

The Weekly British Colonist,

Wednesday, February 8th 1871

The Unknown Land.

Not once, but many times and oftener we receive letters from persons in various parts of the United States and the British North American Colonies, desirous of emigrating to the Pacific Coast, making enquiry about this Colony, its climate, lands, resources and all and sundry, those matters and things respecting which intending emigrants would naturally desire to be informed. These enquiries for the most part emanate from British subjects in a foreign land, who long to return to the beneficent folds of the Union Jack, and who look to British Columbia as presenting a desirable home under Confederation and with a popular form of Government. Of this class is one who writes to us from Iowa, and who is desirous of emigrating to this Colony with a view to engaging in stock-farming. 'I still claim the Union Jack,' says our correspondent, 'and long to feel at home under its shadow.' Our present object in alluding to these circumstances is to impress the Legislature as well as the Government with the importance of adopting the most thorough and efficient means for disseminating such information as is constantly sought through private channels, and the promulgation of which would not fail to bring thousands of ostracised British subjects back to the shadow of the Union Jack. We need go no farther than California to find thousands of this class. When one thinks of the wide and fertile acres with which the Colony everywhere abounds, its varied and immense resources, and its high adaptation to the wants of the industrial class, and when it is remembered that the one great overshadowing desideratum is an industrial population, it is not easy to explain or excuse the persistent refusal of successive Administrations to adopt any of those agencies—by means of which other new countries are populated, and without the use of which no new country has a right to expect population. This subject is not new in these colonies. It is not new in our Legislative halls; and we advert to it now with the earnest hope that the present session may not be permitted to pass without some steps being taken, in the right direction. British Columbia is still an unknown land to those centres of population from which we would otherwise have a right to expect population. In truth much of it is still *terra incognita* to ourselves. But speaking of those parts of it now comparatively known, there need be no hesitation in proclaiming it a land of plenty—a most desirable home for millions. To make its real character and resource known is to secure what alone is needed to make it one of the most prosperous and powerful of all the British Possessions.

The Bear Garden.

It is with extreme regret that we refer to the demoralized condition into which the member for Lillooet has been permitted to bring the Legislative Council. But the recollection yesterday of another of those scenes which have become too common of late, appears to demand the intervention of the press. It would really seem as though the member referred to was actuated by no higher motive in one-half, possibly three-fourths, of the questions with which he combats the notice paper and occupies the time of the House, than as the Hon the Chief Commissioner remarked, to have an opportunity of hearing himself talk and annoying the Government. Certain it is that he is equally certain that he has rendered himself utterly powerless for good to those who committed the egregious blunder of sending him there. But we must say that the members of the Legislature have themselves very much to blame for the reduction of the Council to the status of a bear-garden. If they would display a little more respect for themselves, both individually and collectively and take a firm and dignified stand against the unprofitable, unseemly and unparliamentary license indulged in by the member for Lillooet, such exhibitions would not be so frequent occurrences. The Legislature ought to protect its own dignity.

Saturday, Feb. 4.

ESQUIMALT MAIL NOTICE.—Mr J T Howard, Esquimalt Postmaster, announces that the mail van will leave Esquimalt at 10 o'clock a.m. and 2 to 2 o'clock p.m. and Victoria at 12 o'clock p.m. and 4 1/2 p.m. each day, Sundays excepted. At the Colonial Hotel, opposite the Colonist office, all packages intended for Esquimalt and the Fleet may be left; where passengers will also be taken.

BOUND OVER.—D. Fasanaro was yesterday for an assault on John Taylor bound over to his recognizance, for fifty dollars to keep the peace for three months.

Legislative Council.

FRIDAY, Feb 24, 1871.

Council met at 1:30 p.m. Present.—The Hon. Speaker, Hon. Chief Commissioner, Hon. Attorney-General, Hon. Collector of Customs, Mr. Humphreys, Hon. Dr. Helmecken, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Nathan, Mr. Skinner, Mr. Bonster, Mr. Alston, Mr. DeCosmos, Mr. Cornwall, Hon. Dr. Carrall, Mr. Pemberton.

Minutes of the last meeting read and confirmed.

NOTICE.

Mr. Cornwall gave notice of a motion for an address to His Excellency the Governor asking that \$250 be appropriated for the mail service between Lytton and Nicola-Lake.

PETITIONS.

Mr. Humphreys presented a petition from the inhabitants of the town of Lillooet praying that a Court of Assize may be held at that town as the practice of holding it at Clinton only placed the residents of Lillooet to great inconvenience and expense to attend.

