

MARCHED IN.—One company of the 16th Regiment, who have been engaged in ball practice at Grimsby for the past two weeks, marched into the city and returned to barracks at about nine o'clock last evening. The company left Grimsby in the afternoon, and did not appear greatly fatigued by the tramp.—*Hamilton Times*.

DINNER TO THE OFFICERS OF THE "NORRKOPING."—Last night Baron Falkenberg, the Consul of Sweden and Norway, gave a dinner at the Stadsgården Club, in honor of the officers of the corvette *Norrköping*, now lying in this port. A number of our citizens were invited to meet them, and a very pleasant evening was passed. The following is a list of the officers and gentlemen present: Count Cronstadt and officers, J. B. Forsyth, Capt. Swinhoe, (acting Town Major), E. P. Jones, James Dean, Charles Sharples, C. F. Smith, John J. Foote, John Thomson, sr., W. H. Jeffery, C. R. Coker, Major Evans and Lieut. Douglas, H. M. S. *Aurora*; Major Buller, Col. Chandler, C. Johnson, Secretary; Challoner Smith, T. Beckett, Major McPherson, 30th; and Major Mortyn, 29th. The subjoined toasts were proposed and responded to with the greatest enthusiasm:

"The Queen." "The King of Sweden and Norway." "His Excellency the Governor General." "His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor of Quebec." "Count Cronstadt and Officers." The Health of Baron Falkenberg was proposed in a very feeling manner by the Count, and was received with great applause, to which the respected representative responded in an excellent speech, expressing the great pleasure he felt in meeting the citizens and gentlemen connected with the navy of the country he represented. A section of the band of the 30th Regiment contributed excellent music to the pleasures of the evening.—*Quebec Chronicle*, 14th inst.

IMPORTANT TO VOLUNTEERS.

ACTION AGAINST THE WEST OF SCOTLAND RIFLE ASSOCIATION.

On Saturday Sheriff Strathern took up, in Chambers, a small debt action, arising out of the recent rifle competition at Irvine. Mr. James McLeod, lithographer, South Bridge, Edinburgh, sued Mr. James Lockhart, Secretary to the West of Scotland Rifle Association, for the amount or value of the first prize in No. 7 competition of the programme of the West of Scotland Rifle Association for 1867, shot for at Irvine on Saturday, 8th June, 1867, at 200 and 400 yards, and duly gained by the complainer, and for which he was posted the winner by the defender. The amount of the prize money is £15, but the action was brought for £12. Parties having been called.

Mr. MENZIES, S. S. C., Edinburgh, on the part of the pursuer, gave a brief statement of the case. He said that Mr. McLeod, along with five other gentlemen from Edinburgh, composed a squad in the competition in question. They certainly made excellent scores at 200 yards, but only two of them went on to the 400 yards. In consequence of this a certain suspicion arose in the minds of the Association, and very properly so. Mr. Lockhart also received a protest from the gentleman who was second in the competition, to the effect that the scores made by the squad with which Mr. McLeod shot at 200 yards were extraordinary and

improbable; that four men getting very large scores retired from the squad, being convinced that the marking was erroneous; and that a gentleman who was entered for that competition did not shoot, because he expected unfair dealing on account of his being asked for 2s 6d by a man shooting in the same squad as McLeod for the purpose of bribing the marker. The whole contention was with reference to this last article. Mr. Lockhart along with Major Anderson, as representing the Council of the Association, has gone to Edinburgh and pre-announced the parties in the squad, and he understood got full and free information on every question they chose to put. But those gentlemen were not thoroughly satisfied that they had elicited the whole truth, and at a meeting he had with Mr. Lockhart it had been arranged that the case should be tried in order that the question of bribery might be got at by the parties being put on oath. He should like if Mr. Lockhart would bring forward the party who would be able to prove that the 2s 6d subscription was suggested by one in McLeod's squad. If that could be proved the gentleman who made the suggestion should certainly be branded forever with the odium of having made it. The persons composing the squad were very respectable gentlemen in Edinburgh, belonging to the Queen's Brigade, and they were also very excellent shots. Mr. McLeod, for the clearing of his own character, was very anxious that the case should be tried. The question they had to try was one of bribery, pure and simple.

