

The evidence relating to the vote of Donald McFee was then read.

Mr. McGOWAN.—This vote has undergone more examination than any other during the scrutiny. It is well known that the land on which he voted does not belong to him; it belongs to the Priest; McFee voted for him.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—This is the first time that I heard this man's name mentioned. The value of the land was the question at the Sheriff's Court. The first evidence, John Mails, could not state the value of the property at first, but afterwards says it is not worth 100*l*. He says that 10 years ago it was offered for 30*l*. It is a very different thing to get a piece of land in Georgetown now from what it was 10 years ago. Mills winds up by saying that he would not swear that McFee could not get 100*l* for his property. The next witness says there is not a better cultivated piece of land in King's County. Now, we know that a piece of land in the neighbourhood of Georgetown, and highly cultivated, is very valuable. This witness says the land is worth 120*l*. I think if it were set up at auction to-morrow it would bring that amount. He says the crop taken off McFee's land two years ago was worth 80*l*. The next witness, — Robertson, says he is a good judge of land, but does not know that McFee's land is worth 100*l*. He does not know whether there was a crop on the land last year. He then mentions a lot that was sold for 30*l*.

Hon. Mr. McGOWAN.—I consider 80*l* a high price for it. If it is worth 30*l*, McFee's value would be worth 100*l*. Then Mr. Moore, another witness, says he would give 100*l* for the lot to-morrow. One witness swears it is worth 100*l*, and another swears it is worth 120*l*. None of the other witnesses say positively that it is not worth 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON.—The first witness says there are no buildings on the lot. He values it at 70*l*. Two witnesses value it at less than 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I think the sitting member has misrepresented the evidence of Mr. Moore. He merely says if he wanted a place he would give 100*l* for it.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—I own a Pasture Lot near the same place. It is a wilderness state, and I was offered 40*l* for it five or six years ago.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I understood that Lots in a wilderness state in Georgetown could be purchased for 20*l*.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—We know that a lot consisting of 14 acres of land near Georgetown, in a high state of cultivation, is very valuable. Taking the whole evidence into account, I do not know how we can say it is not worth 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—If we take the average of the price named by the three witnesses who have valued the property it will not make 100*l*.

Hon. the PRESIDENT.—I do not think the evidence throws any doubt on the title. Robertson says he understood till lately that the land belonged to the Rev. Mr. McDonald. That is no evidence.

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—I never understood that the land belonged to McFee. I thought he was only a managing man for the Priest; but he has probably been saving money and investing it in land. I do not say that McFee is not the owner.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—Mr. Moore mentions an uncultivated lot containing 7 acres for which 40*l* were paid; surely it would be worth 100*l* if put in a high state of cultivation. McFee's lot contains 14 acres.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—Land near Sumnerdale is worth more in a wilderness state than when cultivated.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I regret, your Honors, that we are placed in such a difficult position, but we must get through this business the best way we can. One of the witnesses says, I thought till lately that the property belonged to the Rev. Mr. McDonald. That is no evidence. The first witness says, "I think 70*l* is the value of the property." That is not positive evidence. Another witness says he paid 40*l* for an uncultivated lot containing 7 acres in 1861. That is strong evidence; it shows that the first witness has not given a correct estimate of the property. This witness says it is "richly" worth 120*l*. Looking at the whole evidence — taking the positive statements of the witnesses — and considering all the advantages pointed out, I cannot come to the conclusion that the property is not worth 100*l*.

The evidence on this vote was very lengthy. His Honor the Attorney General read it through carefully, and made some observations on it as he proceeded.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—One of the witnesses says that if any man will give five or six pounds more for land near Georgetown, he will give 100*l* for it. If we take the average of the value given by all the witnesses, it will not make 100*l*.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It will make 190 some shillings.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—Well, I cannot make 100 out of 190 some shillings, any way I can see it. I thought it was 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. GOFF.—I have a resolution to the effect that it did not appear by the evidence before the Committee that the qualification of Donald McFee was sufficient to entitle him to vote.

The question being put thereon, the Committee divided:—

Contents.—Hon. Messrs. Yeo, Anderson, McLaren, Lord, Ramsay, Beer, Henderson, Walker, Dingwell and President.

So it passed in the negative.

The evidence relating to the vote of Daniel McDonald was then read.

Mr. McGOWAN.—It appears from the evidence that this man only held the property on trust. He held a Trust Deed, which was submitted to the Sheriff's Court, and he took the oath, but he afterwards came forward and done so.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—If that had been the case it would have been easy to prove. Mr. Stewart says that the property was conveyed to McDonald three years ago. Well, if a man holds a conveyance of a property, that property is his, and he is bound to take care of it. It is not necessary that it should be registered in 1855.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I think enough has been stated by the witness, Donald Stewart, to throw a doubt on this vote. He says the land belonged to Mr. McAulay, and he (Stewart) advised him to make it over to McDonald to save it from his creditors. I think it was incumbent upon the Sheriff to remove this doubt. If the case were taken to the Court of Chancery, McDonald would be compelled to give up the Deed. McAulay lives on the land, and with the knowledge of McDonald has sold a part of it since the Deed was conveyed. That shows that Mr. McDonald is only a nominal owner.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I moved the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the vote of Daniel McDonald is not sufficient in Law.

