



Center *for* Research Libraries
GLOBAL RESOURCES NETWORK

The Center for Research Libraries scans to provide digital delivery of its holdings. In some cases problems with the quality of the original document or microfilm reproduction may result in a lower quality scan, but it will be legible. In some cases pages may be damaged or missing. Files include OCR (machine searchable text) when the quality of the scan and the language or format of the text allows.

If preferred, you may request a loan by contacting Center for Research Libraries through your Interlibrary Loan Office.

Rights and usage

Materials digitized by the Center for Research Libraries are intended for the personal educational and research use of students, scholars, and other researchers of the CRL member community. Copyrighted images and texts may not be reproduced, displayed, distributed, broadcast, or downloaded for other purposes without the expressed, written permission of the copyright owner.

Center for Research Libraries

Identifier: 8d54b538-36ac-4c18-92e3-15ce5fed2c62

Range: Scans 001 - 206

Downloaded on: 2022-05-24 18:59:03

PROTECTORS OF SLAVES REPORTS.

RETURN to an Address to His Majesty, dated 15 December 1830;—for,

COPY OF ANY REPORTS

WHICH MAY HAVE BEEN RECEIVED

FROM THE PROTECTORS OF SLAVES

IN THE COLONIES OF

Demerara, Berbice, Trinidad, St. Lucia, the Cape of Good Hope and Mauritius,

Since the last similar REPORTS presented to Parliament from each of these Colonies respectively; together with Copies of the Proceedings and Decisions in each case of Complaint between Masters and Slaves, whether the Proceedings may have terminated before the Protector, or may have been referred to Colonial Magistrates, or other Public Officers or Courts.

PART I.—DEMERARA.

Colonial Department,
Downing-street,
3 March 1831. }

HOWICK.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed
10 March 1831.

 S C H E D U L E .

PART I.—DEMERARA.

No.

- 1.—Copy of a Despatch from Sir B. D'Urban to Secretary Sir George Murray, dated 21 May 1829; enclosing Protector's Report to April 30, 1829 (Nine Enclosures) - - - - - p. 3
 - 2.—Copy of Despatch from Secretary Sir George Murray to Sir B. D'Urban, dated 2 September 1829 - - - - - p. 20
 - 3.—Copy of a Despatch from Sir B. D'Urban to Secretary Sir George Murray, dated 4 December 1829 (One Enclosure) - - - - - p. 21
 - 4.—Copy of a Despatch from Sir B. D'Urban to Secretary Sir George Murray, dated 15 December 1829, enclosing Report to 31 October 1829 - - - - - p. 23
 - 5.—Copy of a Despatch from Secretary Sir George Murray to Sir B. D'Urban, dated 30 November 1830 - - - - - p. 114
 - 6.—Copy of a Despatch from Sir B. D'Urban to Secretary Sir George Murray, dated 26 July 1830, enclosing Report to 24 June 1830 - - - - - p. 122
 - 7.—Copy of a Circular Despatch from Secretary Sir George Murray to the Governors of the Crown Colonies, dated 7 October 1830 - - - - - p. 200
 - 8.—Copy of a Despatch from Viscount Goderich to Sir B. D'Urban, dated 18 February 1831 - - - - - p. 200
-

 PROTECTORS OF SLAVES REPORTS.

 PART I. — DEMERARA.

N^o 1.

DESPATCH from Sir *B. D'Urban* to Secretary Sir *George Murray*,
&c. &c. &c.

(With Nine Enclosures.)

SIR,

King's House, Demerara, 21st May 1829.

HEREWITH I have the honour to transmit the Report of the Protector of Slaves in this Colony, for the last six months of the last year, in conformity to the 34th Clause of the Slave Ordinance, together with the Abstracts therein referred to, as directed by Mr. Secretary Huskisson's Despatch, N^o 18, of the 8th May 1828.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient and most humble servant,
B. D'Urban.

REPORT from the Protector of Slaves, Demerara, to His Excellency Lieut-Governor
Sir *B. D. Urban*, &c. &c. &c.

(Enclosure 1.)

SIR,

Office of Protector of Slaves, Demerara, 1st May 1829.

IN obedience to the 34th Clause of the Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves and for the Improvement of their condition, I have the honour to forward to your Excellency the particulars of all the Returns, which by virtue of the Ordinance have been made to me by the Assistant Protectors of Slaves in the several districts of the Colony, and which are contained in the duplicate Enclosures numbered 1, 2 and 3, entitled respectively, "List of Offences committed by Male and Female Plantation Slaves in each district of the Colony of Demerara and Essequibo, from the 1st July to the 31st December 1828, inclusive, classified according to their magnitude, and showing the total number of Slaves returned."

"List of Offences committed by Male and Female Plantation Slaves in the Colony of Demerara and Essequibo, from 1st January to 31st December 1828, showing the Comparative Increase and Decrease of Offences in each half of the year."

"List of Plantations, &c. in which no Punishments have been inflicted on the Slaves attached to them, during the half year ending 31st December 1828."

There appears on the face of the first Enclosure a decrease of 726 on the total number of Slaves recorded as attached to the respective estates, when compared with the total number returned in the previous half year, which may probably arise from Slaves being sold and placed on other properties before the close of the half year, their managers having

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

inflicted no punishments and leaving the estate previous to the time for making the return required in such cases, and from the purchasers stating the number of Slaves on the estate at the commencement only of the half year; also from being sold to persons, who, even with this addition may not possess a gang exceeding six in number, and who are consequently not required to keep a record of punishments; and lastly it may arise from deaths.

It is not perhaps necessary to enter fully into the consideration of the causes of the decrease of the Slave population of the Colony generally; but as the last registration proved a great increase among the Creoles, so may we confidently anticipate that a proportionate increase since that period will be shown by the registration now about to take place. And with respect to the Africans originally imported here, I find on inquiry that in no other of our Colonies was the inequality in the number of the sexes so apparent; this must I conceive, be admitted as a strong reason for the decrease last alluded to, since among that class, viz. the Creoles, whose sexes are nearly equal in number, an increase has taken place.

The original Returns from which the particulars contained in the first three Enclosures have been extracted, are carefully preserved in the office and entered in the books and properly indexed.

Such parts of these Returns as called for observation, have been already brought under your Excellency's notice.

The Enclosures numbered 4 and 5, are Records of Slaves manumitted between the date of my last Report and the present time, and an Abstract Classification of them.

Enclosure No. 6 is a Register of Certificates granted also to Slaves during the same period, of their understanding the nature and obligation of an Oath. These certificates were granted on application being made for them, and to enable those in whose favour they were given, to bear witness in some particular suit, and their possessors must by no means be considered as the only Slaves of sufficient religious knowledge to respect the sanctity of that obligation.

I have reason to believe that some few Certificates not included in this Return have been granted, but through ignorance have not been brought to this office to be registered according to law; and as in a recent instance before the Court of Justice, the non-registry of the certificates was argued to be a sufficient reason for its rejection, had the proof of the cause depended solely on Slave evidence, the consequences would have been subversive of the ends of justice. Wherefore it becomes highly necessary for the preceding and especially for this last reason, to adopt measures by which those Slaves who are entitled to these certificates may at once obtain them, and, when registered, thus be placed on the same footing as persons of free condition.

Enclosure 7, is a Register of Marriages, and 8, of Baptisms, both being for the period between the 1st November last and the present time.

No money has been deposited in the Savings Bank for Slaves.

The complaints have not been numerous, those for the non-payment of debts were generally correct, and sundry small sums amounting in the whole to 420*f.* were recovered before me and paid to the parties.

There have been five cases of parties complaining of being withheld from the possession of freedom, but only one substantiated; a mother and two children claiming under will of their former owner, and their manumission will be advertised shortly and effected.

No prosecution has been instituted; 1,040*f.* is the amount of fines exacted for three infringements of the Ordinance, two for improper punishments, one for hiring the slaves of an estate without the permission of their owner.

The foregoing Report is respectfully submitted by

Your Excellency's most obedient humble servant,

Demerara, Sworn before me,

A. W. Young.

this 19th May 1829,

Protector of Slaves.

B. D'Urban. L' G'.

(Enclosure 2.)

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

LIST of PLANTATIONS, TASK GANGS, &c. in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, on which no Punishments have been inflicted on the SLAVES attached to them, during the Half-Year ending the 31st December 1828; exhibiting the Names of the Persons swearing to the Returns, and the Number of Slaves on each Plantation, &c.

