

for years as book-keeper at Barnum's Hotel, and is as well known as any man in the State. He is supported by the evidence of ex-Mayor Spicer and Manly, while Martin is contradicted in many respects by Mr. Wallis, who testifies that until a period after Martin left, the Reformers had equal access to the polls with the Americans, and that in point of fact a large majority of the votes which had been cast, up to that time, were for the Reform ticket. Can there be a doubt as to which statement would be received under the circumstances of the case by an impartial judge?

The case of the Rev. Mr. Mair is noticed by Capt. Johnston, the election judge referred to in Mr. Mair's testimony. Johnston was subjected to a rigorous cross-examination, and we are sure every member of the committee present must have been satisfied from his testimony and the honest manner in which it was given, that the fears of the first named witness, and his scanty acquaintance with our language, had much to do with preventing him from understanding what actually took place at the polls between himself and the judge. The naturalization papers of Mr. Mair, produced by him before the committee, with a seal scarcely discernible to the sharpest vision, were found to have been properly described by Mr. Johnston in his evidence. In the absence of an attempt to impeach either of these witnesses, would any impartial tribunal necessarily believe the entire testimony of the one to the entire discredit of the other?

That the witnesses, after giving their direct testimony as to what they saw of the election, afterwards stated how this election compared with others they had witnessed years before, certainly cannot be regarded as a reason for undervaluing their direct testimony, if worthy of credence in other respects. But in our opinion it tends strongly to prove that wrongs similar to those which were formerly considered venial, have now, by change of circumstances, become to be regarded as utterly without palliation. These witnesses produced for the defence prove that this election—while marked by such disorder and violence as shows that under the influence of cheap whiskey and constantly recurring elections, we have improved upon the evil precedents of our English ancestors—was not accompanied by such violence and irregularity as rendered it void in law.

The forms of law, as to opening and closing the polls, and making the returns were all complied with. The witnesses for the defence swear that, with the exception of the usual crowding at some of the polls at their first opening, access to the polls was free throughout the day, and the returns show that notwithstanding the slight general interest taken in the