Mr. Nathan presented a petition from the Board of Education of the City of Victoria, stating that they had exerted all the means in their power to place the school system in a successful running order, but had failed, that there were now in arrears to teachers and rent in the sum of \$1000, and praying for the repeal of the present act and for relief. The petitioners recommended a small tax on real and personal property as the most equitable means of raising a revenue for the support of schools.

CONSTITUTION.

House went into committee on the Constitution Bill.

The Speaker called Mr. Alston to the Chair.

Mr. Alston said that Mr. Skinner, having acted as Chairman on the first day should continue to sit as such until the completion of the Bill.

Mr. Humphreys objected because Mr. Skinner was a Mainland member.

The Speaker said a rule existed which rendered it imperative on Mr. Skinner to take the Chair. This rule he had overruled in calling upon Mr. Alston.

Mr. Skinner had no objection to take the Chair.

Neither had Mr. Alston, who accordingly took the Chair and the business commenced. To Section 7 Mr. Cornwall objected. He could not see why 12 members should be given to the Island and only 13 to the Mainland. The division was not correct. It was the smallest section and he did not believe it was the most densely populated. It was always disagreeable to draw comparisons between two sections, but in this case it was necessary to point out that the Island was inferior to the Mainland in agricultural land and productions. [Dr. Carrall.—They import their chickens fresh.] In one small district alone of the Mainland there is more land available for settlement than there is on the whole Island. In the face of this fact the Bill gives the agricultural sections of the Island 8 members and those of the Mainland 6. Referring to the Schedule, the hon. member said he would take one member from Marchion, Sooke, etc., and send him to Cariboo—giving Cariboo four members. In each square mile there can be but four pre-emptive lots. So the Council would see that there was a limit to the agricultural population of the Island, while there could be no limit to the population of the Mainland.

Mr. Nelson asked on what basis the mainland was to be allowed only 13 and the island 12.

Mr. Nathan.—On an equitable basis.

Hon. Attorney General suggested that the hon. gentleman should first state his reasons for opposing the motion.

Mr. Nelson wanted returns of the population of the two sections.

Mr. Humphreys thought the Attorney General had said the division was made on the basis of population.

Hon. Attorney General—I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. Humphreys would like to know on what basis the division was made. Was it on population?

Hon. Attorney General.—The hon. gentleman knows very well that no census has been taken.

Hon. Chief Commissioner.—I will go further and say that the opinion of the Government is that the preponderance of white population is on Vancouver Island, and that if representation is to be made on the basis of population the bulk of the representation would be from Vancouver Island.

There were other conditions, however, which weighed in giving the mainland the bulk of representation.

Mr. Nelson said if the Government were in possession of information on the subject of population that information should be laid before the Council.

Mr. DeCosmos thought the Government had acted very fairly in the matter; thought Vancouver Island should have the majority on the score of population; but the territory being taken into consideration the division was fair.

Mr. Humphreys supported the amendment of the hon. member for Yale, but complained that there was no use in talking, as 'counting noses' he saw that all the wisest men in the world might say would be ineffective. Reason in this Council was at a discount. Lillooet District alone produced 3,000,000 pounds of wheat or 2,000,000 pounds of flour.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken particularly asked for information as to where the 3,000,000 pounds of wheat were raised? and where it was sold?

Mr. Humphreys.—In Lillooet District and sold at Cariboo.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken was happy to bear of the productivity of Lillooet District even to the extent of 2,000,000 pounds of flour, and that it was all to be sold at Cariboo.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken.—How much wheat is that to the acre?

Mr. Humphreys.—3000 pounds, the average is 30 bushels to the acre, 15,000 pounds were raised from three acres last year.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken.—2,000,000 pounds of flour would be 10,000 barrels. Say there are 1000 men in Cariboo each of whom will consume four barrels of flour a year (a large allowance). You have got rid of 4000 barrels and you have 6000 barrels to do what with? (Laughter)

with? (Laughter) Hon. Attorney General.—It would require 15,000 acres of wheat land to produce 10,000 barrels of flour.

Mr. Humphreys explained that Indians and Chinamen consumed a great deal of flour.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken was sorry to see such a feeling growing up between the two sections as was developed here to-day. Much had been said about sentiment. If there were any sentiment at all it was in giving the mainland one member more than the Island. He had said and he would say now that the population of the Island was greater than that of the mainland; that the permanent and floating population of the Island were greater than that of the mainland. Any district of Vancouver Island would show more voters than any district on the mainland; but he would not draw comparisons between the two sections which ought now to work as an harmonious whole. There was no sense in talking of what the population of either section will be ten years hence. We had to deal with the present. In this instance the Government was right.

Mr. Humphreys asked, supposing the Island formed a continuous portion of the Mainland what would be the division?

