

trinonf the English case was breadly at firmed, but more recent deciations are based upon a statute, and can hardly be said to sanction the general principle. Ch. J. Gibson, in Cou. vs. Carlista, alrady clied, grapping with the subject and has, to a certain extent, illustrated, the ounty, we have no difficulty of heave jurisdiction and sait has more the senters mumerous instances in which the maximum strateging the senter of the the senter of the senter of the senter of the senter of the the senter of the senter of the senter of the senter of the the senter of the the senter of the relation of the senter of t

. 7 \*

