

individual, is extremely objectionable. Persons are not always good judges of their own interest. We can state, with certainty, after an examination of the number of our Country subscribers, who allow their papers to be called for in Town, that a reduction from 5s. to 2s. 6d. of the charge, would, by inducing these subscribers to make use of the Post-Office, give fully an equal, if not, a greater income to the Post-Office than it now receives at 5s. While we are persuaded that the circulation of papers has been restricted by the amount of the charge, and by the want of post routes, we have reason, we think, to object to the legality of the charge, and to our being put by the Post-Office upon a more disadvantageous footing than other persons.

Adjourned.

---

*Tuesday, 22nd March 1831.*

PRESENT :—Messrs. *Neilson, Peck, Huot* and *Quesnel*.

*Mr. Neilson* in the Chair.

*Robert Armour*, junior, Esquire, again called in ; and examined :—

You mention in your evidence, that your Father has commenced Law proceedings against *Mr. Stayner*, for refusing to transmit his papers by post ; at what time were these proceedings commenced ?—The first protest is dated in January 1830.

Was your Father in arrears with the Post-Office at the time of the refusal to transmit the papers, and to what amount ?—He was never in arrears, the demand was always made for a quarter's postage in advance, and a note granted for the amount.

Was there ever any instance of the notes not being taken up when due ?—They were always taken up when