

THE EXAMINER

A Weekly Journal of Politics, Literature, and News.

"This is true Liberty, when Freeborn Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free."—Euripides.

Vol. VIII. **Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Monday, April 20, 1863.** New Series—No. 15.

COLONIAL LEGISLATURE.

COUNCIL CHAMBER.

THURSDAY, March 26th.

A Bill to incorporate King Hiram Lodge, No. 1123, of Free and Accepted Masons, was read the second time, passed through Committee, and agreed to without any amendment.

Hon. Attorney General laid before the House the Colonial Treasury Accounts for the past year.

The Committee of privileges and elections was then resumed, and the evidence relating to the vote of James Dewar was read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD—This man voted upon 75 acres of land fronting on Grand River. It is well known that it is a valuable property. The only witness brought forward by the petitioning Candidate is Alexander Hamilton, and all he knows about the property is, that on the 4th of April last there was an agreement drawn up between the voter and his father. He says he only looked at the date of the agreement, which is very extraordinary. Then he says he has 50 acres of land on Grand River Road. It is well known that the land was given to him by his father when he went to live there 10 years ago, and it does not follow that if the father gave the son a farm for 5s. it may not be worth £100. The witness saw the agreement, but he does not know what it is about. It may be about a load of potatoes or a stack of hay. I have seen the place, and it is one of the most comfortable looking places in that neighbourhood.

Mr. McGOWAN—His qualification is a piece of land that he only holds since April last. I believe he has a piece of leasehold land in another place, but it is not sufficient to entitle him to vote.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—He has voted on freehold and leasehold property. This document, that the witness speaks of, must be a Deed, for he says that 5s was the consideration money.

Hon. Mr. McLAREN—Some years ago the father gave the son this piece of land for a certain portion. I think one-third of the crop. The son, it appears, was not giving the father the part agreed upon, and they quarrelled. Some different arrangement was made last April. The other piece of land is on the same Township. I believe he has neither a deed nor a lease. The land is his father's.

Hon. Mr. BEER—I think it is very evident that he has no deed or lease, and that he was only allowed to occupy the farm by giving his father a portion of the crop.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—I would like to know from what part of the evidence his honor finds that the man has no lease?

Hon. Mr. BEER—I think it is at least very doubtful if the man has a lease. His honor who asked that question will not say that he has a lease.

Hon. Mr. LORD—I believe he has a lease. He is a respectable man and a good liberal—a man who would not take a false oath. It appears that it is no matter who is sworn, for there is no disparagement made between the characters of parties. I believe every word the voter has stated.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON—I think it is very strange if Mr. Hamilton did not satisfy himself respecting the nature of this document. I think the statements of members of this House who are acquainted with the parties and with the property should have some weight.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY—I would like to know if the father voted upon the same property.

Mr. McGOWAN—He attempted to vote, but would not qualify.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—The entry in the poll book is not very clear. On referring to the Accounts of the Public Land Office, I find that this man got his deed on the 8th of March, 1862. The purchase money was £18 10s.; so I think there can be very little dependence placed on the 75 acres on Grand River. Then the voter says, I have 50 acres of leasehold on Brudenell River, where I reside. That is a sufficient description. The question now is, has there been a reasonable doubt thrown on that qualification. I confess that it is difficult for me to see that there has.

The witness says there was an agreement drawn between the voter and his father last April; but how can he tell what the agreement was about, when he says he did not look at anything but the date. The consideration of 5s, even if it related to the farm, would not show that it was of no value to him. The father may have given the farm to the son, and it may be worth £100 to him.

Hon. Mr. WALKER—There has been a great deal of stress laid on the evidence of Mr. Hamilton, but when I look through it I cannot see anything positive in it from first to last. I cannot think that a respectable man like Mr. Dewar would swear to a qualification which he did not possess.

Hon. Attorney General submitted the following resolution, and it passed in the affirmative:

Resolved, That there does not appear to this Committee to be sufficient evidence to invalidate the vote of James Dewar.