The SHERIFF asked if Mr. Lockhart admitted that Mr. McLeod was the winner.

Mr. LOCKHART said he did, provided the proper score was given, but his defence went further than Mr. Menzies had indicated, and bore out the first part of the protest. He had found on pre-cognition that the scores were not only improbable, but impossible; that they were not true in point of fact. His defence, therefore, went this much further, that the scores, even upon the assumption that there was no bribery, could not be maintained, and that the prize did not fall to Mr. McLeod in consequence of his having proceeded to complete his competition, knowing the scores to be false.

The SHERIFF—How was it impossible?

Mr. LOCKHART—It amounts to almost a physical impossibility that the score McLeod is credited with, namely 27, out of a possible score of 28, could be made with the Enfield rifle.

Mr. MENZIES—It has been done three times in the Simultaneous Match.

Mr. LOCKHART—It has never been made in an open competition since the Enfield rifle was made.

The SHERIFF—Then your defence is—

Mr. LOCKHART—That the score is wrong in point of fact.

The SHERIFF—A second defence is that there was corruption in the matter?

Mr. LOCKHART—The defence is not put by me. We are merely to examine into the facts. The protest is not put in by me, but by a winner in the competition, who says, "Defer paying this prize till you investigate the circumstances."

The SHERIFF—Then you put it no higher than that McLeod has not gained the prize?

Mr. LOCKHART—Because the score is erroneous. I have no objection to my friend bringing out any fact.

The SHERIFF—It would be a pity to involve any question of a corrupt conduct on either side if it is simply a question of error.

Mr. LOCKHART—My friend is anxious that his client should be exonerated.

The SHERIFF—He does not require to be

exonerated if there is no blame imputed.

After evidence had been led at some length,

The SHERIFF said he had considerable satisfaction in being able to discharge from the case all imputation against the character of the Edinburgh gentlemen engaged in the competition. The Council were justified in having the investigation made, because from the information communicated to them, on which they were entitled to rely, they had reason to expect that, whether in the squad who were shooting or with others, something approaching to corruption had been attempted. The inquiry, however, showed that whether this were true or not with reference to others, the six gentlemen from Edinburgh had nothing whatever to do with it, and were not privy to it. He therefore dismissed it from his mind, and stated that he was entirely satisfied that the defence, so far as that was concerned, was without foundation. The only point left was whether there was evidence that McLeod attained the high score credited to him. If he attained that high score he was right in refusing to allow the sheet to be cancelled—he was entitled to go on with the competition with the view of gaining the prize. But the point was whether or not the scorer's sheet was conclusive in the face of challenge of the accuracy of the score. Now he knew nothing of what had been previously determined with regard to those sheets, and he should take the privilege of a lawyer in dealing with the sheet in question as with any other writing presented at a court of justice. Now, if there was one action in law clearer than another, it was, that if a writing was proved to be false, although not with reference immediately to the subject matter in dispute, a false writing was not entitled to credit. He could not tell whether the entry of McLeod's shooting had been accurately made, but he could say, from the evidence honestly and honorably given by other gentlemen in the competition, that there were scores erroneously entered. The motive of the scorer for making wrong entries he could not divine. If he was criminal in making these entries, he was equally criminal in swearing in support of them. He did not place any weight on the assertion that the score was correct in the face of the perfectly clear testimony on the other side. After some further remarks with reference to the state of the sheet, the learned Sheriff said he thought there had been absolute failure in the competition through the misconduct of the hired scorer, a man who from what had taken place ought never to be entrusted with duty of this description again. It had brought discredit on the competition by creating the present discussion; but he hoped this would obviate the possibility of anything of the kind occurring again, and that the same honorable good feeling would exist in future competitions as in the past. He laid the whole blame to Morrow's misconduct. He said nothing about poor Mr. A. S. Smith. He dared say that gentleman swore what he believed to be true, and the impression was on his mind that there had been suggested to him some impure thing. But after what Mr. Brown had himself sworn, and considering the agitated condition in which Mr. Smith himself was, he was willing to believe that the latter labored under a misapprehension that misled Mr. Brand, and through him the Council, who had acted in the matter with perfect propriety. He must, therefore, hold that there was not evidence that Mr. McLeod scored 27, and that there had been no proof that he was the winner of the prize claimed. He gave no costs.