





# IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (MT-3)



Photographic  
Sciences  
Corporation

23 WEST MAIN STREET  
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580  
(716) 872-4503

**CIHM/ICMH  
Microfiche  
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH  
Collection de  
microfiches.**



**Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques**

**© 1986**

# Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- ☐ Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- ☐ Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- ☐ Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- ☐ Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- ☒ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- ☐ Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- ☒ Showthrough/  
Transparence
- ☐ Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- ☐ Includes supplementary material/  
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- ☐ Only edition available/  
Seule édition disponible
- ☐ Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/  
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

☒ Additional comments:  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Docket title page is bound in as last page in book but filmed as first page on fiche.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:


Bibliothèque nationale du Québec

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol  $\longrightarrow$  (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol  $\nabla$  (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:


Bibliothèque nationale du Québec

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole  $\longrightarrow$  signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole  $\nabla$  signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.



COURT OF APPEALS.

OF R. SOVEREIGN LORD THE KING,

*Appellant,*

*and*

ROBERT FROST,


*Respondent,*

*and*

WILLIAM LINDSAY.

—  
Case of ROBERT FROST, the  
Respondent.  
—







*Our Sovereign Lord the KING,*  
(*Intervening party in the Court below,*)

*APPELLANT,*

and

**ROBERT FROSTE,**

(*Plaintiff in the Court below,*)

*RESPONDENT,*

and

**WILLIAM LINDSAY,**

(*Defendant in the Court below.*)

---

*THE RESPONDENT'S CASE.*

---

**T**HE present appeal is brought from a Judgment, rendered in the King's Bench at Montreal, dismissing an intervention filed by "David Ross, Esquire, King's Counsel, for and on behalf of our Sovereign "Lord the King," in a cause wherein the Appellant was Plaintiff and one William Lindsay was Defendant, by which Judgment the intervention of the King was dismissed.

The original action was an action of revendication, instituted by the Appellant against the said William Lindsay, for the recovery of twelve bales of flannels and one bale of superfine cloths, of a large value, belonging to the Appellant and whereof the said William Lindsay had illegally possessed himself.

To this action William Lindsay pleaded the general issue, and two pleas of justification: the first plea of justification alledging that the said goods and chattels were by the said William Lindsay, then and still being Collector of His Majesty's Customs at the Port of St. Johns, arrested, taken and seized *as good and lawful prize to our Lord the King*, for that the said goods were in the possession of persons who, contrary to their allegiance were adhering to and trading with the enemies of our Lord the King, and were then and there employed in conveying the said goods from the Province of Lower-Canada unto the United States of America, for the purpose of trade with the enemies of our Lord the King, in the said United States of America, and of affording assistance and support to the enemies of our Lord the King, whereby the same became and were forfeited as good and lawful prize to our said Lord the King, and that the same then were in the possession of the said William Lindsay as such *lawful prize*.

The second plea of justification states the seizure to have been made by one Menard Harris, one of the Officers of His Majesty's Customs, and by a party of soldiers in the service of our Lord the King. It does not differ in other respects from the preceding plea of justification.



Issue was joined upon these pleas.

In the mean time the Respondent obtained restitution of the property upon giving security for its appraised value.

Subsequently to the joining of issue upon the several pleas of William Lindsay, Mr. Ross obtained leave to file an intervention on the behalf of the Crown.

