in the carriage must have heard it. Mr. McGill came out, and began to damn William (his Nephew), and said it was all his doings.

Cross examined by Mr. Lawson.—Could not hear what Mooney said, but am quite sure it was in disapproval of the people's conduct; the carriage was in the middle of the crowd, Captain Swabey was sitting along side of Mr. Coles.

Matthew May examined.—Could not swear who was in the carriage; did not remember seeing Captain Swabey that night; saw Mr. Whelan in the carriage after it was over; was in favor of Mr. Coles; saw Mr. R. Walsh on horseback; did not hear him tell the people where to go. Remember telling him myself to go down Pownal Street.

Cross examined by the Hon. C. Young. The carriage was waiting at Crabb's corner sometime before Mr. Coles returned from the Election. (The Solicitor General objected to a question from Mr. Young, and the latter said he would call this witness on the defence.)

J. B. Cox examined.--Saw a carriage in the crowd at Mr. Coles's private house; saw Captain Swabey, Mr. Coles and Mr. Whelan in it, cannot say who besides. Saw Mr. Cochran standing on its side. Went with the procession as far as Mr. K. McKenzie's, then went home. I think there was only one carriage. No harm was done to persons or property as far as I went.

Cross examined by Mr. Young.—Did not see that Captain Swabey was in the carriage at Government House; but saw him in it at McKenzie's; do not know where he got in; he might have been at Government House. I think I saw Clark in it at McKenzie's; took very little notice; it was very dark. The carriage stopped at McKenzie's else I should not have known any of the gentlemen in it.

SECOND DAY.

The Solicitor General having obtained leave to examine another witness, called—

Jeremiah Simpson.—I know Mr. Clark, I am a friend of his. A few days after the Election I had a conversation with him. I live at a distance from town—heard sad accounts of the rioting as it was called. I said to Mr. Clark, I hoped he was not implicated in the disgraceful doings; he acknowledged being in the carriage; I enquired if any damage was done; he said there was, but did he not know by whom. I told him he ought to have left the carriage.

Cross examined by Mr. Lawson.—I believe he was sorry for what had happened; at the time the conversation took place no indictment was preferred.

Here terminated the evidence on the part of the Prosecution.

JOHN LAWSON, Esq., then rose and addressed the Jury for

THE DEFENCE.

He commenced with observing, that the case had caused much excitement—an excitement which he feared was not even now altogether allayed. That it was one of those cases to which singular importance had been attached, and one which required that the Jury should come to its consideration with that calmness so indispensably requisite in men who wish to give a just and conscientious verdict, throwing aside all personal, but particularly divesting themselves of political and party feeling (which were the worst of all as respected their influence over the minds of men), regard only the oath they had taken and the honest dictates of their own hearts. He gave the Hon. Solicitor General the highest praise for his candid and mild manner in opening the case for the Crown—even he had admitted that these were times of political excitement from which few escaped participation, and so satisfied was he (Mr. Lawson) that such was the case at the time of preferring the Indictment, that had it not prevailed to such an extent as it did, no such Bill would have been found. He did not wish to be considered as making any charge against the Grand Jury, almost all of whom were his personal friends, and men who were mindful of the solemn oath they had taken on that occasion. But this he would say, that it was matter of notoriety, and a fact acknowledged by all, that the Jury who preferred that Bill were, with the exception of four or five, the decided opponents of Mr. George Coles. Now it unfortunately happened, that human nature is so constituted, that when men's minds were labouring under the influence of political prejudice, they viewed facts with that diseased and jaundiced eye that gave to every event the hue of their own distempered imaginations; and he was well satisfied that if the same Grand Jury were now sitting, (such was the beneficial effect of a little time for reflection,) that no such Bill would have been heard of. This was now, however, of little consequence—the Bill was before them and they must dispose of it.

