

---

# EVIDENCE.

---

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,

COMMITTEE ROOM,

Thursday, 17th February, 1881.

ISIDORE BEDARD, Esquire, in the Chair.

*Henry Crebassa, Notary, of Sorel :—*

I am a Notary, residing in the Borough of Sorel, or William Henry, for thirty six years.

Were you present at the Election that took place at Sorel, for choosing a member of the Provincial Parliament, in July 1827 ?—Yes, I was present all the time in my quality of Returning Officer for the said Election.

Who were the Candidates at that Election ?—The Hon. James Stuart, Attorney General for the Province, and Dr. Wolfred Nelson, of St. Denis.

Was that Election keenly contested ?—Yes, very keenly. It lasted from the 25th July to the 31st of the same month.

Did you hear any threats uttered against several of the Electors who came to vote ?—Yes, I heard the Attorney General vehemently threaten several of the electors who came to vote for Mr. Nelson. He told them that he would prosecute them for perjury ; if they voted that they should be put in the pillory, and that Mr. Nelson could not relieve them from it.

Can you tell the names of any persons who were so threatened by the Attorney General ?—Yes ; one named Antoine Paul Hus dit Cournoyer, and one named Antoine Auffant.

Why did the Attorney General tell those persons that they were entitled to vote ?—Because those two persons were fathers of families who had made donations of their property to their children.

Did Cournoyer and Auffant offer themselves to vote, after an individual named St. Germain had voted for the Attorney General ?—Yes.

Had the said St. Germain made a donation of his property to one of his sons, in the same way as Cournoyer and Auffant had done of their's ?—Yes ; and it was myself who made out the deeds. None of them had any more right to vote than the others. If I had not been Returning Officer, I should have told them not to vote. Each of these individuals had made donation of all their property to their children without any reserve. I will produce copies of their donation deeds.

When St. Germain came forward to vote for the Attorney General, did any one point out to him that he had no right to vote ?—Yes ; Mr. Nelson observed to him that he had no right to vote because he had made a donation of his property, and he told him he did not say so to prevent him voting, but he would do well to consider of it.

What did the Attorney General then say to him ?—The Attorney General told him that he had a right vote, and that his was a good vote.

What did St. Germain then do ?—St. Germain thought it best to retire and not to take the oath.

Did St. Germain come forward a second time ?—Yes, he came forward a second time at the Presbytery, where the Poll was held.

Was it again objected to him that he had no right to vote ?—Yes, Mr. Nelson again represented to him, that as he had given away his property, he could not vote, and that his son had already voted in virtue of the same property.

Did St. Germain acknowledge the fact, and admit that he had made a donation of his property ?—Yes, he acknowledged it, and repeated several times I have given my property to my son.

What did the Attorney General then say ?—The Attorney General told him not to be afraid of any thing, and that he had a right to vote.