Vote of Thomas Walsh—evidence read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD—This man voted on 50 acres of leasehold land. It is said that the lease was transferred to him without the proprietor's consent; but the proprietor has received rent from him, and that is sufficient to show that he has acknowledged him as a tenant. The witness says he would not like to give £100 for the farm; but I do not think he is in a position to pay £10. Though he would not give £100 for it, some other person might. Mr. Rice knows the farm, and he mentions another farm which was sold for £135, and which was to better.

Hon. Mr. BEER—Taking the value of the improvements as given by Mr. Rice, and summing the whole, I make the amount about £70. Mr. Rice says he would not be shy in voting upon it.

Hon. Mr. WALKER—His honor has not allowed anything for wood land.

Hon. Mr. BEER—There are 15 acres clear and 27½ chopped down, so there cannot be much left for wood.

Hon. Mr. YEO—If it were free land it might be worth a bare £100, but being a leasehold it is not worth it.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY—If we go into a valuation of the property, as we did in other cases where there was not sufficient evidence, I do not see how we can bring the value up to £100.

Hon. Mr. LORD—Here is a man who takes a lease and binds himself to pay rent, but we only calculate the value of the improvements. I think we should allow something for the wilderness land.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I confess that taking the whole evidence, I cannot bring the value of this farm up to £100. One witness, Mr. Rice, says he considers it worth £100, but that is only an expression of opinion, and if he had said no more his evidence might have some weight, but he goes on to describe the property, and I do not think he brings it up to the required amount. One witness says there are from 12 to 15 acres clear. It is a rule in law that when a man speaks that way always to take the lowest number. 12 acres at £3 an acre, £36; 25 acres out down at £1, and £5 for the house, makes £67 in all. If it came near £100, I would give the elector the benefit of the doubt, but I cannot bring it near that figure.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—I agree with his honor the Attorney General. I do not think we can bring this property up to £100.

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

Resolved, That the vote of Thomas Walsh is not sufficient in law.

Vote of William Clary—evidence read.

Hon. Mr. BEER—I think it would be for the interest of the sitting member if no evidence had been called but Hamilton. There are 24 acres clear, which, at £3 an acre, would make £72, and that has been the price set upon other lands from the first of the scrutiny. The buildings do not appear to be worth anything.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON—I think your honors will always find that when a farm is in a high state of cultivation there will be some taste displayed about the buildings; and if it were so in this case, we would not hear such a ridiculous and humorous description of them given by the witnesses.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD—When the evidence on this vote was read, I did not think there could be two opinions about it; but if it is to be condemned it is no use to bring evidence. One witness says if the property were his he would not take £150 for it; and Hamilton, whose evidence your honors place so much reliance upon, does not deny that it is worth £100.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—The voter says it is worth £150. Hamilton would not say that it was worth, but said that one-third of the 100 acres was clear. Rice swears positively that it is worth £100. Not one of the witnesses says it is not worth £100.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I do not see that, after Hamilton's evidence, there was any need to call another. The voter swears that the property is worth £100, and Hamilton does not say that it is not. He cannot be such a very scrupulous man but he would say it was not worth £100, if he thought so. Then does Rice disprove it? Hamilton says there are 33 acres clear; Rice says 24. Well, taking the 24 acres at £3 an acre would only make £72; but I have never, in all the votes I have given on this scrutiny, tied myself down to the £3 an acre for land. I have always left a margin for other interests. Would it be supposed that a man would give something for the leasehold interest or good will of the farm? Rice says that the 24 acres are in a high state of cultivation; considering this, along with the statement that it is worth £100, I do not know how we can say that it is not worth that much. It may be within two or three pounds of the amount required, but I would give the elector the benefit of the doubt. I would give evidence to the testimony of Mr. Hamilton; I think he has always kept within bounds.

A resolution was then proposed to the effect, that the vote of William Clary appears to be sufficient in law, and it passed in the affirmative.

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

AFTERNOON SITTING.

A message was brought from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Col. Secretary, with a Bill to incorporate the Grand Orange Lodge of Prince Edward Island and the subordinate Lodges in connection therewith.

The Committee of privileges and elections was resumed. The evidence relating to the vote of William Gordon, polled for Mr. McGowan, was read.

Hon. Attorney General submitted the following resolution, and it passed in the affirmative:

Resolved, That the vote of William Gordon is not sufficient in law.

