

In dealing with grants of land in the Colony, has it been the habit of the Colonial Government to correspond with the Home Government to suggest or consent to any grants of land, without consulting the Legislative Assembly?—I am not aware of any particular case.

How many lots of 60 by 120 feet are there in an acre?—I have heard five.

How many lots would there be in the Church Reserve, and Parsonage?—About 100 more or less.

What would be the average value of each lot in the Church Reserve and Parsonage?—I should think \$500.

At that rate what would be the total value of Church Reserve and Parsonage?—\$50,000.

The Messenger having been questioned by the Chairman, whether he had served certain summonses, delivered to him by the Chairman, replied that he had served a summons on Mr. Gastineau, and that gentleman having failed to attend the Committee, agreeably to said summons, it is resolved by the Committee:

That the Chairman report the same to the House.

Resolved—That the circumstance of Mr. McTavish's intention to leave the Colony, be also reported to the House, and that the Chairman be requested to ask Mr. Speaker to procure the attendance of Mr. McTavish at a special Committee to be held at 10 o'clock, A. M. to-morrow, for the purpose of taking his examination.

The Committee then adjourned till to-morrow at 10 o'clock, A. M.

(Signed), JAMES TRIMBLE, Chairman.

COMMITTEE ROOM, Nov. 17, 1863.—Present, Messrs. De Cosmos, Duncan, Dr. Tolmie. No quorum. Mr. McTavish appeared by request.

COMMITTEE ROOM, Nov. 18, 1863.—Present, Dr. Trimble, (in the chair), Messrs. De Cosmos, Ridge, Duncan, Dr. Tolmie. The minutes of last meeting having been read and confirmed, Mr. W. A. G. Young, Colonial Secretary was called and further examined

By the Chairman.

Did the Governor object to Bishop Hills building a residence on the Church Reserve?

I do not remember any objection being made at the time.

Question by Mr. Duncan.

Do you know by whose authority the House, used as Harbour Master's office, and Post Office in 1857, and part of 1858, at the foot of Fort Street, has been moved?—I do not.

Who held the offices of Harbour Master and Post Master in 1857?—I believe the late Captain Sangster.

Was his office at the foot of Fort Street?—The office in which I once saw him performing his duties as Post Master was situated inside the stockade of the Hudson Bay Company's Fort, on the west side at the end nearest to the harbour, near to what is now the foot of Fort Street.

What interpretation do you put upon the Duke of Newcastle's despatch of 15th April, 1861, when he says that the local Government will be consulted before deciding on the final arrangements to be made with the Company in regard to the disposal of the ground, in the vicinity of Victoria?—That no final arrangement would be made with the Company until the draft of those arrangements had been submitted to the local Government.

By Dr. Tolmie.

What do you consider the meaning of the local Government as used in that despatch?—The Governor.

By Mr. Duncan.

Do the Imperial Government request of the local Government certain further information regarding lands in dispute, maps, &c., before the final completion of the Indenture of Agreement, dated 3d February, 1862?—The only further information they ask for is, for a general plan of the Island, shewing all the portions that have been alienated by the Hudson Bay Company, and the portions that will revert to the Crown.

Has His Excellency Governor Douglas furnished the necessary information and given his consent to the execution of the deeds to complete the Agreement of the Arbitrators?—Not yet.

By Mr. Duncan.

Do you consider the Duke of Newcastle to have broken faith with the local Government in agreeing to the arbitration before submitting it for their approval?—I do not consider myself at liberty to express any opinion, either commendatory or otherwise, on the proceedings of the Duke of Newcastle in this matter.

By Mr. Ridge.

Will you state whether you consider the words of the Duke of Newcastle's despatch, No 84, dated 8th May, 1862, viz.:—"All questions regarding the land have been set at rest by the Agreement concluded with the Company, a copy of which was communicated to you in my despatch No. 84, of 24th January last" as a decided settlement of the question that had been in dispute?—I do of the general question of title; the delay in the final settlement is, as I have before explained, on account of a difference between the Governor of the Colony and the Hudson Bay Company as to the amount of land which should be conveyed under that Indenture.

Do you consider the final settlement of whatever matters remain in dispute, between the Government and Hudson Bay Company, are alone capable of final settlement between those two parties?—I do not. I consider the matter is one entirely between the Imperial Government and Hudson Bay Company, and the only power the Governor has in it, is to advise Her Majesty's Government of local circumstances affecting the case.

Do you consider any action or representation, after due inquiry, made by the House of Assembly or by a Committee appointed by that House, could bear upon the settlement of the subjects still in dispute, if represented to the Imperial Government?—I consider the Duke of Newcastle would treat