NAME of PLANTATION, &c.	NAME OF PERSON SWEARING TO THE RETURN,	Number of Slaves attached.
<i>District of Assistant Protector T. H. Otterbein.</i>		
Bryden, John, Task Gang of - - -	John Bryden - - Owner - - -	20
Jacoba Constantia Plantation - - -	G. A. Van Dyk - ditto - - -	35
Otterbein, T. H. Task Gang of - - -	T. H. Otterbein - ditto - - -	26
<i>District of Assistant Protector J. C. Spieringshoek.</i>		
Beter Verwachting Plantation - - -	R. J. G. Brunel, Owner - - -	19
Contentment - - - ditto - - -	P. H. Thomson - ditto - - -	8
Contentment - - - ditto - - -	P. H. Thomson, qq. - - -	7
Geelhoed, P. J. Task Gang of - - -	P. J. Geelhoed, Owner - - -	11
Mertens, C. S. - - - ditto - - -	C. S. Mertens - ditto - - -	16
Saripapa Saw Mill - - - - -	H. R. Juhlfs, Part owner - - -	40
Timmerman, J. C. M. Task Gang of - - -	J. G. Timmerman, qq. - - -	9
Voorzorg, Ground called - - -	Helena Cuff - - - - -	10
Wurtemberg Saw Mill - - - - -	Johannes Merkle - - - - -	14
<i>District of Assistant Protector J. Hoert.</i>		
Foundry, Demerara - - - - -	James Miller, Owner - - - - -	18
Kemp, Hector, & Co. Carpenter, Gang of	R. Mackenzie, Part Owner - - -	56
Urquhart, W. Carpenter, Gang of - - -	W. Urquhart, Owner - - - - -	85
<i>District of Assistant Protector E. H. Dalton.</i>		
Dorothy's Rust Plantation - - - - -	Heirs of Dr. S. Eburu, Owners - - -	15
Solitude, Place called - - - - -	G. H. Moller, Nom. Uxo. - - -	9
<i>District of Assistant Protector T. Richardson.</i>		
Dufresne, M. A. Slaves of - - - - -	M. J. J. Mottet, Guardian - - -	8
Mercurius, M. - - - ditto - - -	M. Mercurius, Owner - - - - -	8
Stel en Zaam Plantation - - - - -	J. P. Eytels, Owner - - - - -	7
<i>District of Assistant Protector W. W. Kernan.</i>		
Farm Plantation - - - - -	William Odwin, Owner - - - - -	6
Proctor, M. C. Slaves of - - - - -	G. F. Proctor, qq. - - - - -	8
Perica Plantation - - - - -	Alexander Marshall, Owner - - -	29
Philadelphia ditto - - - - -	William Odwin - - ditto - - -	146
<i>District of Assistant Protector M. Thierens.</i>		
Eekhart, Elizabeth, Slaves of - - -	G. F. Perret, qq. - - - - -	8
Hohenkerk, J. W. - - - ditto - - -	J. W. Hohenkerk, Owner - - - - -	21
Onderneeming Brickery - - - - -	M. E. Hartog - - - ditto - - -	27
Perret, G. F. Working Gang of - - -	G. F. Perret - - - ditto - - -	18
Reoch, A. - - - ditto - - - - -	A. Reoch - - - ditto - - - - -	7
Sastedt, A. W. Slaves of - - - - -	A. W. Sastedt - ditto - - - - -	7
<i>District of Assistant Protector R. Watson.</i>		
Perseverance Plantation - - - - -	John G. Ffloyd - Owner - - - - -	9
<i>District of Assistant Protector J. M'Pherson.</i>		
Dumbarton Castle Plantation - - -	W. Elliot - - - Owner - - - - -	68
Hackney - - - - - ditto - - - - -	James Wilson - ditto - - - - -	17
Stronach, R. Working Gang of - - -	R. Stronach - - - ditto - - - - -	15
Westbury (No. 17) Plantation - - -	W. M'Pherson, qq. - - - - -	17
<i>District of Assistant Protector C. Brotherson.</i>		
Charlotte Plantation - - - - -	John Lees - - - - -	43
Hersel, H. Van, Slaves of - - - - -	J. C. Peate, Guardian - - - - -	11
Sans Souci Plantation - - - - -	Aaron Knights, Manager - - - - -	14
Semeri Wood Cutting Establishment -	Elizabeth Galloway, Owner - - -	20
Sand Hill - - - ditto - - - - -	C. Brotherson, Manager - - - - -	17
Three Friends - ditto - - - - -	James Allicock, Owner - - - - -	6
<i>District of Assistant Protector W. Fraser.</i>		
Luby, Elizabeth, Slaves of - - - - -	Elizabeth Luby - - Owner - - - - -	10
Mes Felices Plantation - - - - -	William Moffett - - ditto - - - - -	13
<i>District of Assistant Protector T. Blake.</i>		
Brown, Thomas, Working Gang of - - -	Thomas Brown - - - Owner - - - - -	16
Concordia Plantation - - - - -	Marrott Dougan - ditto - - - - -	14
Jacoba's Lust ditto - - - - -	Jacoba Rademaker - ditto - - - - -	13
L'Harmonie - ditto - - - - -	S. Dealey - - - - - ditto - - - - -	13
Nooit Ge Dacht ditto - - - - -	Philida Gortzen - - ditto - - - - -	14
The Total Number of Slaves in this List is - - -		1,028

Office of Protector of Slaves, Demerara, }
1st May 1829.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 3.)

RECORD of SLAVES Manumitted in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*,

Number.	N A M E of S L A V E.	Colour.	Probable Age.	N A M E OF OWNER or HIS REPRESENTATIVE.	DATE when Manumission was signed.
1	Ruthy - - - -	C.	10	M. Thompson - - -	1828: Nov. 5
2	Frankey, mother of - -	B.	29	John Mansfield - - -	- - - 11
3	James, - - - -	C.	6	- ditto - his father - -	- - - 11
4	William and - - - -	C.	3	- ditto - ditto - - -	- - - 11
5	Jane - - - -	C.	2	- ditto - ditto - - -	- - - 11
6	Catherine, mother of - -	C.	15	Hermanns Van Dam - -	- - - 12
7	Carsten Cornelis - - -	C.	infant	- ditto - - - -	- - - 12
8	Cecilia - - - -	B.	20	{ Zelida Gertsen, executrix of Daniel Gertsen, deceased. J. J. Boullier, guardian of his daughter Jeannette Boullier - - - -	- - - 21
9	Tom - - - -	B.	41	{ Hugh Rogers & B. J. Hop- kinson, qq. S. & M. Rogers	- Dec. 6
10	Jacob - - - -	C.	20	Frances Fraser, guardian -	- - - 4
11	Mary Mings - - - -	C.	18	Eliza James - - - -	- - - 8
12	Christina, sister of - -	C.	16	- ditto - - - -	- - - 8
13	Margaret - - - -	C.	10	Hubert Whillock, her father	- - - 18
14	Mary, sister of - - - -	C.	6	- ditto - - - -	- - - 18
15	Jane - - - -	C.	4	A. Simpson - - - -	- - - 20
16	Frederica, mother of - -	C.	-	- ditto - - - -	- - - 20
17	Henry - - - -	C.	-	Michael <i>alias</i> Michael Green	- - - 29
18	Rose Green, mother of - -	B.	45	- ditto - her father - -	- - - 29
19	Rebecca - - - -	B.	19	- ditto - ditto - - -	- - - 29
20	Chloe, Ann and - - - -	B.	17	- ditto - ditto - - -	- - - 29
21	Betsy Green, <i>alias</i> Betsy Philip - - - -	B.	15	- ditto - ditto - - -	- - - 29
22	Peter, brother of - - -	B.	12	{ Michael <i>alias</i> Michael Green, their father - -	- - - 29
23	Venus - - - -	B.	9	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
24	Gardner - - - -	B.	7	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
25	Sarah and - - - -	B.	5	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
26	Thomas - - - -	B.	3	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
27	Tomy - - - -	C.	9	Jacob N. Levi, his uncle -	1829: Jan. 24
28	George - - - -	C.	1	Francis Croft, his father -	- - - 26
29	Maria - - - -	C.	19	James William Garey - -	- - - 26
30	Sally <i>alias</i> Sarah Terrel -	C.	21	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Ad- vocate and Curator - -	- - - 26
31	George, brother of - - -	C.	7	George Jeems, his father -	- - - 27
32	Sarah Frances - - - -	C.	5	- ditto - - her father -	- - - 27
33	Bell Williamson - - - -	B.	44	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Ad- vocate and Curator - -	- - - 28
34	Joseph - - - -	C.	2	John Farnum, his father -	- - - 28
35	Sarah, mother of - - - -	C.	28	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Ad- vocate and Curator - -	- - - 28
36	Edward and - - - -	C.	7	- ditto - - - -	- - - 28
37	James - - - -	C.	11	- ditto - - - -	- - - 28
38	Polly, mother of - - - -	C.	33	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
39	Icannette - - - -	C.	15	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
40	Margaret and - - - -	C.	12	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
41	John - - - -	C.	10	- ditto - - - -	- - - 29
42	Lucy Ann - - - -	B.	5	James Gray, her father -	- - - 29
43	Mary Elizabeth Jane - -	C.	1	{ H. B. Maggee, guardian of the minor Eleanor Daley	- - - 26
44	Mary Duncan - - - -	C.	23	James Duncan, her father -	- Feb. 3
45	Jane Duncan - - - -	C.	22	- ditto - - - -	- - - 3
46	Nelly - - - -	C.	32	J. G. Watteling - - - -	- Jan. 30
47	Maria <i>alias</i> Maria Junka -	C.	21	Dutchess Dunager - - -	- - - 30
48	Marianne - - - -	B.	48	{ W. A. Claxton and } nom. John Desbrass - } uxo ^{ri}	- - - 30
49	Lemon - - - -	B.	12	- ditto - - - -	- - - 30
50	John Augustus - - - -	B.	9	- ditto - - - -	- - - 30
51	John White - - - -	C.	36	Francis Carmichael, curator	- - - 30
52	James White - - - -	C.	25	- ditto - - - -	- - - 30
53	Jane White - - - -	C.	34	- ditto - - - -	- - - 30
54	Frederick - - - -	C.	14	- ditto - - - -	- - - 30
55	Catherine - - - -	C.	11	- ditto - - - -	- - - 30

