

Turon Signal.

GODERICH, C. W., MARCH 28, 1865.

IMPORTANT FROM EUROPE.

We learn by the arrival of the American steamer, on the 26th, that a spirited discussion took place on Canadian defences in the House of Commons on the 13th. Leading members of both Ministry and Opposition united in declaring that Canada would be defended with all the power of the Empire.

Lord Palmerston denied that England was feeling and believed there was good feeling towards England among the great bulk of Americans. No doubt both North and South have some feeling for our non-responsibility of their cause, but that was no reason why we should not place Canada in a state of defence. The relations between England and the United States were perfectly friendly at present. A slight advance in breadstuffs is quoted.

The funeral of the Count de Morny took place at Paris on the 13th.

SPRING ASSIZES.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE JOHN WILSON.

Bank of Montreal vs. C. Clowes. Verdict for pif. \$982.57. Lewis for pif. Schofield vs. Stanlake et al.—Ejectment. Verdict for pif. Toms for pif.

Wilkie vs. Carter.—Verdict for pif. Cameron for pif.

Commercial Bank vs. Inlath et al.—Verdict for pif. \$408.15 McDermott for pif.

Commercial Bank vs. Sullivan et al.—Verdict for pif. 1731.19. McDermott for pif.

Said vs. Stoy.—Verdict of non suit. Sinclair for pif. Cameron for def.

Hibbert vs. Cote.—Verdict for pif. Gooding for pif.

Boecher vs. Woods.—Verdict for pif. subject to the opinion of the Court. Boecher for pif. Sinclair for def.

Horne vs. Rathin.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500. Shaw for pif. Cameron for def.

Rathin vs. Horne.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500, left to award. Cameron for pif. Shaw for def.

Dickson vs. Crabb.—This was an action brought by pif. to recover damages for false imprisonment, under a warrant issued by the def. authorizing his incarceration for 30 days in default of paying a certain sum of money and costs. After lying in jail for eighteen days, Dickson was discharged on a writ of habeas corpus.

Def.'s counsel submitted that there was prima facie evidence on the face of the warrant that the magistrate had jurisdiction, and further that the order had not been quashed.

The counsel for pif. held that the warrant was illegal and cited statutory authority to prove that no person in such a case could be imprisoned for mere costs. Damages were laid at \$2000.

His Lordship ruled a non-suit, with leave to move. Toms and Robinson for pif. Cameron and K. McKenzie for def.

Bennet vs. Morgan et al.—This was an action virtually against the township of Hullett for trespass. It appears that some twelve or fourteen years ago the township authorities were authorized to open a road through a block of land which has since come into the possession of Mr. Bennet. The statute labor of the section was performed and public money expended on the road. Bennet now claimed the land as his and therefore, instituted the present action. As His Lordship remarked, it would have been better to let a sleeping dog lie, for whereas his deed covers exactly 32 acres, the evidence of his 22 acres without asking in the roadway in question at all. It was also submitted by defendant's counsel that according to statute in that case made and provided, a roadway could not be recovered in this manner after the public had used it for some considerable length of time. Verdict for def. Lewis and Moss for pif., Cameron and Robinson for def.

LARCENY.

The Queen vs. H. Hasco and William Armstrong, larceny. This was a case arising out of a family feud. The particulars, as nearly as we could glean them, were these: Some two years ago Mr. Hasco, according to the evidence of his son, Arthur Hasco, when starting away to Toronto told the latter that he might see as much of his father's property as possible by selling and otherwise disposing of it, as there were a number of executors against him. Arthur Hasco then traded wagon with one Shanahan, and a male subsequently disposed of the wagon so obtained to Dr. Woods of Stanley. He afterwards, bought back the wagon from the Dr. and sold it to John Bolton, a tavernkeeper in Bayfield. On the 3rd of December last Bolton misad the wagon, and on search being made, traced it to the shop of one Warren. The prisoner, Henry Hasco, admitted that he had had the wheels of the wagon. Gen. Warren proved that on the 3rd December (Sunday) he saw Hasco and Armstrong sending up and burning the iron work of the wagon. They buried the iron under some coats, &c. Believing afterwards that the wagon had not been stolen honestly, he let the coat out of the bag. H. B. O'Connor, Esq., testified that the older Mr. Hasco had applied to him to obtain a warrant against his son to recover a number of articles which he claimed as his property, but believing it to be purely a family quarrel, he refused to have anything to do with it.