The question being put thereon, it passed in the affirmative.

The evidence relating to the vote of Rodrick McAulay was then read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—In this case we have Donald Stewart again as a witness. He says it is good wood land. Then James McAulay, a brother of the voter, expresses his surprise that Stewart was so sure of the land. He says there are from 12 to 15 acres clear, and some more to be broken in. He says his brother rose 200 bushels potatoes, 12 of wheat and 70 of oats on his last year. He says he would give 42*l* an acre for the land. Add the value of the clear land to that, and you have over 100*l*. I conceive that the vote is perfectly substantiated.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—Fifty acres of land with pretty fair buildings on it would be worth 100*l*; but I do not think that 50 acres on Lot 69, and an old house with the rafters blown off, are worth that much.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—Land in that neighbourhood sells high. We have convincing proof that it is worth very close upon 100*l*, if not quite.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I think it is sufficiently near the mark to warrant us in concluding that the vote is good.

Hon. Mr. Beer submitted a resolution to the effect that the vote of Rodrick McAulay is sufficient in law.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—The reason that it passed in the affirmative.

The President then resumed the chair, and the House adjourned.

ATTEST: JAMES M. GOWAN, Clerk of the House.

Hon. Attorney General presented to the House the Blue Book for 1861. Also the Public Accounts, the Accounts of the Public Land Office, and the Waste Book for 1862.

Ordered, that they do lie on the table.

The Committee of privileges and elections was then resumed.

Evidence relating to the vote of Rodrick McDonald read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD stated that the object of the resolution was to show that the word "sworn" had been improperly entered in the poll book. His Honor contended that evidence could not be received by the Committee in opposition to the poll book for that purpose.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It might not be proper to receive verbal evidence, but in this case we have written evidence, and I think it may be received strictly in conformity with the rules of law. When evidence is committed to writing, it is not generally permitted to put in contradictory evidence, but yet it is open to the House to be seen some mistake or fraud. For instance, an action might be brought against a Sheriff for a false return. The Poll book might say his book was correct. Surely evidence might be brought to show that there was an error in the book in such a case. Take for instance the case at the recent election of St. Eleanor's. If evidence could be received in that case the poll book would have stood as it was.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—The case at St. Eleanor's was different. In that case the vote was entered in the wrong column. That was easily done; but I do not see how the word "sworn" could be entered in the man's name, if it had not been ret directing to do so.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—Laying out the question about the error in the poll book, I do not see that the man's vote can be sustained, for a doubt is thrown on it by the evidence, and there is no evidence on the other side to remove that doubt.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—The question at the Sheriff's Court was the error in the poll book. I do not think the

evidence throws the slightest doubt on the vote. The voter had receipts and other documents to show that he had been in possession of the property a sufficient length of time to acquire a legal title. Mr. McNeill, the poll clerk, says that neither of the candidates or their representatives directed him to enter the name of the voter in the poll book.

Hon. the PRESIDENT.—If the man refused to take the oath the presiding officer should not have allowed his name to remain on the poll book. He was liable to a fine for not removing it.

Hon. Mr. McLAREN.—I do not remember anything about this vote, but when I heard the circumstances which have been mentioned in the course of the inquiry about it, I had a poll clerk, and on referring to his book, I find that McDonald's name was erased from it. It was not marked "sworn."

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It is quite competent for a candidate to bring evidence to show that there is an error in the poll book. He should not be bound by the errors of an officer over whom he has no control. Perhaps the returning officer would be allowed to give evidence to prove that his own act was an error. If a man refuses to take the oath, his vote is considered void.

The following resolution was submitted by his Honor the Attorney General, and it passed in the affirmative:—

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee that the vote of Rodrick McDonald was illegally allowed to remain on the poll book, and should be struck off.

The evidence relating to the vote of Angus McFee, polled for by Mr. McGOWAN, was then read.

The above named vote was found insufficient in law, and the Committee resolved accordingly.

The President then resumed the Chair, and the House adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, March 25.

Hon. Mr. Anderson presented a petition of certain inhabitants of St. Eleanor's, praying for an Act to prevent horses, mules and sheep from running at large in the streets of that village.

The Committee of Privileges and Elections was then resumed.

Evidence relating to the vote of Thomas Ring read.