(Enclosure 3.)

from the 1st of November 1828 to the 30th of April 1829, inclusive.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

DATE when Manumission was recorded.	CONSIDERATION.	Number of Manumissions.	REMARKS.	
1828: Nov. 6	Deed of gift - - - -	837	} Security given.	
- - 19	- ditto - - - -	885		
- - 19	Natural affection - - - -	886		
- - 19	- ditto - - - -	887		
- - 19	- ditto - - - -	888		
- - 19	- ditto - - - -	870		
- - 19	- ditto - - - -	871		
- - 24	Deed of gift - - - -	873		
- Dec. 10	Faithful services - - - -	859	No security required, being a baker.	
- - 10	Natural affection - - - -	912	- - ditto - - being a tailor.	
- - 10	Deed of gift - - - -	891	} Security given.	
- - 17	Faithful services - - - -	835		
- - 17	- ditto - - - -	836		
- - 24	Natural affection - - - -	797		
- - 24	- ditto - - - -	798		
- - 24	} 1,100 <i>f.</i> paid for herself and son in 1820 - - - - }	879	No security required, she possess- ing property.	
- - 24		880		
1829: Jan. 6	Deed of gift - - - -	348	} - - No security required, they pos- sessing a house and a half lot of land in George Town.	
- - 6	Natural affection - - - -	348		
- - 6	- ditto - - - -	348		
- - 6	- ditto - - - -	348		
- - 6	- ditto - - - -	348		
- - 6	- ditto - - - -	348		
- - 6	- ditto - - - -	348		
- Jan. 24	- ditto - - - -	838	No security required, being appren- ticed to a cooper.	
- Feb. 2	- ditto - - - -	994	- ditto - his father being a tradesman.	
- Jan. 31	Deed of gift - - - -	990	- ditto - she intending to leave Colony.	
- Feb. 2	Reputed free from her birth -	1,047	Security given.	
- - 2	} Natural affection - - - -	975	No security required, their father being a tradesman.	
- - 2		- ditto - - - -		976
- - 2	} 1,400 <i>f.</i> paid to her former owner in 1813 - - - - }	1,072	Possessing property.	
- - 2		1,021		
- Feb. 2	} 3,350 <i>f.</i> paid for herself and two children in 1828 - - - - }	1,052	} Security given.	
- - 2		1,053		
- - 2		1,054		
- - 2		1,016		
- - 2		1,007		
- - 2	Reputed free from her birth -	1,008	} No security required, father possessing [property.]	
- - 2	- ditto - ditto - - - -	1,009		
- - 2	Natural affection - - - -	1,034		
- Jan. 29	} Purchase-money paid by her father - - - - }	1,013	} Security given.	
- Feb. 3		Natural affection - - - -		1,083
- - 3	- ditto - - - -	1,084		
- Jan. 30	2,200 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1811	596		
- Feb. 2	Natural affection - - - -	1,042		
- - 2	} By will - - - -	1,003	} Security given.	
- - 2		- ditto - - - -		1,004
- - 2		- ditto - - - -		1,005
- - 2	} Deed of gift by their mother - - - - }	1,064	} No security required, being a boatbuilder. - ditto - ditto - a tailor. Security given. [a carpenter.] No security required, being apprenticed to Security given.	
- - 2		1,065		
- - 2		1,066		
- - 2		1,067		
- - 2		1,068		

(continued.)

PART I.

(Enclosure 3)—Record of SLAVES Manumitted in the Colony of Demerara and Essequibo,

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Number.	NAME of S L A V E.	Colour.	Probable Age.	NAME OF OWNER or HIS REPRESENTATIVE.	DATE when Manumission was signed.
56	Bill - - - -	B.	45	W. Urquhart, qq. - -	1829: Feb. 2
57	Friday - - - -	B.	36	F. P. Van Berkel - -	- Jan. 31
58	Andrew - - - -	C.	9	H. M'Nish - - - -	- Feb. 2
59	Senora, mother of - -	B.	50	- ditto - - - -	- - 2
60	Aramina - - - -	B.	26	- ditto - - - -	- - 2
61	Amelia - - - -	B.	40	John Paul, qq. Jas. Dunlop - - John Croal, qq. J. H. Albony, executors of Eliza- beth Hatch, deceased - -	- - 2
62	Rosannah - - - -	B.	31	Hugh Rogers - - - -	- - 2
63	Jacob Goodridge - -	C.	50	A. Maigrot - - - -	- - 3
64	Sarah Scott, mother of -	C.	26	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
65	John William Derimple -	C.	12	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
66	Henry - - - -	C.	16	{ F. Cort. qq. John Wilson, executor of Jos. Hamer, deceased - - - -	- - 3
67	Nancy, mother of - -	C.	50	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
68	Petronella - - - -	C.	23	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
69	Margaret - - - -	C.	20	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
70	James - - - -	C.	17	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
71	Peter - - - -	C.	15	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
72	Harriett - - - -	C.	13	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
73	John - - - -	C.	10	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
74	Jenny - - - -	C.	9	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
75	Elizabeth and - - - -	C.	6	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
76	Robert - - - -	C.	2	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
77	James Walcott - - - -	B.	33	James Rowan - - - -	- - 4
78	John Lewis Thomas - -	B.	34	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Ad- vocate and Curator - -	- - 6
79	Ardauntje - - - -	C.	18	Margaretta Martin - -	- - 9
80	Fanny, mother of - -	C.	40	{ G. H. Van Senden, qq. the estate of John Allicock, deceased, father of these children - - - -	- - 9
81	Elizabeth, Mary and -	C.	19	- ditto - - - -	- - 9
82	Henry - - - -	C.	14	- ditto - - - -	- - 9
83	Hester Thompson - - -	C.	24	Kitty M'Inroy, her aunt -	- - 10
84	Nelson Thompson - - -	C.	22	- ditto - - - -	- - 10
85	Edmund Warroner - - -	C.	10	- ditto - - - -	- - 10
86	Richard Warroner - - -	C.	9	- ditto - - - -	- - 10
87	Susan Sampson - - - -	C.	8	- ditto - - - -	- - 10
88	John Sampson - - - -	C.	6	- ditto - - - -	- - 10
89	Floris - - - -	B.	36	Elize De Jongh - - - -	- - 10
90	Nancy Jones - - - -	C.	35	{ Recorder of the Orphan Chamber - - - -	- - 11
91	Little Betty - - - -	B.	41	{ - - John Grant, administra- tor of the estate of Dublin Hopkinson, deceased, father of these children. - -	- - 5
92	Bill - - - -	B.	11½	- ditto - - - -	- - 5
93	Jonathan - - - -	B.	5	- ditto - - - -	- - 5
94	Athan - - - -	B.	5	- ditto - - - -	- - 5
95	Abby - - - -	B.	43	James, J. T. & A. Douglas	- - 24
96	Kitty - - - -	C.	20	W. Lyng - - - -	- - 26
97	Kate - - - -	C.	4	- ditto - - - -	- - 26
98	Henry - - - -	C.	1	- ditto - - - -	- - 26
99	Peggy La Balmondin - -	B.	45	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Ad- vocate and Curator - -	- March 3
100	Eliza - - - -	C.	26	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
101	Charlotte - - - -	C.	22	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
102	Mary Anne - - - -	C.	17	- ditto - - - -	- - 3
103	Patience - - - -	B.	47	Mary Bynoe, her daughter	- - 4
104	Sarah - - - -	B.	25	{ Wm. Thomas Morris, her father - - - -	- - 3
105	Robinnette Singleton - -	B.	30	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Ad- vocate and Curator - -	- - 25
106	Adriana - - - -	C.	10	- ditto - - - -	- - 25
107	Hannah - - - -	C.	6	- ditto - - - -	- - 25
108	Bella, mother of - - -	C.	34	- ditto - - - -	- April 8
109	William - - - -	C.	15	- ditto - - - -	- - 8
110	George - - - -	C.	5	- ditto - - - -	- - 8
111	Susannah - - - -	C.	2	- ditto - - - -	- - 8

from the 1st of November 1828 to the 30th of April 1829—continued.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

