

“fensive as they are unjust.” We would ask Mr. Hagerman, whether our juries at the political trials were not *packed*? Was not the course adopted here which the government would not venture to pursue in Lower Canada, of selecting juries from one political party? Do not the prisoners and their friends assert that they did not get fair play? Did not Mr. Hagerman himself as Attorney General, *challenge* jurors who were known to have been favourable to acquittal on previous trials, and this although the entire jury list had been carefully selected by the Sheriff from one political party? When these questions are answered satisfactorily Mr. Hagerman may talk of the purity of the administration of justice in Upper Canada.

Mr. Hagerman denies the assertion of the Report, that “the late elections were carried by the unscrupulous exercise of the influence of the government, and a display of violence on the part of the tories, &c.” Mr. Hagerman knows that the instructions of Lords Glenelg and Goderich regarding Executive interference at the elections were disobeyed by Sir F. Head. He knows that there *was* violence, and if he can offer no better refutation of Lord Durham’s statements than the report of the committee on Dr. Duncombe’s petition, he will fail to carry conviction to the mind of any impartial person. With regard to violence, we shall quote one case which *prima facie* would bear out Lord Durham’s report. An election took place for the county of Leeds, held we believe at Beverly,—two Conservatives were returned by violence, as was alleged by their opponents, and confirmed by a Grenville committee of the House of Assembly. Another election was held, and again the Conservatives were returned, and again did a Grenville committee unseat them on the ground of violence. A bill was passed to have four polling places for the next election, which being held, *the Reform candidates were returned by a large majority*, and there was no complaint of foul play on either side. This was only a few weeks before the general election in 1836, and *after* the Assembly’s quarrel with Sir F. Head. When the general election was held, the polling place was again fixed at Beverly, and a violent political partizan appointed returning officer; and again were the Conservatives returned *under protest on account of violence*. These facts came under the notice of Lord Durham and they cannot be controverted. A majority of the freeholders of Leeds were in favour of Messrs. Buell and Howard at the last election, notwithstanding which the conservative candidates were returned. We give no opinion ourselves on this matter because we personally know nothing about it,—we state facts which are before the world. Again, was there not violence in the county Simcoe? Did not the Reform candidate, the unfortunate Samuel Lount, retire *under protest* from the hustings, owing to violence? Mr. Hagerman knows that he did, and that his friends would inform him that the outrages committed on him at that election were the main cause of his being induced to take the step which he did. Those who have studied the human character will be able to judge, how far

Hager-  
what the  
do not

ent per-  
subjected  
rebellion  
tion may  
man’s re-  
h regard  
ourselves  
e militia  
r this ad-  
ignation,  
an says,  
ence and  
ord Dur-  
We defy  
adict his  
n his sup-

e British  
s arrest-  
e also an  
ial or on  
sons were  
istrict 75  
gnored by  
remainder  
rs. We  
n without  
h will re-  
exposure.  
have been  
e number  
as much  
se, as we  
24 hours  
of testing  
sons all of  
H. Price,  
er of the  
Mr. John  
County of  
on motion  
e that it is  
I take un-

Report on  
e particu-  
n Juries”  
b, “as ef-