Mr. McGOWAN.—It appears from the evidence, your Honors, that this man has no title to the property on which he claimed to vote. His father died intestate. His mother is living, and there are a number of sons. It is undivided property. There is no authority for dividing it, unless it is an order from the Probate Office.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—The petitioning candidate says that there was no authority for dividing the property. It is very true that the vote of the father has since been paid off. It has been said that the mother paid the assessment on the land, and that therefore the property must be her's. That is no evidence at all, for it is a common thing for one person to pay an assessment with another.

Mr. McGOWAN.—I apprehend that the property that this man voted on is the same as that on which Donald McKinnon voted.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It appears that the title to this property was disputed. Thomas Ring voted on an interest in six lots. He alleged himself to be exclusive owner of Town Lot 169. It appears that he only pays tax for this lot; his mother pays for the rest. Mr. Aitken says he is a witness that the property belonged to his mother. If the property was divided, it is strange that Thomas would have four lots out of six, when there is a large family. If he had a title, I do not see how there could be any difficulty in proving it at the Sheriff's Court. The mother pays the tax in her own name, and Thomas pays in his own name, for one lot.

Hon. Mr. Beer proposed the following resolution, and it passed in the affirmative.

Resolved, That there is not sufficient evidence before this Committee to substantiate the vote of Thomas Ring.

Evidence relating to the vote of Patrick Stephens read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—I do not think it is necessary to say much about this vote. The evidence brought by the petitioning candidate, has confirmed the fact which we already knew, that the man who is an Auctioneer, says he sold a part of Mr. Stephens' property for 425*l*. He cannot say whether the wharf was sold or not. The next witness says there was something said at the time of the sale about the wharf, but does not know whether they were sold or not. The next witness says he pays 22*l* rent to Mr. Stephens. He would not take 100*l* for the part not sold. He believes the sale to have been a sham.

Mr. McGOWAN.—It appears by the poll book that Mr. Stephens voted upon property liable to a mortgage, but all the witnesses say he voted upon a piece of reserved land. It is very strange that he did not give in this piece of reserved land at the election, and not vote on property liable to a mortgage.

Mr. Sanderson had instructions to sell Mr. Stephens' land, and he did so; but it is alleged to have been a sham sale. There was no evidence before the Committee to show that there was a sham sale. It was sold at public auction, and knocked down to the highest bidder. I do not know much about this little piece of reserved land, that is so very valuable. Indeed, it appears to have existed only in the brains of Mr. Stephens.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—The circumstance of the land being sold at public auction, and which has not been denied, raises a reasonable doubt on Mr. Stephens' vote. If there was a mortgage on the land, he should have shown that he had an interest in it, over and above the amount of the mortgage, sufficient to entitle him to vote.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—Mr. Stephens' character is well known. I have had dealings with him for a long time, and always found him a very correct man. The auctioneer does not say that all the property was sold. Stephens offered the property to me several times. The price he asked, if I remember right, was 4500*l*. He believed in the value of the property, and he said that he had 100*l* worth of property unless he had it. I have no doubt but that this piece of reserved land is worth 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—He did not vote on the reserved piece, but on the mortgaged property. Besides, he did not vote as a freeholder, but as a leaseholder.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—If the land was sold it is not very probable that he would be receiving the rent. I believe if he were to sell a share of the property, I do not think that a mortgage on the property should invalidate the vote. Many men vote on property on which there are mortgages.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—We are very much in the dark about this vote, and I think it is Mr. Stephens' fault, as he has not maintained the property on which he voted. It is either the fault of the voter, or of the candidate for whom he voted. It has been said that the voter has a valuable piece of land in another place, but the evidence does not show whether that is included in the mortgage or not. My impression is, that it is included in the mortgage, and we are therefore confined to the mortgaged property. Now, it appears that the property was sold to him, and he is incumbent upon the voter to show that he had an interest in it to the amount of 100*l*. He should have placed his title in the Sheriff's hand. If it is a leasehold property, and mortgaged, then it does not belong to Stephens, for all his right, title and interest is signed over in the mortgage, and becomes a lien in the mortgagee. He says he will not swear that it is his, but he says he has no right to it. It has been said that an intelligent man. That I admit, and the more explanations would be expected from him on that account. It has been said that it was a sham sale; but if it were tried by an action in law, he would not be allowed to say that it was a sham sale. It is possible that he may retain an interest in the property to the amount of 4500*l*, but it does not appear so by the evidence. I think the evidence shows that he has no right to vote on the property. Augustine McDonald says he pays 25*l* rent to Stephens; but if the term of the mortgage has expired, the mortgagee may call upon him at any day, and compel him to pay the rent to him. The mortgage allows the mortgagee to receive the rent, and he is no longer bound to pay it to the mortgagor. I think it is one of those cases where documentary evidence should have been produced. I would be inclined to deal more strictly with an intelligent man like Mr. Stephens, than I would with a poor illiterate man. When an intelligent man attempts to smuggle through a doubtful vote, it is a very bad example.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—The reason that there is not more evidence before the Committee is, that Mr. Stephens was not aware that his vote was being scrutinized till after the Sheriff's Court was closed. There should be no fault found with the voter for his property not being described in the poll book. The opposing candidate should have proposed such questions as would have elicited a description of the property. I do not think that Patrick Stephens ever attempted to "smuggle" in his vote at that or any other election; and I believe he would have done so if he had known what was going on. I do not think it is using a respectable man's name to insinuate that he smuggled his vote.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I think it might have been spoken in favour of the amount of 500*l*, but it does not appear from the evidence; and in consequence of the doubt thrown upon it he should have shown us that the mortgage had not deprived him of his right to vote.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I think some of your honors who have spoken in favour of the amount of 500*l*, have not shown that the property was mortgaged for more than it sold for at auction.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—When property is sold at auction it does not always bring its value.

