

say that several instances have occurred where the Legislature has interposed its power, and granted re-hearings of causes that had been decided. As late as 1833, ch. 184, a law passed authorising a bill of review and a re-argument upon the terms to which these memorialists now submit themselves. But the committee have not felt themselves concluded by the precedents to which their attention has been directed. It appears to them that no certain fixed rules can be established for the government of the Legislature in such cases. If any relief can be granted at all, we should consider rather the peculiar circumstances of each application to determine upon the propriety of gratifying it. It should not be accorded in any case merely because of the pecuniary amount involved, nor of the importance of the case to the parties themselves. If such applications were to depend solely on these considerations, what imagination could be restrained within reasonable bounds, when a person's opinion of his own case constitutes his only right to petition? Who can define the end of such demands, or foretell the mischief they may work in bringing the Legislative and Judicial departments in conflict? The committee conceive that the safest course is not to gratify such applications, except upon the clearest convictions of error in the judgment of the court, and that injustice would grow out of its extension. Avoiding a decision of the right to interfere, they have examined and deeply reflected upon the statements and proofs accompanying the memorial, to discover the circumstances that commend this petition to the favorable notice of the Legislature. After a very careful investigation of the whole case, they are not prepared to say that the decision of the court will cause such injustice and oppression as, in their opinion, alone should justify any legislation to impede or arrest the course of judicial proceedings. But it is alleged that evidence has been discovered since the date of the decree, which, with that in possession of the court before, will tend to prove the illegitimacy of Mrs. Ewing. This allegation would present a strong ground for a review and re-hearing of the evidence, were such as to afford a reasonable presumption that the court would have decided differently, if that new evidence had been previously before them. Upon the case then proved, the court were of opinion that Melvina Ewing was the sole heir of Henry Moore, and