

power of compelling a person to sell you property does not, of itself, constitute you proprietor of that property. Elliott undoubtedly could have voted as occupant, with propriety: but, as he voted as owner, his vote, according to strict law, should have been rejected.

---

NOTE, K (p. 66.)

The Chairman's opinion upon Cook's vote, was correct and consistent. The position of this voter was precisely the same as that of several others whose votes had been rejected.

---

NOTE L. (p. 69.)

The minority of the Committee might at first sight be supposed to have departed, in this decision, from the principle they had previously maintained with regard to the Mille Isles voters who had not designated their properties on the Poll Book, but it is not so. They have here drawn a very just distinction between these persons in Gore who voted as "occupants" and those in Mille Isles who voted as "proprietors." As the qualification of occupant appeared to require a physical possession which was susceptible of direct evidence: they thought that evidence of occupancy by the voter, of a particular property, and of none other, afforded conclusive proof of the property on which alone he could have voted. On proof therefore that these voters were not legally occupants of the properties they respectively held, the Committee were unanimous in rejecting their votes.