Hon. Mr. WALKER.—Did the property sold by the Sheriff on Lot 66 bring its value?

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—I think it would be better to defer this vote for future consideration. When the written evidence is unsatisfactory, I do not see any reason why some other evidence might not be brought that would be more decisive.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—If we are going to examine evidence before this Committee we may sit here for another year. It has been said that the sale was a sham. I think the vote is a sham vote.

The following resolution was submitted by the Hon. Mr. Beer, and it passed in the affirmative:—

Resolved, That there is not sufficient evidence before this Committee to show that the vote of Patrick Stephens is valid in law.

The evidence relating to the vote of Edward Sullivan was then read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—There was only one witness produced by the petitioning candidate on this vote, and he does not know the farm. He says that the Hon. Mr. Hayland was at the election with a long list of tenants who were in arrears for rent. If that was the case it looks very much like intimidation. The witness does not say anything about the value of the farm, and if there was a large amount of rent

due, why did not the petitioning candidate get Mr. Hayland to prove that such was the case. It has already been shown during this scrutiny that back rent on a farm did not effect the vote taken for rent while there is personal property on it. The evidence does not show that this individual had no other means of paying his rent. The second witness swears positively that the farm is worth 100*l*.

Hon. the PRESIDENT.—The elector has sworn to his qualification, and the witness brought forward by the petitioning candidate does not know the value of the property. The man is more or less of a fortune teller.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I do not think the first witness raises a doubt on this vote. The question rests altogether on the amount of rent due, but in regard to that we have nothing but hearsay evidence. If there was a large amount of back rent due, Mr. Hayland admitted that there was 100*l* due. Even suppose there was 150*l* due, it does not follow that the man has no vote. It has not been decided yet whether the rent up to 1858 has not been swept off by the Award of the Land Commissioners. Even if we were to go into a valuation of the property, I think the vote would be sustained, for one evidence says that there are 25 acres cultivated, and he says the buildings are worth 20*l*. But I go altogether on the weakness of the first evidence.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I do not know if his Honor the Attorney General has taken notice that the word "arrears" is entered as an objection in the poll book. I think that raises a doubt, and the opposing candidate should have said that the arrears were not due. Even supposing there were no arrears, I do not think the property is worth 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—I do not think there are any 50 acres of leasehold land in the country, suitably situated, worth 100*l*. I have sold a great many farms through the country, and I always considered 42 an acre a good price for freehold land.

Hon. Mr. Walker submitted the following resolution, and it passed in the affirmative on the division as given below.

Contents.—Hon. Messrs. Attorney General, President, Ramsay, Walker, Dingwell and Lord.—6.

NON-CONTENTS.—Hon. Messrs. Yeo, Anderson, McLaren, Beer and Henderson.—5.

The evidence relating to the vote of Patrick Grinlay, polled for by Mr. McGOWAN, was then read. It was found insufficient to sustain his vote, and the Committee resolved accordingly.

ATTEST: JAMES M. GOWAN, Clerk of the House.

A message was brought from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Col. Secretary, with a Bill relating to steam navigation with this Island.

Hon. Mr. John Yeo, with a Bill to incorporate King Hiram Lodge, No. 1123, of free and accepted Masons of St. Eleanor's.

The Committee of privileges and elections was then resumed.

Evidence relating to the vote of Hugh McQuade was read.