His Lordship said it would be unsafe to convict under the circumstances, and a verdict of not guilty was entered accordingly. In discharging Hasco His Lordship said he was always in difficulty,

and, as a general rule, people of that kind were nearly always in the wrong. [Laughter.] It would have been for better to have given up everything than to hide his goods from creditors in an underhand manner, the result of which was an unnatural estrangement from his son. The defendants were then discharged. Boecher for the defence.

ENLISTING.

The Queen vs. John Smith.—This is the case of alleged crimping in May last, the particulars of which have been given in detail in former issues of the Signal. The jury brought in a verdict of guilty with a recommendation to mercy. His Lordship after laying before the prisoner in an impressive manner the enormity of the crime of which he had been convicted, sentenced him to three years imprisonment in the Penitentiary at hard labor. Smith went off with a constable in very bad humor, grumbling that he was an innocent victim. The spectators did not appear to waste much sympathy upon him.

ABSON.

The Queen vs. John Finkle.—This was a case arising out of the burning of the house and store of M. W. H. Perrin, of Clinton, in November last, the particulars of which were published in our columns at that time. The evidence of Mr. Perrin, Mrs. Perrin his wife, and others went to show that for some time past a family quarrel had subsisted between the Perrins and Mrs. Finkle, the mother of Mrs. Perrin. They lived about a quarter of a mile apart.

On the 4th of November Mr. Perrin started for Brantford, leaving his wife at home. Next day Mrs. Finkle persuaded her daughter to leave her own home and come and stop with her. It appears that Mrs. Perrin's son devious became aroused while at her mother's house that night. Mrs. Finkle was up and dressed nearly all night, and her son John Finkle, the night, went out and in repeatedly, stating by way of excuse that he was afraid of fire at Perrin's house. Mrs. Perrin, as she lay in bed, heard whispered conversations between her mother and prisoner. Finally, John Finkle went away some time next morning, telling a little dog with him; soon afterwards he returned, saying he slept fine. An alarm was given that Perrin's house was on fire. At the investigation a coroner's jury into the origin of the fire, it was proved that a peculiar track, corresponding with one of prisoner's boots, had been traced to the neighborhood of the fire, that track was accompanied by the track of a dog, a dog was burned in the house, a couple of baskets were thrown over a fence, and taken up as evidence on the face of the warrant that the magistrate had jurisdiction, and further that the order had not been quashed.

The counsel for pif. held that the warrant was illegal and cited statutory authority to prove that no person in such a case could be imprisoned for mere costs. Damages were laid at \$2000.

His Lordship ruled a non-suit, with leave to move. Toms and Robinson for pif. Cameron and K. McKenzie for def.

Bennet vs. Morgan et al.—This was an action virtually against the township of Hullett for trespass. It appears that some twelve or fourteen years ago the township authorities were authorized to open a road through a block of land which has since come into the possession of Mr. Bennet. The statute labor of the section was performed and public money expended on the road. Bennet now claimed the land as his and therefore, instituted the present action. As His Lordship remarked, it would have been better to let a sleeping dog lie, for whereas his deed covers exactly 32 acres, the evidence of his 22 acres without asking in the roadway in question at all. It was also submitted by defendant's counsel that according to statute in that case made and provided, a roadway could not be recovered in this manner after the public had used it for some considerable length of time. Verdict for def. Lewis and Moss for pif., Cameron and Robinson for def.

Hibbert vs. Cote.—Verdict for pif. Gooding for pif.

Boecher vs. Woods.—Verdict for pif. subject to the opinion of the Court. Boecher for pif. Sinclair for def.

Horne vs. Rathin.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500. Shaw for pif. Cameron for def.