Hon. Dr. Helmecken said that neither politically nor practically was Vancouver an Island. It was just as much a part of the Mainland as any other part of the Colony—only being divided by two-half miles of water. Vancouver members would vote together on this bill, because it was fair and honorable. He regretted to see such a division between Mainland and Island members; it had never occurred before and he was sorry indeed to see to-day any attempt made to create a sectional division.

Hon. Dr. Carrall hoped the amendment would be taken pleasantly. He concurred in the remark that had been made with respect to this not being practically an island, and said the terms island and mainland should only be used to indicate the two sections. It was his honest conviction that the mainland should have 14 members and the island 11.

In the Executive Council he had withheld his support on this section. He had been asked to support 10 to 15, but such a difference would not be right. The resources and population of the mainland were such as to entitle it to the number claimed by the amendment of the member for Yale. Twenty-five members were out of proportion to the population of the colony—it was antiquated. Now, any district of the colony may be represented by a resident of any other district. Perhaps an islander may be chosen to represent a mainland district, and that would through the weight of representation into the hands of the Island. This was one of the strongest reasons why the amendment should be agreed to now.

Hon. Chief Commissioner said if there had been any doubt in the mind of the Executive as to the advisability of dividing the representation as the bill proposed, the discussion to-day had removed them. Were the division otherwise, it was quite evident that the section now desiring a large majority of representatives would have done as it pleased. The hon. member for Lillooet, who never missed an opportunity to attack his name to that of the Chief Commissioner, and was entitled to all the honor he might gain thereby.

Mr. Humphreys—I have simply tried to do my best to represent a large and important constituency, and I protest against these personalities.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken.—There are no personalities.

Hon. Chief Commissioner.—I was going on to say, when I was interrupted, that the Government had been twitted with making empty speculations with respect to the population of the two sections. From the 'Blue Book for 1869, which he held in his hand, he returns, he would say, were incomplete—the hon. gentleman proceeded to show that the white population of the mainland was 2914 males and 377 females; while that of the island was 2600 males and 1819 females. The statement of the votes polled in the two sections also showed that the Island had the preponderance of the colony.

The total white population of the colony, according to the 'Blue Book' was 8000. He believed it would reach 10,000 and that Vancouver Island had the most inhabitants; that the Government, taking into consideration the extent of the mainland, had decided to give it one member more than the island.

Mr. Nelson produced facts to show that the returns were incomplete.

Mr. Humphreys spoke after again stating that he might say would be useless.

Mr. Skinner in a brief speech supported the amendment.

Mr. Nathan said that the bill, if anything, was too favorable to the mainland, and as it had been developed in this debate that Vancouver Island had the largest population, he should at the proper time support an amendment to take one member from the mainland and give him to the island.

Mr. Nelson produced statistics to show that the revenue of the mainland was more previous to union than the revenue of the united colony after union.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken claimed that that was owing to a diminishing population.

Mr. Nelson replied that the union of the colonies would have more than made up the difference if the island had the greater population.

Mr. Bonster spoke in favor of the original section.

Mr. Cornwall replied in support of the amendment.

Hon. Attorney General said 25 representatives would give the colony a member for every 100 voters.

Hon. Chief Commissioner.—Yale will have a member for every 50 voters.

Hon. Attorney General said it was impossible for the Government to procure a correct estimate of the population in time to bring down the bill at this season. The vote of opinion that the majority of the voters would be found on Vancouver Island and that if population was taken as the basis the Island would have more; yet taking into consideration the resources and extent of the Mainland and its probable more rapid growth, they came to the conclusion to give the one 13 and the other 12. The feeling he had seen exhibited here to-day perturbed no good to the colony in the future. He asked hon. gentlemen whether if the Mainland had been given 15 and the

Island 10, the Mainland would not have been in a position to put its feet upon the Island and do with it as it pleased? It was unfair to twit the Government upon coming down unprepared with statistics. The bill might be amended at the very next session—it was merely tentative.

Mr. Nelson complained that no estimate had been made of the population. He estimated that the Government itself had created sectional feeling in saying that the Mainland would put the Island under its heel if it had the chance.

The motion was then put and lost—5 to 9. The yeas were Messrs Carrall, Nelson, Humphreys, Cornwall, Skinner.

The section was passed by a similar vote. Mr. Humphreys complained that Lillooet district had not been divided.

Hon. Chief Commissioner said any member wishing to change the lines which had been fixed by the schedule should submit it in writing. It was not at all possible to fix the lines more definitely on the Mainland as there had not been surveys sufficient.

Hon. Attorney General said that 'unless a district could be well defined by surveys much trouble would arise. He agreed that the districts were too large. This Bill might be considered as temporary and could be amended the next session.