Mr. McGOWAN.—This man is a leaseholder, yet he has had a clause in his original lease, which was taken by his mother to prevent it from being transferred without the consent of the proprietor.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—The evidence shows that this man holds a lease from his father. As to the clause in the lease to prevent its transfer, it is all hearsay. If the proprietor had a claim against any person on that account it would be a defect in the title. The fact that the proprietor received rent from the son, is an acknowledgement that he is accepted as a tenant. There is no proof that there is such a condition in the lease.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON.—If there was a clause in the lease forbidding its transfer without the consent of the proprietor, and this clause not complied with, I think it would disqualify the voter.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—Mr. Hamilton swears that the consent of the proprietor was not given to the transfer of the lease. I think that throws sufficient doubt upon the vote to call for evidence from the opposing candidate to show that the vote is good.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The witness says there was a clause in the lease prohibiting its transfer without the consent of the proprietor. If that is the case, and the consent of the proprietor was not obtained, then the transfer would not be legal. But the question is, did the lease contain such a clause. We have no evidence that it did. If it had it would raise a doubt on that vote.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—The fact that the assessor has the effect that the vote of Hugh McQuade had not been disproved by any evidence before the committee, and it passed in the affirmative.

The evidence relating to the vote of John Garmley was then read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—Mr. Hamilton, who is again brought forward as a witness, appears to know all the farms upon this road. He says he would give 100*l* for this farm, because he had a right to it. He says he would not swear that it is not worth 100*l*. Another witness says he knows that it could not be bought for less than 200*l*. Besides, his brother being dead, he has a right to vote on a share of 109 acres which he held.

Mr. McGOWAN.—One witness has sworn that he would not give 100*l* for the house, it appears, is on the part that he held by his brother. He says he will not give up the value of the property, and he says he will not give up the value of the property, and he says he will not give up the value of the property.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—He has no right to vote on his brother's property. The vote, if it stands at all, must stand on the 50 acres. I think there is a strong doubt raised upon it.

Hon. the PRESIDENT.—The last witness says the land is all that he has. If that is the case there would be 35 acres of clear land, which, at 43 an acre, would amount to 1505*l*. He says there is a well upon it, and that would lead us to infer that the buildings were on the 50 acres. It is very clear that he cannot vote on a part of his brother's property.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—The first evidence says he will not swear that the land is not worth 100*l*. It is probable that he had made up his mind that it was worth very near, if not quite, 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I think your honors must be pretty well satisfied from the evidence that the buildings are on the brother's part of the property, because it is said that they are in the middle of the farm, and the value of 150 acres of land, and the value of the buildings, is 1505*l*.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY.—If the man has 35 or 40 acres of land clear, I certainly think he is entitled to a vote.

Hon. Mr. McLAREN.—There is a great difference between clearing land that is covered with heavy wood and land on which there is scarcely any wood at all. The fire ran through this land about 40 years ago, and several times since then. The stumps were all decayed away, and there was very little wood left.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL.—We have always valued cultivated land at 43 an acre, without considering how it was cleared. If it was cleared by steam I do not see that the value of the land would be depreciated thereby. If the man has 35 acres of land clear he must be an industrious man, and we should not deprive him of his vote.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I am not quite satisfied that the land is not worth 100*l*. Hamilton does not speak in very positive terms. He says he will not swear that the land is not worth 100*l*. We have no evidence that the house is on the 50 acres, but 35 acres at 43 an acre, will not make 1500*l* without anything else.

Hon. Mr. Walker proposed the following resolution:—

Resolved, That there is no evidence before this Committee to invalidate the vote of John Garmley.

The Committee divided:—

Contents.—Hon. Messrs. Attorney General, President, Walker, Ramsay, Dingwell and Lord.—6.

NON-CONTENTS.—Hon. Messrs. Yeo, Anderson, McLaren, Beer and Henderson.—5.

So it passed in the affirmative.

The evidence relating to the vote of Dennis Mulligan, polled for by Mr. McGOWAN, was then read.

After a few remarks the Hon. Attorney General submitted the following resolution, and it passed in the affirmative:—

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee that there is not sufficient evidence to invalidate the vote of Dennis Mulligan.

Vote of Thomas Clenton, voted for by Mr. McDONALD.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD.—I think your Honors will decide in this case, as in the last, that there is no evidence to invalidate the vote. This standing witness, Mr. Hamilton, has again been brought to throw doubt on this vote. He says he never saw the land. The whole amount of his evidence is, that he would not swear that the land was worth 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON.—One witness says the soil is very poor and light, and that the house is of very little value. Another witness said, at first, that he would not swear that the man was worth 100*l*, but afterwards, it appears that he made up his mind that the man and farm together were worth that amount.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—The elector at first refused to qualify, but afterwards done so. It would appear as if he had got something to make his conscience a little more obtuse.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—I suppose the man weighed the matter in his mind, and then came forward and qualified. He says he would not swear that the land was worth 100*l*. He would not swear that the property was not worth 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. BEER.—I think we must admit that the evidence of Mr. Hamilton is very impartial. We must take the whole of his evidence.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—I do not think there is one of your Honors who can say you have no doubt, but the land is worth 100*l*.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY.—There is a good deal of difference between this vote and the last but one that we had under consideration. That farm was principally clear land. The land in this case is a bog, and the buildings are worth 20*l*. I do not consider land without improvements worth 20*l* an acre.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I am not satisfied that the land is worth 100*l*. Besides, there is a doubt raised upon the title. The witness says he understood that the voter's brother had a claim on the property.