Vote of William Clow—evidence read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD—Even from his own testimony he has no vote. He voted on freehold and leasehold, but says he had neither deed nor lease in his own name. Under these circumstances he cannot have a good vote. Besides, every person who knows anything about the affairs of the late Thomas Clow, knows that there were bonds against his estate for more than the property would amount to. William Clow, therefore, could not vote on the property as his father's heir.

Hon. Mr. YEO—I was well acquainted with the late Thomas Clow. He was a very honest man. I do not think his son would have attempted to vote if he had not been properly qualified. I know there were very valuable buildings on the place. It is evident that he voted on freehold property.

Hon. Mr. LORD—I know that Thomas Clow died intestate, and the creditors seized all the property. William Clow lives there merely by sufferance. He might have a lease, but I do not think he has.

Hon. Mr. BEER—I presume that it is not the same piece of land, for he says freehold and leasehold. He says he has no lease, but he does not say that he has no deed. When he says freehold and leasehold, it gives us the idea that he had another property besides his father's.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I am always a little suspicious of entries made in this way, but yet the Act admits both freehold and leasehold. The entry is not made by the voter himself, but by the Clerk, and perhaps the answer of the voter was more distinctly given. There is very little of the evidence that can be called evidence. One says I do not recollect whether he said freehold or leasehold—I understood him to vote on the leasehold. I do not think there is sufficient evidence to throw a doubt on this man's vote, even if he admit that he said he had neither a deed nor lease, for he may have a freehold property without either. He may be a leaseholder without having a lease; he may have a separate assignment of the original lease. If his father left a great deal of valuable property, he, as his father's heir, might have an interest in it to the amount of £100, and have neither deed nor lease. When he was asked at the hustings if he had a deed or lease, the circumstances were then brought to his recollection, and under those circumstances he surely would not take the oath without knowing that he was legally qualified to vote, though without being possessed of either of these documents.

Hon. Mr. WALKER—I do not know how we can say that that vote is good. It is well known that Thomas Clow died intestate. If the voter had a deed or lease it would have been easy for him to have said so.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON—I do not know any of the Clows personally, but from what I have heard of them, I believe they are honest and intelligent men—men who would feel the solemnity of an oath, and would not swear to a qualification which they did not possess.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—I do not know why we should place more dependence on one man's oath than on that of another. On former occasions, when a doubt was thrown on a vote, the opposing candidate had to bring evidence to prove it good, but there is no such evidence produced in this case. I am sorry that we have departed from our former rule.

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

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

Vote of Donald Johnston—evidence read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD—This man voted on an agreement, and therefore, by his own confession, he cannot be a qualified elector; for, it is a fixed principle that an elector must be either a freeholder or a leaseholder.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—It is true that an elector must be either a freeholder or a leaseholder, but a man may be a freeholder under an agreement. I have known men to hold agreements for a long time without taking out deeds. If a man held property under an agreement for 20 years, he would then have acquired a freehold title. It is a fixed principle in law that, if a man has what is called a color of title to allow him to take possession, it amounts to a freehold when held for 20 years. If it is under seal, it may have all the legal effect of a deed, without the man being 20 years in possession.

Hon. Mr. McLAREN—It is well known that this man voted on possession. I have travelled through that settlement; I saw the first man who settled there; he has receipts for land tax as far back as 1841, and all who settled there at the same time were considered to have good titles.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—Actions in law have been brought against parties in that settlement, in which I was employed as Attorney, and we failed to eject them.

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

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Committee, there is no evidence to call in question the vote of Donald Johnston.

The evidence relating to the votes of Henry Matheson, Murdoch Doherty and Donald Nicholson, polled for Mr. McGowan, was then read. They voted under circumstances similar to those of Donald Johnston, and their votes were sustained by the committee.

Henry J. Brehat also voted for Mr. McGowan. He voted under an agreement, and not entered in the poll

book either as a freeholder or leaseholder, consequently his vote was not sustained by the Committee.

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

FRIDAY, March 27.

Committee of privileges and elections resumed.

Vote of W. B. Aitken—evidence read.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD—It appears that Mr. Aitken stated that he held a lot in Georgetown, but it is well known that he holds no property in his own name. He refused to answer any questions about his property, and therefore his vote should not have been allowed to remain on the poll book.

