law and lawyers, and Mr. Blake's purifying Bill is the more urgently necessary. I think if a like case had been referred by Hamlet's father to his Lord Chancellor, or whoever might there be the proper authority, and he had reported no remedy, King Hamlet would have thought and said there was