A resolution was then submitted to the effect that the vote of Thomas Clenton was not sufficient in the law, and it passed in the affirmative.

The evidence relating to the vote of John McCarty and Felix Farmer, (polled for by Mr. McDONALD) was found insufficient to sustain them, and the Committee resolved accordingly.

The President then resumed the Chair, and the House adjourned.

of the falling beams and roaring flames, and pushed out to save themselves, they were met by the fire, and pushed them back into the fire with their bayonets.

At the encounter at which 65 of the former Poles and 100 Russians were killed, the Poles, who had joined the insurgents in man's costume, and performed all the duties of a soldier, was among the dead. She long defended herself with a revolver, and then, after a scythe, did much execution on her assailants, but at last fell, pierced with a cannon ball. The Cossacks then stripped the body, and pierced it with upwards of a hundred bayonet wounds.

A letter from the Polish frontier in the *Debats* dated 22nd.—When the insurgents to the number of 3000 scythemen and 2000 soldiers, with cavalry and infantry, entered the town of Soudz, among their ranks was remarked a young man, who was recognized as M. Micklaska, a lady belonging to the nobility, 23 years of age, and the mother of two children. The Muscovites, who consisted of 5000 Poles, and 1000 Cossacks, were ordered to surround the town. The Poles fought with round shot against an enemy ten times as numerous. Micklaska covered herself with glory, and killed several Cossacks. At length, having fallen into the hands of the enemy, she was rescued by the Poles. The next day she fell into the hands of the field of battle. As they were stripped of their clothes, the numerous wounds which they had received could be counted. The Russians after the fight proceeded to carry off the wounded, who filed two waggons.

The *Cas* says:—The murders and cruelties of the Russians exceed all idea. The Cossacks, when returning from the expedition to the village of Flaboroga, near Alava, attacked the chateau of his neighbor, the proprietor of the above named chateau, having shown himself on the balcony while the troops were approaching, the soldiers obliged him to come down, and he was killed. The Russian Government is endeavouring to repress Europe with false despatches, which describe the insurrection as completely subdued, while in reality it is increasing, and becoming more and more desperate. It is followed by the creation of fresh bodies of insurgents, who precipitate themselves upon the enemy with an enthusiasm and a contempt of death worthy of the first Christians. The murder, poisoning and other treatment which the Cossacks and Cossack troops have used towards the Poles, far from inspiring terror among the population, seem, on the contrary, to still further excite the courage of the insurgents. The most recent result is to suggest the idea of a general insurrection.

The gymnasium of the Prussian town Tarnobrzeg, in the Grand Duchy of Posen, has been ordered to be closed by the Government, in consequence of forty of the students having joined the Polish insurgents.

LEMBURG, March 11.—By resolution of the Central National Congress, General Langiewicz has been proclaimed Dictator of Poland, and has issued a proclamation, which has produced a prodigious effect. The proclamation has been translated into the Russian language, while the direction of the civil administration has been intrusted to Poniokowski. Preparations for a battle are being made on both sides.

CRAOW, March 12.—It is confirmed that the independent members of the Council of State for Poland, who have been elected by the Poles, and the members of the Municipal Council of Warsaw have also resigned.

CRAOW, March 19.—Intelligence received from Lithuania states that all the Marshals of the Corporations in that province, all the judges and judicial officers, and all independent public functionaries, have resigned their offices. These resignations are based upon the resolution not to receive any communication from the Government in the Russian language. The functionaries who have resigned are to be considered infamous all who should consent to fill the positions they vacate.

MORE MASSACRES BY THE RUSSIAN SOLDIERS.

The local quarters of the Dictator General Langiewicz are established at Dzialoszyce. A proclamation of the Central Committee of Warsaw confers full powers upon Langiewicz as Dictator of Poland.

The Russians have sacked and plundered Michalowice. Massacres have been committed at Gielonkow and Gorka. At the latter place, at Piskunow, corn merchant, and a British subject, was robbed and seriously wounded.

A fresh body of insurgents, numbering 1600 men, has been organized in the districts lying to the south of Lublin. They are well armed, and have proclaimed a National Government in several places.

The Warsaw Post Office authorities have not been able to receive any letters from Warsaw and Vienna have ceased running.

Private letters from St. Petersburg assert that the reduction of the import duty on sugar has been postponed to the 1st January 1855. Delegates from the Russian Government, who had been sent to the Diet, have returned to St. Petersburg.

May I request you will do me the favor to insert an article, received by the last mail, as appearing in the *Caribbean Journal*, March 23rd, 1854.

Charlottetown, 9th April, 1863.