Hon. Mr. BEER—Mr. Aitken is a highly respectable man, and I am satisfied that he had a vote or he would not have sworn. He has stated what he voted on, and I think he has fully complied with the requirements of the Act.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—I do not doubt the respectability of Mr. Aitken, but he should have stated how he held his property. If he had a good title, I do not see why he would refuse to answer the questions that were put to him respecting it. He had a right to answer the questions put to him, and his refusing to do so raises a doubt on his vote in my mind.

Hon. Mr. McLAREN—Mr. Aitken is a very respectable man, and he would not have sworn if he had not a good vote. He is not the only man who was stubborn in answering questions. There was a man at Montserrat River who refused to answer questions, and he lost his vote, though it was well known that he had property worth £1000. He thought they had no right to ask him questions, and Mr. Aitken was probably under the same impression. There was no evidence taken on his vote at Georgetown, and that was the proper place to question it.

Hon. Mr. BEER—The scrutiny being held in Georgetown where Mr. Aitken resides, there could be no difficulty in procuring evidence to throw a doubt on his vote if it was not good. But it appears that they were afraid to do so, for fear the vote would be substantiated. To bring it forward in this way is not doing justice to the man who has sworn to his vote.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—If we acknowledge the principle that an elector may refuse to answer questions respecting his property, it may lead to a great deal of inconvenience. The question now is, whether the poll clerk was justified in allowing the name of Mr. Aitken to remain on the poll book, after he had refused to answer any questions respecting his property. The election Act of 1861, which applies to the election of Legislative Councilors, evidently requires that an elector, when questioned, shall truly describe his property, whether leasehold or freehold. Suppose every man should refuse to answer questions respecting his property, what chance would there be for a scrutiny? I am placed at a great disadvantage here, for it is supposed that I should give a legal opinion, just on the spur of the moment, on questions which lawyers generally would take time to consider; but I must act on the emergency as best I can. My opinion is, that it is imperative on the voter to describe his property, and my opinion is confirmed when I refer to the Council Act of 1862. (Here his honor read two or three clauses of the Act, and the forms of oaths to be taken by the electors.) From this it appears that an elector cannot legally take the oath till the description of the property has been "taken down in the poll book." Therefore, I consider that the returning officer was not justified in admitting that vote. I think he was bound to reject the vote, for it is an evasion of the law. There is sufficient on the face of the poll book to justify us in rejecting that vote. I know he is a highly respectable man, and he may believe himself to be properly qualified; if not, he would not have taken the oath; but that will not do. The law must be complied with, or the result will be very mischievous.

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

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee that the returning officer was not justified in taking the vote of W. B. Aitken down in the poll book, he having refused to describe his property as required by law.

The vote of Donald Campbell, polled for McGowan, next came under consideration. He voted under an agreement for a lease—not entered in the poll book as a leaseholder or freeholder. After some desultory debate, the Committee came to the following resolution:

Resolved, That there is no evidence before this Committee to show that Donald Campbell was qualified to vote for a Legislative Councilor as the law directs.

The votes of Kenneth Gordon and Alexander McLeod, polled for McGowan, were then considered, and sustained by the Committee.

The House was then resumed.

Hon. Mr. Lord presented a petition of certain merchants, and other inhabitants of Charlottetown, praying for an Act to incorporate an additional Bank.

House adjourned till 3 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Committee of privileges and elections resumed.

The vote of Patrick Brennan came under consideration. It was marked "objected by McLaren" in the poll book, and the Committee decided that it could not be scrutinized by McGowan.

Respecting the votes not marked objected by any Candidate, the Committee came to a resolution, to the effect that it was competent for the sitting member and the petitioning candidate to bring evidence before the Committee to show by whom those votes were objected to.

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

SATURDAY, March 28.

Hon. Attorney General presented a memorial of the Directors of the Institution for the education of the Deaf and Dumb, at Halifax, praying for aid in support of that institution.

Hon. Mr. Beer, Chairman of the joint Committee appointed to prepare an Address to Her Majesty the Queen on the Land Question, reported a draft Address, which was received, read the first time, and ordered to be read the second time on Monday next.