Rathin vs. Horne.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500, left to award. Cameron for pif. Shaw for def.

Dickson vs. Crabb.—This was an action brought by pif. to recover damages for false imprisonment, under a warrant issued by the def. authorizing his incarceration for 30 days in default of paying a certain sum of money and costs. After lying in jail for eighteen days, Dickson was discharged on a writ of habeas corpus.

Def.'s counsel submitted that there was prima facie evidence on the face of the warrant that the magistrate had jurisdiction, and further that the order had not been quashed.

The counsel for pif. held that the warrant was illegal and cited statutory authority to prove that no person in such a case could be imprisoned for mere costs. Damages were laid at \$2000.

His Lordship ruled a non-suit, with leave to move. Toms and Robinson for pif. Cameron and K. McKenzie for def.

Bennet vs. Morgan et al.—This was an action virtually against the township of Hullett for trespass. It appears that some twelve or fourteen years ago the township authorities were authorized to open a road through a block of land which has since come into the possession of Mr. Bennet. The statute labor of the section was performed and public money expended on the road. Bennet now claimed the land as his and therefore, instituted the present action. As His Lordship remarked, it would have been better to let a sleeping dog lie, for whereas his deed covers exactly 32 acres, the evidence of his 22 acres without asking in the roadway in question at all. It was also submitted by defendant's counsel that according to statute in that case made and provided, a roadway could not be recovered in this manner after the public had used it for some considerable length of time. Verdict for def. Lewis and Moss for pif., Cameron and Robinson for def.

LARCENY.

The Queen vs. H. Hasco and William Armstrong, larceny. This was a case arising out of a family feud. The particulars, as nearly as we could glean them, were these: Some two years ago Mr. Hasco, according to the evidence of his son, Arthur Hasco, when starting away to Toronto told the latter that he might see as much of his father's property as possible by selling and otherwise disposing of it, as there were a number of executors against him. Arthur Hasco then traded wagon with one Shanahan, and a male subsequently disposed of the wagon so obtained to Dr. Woods of Stanley. He afterwards, bought back the wagon from the Dr. and sold it to John Bolton, a tavernkeeper in Bayfield. On the 3rd of December last Bolton misad the wagon, and on search being made, traced it to the shop of one Warren. The prisoner, Henry Hasco, admitted that he had had the wheels of the wagon. Gen. Warren proved that on the 3rd December (Sunday) he saw Hasco and Armstrong sending up and burning the iron work of the wagon. They buried the iron under some coats, &c. Believing afterwards that the wagon had not been stolen honestly, he let the coat out of the bag. H. B. O'Connor, Esq., testified that the older Mr. Hasco had applied to him to obtain a warrant against his son to recover a number of articles which he claimed as his property, but believing it to be purely a family quarrel, he refused to have anything to do with it.

His Lordship said it would be unsafe to convict under the circumstances, and a verdict of not guilty was entered accordingly. In discharging Hasco His Lordship said he was always in difficulty,

and, as a general rule, people of that kind were nearly always in the wrong. [Laughter.] It would have been for better to have given up everything than to hide his goods from creditors in an underhand manner, the result of which was an unnatural estrangement from his son. The defendants were then discharged. Boecher for the defence.

ENLISTING.

The Queen vs. John Smith.—This is the case of alleged crimping in May last, the particulars of which have been given in detail in former issues of the Signal. The jury brought in a verdict of guilty with a recommendation to mercy. His Lordship after laying before the prisoner in an impressive manner the enormity of the crime of which he had been convicted, sentenced him to three years imprisonment in the Penitentiary at hard labor. Smith went off with a constable in very bad humor, grumbling that he was an innocent victim. The spectators did not appear to waste much sympathy upon him.

ABSON.

The Queen vs. John Finkle.—This was a case arising out of the burning of the house and store of M. W. H. Perrin, of Clinton, in November last, the particulars of which were published in our columns at that time. The evidence of Mr. Perrin, Mrs. Perrin his wife, and others went to show that for some time past a family quarrel had subsisted between the Perrins and Mrs. Finkle, the mother of Mrs. Perrin. They lived about a quarter of a mile apart.