Mr. Cornwall moved an amendment to divide Yale district as follows:—1st—Hope, Yale, Lytton and the intervening country, 2d—From Lytton to the Thompson and Kamloops, 3d—The balance of the district.

Considerable discussion arose on the matter proposed to divide the Mainland generally and on motion the committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

MECHANIC'S INSTITUTE.

Mr. Alston moved the second reading of this bill which was agreed to and ordered to be committed on Tuesday.

INSTALLMENTS DUE ON LAND.

Mr. DeCosmos by request allowed this question to be deferred.

SURVEYS OF CLAIMS.

Mr. Humphreys asked the hon. Chief Commissioner whether it is the intention of the Government to let by contract the surveys of the pre-emption and grazing claims proposed to be surveyed during the present year, and if such letting by contract would not be cheaper and more expeditious than the present slow and expensive system.

Hon. Chief Commissioner replied as follows:—I am not aware whether or not it is the intention of Government to let by contract the surveys of pre-emption and grazing claims during the present year; but I am of opinion that such a system would be neither cheaper nor more expeditious than the present, which I do not consider either a slow or expensive system.

Mr. Humphreys rose to express his dissatisfaction at the reply, when the hon. Chief Commissioner rose to a question of order and appealed to the Speaker to know if, when a clearly defined question was answered in a clear and distinct manner, as had been done in this instance, should the matter rest there and no further discussion take place? It appeared to him that the hon. Chief Commissioner had the member for Lillooet put forward these questions for the purpose of having an opportunity to talk and to annoy the Government.

The hon. Speaker said it had been the custom to allow members to reply if they were not satisfied with the explanation given to their questions.

Mr. Humphreys complained of the treatment he had, upon this and other occasions, received at the hands of the hon. Chief Commissioner, [who withdrew to the lobby] and after exhausting himself, resumed his seat.

WAGON ROAD RETURNS.

Mr. Humphreys asked leave to have the motion for returns respecting the wagon roads postponed for one week, as he might have to move an address to the Governor enquiring whether the hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works has a right to issue the people's representatives in that House, leave granted.

GOVERNOR'S REPLY TO MR. MITCHELL AND OTHERS.

Mr. Humphreys said this had already been complied with and he read the letter asked for in the motion for an address.

LEGAL PROFESSIONS BILL.

Hon. Dr. Helmecken moved the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. Nathan seconded.

Mr. Alston opposed the Bill altogether. He thought it his duty to stand up for the dignity of the profession as well as for the interests of the public. He knew the ins and outs of the whole thing. Five out of the eight who had signed the petition knew nothing about the Bill at the time and were now opposed to it. He was sorry to see that two barristers had signed it, but he was glad to see that it did not contain the name of a barrister from England. English barristers were too proud of their dignity to consent to such a thing. The proposers of the Bill had offered an insult to the profession. None of the Judges had been consulted by them. Should this Bill pass this colony would enjoy the unique distinction of occupying a position differing from any other part of the world. He intimated that some political distinction was sought by the passage of the Bill.

Hon. Attorney General said he would oppose the bill, not on account of any personal interest, but in the interest of the people. Barristers had nothing to lose by the proposition, but the attorneys anything to gain. There should be a commission appointed to frame a bill of this nature. He had seen the two professions united, but it had proved a great course. He thought this a piece of legislation that should be done under the patronage of the Canadian Government. The hon. gentleman continued at some length, concluding by saying that this question should be left to a new House, and not determined by what might be termed a dying mitigation.

The question was taken for the second reading, when a vote occurred and the Speaker gave his casting vote against the bill.

THOMPSON ROAD STEALER BILL.

Hon. Dr. Carrall asked leave to introduce this bill, and explained that he was absent

on Wednesday when he was to bring it in. The rules were suspended and the bill was read a first time.

It was moved that the second reading be fixed for Monday.

Mr. Humphreys asked that the second reading be postponed until after the arrival of the steamer from New Westminster, as he had written to his constituents and wished to hear from them on this matter.

Several members spoke to the question and the second reading was finally fixed for Wednesday.

Council adjourned till 1 o'clock p.m. on Monday.

COMMITTED.—Mrs. Amelia Copperman was yesterday examined on a charge of committing perjury in the case of Copperman v. Hedges and committed to the Assize Court. The offence charged is that Mrs. Copperman is sworn to pay for the four receipts produced by her as a payment for the rent claimed by Hedges, and she consequently signed receipts which she denied having presented. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is that Mrs. Copperman is a case, swore that the four receipts produced by her were signed by Hedges himself, and also that she denied having presented a receipt for October signed Hedges. The evidence against her was confirmed by four witnesses. The Magistrate manifested a great deal of leniency in the management of the case, as the accused had no counsel. Her defence charge is