DATE when Manumission was recorded.	CONSIDERATION.	Number of Manumission.	REMARKS.
1829: Feb. 3	2,000 <i>f.</i> paid for himself in 1820	63	No security required, being a tailor.
- - 3	Faithful services - - -	872	A carpenter.
- - 3	Deed of gift - - -	991	Security given.
- - 3		922	- ditto. [man.]
- - 3	Faithful services - - -	993	No security required, her husband a trades-
- - 3		996	Security given.
- - 3	By will - - -	1,085	- ditto
- - 3	1,800 <i>f.</i> paid for himself in 1828	1,082	No security required, being a carpenter.
- - 9	{ 3,000 <i>f.</i> paid for herself and son in 1828 - - - }	1,079	Security given.
		1,080	- ditto.
- - 9	By will - - -	1,077	No security required, being a carpenter.
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,024	} Security given.
- - 9	Reputed free from her birth -	1,025	
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,026	} No security required, being a carpenter.
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,027	
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,028	- - ditto - - ditto.
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,029	Security given.
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,030	} No security required, being ap- prenticed to a cooper.
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,031	
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,032	Security given.
- - 9	- ditto - - -	1,033	- ditto.
- - 9	2,040 <i>f.</i> paid for himself in 1828	1,056	No security required.
- - 9	880 <i>f.</i> paid for himself in 1819 -	1,046	- ditto - being a carpenter.
- - 9	Natural affection - - -	881	No security required.
- - 10	By will - - -	1,060	- ditto - possessing property.
- - 10	- ditto - - -	1,061	- ditto.
- - 10	- ditto - - -	1,062	- ditto.
- - 13	Purchase money p ^d by her mother	1,035	Security given.
- - 13	Reputed free from his birth -	1,036	No security required, being a carpenter.
- - 13	- ditto - - -	1,037	- ditto - apprenticed to a cooper.
- - 13	- ditto - - -	1,038	- ditto - ditto.
- - 13	- ditto - - -	1,039	Security given.
- - 13	- ditto - - -	1,040	- ditto.
- - 13	2,300 <i>f.</i> paid for himself in 1825	984	No security required, being a carpenter.
- - 13	1,400 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1811	354	Security given.
- - 20	By will - - -	997	No security required.
- - 20	- ditto - - -	998	- ditto - apprenticed to a trade.
- - 20	- ditto - - -	999	Apprenticed.
- - 20	- ditto - - -	1,000	Apprenticed.
- - 24	Deed of gift - - -	1,041	Security given.
- - 27	- ditto - - -	847	- ditto.
- - 27	- ditto - - -	848	- ditto.
- - 27	- ditto - - -	849	- ditto.
- March 5	- ditto - - -	907	- ditto.
- - 5	Reputed free from her birth -	908	- ditto.
- - 5	- ditto - - -	909	- ditto.
- - 5	- ditto - - -	910	- ditto.
- - 5	{ Purchase money paid by her daughter - - - }	1,016	- ditto.
- - 5	Natural affection - - -	1,078	Security given.
- - 31	{ 1,500 <i>f.</i> paid for herself and one child in 1819 - - - }	1,010	} No security required, they having two negroes.
- - 31	- - - - -	1,011	
- - 31	Reputed free from her birth -	1,012	- ditto.
- April 11	1,000 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1807	947	Security given. [carpenter.]
- - 11	Reputed free from his birth -	948	No security required, apprenticed to a
- - 11	- ditto - - -	949	Security given.
- - 11	- ditto - - -	950	- ditto.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 4.) - - - - -

STATEMENT exhibiting the Number of SLAVES manumitted in the Colony of *Demerara* and for which they have been manumitted; the total Amount of Sums paid by them

The TOTAL Number of SLAVES manumitted from - - - - -

Of whom received their Freedom in - - - - -

Being the children, wives or other connexions of the parties who freed them, or who purchased their freedom.	Faithful Services and Deed of Gift.	TOTAL Number of Slaves who have received their Freedom without any valuable consideration being paid by them to their owners.	Purchase Money paid by them for their Freedom previous to the 1st January 1826, and Amount,	Purchase Money paid by them for their Freedom subsequent to the 1st January 1826, and Amount,
55.	36.	91.	13 - <i>f.</i> 15,980.	7 - <i>f.</i> 10,190

Office of Protector of Slaves, Demerara, }
1st May 1829.

(Enclosure 5.) - - - - -

REGISTER of CERTIFICATES granted to SLAVES, of their understanding the Nature and

Number.	NAMES of SLAVES.	NAMES of OWNERS, or Plantations to which they belong, and where they reside.
1.	Noel (male) - - - -	Miss Manville -
2.	July Ann (female) - - -	Miss B. Oosted -
3.	Sampson (male) - - - -	Mr. M'Alpine -
4.	Peter (male) - - - -	Mr. Unis - - -
		} George Town.

Office of Protector of Slaves, Demerara, }
1st May 1829.

- - - - - (Enclosure 4.)

Essequibo, from the 1st November 1828 to the 30th April 1829, inclusive; the Considerations for the purchase of their Freedom, and the Average Price of each Freedom.

- - - - 1st November 1828 to 30th April 1829, inclusive, is 111.

consideration of	Average Price of each of the Thirteen Slaves freed for Valuable Consideration, paid by them previous to the 1st January 1826,	Average Price of each of the Seven Slaves freed for Valuable Consideration, paid by them subsequent to the 1st January 1826.	Average Price of each of the Twenty Slaves freed for Valuable Consideration, paid by them,
TOTAL Number of Slaves who have purchased their Freedom, and TOTAL AMOUNT paid by them, 20 - - f. 26,170	f. 1,229. 4. 9.	f. 1,455. 14. 4.	f. 1,308. 10.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

- - - - - (Enclosure 5.)

Obligation of an Oath, from the 1st July 1828 to the 31st December 1828, inclusive.

NAME of PERSON GRANTING CERTIFICATE, And place of his Abode.	DATE of CERTIFICATE.
James Sugar, A.B. Rector of St. George's Parish, George Town.	1828:
	- 21 November.
	- 3 December.
	- 8 December.
	- 8 December.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 6.)

REGISTER of MARRIAGES of SLAVES, Solemnized in the Colony of *Demerara*

No.	NAMES OF SLAVES MARRYING.				NAME of OWNER or PLANTATION To which they belong.
	MALE.	Age.	FEMALE.	Age.	
1	Jem	-	Phoebe	-	Lancaster
2	Joe	-	Di	-	- ditto
3	David	-	Rachael	-	- ditto
4	Bristol	-	Bella	-	- ditto
5	Cooley	-	Susey	-	- ditto
6	Davy	-	Amelia	-	- ditto
7	Tom	-	Fanny	-	- ditto
8	Davy	-	Hannah	-	Ann's Grove
9	Boatswain	-	Ruba	-	Hope
10	Tom	-	Sue	-	Cove
11	Leander	-	Sarah	-	Ann's Grove
12	Bristol	-	Venus	-	John and Cove
13	Alfred	-	Mercy	-	- ditto - ditto
14	Ben	-	Agnes	-	- ditto - ditto
15	Duncan	-	Flora	-	- ditto - ditto
16	Mark	-	Harriet	-	- ditto - ditto
17	Timba	-	Lauretta	-	Ruimveld
18	Tom	-	Lucinda	-	- ditto
19	Will	-	Flora	-	- ditto
20	Tom	-	Menimia	-	- ditto
21	Pampier	-	Gratia	-	- ditto
22	Nimrod	-	Quasheba	-	- ditto
23	Secundo	-	Sepora	-	- ditto
24	Hendrick	-	Harrietta	-	- ditto
25	Mabiere	-	Egle	-	- ditto
26	Cornette	-	Sally	-	- ditto
27	Cesar	-	Charlotte	-	Brocken Waterland
28	Daniel	-	Lydia	-	John Mackay
29	Cisar	-	Atta	-	Woodlands
30	Munro	-	Hariet	-	Good Hope
31	Gray	-	Bella	-	- ditto
32	George	-	Sally Ann	-	Greenfield
33	Wellington	-	Serena	-	Strathavon
34	Ben	-	Nancy	-	- ditto
35	Rolla	-	Clarissa	-	James Watson
36	Trim	-	Betsy	-	Essex and Batavier
37	Scotland	-	Maria	-	- ditto - ditto
38	Rodney	-	Norah	-	Strathavon
39	Billy	-	Princess	-	Woodlands
40	Quashy	-	Sena	-	Houstoun

Office of Protector of Slaves, }
Demerara, 1st May 1829. }

(Enclosure 6.)

and *Essequibo*, from the 1st July to the 31st December 1828 inclusive.

PLACE of ABODE of the PARTIES CONTRACTING.	AUTHORITY under which MARRIED.	DATE of MARRIAGE.	NAMES of PERSONS Solemnizing MARRIAGE.
		1828.	
Lancaster - - -	Manager's - - -	September 5	} -- Leonard Strong, officiating minister, parish of St. Mary's Mahaica.
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - 7	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - 12	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
Ann's Grove - - -	Assistant Protector's	- ditto - 21	
Hope - - -	- ditto - ditto -	October - 5	
Cove - - -	- ditto - ditto -	November 2	
Ann's Grove - - -	- ditto - ditto -	- ditto - -	
John and Cove - - -	Manager's - - -	December 14	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
Ruimveld - - -	Attorney's - - -	July - - 7	} -- John Thos. Hynes, Roman Catholic vic- car, George Town.
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - 14	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - 20	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	August - 4	
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	
Brocken Waterland - - -	Proprietor's - - -	July - 27	John Wood, Mahaica.
George Town - - -	- ditto - - -	August - 10	{ Joseph Fletcher, George Town.
Woodlands - - -	Attorney's - - -	- ditto - -	- ditto - ditto.
Good Hope - - -	- ditto - - -	September 14	{ Jno. Edmondson, Mahaica.
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - -	- ditto - ditto.
Greenfield - - -	- ditto - - -	October - 19	John Woods, ditto.
Strathavon - - -	Proprietor's - - -	- ditto - 26	Jno. Edmondson, ditto.
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	November 23	- ditto - ditto.
Dantzie - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - 30	- ditto - ditto.
Essex - - -	Attorney's - - -	December 14	{ Joseph Fletcher, George Town.
- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - 21	{ Jno. Edmondson, Mahaica.
Strathavon - - -	Proprietor's - - -	- ditto - -	- ditto - ditto.
Woodlands - - -	Attorney's - - -	- ditto - 28	- ditto - ditto.
Houstoun - - -	Manager's - - -	October - 19	{ Joseph Fletcher, George Town.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 7.)