The Solicitor General had anticipated that the defence would be, that it was a mere election riot, and that at such times all things were lawful. He (Mr. Lawson) did not stand there to uphold breaches of the peace or infractions of the laws; but it was well known that commotions and displays of popular feelings were common and incidental, nay, almost inseparable from elections where every man came forward to uphold his favorite candidate on the side of party politics which he supported; and he would go a little further and say, that they were a kind of safety valve which allowed feelings to escape, which, if pent up, might burst forth at other times and in other forms with more destructive violence. They were like those sudden gusts in nature which, though accompanied with severe violence, leave a clearer and purer atmosphere. He wished it were otherwise, and that men could vote for Members of Parliament in the same quiet and unbiased manner as the Jury would give their verdict this day. But the question here was not whether this were an Election *Row*, but whether it were a riot. Now, a riot had been defined—(Here the learned Counsel read from 'Russell on Crimes,' and other works, and contended that there had been no proof of a riot.) The most essential part of the evidence necessary to constitute a riot in the eye of the law, was wanting, this was the mutual determination and agreement of three or more persons to assist each other in the commission of some act of violence. No such mutuality had been proved. It was unfortunate for the Traversers that all who were in the carriage had been included in the Indictment, or that they were mutually deprived of that evidence which would show, that so far from participating in, they felt the same abhorrence at the acts of violence as they, the Jury, the Crown Officers, and every well-disposed member of the community could feel. (The learned Gentleman proceeded to comment upon the evidence, and was desired to confine himself to the defence of his particular clients.) He then observed that throughout the whole of the evidence the names of his Clients, Messrs. Clark and Cochran, had scarcely ever been named—the fact of their having been there at all rested only on their own admissions, and when these admissions were made, they respectively disclaimed all participation in the acts of violence which had been committed. He abstained from going into the evidence for the defence, as he felt that his own Clients needed none; but his friend, Mr. Young, would follow, and he trusted that when they had heard his address and the evidence that would be adduced on the part of the defence, they would have no difficulty in acquitting not only his clients but the whole of the Traversers.

[We are reluctantly compelled to postpone to next week the other speeches and the evidence which followed.]

SUPREME COURT.

FRIDAY, JAN'Y. 7.

The Queen *vs.* Phoebe Cole. Indictment for firing a loaded gun at one Hugh McLeod, with an intent to kill, maim, disfigure, or do him some serious bodily injury.—There was no real defence in this case—Mr. Young for the prisoner addressed the Jury, who acquitted her on the 1st, 2d and 3d counts of the Indictment, and found her guilty on the fourth—that of shooting with an intent to do some bodily injury.

The Queen *vs.* James Flemming. Indictment for Larceny.—The facts in this case were: that the prosecutor (a simple sort of fellow) went into the Barrack with the prisoner, a soldier, having a bundle in which was contained a new frock coat, which he stated he put under his head when he went to bed. The prisoner was found coming into Barrack next morning with the coat on his back, when he stated that he had taken it out of a lark. The Jury being of the same opinion, acquitted the prisoner. Mr. Lawson conducted the defence.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 8.

The Queen *vs.* George McDonald. Indictment for maliciously stabbing Uriah Billingham.—The case for the prosecution was, that the prisoner, in the house of Catherine McEachern, in a quarrel which arose between him and the prosecutor, Billingham, who is a Sergeant of the 23d Regt., stabbed the latter in two places, with a sharp pointed knife. The prisoner was defended by Mr. Lawson, who produced evidence to contradict the statement of the prosecutor. The Jury having retired for a short time, found the prisoner guilty on the 4th count of the Indictment, for stabbing with intent to do some grievous bodily injury.

Same against Same. For maliciously stabbing James Hargest.—This case arose out of the same quarrel as the former, and the same evidence adduced on both sides. Verdict guilty on the 2d count, for stabbing with intent to maim. Mr. Lawson for the Defendant.

MONDAY, JANUARY 10.