On the 4th of November Mr. Perrin started for Brantford, leaving his wife at home. Next day Mrs. Finkle persuaded her daughter to leave her own home and come and stop with her. It appears that Mrs. Perrin's son devious became aroused while at her mother's house that night. Mrs. Finkle was up and dressed nearly all night, and her son John Finkle, the night, went out and in repeatedly, stating by way of excuse that he was afraid of fire at Perrin's house. Mrs. Perrin, as she lay in bed, heard whispered conversations between her mother and prisoner. Finally, John Finkle went away some time next morning, telling a little dog with him; soon afterwards he returned, saying he slept fine. An alarm was given that Perrin's house was on fire. At the investigation a coroner's jury into the origin of the fire, it was proved that a peculiar track, corresponding with one of prisoner's boots, had been traced to the neighborhood of the fire, that track was accompanied by the track of a dog, a dog was burned in the house, a couple of baskets were thrown over a fence, and taken up as evidence on the face of the warrant that the magistrate had jurisdiction, and further that the order had not been quashed.

The counsel for pif. held that the warrant was illegal and cited statutory authority to prove that no person in such a case could be imprisoned for mere costs. Damages were laid at \$2000.

His Lordship ruled a non-suit, with leave to move. Toms and Robinson for pif. Cameron and K. McKenzie for def.

Bennet vs. Morgan et al.—This was an action virtually against the township of Hullett for trespass. It appears that some twelve or fourteen years ago the township authorities were authorized to open a road through a block of land which has since come into the possession of Mr. Bennet. The statute labor of the section was performed and public money expended on the road. Bennet now claimed the land as his and therefore, instituted the present action. As His Lordship remarked, it would have been better to let a sleeping dog lie, for whereas his deed covers exactly 32 acres, the evidence of his 22 acres without asking in the roadway in question at all. It was also submitted by defendant's counsel that according to statute in that case made and provided, a roadway could not be recovered in this manner after the public had used it for some considerable length of time. Verdict for def. Lewis and Moss for pif., Cameron and Robinson for def.

Hibbert vs. Cote.—Verdict for pif. Gooding for pif.

Boecher vs. Woods.—Verdict for pif. subject to the opinion of the Court. Boecher for pif. Sinclair for def.

Horne vs. Rathin.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500. Shaw for pif. Cameron for def.

Rathin vs. Horne.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500, left to award. Cameron for pif. Shaw for def.

Dickson vs. Crabb.—This was an action brought by pif. to recover damages for false imprisonment, under a warrant issued by the def. authorizing his incarceration for 30 days in default of paying a certain sum of money and costs. After lying in jail for eighteen days, Dickson was discharged on a writ of habeas corpus.

Def.'s counsel submitted that there was prima facie evidence on the face of the warrant that the magistrate had jurisdiction, and further that the order had not been quashed.

The counsel for pif. held that the warrant was illegal and cited statutory authority to prove that no person in such a case could be imprisoned for mere costs. Damages were laid at \$2000.

His Lordship ruled a non-suit, with leave to move. Toms and Robinson for pif. Cameron and K. McKenzie for def.

Bennet vs. Morgan et al.—This was an action virtually against the township of Hullett for trespass. It appears that some twelve or fourteen years ago the township authorities were authorized to open a road through a block of land which has since come into the possession of Mr. Bennet. The statute labor of the section was performed and public money expended on the road. Bennet now claimed the land as his and therefore, instituted the present action. As His Lordship remarked, it would have been better to let a sleeping dog lie, for whereas his deed covers exactly 32 acres, the evidence of his 22 acres without asking in the roadway in question at all. It was also submitted by defendant's counsel that according to statute in that case made and provided, a roadway could not be recovered in this manner after the public had used it for some considerable length of time. Verdict for def. Lewis and Moss for pif., Cameron and Robinson for def.

LARCENY.