RETURN of the NUMBER of BAPTISMS of SLAVES in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, from the 1st July to the 31st December 1828, inclusive.

	ADULTS.	INFANTS.	TOTAL.
Baptized by the Clergymen of the Church of England	195	339	534
Ditto - - - ditto - - - Kirk of Scotland -	Not distinguished.		359
Ditto - - - ditto - - - Roman Catholic -	Ibid.		151
Ditto - - - ditto - - - Wesleyan Missionary	152	100	252
Ditto - - - ditto - - - Lutheran Congre- gation - - -	52	19	78
Total Number of BAPTISMS	-	-	1,374

Office of Protector of Slaves, }
Demerara, 1st May 1829. }A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 8.)

LIST of OFFENCES committed by MALE and FEMALE PLANTATION SLAVES in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, made up from the Returns of Punishments forwarded to the Protector of Slaves, by the Assistant Protectors of the several Districts, from the 1st January to the 31st December 1828, inclusive; showing the Nature of the Offences, the Number of Slaves committing each particular Offence in each half of the Year, and their Comparative Increase and Decrease, and the Total Number of Slaves returned.

NATURE OF OFFENCES.	For the Half-Year, ending 30th June 1828.			For the Half-Year, ending 31st December 1828.		
	TOTAL.		Grand TOTAL.	TOTAL.		Grand TOTAL.
	Male.	Female.		Male.	Female.	
SERIOUS and Aggravated Offences :						
Murder - - - - -	-	1	1	-	-	-
Stealing and attempting to murder - - -	1	-	1	-	-	-
Running away and attempting to murder -	1	-	1	-	-	-
Attempting to murder - - - - -	1	-	1	3	-	3
Attempting to drown her child - - - - -	-	1	1	-	-	-
Attempting to commit suicide - - - - -	1	-	1	3	-	3
Attempting to poison - - - - -	-	-	-	1	-	1
Sodomy - - - - -	1	-	1	-	-	-
Attempting to ravish - - - - -	5	-	5	7	-	7
Cutting and wounding others with cutlasses, &c.	18	4	22	15	7	22
Attempting to cut others with cutlasses, &c. -	4	1	5	13	3	16
Incendiaries - - - - -	1	1	2	3	1	4
Cruelty to children - - - - -	3	4	7	5	1	6
Killing and destroying stock - - - - -	11	-	11	3	-	3
House breaking and stealing - - - - -	31	2	33	38	-	38
Cruelty to animals - - - - -	10	-	10	9	1	10
THEFTS, &c.						
Theft and running away - - - - -	26	-	26	30	2	32
Theft - - - - -	422	49	471	383	48	431
Conniving at theft - - - - -	6	1	7	2	-	2
Receiving stolen goods knowing them to be such - - - - -	2	1	3	6	-	6
Encouraging their children to steal - - -	1	1	2	-	-	-
INSUBORDINATION, accompanied with Violence :						
Striking manager - - - - -	1	1	2	1	-	1
Striking overseer - - - - -	-	1	1	2	1	3
Biting overseer - - - - -	1	-	1	-	-	-
Striking driver, raising cutlass to him -	10	9	19	17	10	27
Biting driver - - - - -	-	1	1	-	1	1
Spitting in overseer's face - - - - -	-	2	2	-	-	-
Resisting manager, overseer, &c. in discharge of his duty - - - - -	7	2	9	7	8	15
Maliciously breaking and attempting to break mill or other buildings - - - - -	14	2	16	5	10	15
Breaking out of hospital, stocks, &c. - -	14	4	18	18	7	25

NATURE OF OFFENCES.	For the Half-Year, ending 30th June 1828.			For the Half-Year, ending 31st December 1828.		
	TOTAL.		Grand	TOTAL.		Grand
	Male.	Female.	TOTAL.	Male.	Female.	TOTAL.
INSUBORDINATION unaccompanied with Violence :						
Refusing to work - - - - -	101	238	339	129	265	394
Refusing to do the usual day's work, threaten- ing language, and absconding - - - - -	2	4	6	-	2	2
Mutinous conduct, defying manager or overseer, &c.	20	25	45	20	12	32
Seditious conduct, instigating others to neglect duty	20	48	68	14	8	22
Conspiring and refusing to do the usual day's work	34	17	51	21	40	61
Not finishing day's work and quitting the field	6	8	14	11	6	17
Refractory behaviour and neglect of duty -	68	143	211	72	90	162
Absconding ; running away - - - - -	387	64	451	476	49	525
Disobedience - - - - -	500	220	720	606	264	870
Insolence and abusive language to owner, manager or overseer - - - - -	141	261	402	168	333	501
Encouraging others to abscond - - - - -	3	-	3	5	-	5
Holding clandestine meetings at night - - -	3	1	4	1	-	1
Contemptuous language and behaviour - - -	8	10	18	11	11	22
Quarrelling and insubordinate conduct - - -	17	16	33	13	22	35
DOMESTIC OFFENCES :						
Beating and ill-treating parents - - - - -	4	2	6	6	4	10
Beating and maltreating others - - - - -	36	9	45	42	13	55
Fighting and disorderly conduct at night - -	29	13	42	23	25	48
Quarrelling and fighting - - - - -	70	68	138	53	35	88
Neglect of duty - - - - -	1,556	565	2,121	1,580	475	2,055
Not doing day's work - - - - -	883	1,261	2,144	1,085	1,084	2,169
Bad work - - - - -	169	140	309	200	62	262
Laziness and idleness - - - - -	306	200	506	298	256	554
Absenting from work - - - - -	142	62	204	177	65	242
Neglect of duty as watchman - - - - -	253	-	253	214	-	214
Neglect of duty as driver - - - - -	62	-	62	83	-	83
Destroying produce - - - - -	11	1	12	13	2	15
Cutting and destroying canes, plants, &c. - -	21	2	23	7	10	17
Selling or making away with implements fur- nished by owner - - - - -	9	-	9	5	1	6
Neglecting their children - - - - -	-	2	2	-	2	2
Biting others - - - - -	1	-	1	-	2	2
Rioting and causing disturbance - - - - -	45	64	109	55	54	109
Riding and ill-using horses at night, &c. - -	8	-	8	7	-	7
Drunkenness - - - - -	198	11	209	227	6	233
Not coming to work in proper time - - - - -	38	275	313	53	209	262
Neglecting stock - - - - -	47	-	47	31	1	32
Harbouring runaways - - - - -	12	3	15	13	2	15
Absenting from estate without pass - - - - -	99	30	129	43	19	62
False pretence of sickness and refusing to work	7	81	88	29	112	141
Introducing rum on estate - - - - -	14	2	16	5	-	5
Carelessness, carrying fire into megass, logie, &c.	15	5	20	14	4	18
Lying, false swearing, &c. - - - - -	22	6	28	7	2	9
Practising obeah - - - - -	1	-	1	4	-	4
Allowing cattle to trespass on cultivation - -	56	-	56	38	-	38
Seducing and attempting to seduce other men's wives	6	-	6	5	-	5
Infidelity to husbands - - - - -	-	4	4	-	3	3
Neglecting and concealing sores - - - - -	27	3	30	42	4	46
Fornication - - - - -	1	1	2	1	-	1
False complaints - - - - -	1	3	4	14	1	15
Breaking boats, carts, &c. - - - - -	5	-	5	10	-	10
Leaving estate at night - - - - -	15	2	17	12	8	20
Filthiness and neglect of person - - - - -	8	3	11	10	-	10
Dancing and carousing on estate without leave	10	-	10	3	1	4
Eating clay - - - - -	-	1	1	2	1	3
Found with gunpowder, and using it in a dan- gerous manner - - - - -	1	-	1	-	-	-
Offence unknown, punished by Fiscal - - - -	2	-	2	13	-	13
TOTAL Number of Offences - - - - -	6,092	3,962	10,054	6,542	3,665	10,207
TOTAL Number of Slaves Returned	34,106	28,246	62,352	33,635	27,991	61,626

(Enclosure 9.) - - - - -

LIST of OFFENCES committed by MALE and FEMALE PLANTATION SLAVES in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, several Districts, from the 1st July to the 31st December 1828 inclusive; showing the Nature of the Offences, the Number

