Polls had no qualification in Howard. (*Query*, why not also in Arundel, Montcalm, Wolfe, &c., where no Polls were held?) It is a new idea in civil law, that the party supporting the negative of a proposition is obliged to prove the negative of every hypothesis of a substantive character, however improbable, that can enter into the imagination of his opponent. According to every rule of law and principle of justice, the Sitting Member should have been told: "Sir, these voters say they are of Morin, and they vote there; and it has been "shewn that there are no votes in Morin. If you pretend that they have "votes elsewhere, and have voted in Morin under an exceptional provision of "the law, it is for you to prove it."

The mode by which the Committee arrived at the conclusion that Maillé voted as proprietor, and not as tenant, though both qualifications were appended to his name, does not appear.

NOTE G. (*p.* 47.)

The question presented by Mr. Cameron was difficult of solution, upon the evidence of record. On the one hand the watch of the Returning Officer and the clock in Mr. Bellingham's open house, though both open to suspicion, afforded evidence that the Poll had been opened at the proper hour; while the testimony of Snowdon and Brophy, though unsupported by any time piece, appeared to point to a different conclusion. As the evidence was so strong on both sides, the Committee were probably in the right in allowing the presumption in favor of the acts of a public officer like the Returning Officer, to turn the scale. The question would have been less difficult, if his conduct in receiving votes had been less exceptional. (See App., A, pages 191 to 217).

NOTES H and I. (*pp.* 62 & 63.)

These decisions turn upon the same point, and involve the only question of importance upon which any difference of opinion existed in the Committee The dissenting members forming the minority, adopt the view, that without the