The Queen vs. H. Hasco and William Armstrong, larceny. This was a case arising out of a family feud. The particulars, as nearly as we could glean them, were these: Some two years ago Mr. Hasco, according to the evidence of his son, Arthur Hasco, when starting away to Toronto told the latter that he might see as much of his father's property as possible by selling and otherwise disposing of it, as there were a number of executors against him. Arthur Hasco then traded wagon with one Shanahan, and a male subsequently disposed of the wagon so obtained to Dr. Woods of Stanley. He afterwards, bought back the wagon from the Dr. and sold it to John Bolton, a tavernkeeper in Bayfield. On the 3rd of December last Bolton misad the wagon, and on search being made, traced it to the shop of one Warren. The prisoner, Henry Hasco, admitted that he had had the wheels of the wagon. Gen. Warren proved that on the 3rd December (Sunday) he saw Hasco and Armstrong sending up and burning the iron work of the wagon. They buried the iron under some coats, &c. Believing afterwards that the wagon had not been stolen honestly, he let the coat out of the bag. H. B. O'Connor, Esq., testified that the older Mr. Hasco had applied to him to obtain a warrant against his son to recover a number of articles which he claimed as his property, but believing it to be purely a family quarrel, he refused to have anything to do with it.

His Lordship said it would be unsafe to convict under the circumstances, and a verdict of not guilty was entered accordingly. In discharging Hasco His Lordship said he was always in difficulty,

and, as a general rule, people of that kind were nearly always in the wrong. [Laughter.] It would have been for better to have given up everything than to hide his goods from creditors in an underhand manner, the result of which was an unnatural estrangement from his son. The defendants were then discharged. Boecher for the defence.

ENLISTING.

The Queen vs. John Smith.—This is the case of alleged crimping in May last, the particulars of which have been given in detail in former issues of the Signal. The jury brought in a verdict of guilty with a recommendation to mercy. His Lordship after laying before the prisoner in an impressive manner the enormity of the crime of which he had been convicted, sentenced him to three years imprisonment in the Penitentiary at hard labor. Smith went off with a constable in very bad humor, grumbling that he was an innocent victim. The spectators did not appear to waste much sympathy upon him.

ABSON.

The Queen vs. John Finkle.—This was a case arising out of the burning of the house and store of M. W. H. Perrin, of Clinton, in November last, the particulars of which were published in our columns at that time. The evidence of Mr. Perrin, Mrs. Perrin his wife, and others went to show that for some time past a family quarrel had subsisted between the Perrins and Mrs. Finkle, the mother of Mrs. Perrin. They lived about a quarter of a mile apart.

On the 4th of November Mr. Perrin started for Brantford, leaving his wife at home. Next day Mrs. Finkle persuaded her daughter to leave her own home and come and stop with her. It appears that Mrs. Perrin's son devious became aroused while at her mother's house that night. Mrs. Finkle was up and dressed nearly all night, and her son John Finkle, the night, went out and in repeatedly, stating by way of excuse that he was afraid of fire at Perrin's house. Mrs. Perrin, as she lay in bed, heard whispered conversations between her mother and prisoner. Finally, John Finkle went away some time next morning, telling a little dog with him; soon afterwards he returned, saying he slept fine. An alarm was given that Perrin's house was on fire. At the investigation a coroner's jury into the origin of the fire, it was proved that a peculiar track, corresponding with one of prisoner's boots, had been traced to the neighborhood of the fire, that track was accompanied by the track of a dog, a dog was burned in the house, a couple of baskets were thrown over a fence, and taken up as evidence on the face of the warrant that the magistrate had jurisdiction, and further that the order had not been quashed.

The counsel for pif. held that the warrant was illegal and cited statutory authority to prove that no person in such a case could be imprisoned for mere costs. Damages were laid at \$2000.

His Lordship ruled a non-suit, with leave to move. Toms and Robinson for pif. Cameron and K. McKenzie for def.