In this intervention it is alleged, "that on or about the 20th day of December, 1814, and long before and afterwards our Sovereign Lord the King was at open war with the Government of the United States of America, and being so at war, no subject of the King, an inhabitant of this Province of Lower-Canada, had a right to export any articles whereby the enemies of our said Lord the King could be assisted or receive succour. That flannels and every kind of woollens were prohibited and not allowed to be exported from this Province into the United States of America. That the said Plaintiff, in defiance of the common Law and contrary to the allegiance which he ought and was bound to bear to our said Sovereign Lord the King, did on or about the said 20th day of December, 1814, illegally, by circuitous roads and paths, convey and cause to be conveyed to the Southward and beyond the Port of St. John and towards the lines between this Province and the United States of America, the following described goods and chattels, wares and merchandize, to wit, twelve bales or packages of flannels, marked, &c. and numbered respectively, &c. and one bale of superfine cloths, marked, &c. and numbered, &c. with an intent to trade, export or convey the same unto the United States of America, and therewith and thereby aid and succour the Government and the people of the United States of America, then the open enemies of our said Lord the King, contrary to the Laws, statutes and regulations in this behalf made and provided. By reason of which premises the said last mentioned bales and packages were liable to be seized and forfeited. That on the day last aforesaid, at St. John in the District of Montreal, in the Province of Lower-Canada, the bales and packages above and in the Plaintiff's Declaration mentioned and described, were by the said William Lindsay, then and still being Collector of His Majesty's Customs, at the Port of St. John, in the said District, arrested, taken and seized *as good and lawful prize*. Because at the time of the arresting, taking and seizing thereof as aforesaid, the said bales and packages belonged to and were the property of persons unknown, subjects of our said Lord the King, who contrary to their allegiance were then and there adhering to and trading with the enemies of our said Lord the King, and were then and there employed in conveying and causing to be conveyed the said bales and packages out of or from the said Province of Lower-Canada into the said United States of America, for the purpose of trading with and succouring the enemies of our said Lord the King, to wit, the Government and people of the said United States of America; whereby the said bales and packages became and were forfeited *as good and lawful prize* to our said Lord the King, and the same have since continued and now are in the possession and custody of the said William Lindsay, as being such lawful prize as aforesaid, to be disposed of accordingly.

"The King's Counsel prays in consequence that the said bales and packages may, for the reasons aforesaid, be adjudged and declared such good and lawful prize and forfeited, and that the said goods, wares and merchandizes may be ordered to be delivered to our said Lord the

" King, the intervening party in the said cause for the benefit of our  
" said Lord the King, *and all others*, or that the value thereof may be  
" adjudged to be by the Plaintiff paid to our said Lord the King."

To this intervention the Plaintiff filed a plea of general issue.

The cause having been fixed for the adduction of evidence on the  
issue raised upon the intervention, five witnesses were examined on the  
part of the Appellant and four witnesses on the part of the Crown.

The witnesses produced by the Appellant<sup>respondent</sup> are persons whom, if he had  
not been sensible of the unfounded nature of the charge contained in the  
intervention, it would have been the height of indiscretion to produce.

They are the carriers employed by him and the clerk under whose im-  
mediate superintendence the effects were, during their conveyance; men  
who must have known the place of destination of the effects, and who with  
one voice declare that it was Missisqui Bay, in this Province, and not any  
place in the United States of America, and who explain most satisfactorily  
the circumstances which *had excited* the unfounded suspicions of the offi-  
cers of the Customs at St. John.

The witnesses on the part of the Crown are first, two soldiers of the late  
Regiment of De Menron, who were employed to assist in making the  
seizure.

They prove that these effects were seized by them in this Province  
without any warrant whatever, but *manu militari*, the same being in the  
possession of the subjects of the King proceeding in their lawful occupa-  
tions, from one part of the Province to another part of the Province. That  
the persons who were thus interrupted in their lawful avocations were  
but little satisfied with this exercise of military authority, and that there  
was reason to suspect that they would have willingly made a small pe-  
cuniary sacrifice to relieve themselves from the state of duress in which  
they were placed.

A third witness, Joseph Colbath, who had been a prisoner in the United  
States but had effected his escape, swears, that when in confinement, he  
overheard a conversation between some American Officers, in which it was  
said by them that they had no *blankets* for their men, but expected some  
from the North; which information he communicated to the Commanding  
Officer at St. John.

And this evidence is offered on the part of the Crown to shew that the  
Appellant, to supply this want of the King's enemies, had sent to them  
*flannels and superfine broad cloths*.