A message was brought from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Hensby, with a Bill to incorporate the Marine Insurance Company of Prince Edward Island.

Hon. Mr. Beer presented a petition of Daniel Davies, James Duncan, George Beer, and others praying this Council to concur with the House of Assembly in passing a Bill to incorporate the Marine Insurance Company.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on the Bill to incorporate the Marine Insurance Company.

Hon. Mr. Goff in the chair.

The first nine clauses were agreed to without any amendment. The House was then resumed, and progress reported.

Adjourned till half-past three o'clock.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD asked leave to present the scrutiny, by bringing other evidence before the Committee besides that taken at the Sheriff's Court, there being a number of votes marked "objected" on the poll book, on which no evidence had been taken, on account of the time for the return of the writ of election having expired.

Hon. Messrs. BEER, GOFF and HENDERSON each addressed the House on the subject. They were tired of the scrutiny. They thought it was about drawing to a close, and were unwilling to have it prolonged for an indefinite time, by admitting fresh evidence, unless the law required them to do so.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL was also tired of the scrutiny, and would like to see it brought to a close; but still, if the law permitted, and if the ends of justice demanded such a course, he was willing to accede to the request of the sitting member, though some additional expense would be incurred thereby. I am willing, said his honor, to act on that maxim of the ancients, "let justice be done, though the sky should fall." His honor suggested that Counsel should be heard at the Bar on the subject, to which the House agreed.

The Bill to incorporate the Marine Insurance Company was recommitted, and agreed to, with a few verbal amendments.

House adjourned MONDAY, March 30.

Hon. Mr. Walker presented a petition of certain inhabitants of Rustico and vicinity, praying for an Act to incorporate a Bank, to be called "The Bank of Farmers of Prince Edward Island."

The Committee of privileges and elections was resumed.

The Hon. W. H. Pope, Col. Secretary, came to the Bar of the Council Chamber, and was sworn to give evidence relating to the election at the polling division of Lot 66, the consent of the House of Assembly having been previously asked and obtained by message for that purpose.

Question—Were you at the polling division of Lot 66, at the Council election?

Answer—Yes, as the representative of Mr. McGowan.

Q.—Did you object to a number of votes on Mr. McGowan's behalf?

A.—I did.

Q.—On what grounds?

A.—I objected to them, I think all of them, on the grounds that the voters had no titles by reason of the lands, in respect of which they claimed to vote, having been sold by the Sheriff in 1849 or 1850 for non-payment of land tax.

Q.—On whose behalf were the objections made?

A.—All the votes marked objected were, as well as I can recollect, so marked by my direction, on behalf of Messrs. McGowan and McLaren. I know not how they were entered on the address. I know not how they were entered on the address. I will not suppose it because I think the Award will be any benefit to the tenants, but because the Award have been led to believe that it would be a benefit.

Q.—What was your objection to the voters who were not marked as such?

A.—I believe they were all marked as such, and I believe that they were not marked as such, but for my part, I have no faith in the Award, and I believe that they will never be any good result from it, nor do I think it will ever become the law of the land; but still I think it would be wisdom for this House to pass the award unanimously. As to the price of the land, I would far sooner deal with the proprietors, than with the Award. I have been offered to purchase for 15s. an acre since I came to town, therefore the Award would be no great benefit to me.

Q.—Were the votes of Donald McPherson and Murdoch Nicholson, which were polled for McLaren and McGowan at the Lot 66 polling division and marked objected, were these votes marked by McDonald or by Whittman?

A.—Decidedly by McDonald, in my opinion, or by his representative. There was one active agent on either side. The objection applied to either Candidate.

Q.—Did you object to the vote of Richard Gill?

A.—I cannot tell without the poll book. (The poll book was then handed to the witness.) From the entry in the poll book, I should say that I did. I would state that in objecting to all votes I was guided by the plan attached to the Sheriff's deed. Where there was any doubt, I ordered them to be marked objected.

Q.—Can you say that you objected to the vote of John Gill?

A.—No! I cannot distinguish between Richard Gill and John Gill.

Q.—Did you object to the vote of Richard Gill?

A.—I distinctly recollect objecting to the vote of either John Gill or Richard Gill, which, I cannot say.