CHURCHWARDENS AND FREE SEATS.—The *Mainland* Church says:—For some time past the question has been agitated by the congregation, whether churchwardens have a control over the free seats in the parish church. The dispute arose out of a young man, named Chapman, claiming a right to occupy a seat near the altar, which the churchwardens refused to admit. After a good deal of squabbling the matter was submitted to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who decided that the churchwardens have a full right over the seats, except those which are reserved by the congregation, and that the churchwardens have a right to put any persons into any seat they may think desirable, and to appropriate for ever by the Society for the Enlargement and Building of Churches, his Grace was of opinion that the Society could not overrule the churchwardens in the matter of seats over all the seats of the church.

of the falling beams and roaring flames, and pushed out to save themselves, they were met by the fire, and pushed them back into the fire with their bayonets.

At the encounter at which 65 of the former Poles and 100 Russians were killed, the Poles, who had joined the insurgents in man's costume, and performed all the duties of a soldier, was among the dead. She long defended herself with a revolver, and then, after a scythe, did much execution on her assailants, but at last fell, pierced with a cannon ball. The Cossacks then stripped the body, and pierced it with upwards of a hundred bayonet wounds.

A letter from the Polish frontier in the *Debats* dated 22nd.—When the insurgents to the number of 3000 scythemen and 2000 soldiers, with cavalry and infantry, entered the town of Soudz, among their ranks was remarked a young man, who was recognized as M. Micklaska, a lady belonging to the nobility, 23 years of age, and the mother of two children. The Muscovites, who consisted of 5000 Poles, and 1000 Cossacks, were ordered to surround the town. The Poles fought with round shot against an enemy ten times as numerous. Micklaska covered herself with glory, and killed several Cossacks. At length, having fallen into the hands of the enemy, she was rescued by the Poles. The next day she fell into the hands of the field of battle. As they were stripped of their clothes, the numerous wounds which they had received could be counted. The Russians after the fight proceeded to carry off the wounded, who filed two waggons.

The *Cas* says:—The murders and cruelties of the Russians exceed all idea. The Cossacks, when returning from the expedition to the village of Flaboroga, near Alava, attacked the chateau of his neighbor, the proprietor of the above named chateau, having shown himself on the balcony while the troops were approaching, the soldiers obliged him to come down, and he was killed. The Russian Government is endeavouring to repress Europe with false despatches, which describe the insurrection as completely subdued, while in reality it is increasing, and becoming more and more desperate. It is followed by the creation of fresh bodies of insurgents, who precipitate themselves upon the enemy with an enthusiasm and a contempt of death worthy of the first Christians. The murder, poisoning and other treatment which the Cossacks and Cossack troops have used towards the Poles, far from inspiring terror among the population, seem, on the contrary, to still further excite the courage of the insurgents. The most recent result is to suggest the idea of a general insurrection.

The gymnasium of the Prussian town Tarnobrzeg, in the Grand Duchy of Posen, has been ordered to be closed by the Government, in consequence of forty of the students having joined the Polish insurgents.

LEMBURG, March 11.—By resolution of the Central National Congress, General Langiewicz has been proclaimed Dictator of Poland, and has issued a proclamation, which has produced a prodigious effect. The proclamation has been translated into the Russian language, while the direction of the civil administration has been intrusted to Poniokowski. Preparations for a battle are being made on both sides.

CRAOW, March 12.—It is confirmed that the independent members of the Council of State for Poland, who have been elected by the Poles, and the members of the Municipal Council of Warsaw have also resigned.

CRAOW, March 19.—Intelligence received from Lithuania states that all the Marshals of the Corporations in that province, all the judges and judicial officers, and all independent public functionaries, have resigned their offices. These resignations are based upon the resolution not to receive any communication from the Government in the Russian language. The functionaries who have resigned are to be considered infamous all who should consent to fill the positions they vacate.

MORE MASSACRES BY THE RUSSIAN SOLDIERS.

The local quarters of the Dictator General Langiewicz are established at Dzialoszyce. A proclamation of the Central Committee of Warsaw confers full powers upon Langiewicz as Dictator of Poland.

The Russians have sacked and plundered Michalowice. Massacres have been committed at Gielonkow and Gorka. At the latter place, at Piskunow, corn merchant, and a British subject, was robbed and seriously wounded.

A fresh body of insurgents, numbering 1600 men, has been organized in the districts lying to the south of Lublin. They are well armed, and have proclaimed a National Government in several places.

The Warsaw Post Office authorities have not been able to receive any letters from Warsaw and Vienna have ceased running.

Private letters from St. Petersburg assert that the reduction of the import duty on sugar has been postponed to the 1st January 1855. Delegates from the Russian Government, who had been sent to the Diet, have returned to St. Petersburg.

May I request you will do me the favor to insert an article, received by the last mail, as appearing in the *Caribbean Journal*, March 23rd, 1854.

Charlottetown, 9th April, 1863.