NAMES OF DISTRICTS	District of Assistant Protector T. H. Otterbein.		District of Assistant Protector J. Van Waterschootd.		District of Assistant Protector S. C. Spieringshoek.		District of Assistant Protector J. Koert.		District of Assistant Protector E. H. Dalton.		District of Assistant Protector T. Richardson.		District of Assistant Protector W. W. Kernan.		District of Assistant Protector M. Thierens.	
	No. of Slaves in each District -															
NATURE OF OFFENCES.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.
	SERIOUS and aggravated Offences:															
Attempting to murder	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attempting to commit suicide	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Attempting to poison	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attempting to ravish	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cutting and wounding others with cutlasses, &c.	3	-	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Attempting to cut others with cutlasses, &c.	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Incendiaries	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cruelty to children	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Killing and destroying stock	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
House-breaking and stealing	4	-	1	-	3	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
Cruelty to animals	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
THEFT, &c.:																
Theft and running-away	1	-	3	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	2	-
Theft	30	-	59	11	32	1	6	5	20	1	-	-	1	2	39	2
Conniving at theft	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Receiving stolen goods, knowing them to be such	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
INSUBORDINATION accompanied with Violence:																
Striking manager	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Striking overseer	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Striking driver, raising cutlass to him	3	-	1	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Biting driver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Resisting manager, overseer, &c. in discharge of his duty	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-
Maliciously breaking and attempting to break mill or other buildings	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	1	-
Breaking out of hospital, stocks, &c.	3	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	3	-
INSUBORDINATION, unaccompanied with Violence:																
Refusing to work	4	4	11	51	3	16	1	2	1	5	-	-	9	5	12	19
Refusing to do the usual day's work, threatening language, and absconding	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mutinous conduct, defying manager, overseer, &c.	4	1	-	1	3	1	5	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Seditious conduct, instigating others to neglect duty	-	-	1	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	1
Conspiring, and refusing to do the usual day's work	-	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-
Not finishing day's work, and quitting the field	9	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Refractory behaviour and neglect of duty	22	24	4	8	3	16	-	-	1	1	-	-	16	14	8	5
Absconding, running-away	30	3	50	3	20	3	90	6	15	-	-	-	21	1	49	6
Disobedience	17	10	85	74	24	16	46	6	20	8	5	-	37	18	40	13
Insolence and abusive language to owner, manager, overseer, &c.	16	29	17	42	13	24	15	24	6	23	-	-	1	10	21	32
Encouraging others to abscond	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Holding clandestine meetings at night	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contemptuous language and behaviour	2	-	2	-	2	5	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
Quarrelling and insubordinate conduct	2	6	3	4	-	6	1	1	1	1	-	-	3	-	-	-

(Enclosure 9.)

made up from the Returns of Punishments forwarded to the Protector of Slaves, by the Assistant Protectors of the of Slaves committing each particular Offence, in each District of the Colony, and the Total Number of Offences.

District of Assistant Protector E. Bishop.		District of Assistant Protector R. Watson.		District of Assistant Protector J. M'Pherson.		District of Assistant Protector C. Brotherson.		District of Assistant Protector W. M'Keand.		District of Assistant Protector W. Fraser.		District of Assistant Protector A. M'Kenzie.		District of Assistant Protector N. M. Manget.		District of Assistant Protector T. Blake.		TOTAL.		GRAND TOTAL.
Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	
1,475	1,173	936	777	4,220	3,272	841	444	3,111	2,839	1,508	1,194	2,853	2,283	1,864	1,630	1,140	875	33,635	27,991	61,626
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17	17	7
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	15	7	22
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	16
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	6
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	38	38	38
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	1	10
10	1	3	1	23	4	11	3	18	6	10	3	33	1	25	11	17	3	30	2	32
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	383	48	431
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	6
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17	10	27
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	8	15
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10	15
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	7	25
7	8	3	10	10	15	15	1	12	54	2	17	4	32	27	9	8	17	129	265	394
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	20	12	32
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14	8	22
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21	40	61
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	6	17
2	3	11	3	38	8	10	2	13	1	23	1	49	10	29	2	18	8	72	90	162
7	2	20	7	34	6	28	1	34	48	18	9	65	31	47	6	27	8	476	49	525
19	3	9	17	13	15	4	5	11	27	3	12	10	27	4	11	15	28	606	264	870
8	7	9	17	13	15	4	5	11	27	3	12	10	27	4	11	15	28	168	333	501
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	11	22
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	22	35

(continued.)

(Enclosure 9.)—List of Offences committed by Male and Female Plantation Slaves

NAMES OF DISTRICTS	District of Assistant Protector T. H. Otterbein.		District of Assistant Protector J. Van. Waterschoot.		District of Assistant Protector S. C. Spieringshoek.		District of Assistant Protector J. Koert.		District of Assistant Protector E. H. Dalton, &c.		District of Assistant Protector T. Richardson.		District of Assistant Protector W. W. Kernan.		District of Assistant Protector M. Thierens.	
	1,928	1,605	3,281	2,985	2,366	2,070	3,069	2,620	1,002	836	52	37	935	776	3,049	2,575
(continued.) NATURE OF OFFENCES.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.
DOMESTIC OFFENCES:																
Beating and ill-treating parents	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-
Beating and maltreating others	2	1	4	2	3	1	2	1	1	-	-	-	3	-	4	-
Fighting and disorderly conduct at night	5	7	3	5	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Quarrelling and fighting	3	1	3	9	4	2	8	2	-	4	-	-	-	-	2	2
Neglect of duty	173	75	230	112	99	22	94	20	41	22	-	-	91	57	191	23
Not doing day's work	95	96	159	224	54	223	106	104	39	34	-	-	19	22	178	41
Bad work	16	12	41	24	18	3	16	9	5	2	-	-	1	1	42	-
Laziness and idleness	54	56	7	77	40	24	25	48	23	2	-	-	5	-	57	6
Absenting from work	22	4	36	6	8	1	8	-	3	5	-	-	7	4	24	16
Neglect of duty as watchman	21	-	59	-	21	-	14	-	8	-	-	-	17	-	14	-
Neglect of duty as driver	3	-	8	-	6	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	5	-	12	-
Destroying produce	3	-	1	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Cutting and destroying canes, plants, &c.	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	-	1
Selling or making away with implements furnished by owner	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Neglecting their children	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biting others	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rioting and causing disturbance	4	6	2	9	1	8	8	1	4	-	-	-	2	-	4	7
Riding and ill-using horses at night, &c.	-	-	1	-	-	-	8	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drunkenness	15	-	21	1	22	2	42	10	10	1	-	-	8	-	23	-
Not coming to work in proper time	9	18	8	39	-	4	10	7	11	-	-	-	7	12	6	2
Neglecting stock	1	-	1	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-
Harbouring runaways	1	-	2	-	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Absenting from estate without pass	-	-	12	5	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
False pretence of sickness, and refusing to work	1	-	12	56	2	1	-	1	-	20	-	-	-	-	-	9
Introducing rum on estate	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carelessness, carrying fire into me-gass logie, &c.	-	-	5	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lying, false swearing, &c.	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-
Practising obeah	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Allowing cattle to trespass on cultivation	7	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	8	-
Seducing and attempting to seduce other men's wives	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Infidelity to husbands	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Neglecting and concealing sores	7	-	6	-	2	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	8	-
Fornication	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
False complaints	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-
Breaking boats, carts, &c.	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
Leaving estate at night	-	-	3	5	-	-	4	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Filthiness and neglect of person	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5	-
Dancing and carousing on estate without leave	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eating clay	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Offence unknown, punished by fiscal	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTALS	639	381	892	776	416	391	574	260	208	148	6	-	296	157	785	191

Office of Protector of Slaves,
Demerara, 1st May 1829.

N^o 2.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

DESPATCH from Sir *George Murray* to Sir *B. D'Urban*, K.C.B.

Downing-street, 2d September 1829.

S I R,

I HAVE received your Despatch of the 21st of May last, enclosing the Report of the Protector of Slaves preceding the first of May.

There is a material defect in the Abstracts of the Punishment Records, in as much as the offences only, and not the punishments, are given in it. Opposite to each offence, the Maximum and Minimum punishment, which have been inflicted on its account, ought to have been specified. You will have the goodness to call upon the Protector to supply this omission.

I have also to observe, that in the very few cases in which Fines have been levied, for the improper punishment of Slaves, the proceedings appear to have been conducted in privacy, and neither the Names of the offenders, nor the nature of their offences, are stated in the Protector's Report. This omission must be supplied.

I do not perceive that any return is made of the Complaints which may have been addressed to the Protector, or of his proceedings upon them. This also is an important omission, which you will call upon the Protector to supply.

It is stated, that the Complaints have not been numerous. Unfortunately, however, the same statement cannot be made respecting the number of Punishments; they amount to the extraordinary number of 10,207, during one half year, upon a population of 61,626. The infrequency of complaints, under such circumstances, must either imply a great consciousness of criminality on the part of the Slaves, or some distrust of their prospect of redress for any injuries they may have received. In either case the result is much to be lamented.