Q.—Can you, of your own knowledge, state if you objected to the vote of Hugh Rooney?

A.—No.

Q.—Can you, of your own knowledge, state if you objected to the vote of James Wickham?

A.—No.

Q.—Can you, of your own knowledge, state whether you did or did not object to the vote of Patrick Power?

A.—It is impossible for me to give any other answer than a negative. I was guided by the plan attached to the Sheriff's deed.

Q.—You consider that you personally objected to every vote which was polled contrary to the interest of McGowan and McLaren?

A.—I did.

Q.—Did you object to the vote of John Evans?

A.—I did. I believe I objected to 23 or 24 votes, perhaps more than that.

Q.—Is it consistent with your recollection whether or not the qualification, as given in by any elector for Messrs. McDonald and Whittman, would have been sufficient were it not for the Sheriff's Deed?

A.—I believe some of them would have had good votes. Several of the voters would have had an adverse possession extending over a period of twenty years; but to how much of their respective farms this adverse possession would extend, I am unable to say.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Hon. Attorney General presented the School Visitor's Report for the past year.

A Bill to continue certain Acts therein mentioned, and a Bill relating to Steam Navigation with this Island, were severally read the second time, passed through Committee, and agreed to without any amendment.

Question of Hon. Mr. Beer, the Address to Her Majesty the Queen, praying Her Majesty to allow the Acts passed in 1852 to give effect to the Award of the Commissioners on the Land Question to go into operation, unless the contrary can be shown before a Judicial Tribunal by the proprietors to be affected by the same, was read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

a good deal of land in the market. The best tenants would be once made themselves free, and that would urge the proprietors to offer their lands at a moderate rate to the Government. The proprietors would have none but the poor tenants left, and sooner than be put in that position they would offer their lands to the Government. As to the Fishery Reserves, I think it would be better for the tenants to pay for them at the same rate as they pay for their other land than have them thrown open to fishermen. The agitation of this land question has been going on for some time, and the sooner it is settled the better. When the tenants have an amount of arrears hanging over their heads they become discouraged—they think it is no use for them to make improvements; they become disheartened, and that retards the general prosperity of the country. I hope the question will soon be brought to an issue.

Hon. Mr. YEO—I think the last speaker but one is rather mistaken about the 20 years purchase. The proprietors cannot ask more than that, but they may take 10 or 15 or as much less as they like. As to the Fishery Reserves, no man would think of taking them from the tenants. I own a small island myself, and what would be the use of it to me if the Fishery Reserves were taken from me? I could not get it back. It would be a great advantage to the country to have the question settled. I have sold my land, both in large and small tracts, and I would take timber or anything they could give me. If the tenants can get their land at 15s or 20s an acre, I think it will be an advantage to them. I never signed the reference, or agreed to come under the award, but I offered to do so at any time. I have often sold my land for 15s or 16s an acre since I came to town, therefore the Award would be no great benefit to me.

Q.—A large amount of arrears of rent will be paid off by the Award, and that will be a great boon to the tenants.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—I do not rise, your honors, to oppose the address. I will not suppose it because I think the Award will be any benefit to the tenants, but because the Award have been led to believe that it would be a benefit. I have been offered to purchase for 15s. an acre since I came to town, therefore the Award would be no great benefit to me.

Q.—The Award would be no great benefit to me.

A.—I believe they were all marked as such, and I believe that they were not marked as such, but for my part, I have no faith in the Award, and I believe that they will never be any good result from it, nor do I think it will ever become the law of the land; but still I think it would be wisdom for this House to pass the award unanimously. As to the price of the land, I would far sooner deal with the proprietors, than with the Award. I have been offered to purchase for 15s. an acre since I came to town, therefore the Award would be no great benefit to me.

Q.—Were the votes of Donald McPherson and Murdoch Nicholson, which were polled for McLaren and McGowan at the Lot 66 polling division and marked objected, were these votes marked by McDonald or by Whittman?

A.—Decidedly by McDonald, in my opinion, or by his representative. There was one active agent on either side. The objection applied to either Candidate.

Q.—Did you object to the vote of Richard Gill?

A.—I cannot tell without the poll book