CHURCHWARDENS AND FREE SEATS.—The *Mainland* Church says:—For some time past the question has been agitated by the congregation, whether churchwardens have a control over the free seats in the parish church. The dispute arose out of a young man, named Chapman, claiming a right to occupy a seat near the altar, which the churchwardens refused to admit. After a good deal of squabbling the matter was submitted to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who decided that the churchwardens have a full right over the seats, except those which are reserved by the congregation, and that the churchwardens have a right to put any persons into any seat they may think desirable, and to appropriate for ever by the Society for the Enlargement and Building of Churches, his Grace was of opinion that the Society could not overrule the churchwardens in the matter of seats over all the seats of the church.

of the falling beams and roaring flames, and pushed out to save themselves, they were met by the fire, and pushed them back into the fire with their bayonets.

At the encounter at which 65 of the former Poles and 100 Russians were killed, the Poles, who had joined the insurgents in man's costume, and performed all the duties of a soldier, was among the dead. She long defended herself with a revolver, and then, after a scythe, did much execution on her assailants, but at last fell, pierced with a cannon ball. The Cossacks then stripped the body, and pierced it with upwards of a hundred bayonet wounds.

A letter from the Polish frontier in the *Debats* dated 22nd.—When the insurgents to the number of 3000 scythemen and 2000 soldiers, with cavalry and infantry, entered the town of Soudz, among their ranks was remarked a young man, who was recognized as M. Micklaska, a lady belonging to the nobility, 23 years of age, and the mother of two children. The Muscovites, who consisted of 5000 Poles, and 1000 Cossacks, were ordered to surround the town. The Poles fought with round shot against an enemy ten times as numerous. Micklaska covered herself with glory, and killed several Cossacks. At length, having fallen into the hands of the enemy, she was rescued by the Poles. The next day she fell into the hands of the field of battle. As they were stripped of their clothes, the numerous wounds which they had received could be counted. The Russians after the fight proceeded to carry off the wounded, who filed two waggons.

The *Cas* says:—The murders and cruelties of the Russians exceed all idea. The Cossacks, when returning from the expedition to the village of Flaboroga, near Alava, attacked the chateau of his neighbor, the proprietor of the above named chateau, having shown himself on the balcony while the troops were approaching, the soldiers obliged him to come down, and he was killed. The Russian Government is endeavouring to repress Europe with false despatches, which describe the insurrection as completely subdued, while in reality it is increasing, and becoming more and more desperate. It is followed by the creation of fresh bodies of insurgents, who precipitate themselves upon the enemy with an enthusiasm and a contempt of death worthy of the first Christians. The murder, poisoning and other treatment which the Cossacks and Cossack troops have used towards the Poles, far from inspiring terror among the population, seem, on the contrary, to still further excite the courage of the insurgents. The most recent result is to suggest the idea of a general insurrection.

The gymnasium of the Prussian town Tarnobrzeg, in the Grand Duchy of Posen, has been ordered to be closed by the Government, in consequence of forty of the students having joined the Polish insurgents.

LEMBURG, March 11.—By resolution of the Central National Congress, General Langiewicz has been proclaimed Dictator of Poland, and has issued a proclamation, which has produced a prodigious effect. The proclamation has been translated into the Russian language, while the direction of the civil administration has been intrusted to Poniokowski. Preparations for a battle are being made on both sides.

CRAOW, March 12.—It is confirmed that the independent members of the Council of State for Poland, who have been elected by the Poles, and the members of the Municipal Council of Warsaw have also resigned.

CRAOW, March 19.—Intelligence received from Lithuania states that all the Marshals of the Corporations in that province, all the judges and judicial officers, and all independent public functionaries, have resigned their offices. These resignations are based upon the resolution not to receive any communication from the Government in the Russian language. The functionaries who have resigned are to be considered infamous all who should consent to fill the positions they vacate.

MORE MASSACRES BY THE RUSSIAN SOLDIERS.

The local quarters of the Dictator General Langiewicz are established at Dzialoszyce. A proclamation of the Central Committee of Warsaw confers full powers upon Langiewicz as Dictator of Poland.

The Russians have sacked and plundered Michalowice. Massacres have been committed at Gielonkow and Gorka. At the latter place, at Piskunow, corn merchant, and a British subject, was robbed and seriously wounded.

A fresh body of insurgents, numbering 1600 men, has been organized in the districts lying to the south of Lublin. They are well armed, and have proclaimed a National Government in several places.

The Warsaw Post Office authorities have not been able to receive any letters from Warsaw and Vienna have ceased running.

Private letters from St. Petersburg assert that the reduction of the import duty on sugar has been postponed to the 1st January 1855. Delegates from the Russian Government, who had been sent to the Diet, have returned to St. Petersburg.

May I request you will do me the favor to insert an article, received by the last mail, as appearing