

close confinement [with an allowance of some 7s. a week for her safe keeping.] must soon follow such a violent ebullition of fury and rancour. Did'st never hear Mr. Editor, of a storm in a teapot? But joking apart, what can be thought of the deplorable ignorance—the unhappy, mistified, unperverted [because natural] understanding, (it could be measured in a thimble) of the poor creature that could pen such trash as the following:—

“As a body of men placed in a public situation and having the public as their judges. The House of assembly, I grant to be judged according to their deserts.” (*Thank God! for we shall soon have vacancies.*) “and are a fair subject of censure.”

The House are a fair subject !!!

“Or if the public papers must be resorted to, let the people set themselves up as the censurers of other mens conduct, do it openly and fairly, not in the despicable and mean way that they have hitherto had recourse to.”

Laud we the Gods! what force—what a glow of language—what a beautiful arrangement of words, what noble contempt for the “pedantry of grammar,”—what arrogant trash!

A story is told of an Irish Gentleman, who, alluding to the rebellion in Ireland, said, it was the bounden duty of every man to give the last guinea he had in the world to save the remainder; but for the “people to set themselves up as the censurers of other mens conduct, do it openly and fairly,” is a high joke, besides being a master-piece of composition.

The old woman says, “Such ridiculous and nonsensical follies can but meet with silent disapprobation from all good and well meaning members of society.” What then is the inference? Why, nothing less than that, Vindicator, having openly expressed her disapprobation, is neither the one nor the other.

“Finis coronat opus.” “Crito had much better have kept himself in his natural sphere.” This remark, for unblushing impudence and effrontery, outdoers Herod, and promptly suggests the question, where would Vindicator be, judging from her contemptible and “despicable” production alone, were she herself confined to her natural sphere? The office of necessary woman [it is mentioned in the court calendar] is unknown here. But in the spirit of pity, and utter contempt, I must bury in charitable oblivion, the rest of the poor creature's outpourings; and possessing as I do, a little of the milk of human kindness in my composition, I beg to inform her in order that she may be partly relieved from the very natural anxiety she evinces, lest the House of Assembly should be lowered in public estimation, that so well understood and so duly appreciated are the important services rendered by the members to themselves; and their friends and the country, during the last session of the General

Assembly, it is a moral impossibility that the members of it can ever be held in “lower public estimation” than they are at the present moment. I am Mr. Editor, Yours, &c. &c. &c.

One of the party that fill your columns.

April 25, 1833.

Sta.—The march of reform is making such rapid strides through the nations of Europe, that one would think its besom ere now, would reach every cobweb that obscures the vision of common sense: the Church—the State, every thing but the Law, has felt its touch! It seems, the Lawyers like the Druids of old, are determined to have their secret, though not sacred, rights and incantations inviolate! Look at the Acts of Legislatures, look at the construction that is put on them by the law gentry, and you can easily conceive they are neither in accordance with reason, sense, or language: the reason is obvious, if law affairs were managed according to the purpose for which they were designed, there would be more wise men and less dupes: this the lawyers know well, and in order to pick the pockets of their dupes, they study a proposition as plain to common sense as the noonday sun, in order to give an air of solemnity to their long studied chicanery!

If law documents or law proceedings were constructed or conducted according to the plain and obvious sense of the language, and divested of its mystical laughtology, how much it would benefit society! how many endless lawsuits would it prevent; and how many individuals it would save from ruin! for nine cases in ten, such disputes arise, more from the misconception of words than from any real cause. The idea I attach to the word Law, is this: a scrutiny or examination in order to learn how far any subject of dispute, between parties, is conformable or repugnant to certain rules, formed by the common consent of society, for their well-being, in order to meet the ends of justice. Now these rules commonly called laws, being made for society, and not for any particular individual, should be as intelligible as possible to every person on whom they are binding. Is this the case? No such thing; the law folk have generally a hand in making them, therefore, they seldom fail to fashion them so that their obscurity may, one day or other, bring them a fee for an *admirceissement*: so it is, nature wisely provides for the support of her offspring—one animal lives by sucking the blood of another! Language was given us in order to express our ideas, and to communicate our thoughts to one another.—Now when two persons mutually agree in some contract, it is not obvious they use the most appropriate expression, that they may reciprocally understand the nature of the covenant,—thus agreed, and thus understanding each other, they procure a legal scribe to give body and substance to the subject, in order to stand the fiery ordeal of a forensic investigation. This he draws up in a law jargon of antiquated Norman French, Old Saxon, and obsolete phrases, the meaning of which he scarcely understands himself; and six in ten, ordinary readers understand as little as they do Chinese. What can be more truly ridiculous, than the frivolous tautology of synonymous terms, used in almost every contract between man and man? I always thought that “the whole included all its parts” but a lawyer says, no, unless all the parts are particularized. A piece of land is sold with “All and singular its appurtenances” and yet the land is not granted, sold, bargained, released, or confirmed, wherever “situated, lying, and being,” without

particularizing the “yards, gardens, meadows, trees, woods, underwoods, waters, water-courses, paths, passages, privileges, &c. &c. &c.” which the purchaser is “to have, hold, &c. &c. occupy, possess and enjoy!” Thus a whole skin of parchment is covered over with idle repetitions, when a visiting card would contain every necessary article to render the contract valid, “both at law and in equity.” When will the world get rid of such trowmery, and the simple dupes of the crafty lawyers of the extortions practised on them.

LEX SIMPLEX.

Charlotte-Town, April 25.

For the British American.

Mr. Editor,—The act passed last session to explain and amend the road compensation act, contains a table of fees embodied in it which cannot but strike every member of society as being most partial selfish and unjust. Every one knows that the Commissioners of roads in the House of Assembly are a formidable party; one in particular is said to possess influence so great as to hold the majority of the “enlightened Legislature,” as Mr. Lewellin terms that body in *terrorem*, whenever he thinks proper to menace them with his shaggy eye brows, which I am told has an irresistible effect even to fascination of carrying every measure he wishes through the House, with a flaming majority. But, to the point, Commissioners of highways are allowed 15s. per diem, from the time of leaving home until their return, when attending as witnesses under this act, and sixpence per mile for travelling, while the Jurors, who are no doubt considered by these enlightened gentlemen as an inferior race of beings, doomed by their maker to be drudges to these statesmen, are only to have 5s. per day. The Sheriff, one of the highest and most respectable officers in the Island, is allowed by this scale of fees, the pitiful pittance of 4d. per mile for travelling!!!

Now, Sir, with regard to the Jury, I should say that they have hitherto under this act, been composed of men equal and in some respects superior, in point of ability, and respectability without disparagement to any of the Commissioners. Many of them I am certain by attending as Jurors on these occasions, would lose more by their absence from business and their homes, than these great, these mighty Commissioners who hold numberless salaries, and whose salaries out of the public funds are accumulating daily, whether they be at home or abroad. Does not this then show the corruption that exists in the House, and that reform, to use a favorite phrase, is necessary? Why in the name of wonder should Commissioners be paid more than other witnesses! Is it on account of their individual superiority, or because they are members of the honorable house of Assembly? In cases tried in the superior court of common law, there is no respect of persons whatever. The rich and the low, the rich and the poor, receive the same recompence for their attendance, whether between party and party, or where the Crown is concerned, and the cases that occur under this act, ought in common honesty to be placed precisely on the same footing. If numberless instances were not already glaringly exhibited of the most self-interested motives of Assembly? In cases of this nature, alone should suffice to open the eyes of the people to their deserts; and I trust that at the next sitting of the House the subject will receive that consideration which its importance deserves, and that at least it will be so far amended as to provide equally