Bennet vs. Morgan et al.—This was an action virtually against the township of Hullett for trespass. It appears that some twelve or fourteen years ago the township authorities were authorized to open a road through a block of land which has since come into the possession of Mr. Bennet. The statute labor of the section was performed and public money expended on the road. Bennet now claimed the land as his and therefore, instituted the present action. As His Lordship remarked, it would have been better to let a sleeping dog lie, for whereas his deed covers exactly 32 acres, the evidence of his 22 acres without asking in the roadway in question at all. It was also submitted by defendant's counsel that according to statute in that case made and provided, a roadway could not be recovered in this manner after the public had used it for some considerable length of time. Verdict for def. Lewis and Moss for pif., Cameron and Robinson for def.

Hibbert vs. Cote.—Verdict for pif. Gooding for pif.

Boecher vs. Woods.—Verdict for pif. subject to the opinion of the Court. Boecher for pif. Sinclair for def.

Horne vs. Rathin.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500. Shaw for pif. Cameron for def.

Rathin vs. Horne.—Verdict by consent for pif. \$500, left to award. Cameron for pif. Shaw for def.

Dickson vs. Crabb.—This was an action brought by pif. to recover damages for false imprisonment, under a warrant issued by the def. authorizing his incarceration for 30 days in default of paying a certain sum of money and costs. After lying in jail for eighteen days, Dickson was discharged on a writ of habeas corpus.

Def.'s counsel submitted that there was prima facie evidence on the face of the warrant that the magistrate had jurisdiction, and further that the order had not been quashed.

The counsel for pif. held that the warrant was illegal and cited statutory authority to prove that no person in such a case could be imprisoned for mere costs. Damages were laid at \$2000.

His Lordship ruled a non-suit, with leave to move. Toms and Robinson for pif. Cameron and K. McKenzie for def.

Bennet vs. Morgan et al.—This was an action virtually against the township of Hullett for trespass. It appears that some twelve or fourteen years ago the township authorities were authorized to open a road through a block of land which has since come into the possession of Mr. Bennet. The statute labor of the section was performed and public money expended on the road. Bennet now claimed the land as his and therefore, instituted the present action. As His Lordship remarked, it would have been better to let a sleeping dog lie, for whereas his deed covers exactly 32 acres, the evidence of his 22 acres without asking in the roadway in question at all. It was also submitted by defendant's counsel that according to statute in that case made and provided, a roadway could not be recovered in this manner after the public had used it for some considerable length of time. Verdict for def. Lewis and Moss for pif., Cameron and Robinson for def.

LARCENY.

The Queen vs. H. Hasco and William Armstrong, larceny. This was a case arising out of a family feud. The particulars, as nearly as we could glean them, were these: Some two years ago Mr. Hasco, according to the evidence of his son, Arthur Hasco, when starting away to Toronto told the latter that he might see as much of his father's property as possible by selling and otherwise disposing of it, as there were a number of executors against him. Arthur Hasco then traded wagon with one Shanahan, and a male subsequently disposed of the wagon so obtained to Dr. Woods of Stanley. He afterwards, bought back the wagon from the Dr. and sold it to John Bolton, a tavernkeeper in Bayfield. On the 3rd of December last Bolton misad the wagon, and on search being made, traced it to the shop of one Warren. The prisoner, Henry Hasco, admitted that he had had the wheels of the wagon. Gen. Warren proved that on the 3rd December (Sunday) he saw Hasco and Armstrong sending up and burning the iron work of the wagon. They buried the iron under some coats, &c. Believing afterwards that the wagon had not been stolen honestly, he let the coat out of the bag. H. B. O'Connor, Esq., testified that the older Mr. Hasco had applied to him to obtain a warrant against his son to recover a number of articles which he claimed as his property, but believing it to be purely a family quarrel, he refused to have anything to do with it.

His Lordship said it would be unsafe to convict under the circumstances, and a verdict of not guilty was entered accordingly. In discharging Hasco His Lordship said he was always in difficulty,

PRESENTMENT OF GRAND JURY.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The Grand Jurors of our Sovereign City of Toronto, for the present Assizes, adjourned on the 27th inst. to the 28th inst. at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.