The Queen *vs.* Richard Gill and others. Indictment for a Riot in Belfast, preferred last term.—This case arose out of the unfortunate transactions at the late Belfast election. One of the prisoners only, Henry Burns, was found guilty; the others were acquitted. Mr. Young and Mr. Longworth for the Traversers.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 11.

The Queen *vs.* Thomas Poole and others. Indictment for Rescue.—The facts in this case were, that Donald McPhee, the constable, had an attachment issued from the Commissioners' Court, under which he seized a cart, the property, as was alleged, of one Glydden, an absent debtor. The seizure was resisted by the traversers, on the ground that the writ did not warrant the seizure. There were a great number of witnesses examined, and much contrary swearing. The Jury having remained out a considerable time, at length returned with a verdict, finding Thomas Poole and John Glydden guilty, but recommending them to the mercy of the Court. Mr. Lawson for the traversers.

WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY.

The Queen *vs.* Edward Love—the Queen *vs.* Thomas Terlizzick. Indictments for Nuisance.—Traversers found guilty. As this is a matter of some importance as respects future proceedings with regard to Boundary Lines, we trust to be able to put our readers, especially those of the town, in possession of all the important facts, as well as the law, of the case.

FRIDAY.

Hobkirk *vs.* the Queen. Account against the Queen for services rendered as a Medical man, by order of the Government. This case commenced on Thursday afternoon, occupied the whole of Friday—and may be, it is possible, decided to-day. As this is the first action of the kind that has been commenced in this or in any other colony that we are aware of, an outline of the cause and proceedings shall be given in an early No. of this paper.

THE CURRENCY.

The financial affairs of this Colony must be, to every one who feels an interest in its improvement, a subject of deep and engrossing interest. Whatever may be the scheme adopted by the Legislature in its approaching Session, public men, in both Houses, cannot fail to discover the necessity of a change. We, therefore, think that—whilst we, as a public Journalist, may reasonably hesitate to enter into the details of the subject, or advance any theory of our own—we cannot more advantageously occupy a portion of our paper than in giving publicity to such information and such well-digested opinions as correspondents may from time to time bring under our observation. The following Letter on this subject we have read with much interest, and whilst we hold ourselves free either to entertain or reject the views of the writer of this, or any other letter in reference to the matter, our readers cannot fail to regard it with earnest, if not favourable, consideration.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR;

Your article respecting the financial affairs of the Colony seems to invite discussion, and your Correspondent "Cambiatore" having left us rather hungry for another of his able letters, without catering for our appetites, I may, perhaps, be pardoned if I offer few remarks (intended to be practical) on the subject.

Lord Grey's proposition includes the buying up or absorbing all the Treasury Warrants afloat, which, according to the Report of the Committee of Accounts made to the Assembly on March 22d, 1847, then amounting to 29,317*l.* 11s. 8½d., as well as the Treasury Notes in circulation, which the same Report calls 11,500*l.*

The bonds and cash available at the same date (including 2,171*l.* 4s. 6d. retained for Warrants called in) amounted to 14,631*l.* 16s. 3½d.

Thus the balance against the Colony was 26,185*l.* 15s. 5d. The Revenue, it is probable, will be 20,000*l.*

But we must make use of last year's data in the absence of this year's account.

Lord Grey proposes then that the Notes and Warrants in circulation shall be absorbed or bought up. For these purposes 40,817*l.* 11s. 8½d. will be required.

Now this amount is to be replaced, in part, by the issue of Notes payable on demand, and in part by borrowing at an interest of 6 per cent. By way of safeguard for the Treasury against the consequences of too quick a presentation of Notes payable on demand, Lord Grey proposes a restriction to be imposed on holders, purporting that they shall not present for payment a less amount of Notes than represent 50*l.*, and the Notes are made (within the Island, of course,) a legal tender. This restriction in a poor country cannot be supported, and would be so unpopular that it might risk the success of the whole scheme. It cannot, therefore, be maintained.

The Treasury or Bullion Office or Exchange Office, or whatever it may be, must constantly have ready a sum sufficient to meet the contingency of these convertible