I must further observe, that some of the charges are singularly indefinite. Thus, no less than 2,055 punishments were inflicted, under the head of "*neglect of duty*," 870 for "*disobedience*," 394 for "*refusing to work*," 431 for "*theft*" and "*running away*," 2,169 for "*not doing a day's work*." It would appear as though the attention of the Protector had not been drawn, either to the extraordinary number, or to the indefinite character of these charges. You will call upon him to state what inquiries he has made into the subject, and what is the result of those inquiries.

Other cases are stated, in which Domestic Punishments appear to have been inflicted for offences of the most serious character. Thus, three Slaves seem to have been thus punished for "the attempt to murder;" one for "attempting to poison," seven for "attempting to ravish," twenty-two for "wounding others with cutlasses," four as incendiaries," thirty-eight for "housebreaking." It is obvious that crimes of this nature should be punished by the Court of Justice, not by the domestic authority of the Owner. You will call upon the Protector to report upon the circumstances of these cases, and to explain what measures he may have already adopted, for inquiring into these imputed crimes. Of the 10,207 punishments, mentioned in this Report, thirteen only are said to have been inflicted by the Fiscal. It is possible that among those thirteen may have been included some of those to which I have referred.

I observe that no Prosecutions have been instituted by the Protector of Slaves, during the six months comprised in his present Report.

It will be convenient that the Protector should express in pounds sterling, as well as in florins, all sums of money which he has occasion to give an account of, in his Reports or Returns.

I have, &c.

(signed) *G. Murray*.

N^o 3.DESPATCH from Sir *B. D'Urban* to Sir *George Murray*, &c. &c. &c.

(With an Enclosure.)

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

SIR,

King's House, Demerara, 4th December 1829.

IMMEDIATELY upon my having received your Despatch of the 2d of September, I communicated its contents to Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves, and he has addressed me a Report thereon, which I have the honour herewith to transmit. I have so recently written to you very fully upon all the different points and bearings of this subject, (in my Despatch, No. 42, of the 14th September) that I am not aware of any additional observations which I could with any utility offer to your attention upon this occasion. It is, however, no more than justice to Colonel Young, to express to you my entire belief in the correctness of his assurance, (and I think I could not fail to know if it were otherwise,) "that Complaints made to him by the Slaves are never neglected."

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient and most humble servant,

B. D'Urban.

P. S.—I am very glad to see by the Half-yearly Records of Punishment (for the first half of the present year) now about to be transmitted to you, that the number of punishments has very considerably diminished, being in the aggregate about one-sixth less than that of either of the two preceding half-yearly periods.

B. D.

(Enclosure.)

REPORT from Protector *A. W. Young*, to Sir *B. D'Urban*, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,

Office of Protector of Slaves, Demerara, 26th October 1829.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

THOUGH many of, if not all, the points contained in the present Despatch of the Right honourable the Secretary for the Colonies, dated 2d September ultimo, have on a recent occasion been reported upon, in obedience to your Excellency's commands, issued on the receipt of a former Despatch, dated 10th May last, and I trust satisfactorily—the importance of the subject and my own most earnest wish to place every information relative to it, in the clearest point of view possible, will equally excuse the repetition which necessarily ensues from the endeavour to afford further explanation.

1st.—The defect of a Maximum and a Minimum not being stated.

I beg respectfully to remind your Excellency, that the Abstract Returns sent home, by express commands, in lieu of copies of the original Returns formerly transmitted, are precisely similar to those from Trinidad; which the Right honourable (late Secretary) Mr. Huskisson desired should be taken as guides for the formation of Demerara Returns.

The defect will, however, be remedied in the Returns which will accompany the Half-yearly Report, shortly to be laid before your Excellency.

2d.—Privacy in the mode of levying Fines, and Names of Parties not stated.

If, on proof of complaint, the party complained against, after demand, refuse payment of the penalty, a prosecution is commenced, and the case is as public as any other before the Court of Justice. Should they pay the penalty, the fact of doing so is known to the complainant and witnesses on both sides, to any one else in the office at the time, and to any one in the colony desirous of ascertaining the termination of the complaints.

The Names of Parties will be inserted in the Returns about to go home, and for the future.

3rd.—The frequency of Punishment, the infrequency of Complaint; the consequent consciousness of Criminality on the part of the Slaves, or some distrust of their prospect of Redress.

After an attentive perusal of the Ordinance, I cannot find that I am, in any part of it, authorized or instructed to take cognizance of those punishments which *by law* may be inflicted

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

inflicted on Slaves. The exercise of limited punishment is left to the discretion of the person in charge of the slave: Should this limited punishment be inflicted without the observance of the requisite formalities, viz.—Presence of witnesses, vicinity of buildings, lapse of time after commission of offence, &c. then I am authorized, as also for excess of punishment, to impose a Penalty; but if all these formalities be observed and the punishment exceed not twenty-five lashes, the Crown Advocate agrees with me in thinking that my interference would be ineffectual because not warranted by law.

On reference to the Reports from the Trinidad Protector, it will be found that his inability has been remedied by subsequent enactment. I cannot avoid expressing the difficulty I experience in couching my answer to the concluding part of the 3d Remark of the Despatch; from which it is impossible not to infer an imputation of backwardness upon my part to afford redress, in such terms as may at once serve to prove (what I really know) that it is unfounded, and be within the bounds of that respectful language which I certainly intend, and which is so properly due to the Right honourable Secretary. It is a difficulty arising from my education, and from those pursuits to which my profession through life necessarily led me; these have fitted me rather to judge correctly of plain facts than enabled me to support my opinions by lengthened arguments, and therefore I fear my answer may be deemed somewhat short; for its accuracy, however, I appeal to your Excellency or to any other person in the colony.

It is very possible that if a Slave is conscious of having committed the Offence for which he has been punished, and knows also that the Punishment has not exceeded the law, he will not come to complain, nor in that case am I aware that I could interfere if he did.

With respect to their having any cause to distrust their prospect of Redress, the spirit of my oath of office forbids my giving them such cause; I value both the sanctity of an oath and my own reputation, and I may securely affirm that their complaints to me have never been neglected.

4th.—Indefinite Charges.

I have called upon all proprietors, &c. by a circular letter, to be more definite and precise in recording the shade and degree of offences;—of those enumerated in the Despatch—

- “ Neglect of Duty,
- “ Disobedience,
- “ Not doing a Day’s Work,”

will certainly admit of more specific description, by stating the precise acts of omission in each case; but

- “ Refusing to Work,
- “ Theft or Running Away,”

it may be difficult to define more distinctly.

The truth of these records is all sworn to by the parties.

5th.—Serious Crimes.

With regard to serious crimes, as more appropriately punishable by the criminal law, many of those enumerated in the Despatch would appear to have been attempts, not perpetrations; but I apprehend that this is not a question which comes within the Protector’s duty to agitate, since it is clear that the slave is less severely punished than if he were given over to the civil tribunals; and by the Ordinance I am directed to defend slaves, not to prosecute them, which would be the case were these crimes proyed against them. And were the Protector to institute inquiries respecting these crimes, with a view to their more severe and proper punishment, it would most certainly tend to create a feeling of distrust between him and the slave; at present, however, the law does not authorize his interference, nor am I aware, for the reason before stated, that any change of it in this particular would be attended with advantage.

To my next Half-yearly Report, nearly completed, will be annexed a nominal List of all Punishments, extracted from the Returns sent to me, as inflicted by the Court of Justice or by order of the Fiscals.

In future I will state the amount of the Penalty in pounds sterling as well as in guilders.

And, in conclusion, I have only to assure your Excellency, that the pleasure of His Majesty’s Government having been in these Despatches, on several parts of my duty, for the first time made known, will meet with all due attention. I would, however, in the most respectful manner, deprecate from myself responsibility for any feeling of disappointment on matters relative to slaves, for which the state of the law and the recognized customs of the colony ought to be charged, and not the servant of the law.

I have, &c.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

N^o 4.

DESPATCH from Sir *B. D'Urban*, to Sir *George Murray*, &c. &c. &c.
(With an Enclosure.)

PART I.
DEMERARA.
Correspondence.

SIR,

King's House, Demerara,
15th December 1829.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith the Half-yearly Report of the Protector of Slaves for the first six months of the present year, with the Abstracts of the Punishment Records for that period.

I am not aware that I can add any thing in elucidation of the Protector's Report; nor, with reference to my late despatches, that I have now any other observations to make upon this subject, further than to express my satisfaction that upon a comparison of this period with the two preceding periods respectively, there appears a diminution in the number of Punishments of nearly one-sixth.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient and most humble servant,

B. D'Urban.

(Enclosure.)

REPORT from Protector *A. W. Young*, to Sir *B. D'Urban*, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,

Office of Protector of Slaves, Demerara, 10th Dec. 1829.

IN compliance with the directions contained in the 34th clause of the Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves and for the Improvement of their condition in this united Colony; I have the honour to submit to your Excellency the following Documents: Report from Protector of Slaves.

No. 1. List of Offences compiled from the original Half-yearly Punishment Record Returns, ending on the 30th June 1829; to which is added an Abstract, showing the nature and extent of the punishment inflicted for said offences.

