

RESOLVED, *Nemine contradicente*, that Mr. Panet ought to be interrogated.

Mr. Panet being returned, the Resolution of the Committee was read to him.

The following questions were then put to him :

*Question*—Do you know if any inconveniencies have arisen from Judges offering themselves at Elections, as Candidates ?

*Answer*—Yes.

*Question*—What inconveniencies ?

*Answer*—As a citizen I perceived that when one of the Judges presented himself as a Candidate for the Upper Town of *Quebec*, where I was also a Candidate in 1804, the Electors appeared considerably influenced by the station and authority of the Judge. Many told me that they would vote for me, and for any other Candidate but the Judge ; but they were afraid, as they had Law suits pending or would soon have, and might thereby injure their cause. Others told me that the Judge gave advice *gratis* ; as it was announced in the City and Suburbs, but that the Lawyers would be well paid.—And at the Election, I stated to the said Judge, before the people at the Poll, these inconveniencies, and told him, that, as a Lawyer, many of my clients had informed me they were much afraid, and others in great hopes of losing or gaining their causes by voting for or against the Judge Candidate. Many of my brother Lawyers, declared to me they had received the same information from their clients. Some of my clients had told me that their adverse parties had been to the Judge, to curry favour with him, but that they had been themselves for the same purpose ; that one of them, among others, had said, my adversary has been caught, I was there first.—I have often heard it said, that many attributed the gain or loss of their causes, to the votes given for or against the Judge. It was commonly reported that people in litigation consulted the Judge Candidate.

Mr.