The parties having been heard upon the intervention and evidence, the  
Court below by their judgment of the 20th day of June, 1817, dismissed  
the intervention.

It is difficult to conceive that the Court below should have pronounced  
any other judgment upon this intervention.

For,

First, the demand is not brought in the name of any Public Officer, by  
Law authorized to bring it.

It is brought in the name of a Gentleman styling himself " King's Coun-  
sel for and on behalf of Our Sovereign Lord the King."

The King's Counsel is not an Officer of the Crown. His commission gives to him precedence but not power of Emolument.

Indeed the King could not by Law grant unto him the power of flying an information or intervention.

1st. Because it would not be warranted by ancient usage.

2dly. Because it would abridge the office and powers of His Majesty's Attorney-General.

But supposing the demand in intervention to have been well brought by the "King's Counsel, for and on the behalf of Our Sovereign Lord the King," it is bad—

1st. Because there is no averment that, when the goods in question were conveyed to *the Southward and beyond the Port of St. John*, our Sovereign Lord the King was at open war with the persons administering the Government of the United States of America; and because it is said only that they were so conveyed about the 20th day of December, 18— which is vague and uncertain.

2dly. Because there is in the said intervention averred as the ground of the demand, a traitorous intent in the Respondent, accompanied by an overt act, which is high treason, and cannot be tried in any civil suit or action.

3dly. Because it is not in the said intervention averred that the goods mentioned in the said intervention are the goods restitution whereof is by the Plaintiff in and by his Declaration demanded.

4thly. Because trading with the King's enemies does not, by the common or Statute Law of the Kingdom, work any forfeiture of the goods used in such trade. Such trading it may be admitted is illegal; an insurance upon the vessel employed in it or upon her cargo may be void (8 T. R. 548.) It may be a misdemeanor to carry corn to the enemy in time of war, as all the Judges said, on a reference in King William's time (1 T. R. 85.) By the Maritime Law, it may be cause of confiscation, provided the party be taken in the act. (Ib.) But this serves only to prove that there are other remedies provided for the mischief. To divest the Appellant of his goods, some known and certain rule of Law must be produced on the part of the Crown.

5thly. But if trading with the enemy does work a forfeiture of the goods used in such trade, the mere intent to trade, though accompanied by an overt act, will not work a forfeiture. The trading itself is a mere misdemeanor, the intent to trade with an overt act, is therefore no crime. In all the cases of condemnation under the Maritime Law in this matter, there has been an *actual trading*, (case of the *Hoop*, L. R. A. R. 1. 196, and cases there cited.)

6thly. If these goods are liable to condemnation at all, they are so liable as prize of war, it is accordingly on this ground that their condemnation is prayed. They must then be goods taken by maritime capture, (which it is not pretended that these goods are,) or goods taken as plunder or booty in a mere continental land war. And although there is no instance in history or law, ancient or modern, of any question before any legal judicature, ever having existed about plunder or booty in the Kingdom of England, (Lord Mansfield, *apud* Doug. 614,) yet it is quite certain that to constitute plunder or booty, there must be a taking *from the enemy*. Now the goods in question were not taken from the enemy but from one of the King's subjects.

7thly. But if the goods be liable to confiscation as prize of war, the question of prize or no prize cannot be tried by a Court of mere Municipal Jurisdiction, such as the Court of King's Bench, at Montreal. It could only be tried by a Court conversant with and acting under the Law of Nations. *Lecaux vs. Eden*, (2. Doug. 594, and *Lindo vs. Rodney*, and another.)

8thly. But if the Court of King's Bench at Montreal could lawfully condemn these goods as prize of war, that Court could only so condemn them *during the war*. Now the intervention was filed and the judgment of the Court pronounced after the return of peace.

Lastly. There is no evidence that these goods were conveyed from Montreal with the intent of trading with the enemy,

Quebec, 20th July, 1818.