The total number of Offences of Male Slaves is 5,666;—of this number 5,354 were punished by flogging, and 312 by confinement in stocks, &c.; of the 5,354 punished by flogging, the greater number did not receive the full measure of punishment allowed by the Ordinance.

The extent of punishment allowed by the Ordinance has not been exceeded.

The number of Offences of Female Slaves for the same half year, 3,044, all punished by confinement in stocks, &c.

The punishment of offences enumerated in this list, has been inflicted by the manager or other person in charge of the Slaves. The maximum of punishment being 25 lashes, and the minimum one night's confinement in the bed stocks.

No. 2. List of Cases appearing in the Punishment Record Returns for the above half year, in which the Offences of Slaves have been referred to the Magistracy for punishment, and showing, where recorded by the party making the Return, the nature of the offences committed by the Slaves and the extent of the punishment inflicted for the same.

These offences and punishments are exclusive of those contained in List No. 1, and are 18 in number.

It would appear optional with the person in charge of the Slave, to record a punishment not actually inflicted by his orders.

No. 3. List of Plantations and Task Gangs, &c. upon which no Punishments have been inflicted on the Slaves attached to them, for the above half year; these are 46 in number.

No. 4. List of Offences of Slaves for this half year, compared with the List of the preceding half year.

There is a decrease in the offences of Male Slaves, of 876, in those of Females, of 621, making a total decrease of 1,497; and it will be observed, that the decrease is greatest in the offences of a more serious nature; for the number of offences under the first four classes of the Document No. 1, which embrace the more serious description, for the half year ending 30th June 1829, is 2,531, and the total of domestic or lighter offences for the same half year, is 6,179=8,710; whilst for the preceding half year, the number under these classes respectively, were 3,320 and 6,887=10,207.

These Returns are made out in the same form as has hitherto been adopted, with the exception of receiving such alterations as have from time to time been directed from home.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

The original Punishment Record Returns have been entered as usual in the proper books, and remain deposited in this office.

The offences are worded agreeably to the description given by the manager or other person making the Return, but necessarily in fewer terms; for if the whole of the generally full explanation of the offence as inserted in the Returns of Punishments, be placed on the face of the List, it would cease to be a summary, become very lengthened and yet not afford adequate information; the description of the offence is therefore condensed without being materially altered.

No. 5. Record of Slaves manumitted during the half year from 1st May to 31st October 1829.

The number of Slaves manumitted is 131, of whom 54 are Males and 77 Females. Annexed to the Record is a Statement showing the Considerations for which they have been manumitted, and the Average Price paid by each of those who have purchased their Freedom; also showing the Total Number of Slaves manumitted in this Colony, from the 1st January 1826 to the 31st October 1829, viz. 1,402, of whom were Males 523, and Females 879.

Independently of the manumissions actually given out, the Deeds which have been prepared in consequence of no opposition being entered to the regularly advertised notice of intention to manumit, are exceedingly numerous. That they have not been called for I can only attribute to a supposition that the manumission is effected by the observance of this imperfect formality, to the distance from town at which many of the parties reside, or probably, as the deed is a voluntary one, ignorance on the one side, and negligence on the other, may account for the circumstance; as, however, it might prove injurious to the interests of the Slaves, in the event of the death of the proprietor, I shall at the first opportunity of leisure from the more immediate press of business take measures to obviate the danger.

No. 6. Return of Marriages of Slaves reported to Protector, from the 1st January to 30th June 1829 inclusive; these are 85 in number.

No. 7. Return of Baptisms of Slaves reported to Protector during the same period; in number 2,518, and chiefly adults.

No. 8. Return of the number of Slaves reported to the Protector, for the same period, as understanding the nature and obligation of an Oath, 168 in number; the increased number of certificates granted to Slaves, may be attributed to the importance of the matter having been specially brought under notice, as recommended in the Report of the preceding half year.

No. 9. Return of Complaints made to the Protector, from 1st May to 31st October 1829, 52 in number; of which the following are still not finally disposed of,—

No. 1. David *against* the Orphan Chamber, for remuneration whilst illegally detained in slavery.

No. 19. Hannah, of Plantation Walton Hall, *against* the Orphan Chamber, for freedom of her child Jane, and recovery of property left said child by her father Geo. Anderson.

No. 23. Francis *against* J. M'Carty, for recovery of a debt.

No. 48. Susan Rogers *alias* Spooner, *against* M. Tobie, free coloured man, a carpenter, for recovery of a debt.

No. 51. Nelly Sue *against* Catharine Browne, to deposit in saving bank, a sum of money paid said Catharine Browne, in part of complainant's purchase-money.

No. 54. Thomas *against* the Orphan Chamber, representing the bordel of his late master, claiming freedom, now with the Crown Advocate, to apply to the court for an appointment of curator to manumit him.

No. 55.—Diana Spraa *against* J. C. Scheffers, free coloured man, a carpenter, for recovery of debt.

No. 57.—Jacoba, Julia Dorothea, Ana, and Effie, of Plantation Le Repentir, *against* M. Rush, for illegal confinement of complainants; fine of 1000 guilders (71 *l.* 8 *s.* 6 *d.* sterling), demanded, as prescribed by the 13th clause of the Ordinance, and first of the amended Act.

No. 60.—Francis *against* A. Sills, of this town, for beating her with a horse whip, fine of 1,400 guilders (or 100 *l.* sterling) demanded, as prescribed by the 14th clause of the Ordinance.

No. 61.—Ben William *against* A. F. Hanower, claiming freedom.

In the cases of complaint for recovery of debts due to Slaves, the Protector considering the poverty of the persons complained against, and the heavy expenses to which the immediate adoption of legal proceedings would subject them, and that too, perhaps, without ensuring payment to the Slave (the parties in many instances possessing no property), has generally, with the acquiescence of the complainants, allowed them a short time to procure the amounts due.

The instances of actual ill treatment or illegal punishment of Slaves embraced by this Return, and in which the Protector deemed it necessary to demand fines, are two (Nos. 57. and 60.); and one (No. 33.) in which the Slaves of the party complained against were, on application by the Protector, placed under curatorship, the proprietor Mary Lowe, free coloured woman, not being a proper person to have the charge of Slaves.

This Return also embraces eight claims to freedom (Nos. 1, 14, 19, 51, 53, 54, 61, and 62.) and seven complainst for recovery of debts (Nos. 18, 23, 25, 34, 38, 48 and 55.)

It sometimes happens, that delay occurs in the investigation and decision of complaints; this is attributable to the parties in such instances residing at a distance from town, and often having no conveyance of their own to enable them to attend promptly when summoned. Generally, however, every facility which their circumstances will admit of, is given by owners or managers to the Protector in investigating complaints.

Slaves are sent, as stated in the complaints, to the barracks or colonial jail during the investigation of their statements, and are detained until the determination of their case; but without other restraint than is necessary for their safe custody. Some public establishment there must be, in which Slaves, whilst absent from their owners, may receive food and lodging and medical attendance if needed.

The colonial jail is the only one in which these requisites are united.

No. 10.—The Number of Suits and Prosecutions instituted by the Protector on behalf of Slaves, and in the hands of the Crown Advocate to be brought forward, are, up to 31st October 1829, fifteen; of these two are for improper punishment of Slaves. On the particulars of the first (Johannes Saurman, late manager of Plantation Zeelught) I beg to refer to my former Report. In the latter case, A. Simpson of this town, improperly punished his slave James, by cuffing him, and then beating him with the flat part of a hand-saw, and not counting the number of blows he gave.

A. Simpson is a cooper, in very embarrassed circumstances, and on that account the Protector, in the first instance, directed him to pay a fine of 220 guilders, or 15*l.* 14*s.* 3½*d.* sterling, within a stipulated time, in failure whereof he will be prosecuted for the offence, which is in contravention of the 13th Clause of the Ordinance, and 2d of the amended Act.

The discretionary power exercised in this case, by the Protector, in mitigating the fine and allowing time for its payment, was prior to the receipt of the despatch of the Secretary of State forbidding the exercise of such power.

The termination of such of these cases as may be decided, will accompany the next Report.

One instance of a complaint, the only one of a similar nature that has been before me, is that of a female Slave, named Cornelia, belonging to a free coloured woman, named Mary Hughes, who imported her into this colony as a domestic, and received a permit from the Custom-house to land the Slave as such, not to be sold or left behind. Mary Hughes, it appeared, had attempted to sell her, but failing in that she left the Slave in question behind her in pledge for a certain sum.

On it reaching me I called the attention of His Majesty's Customs to the case; the slave was seized by them, condemned by the Admiralty Court, and is now free, as also her child.

The provision on the landing permit against the selling, or not leaving the negro in the colony, though highly beneficial, and to which the collector here seems to have given a just interpretation in the spirit of the Act; still, however, it does not rest upon any statutory enactment, or even local law, but is merely a dictum of usage adopted here; and I venture to submit, it would be extremely useful in the prevention of frauds, if it were enacted in the form of a positive law, either by Act of Parliament or otherwise.

I had the honour some time ago to bring under your Excellency's notice, several cases in which two punishments by stocks were carried to an improper excess. It is unnecessary now to forward copies of my letters, and of the references to the law officers of the colony in relation thereto, as the amended Slave Act lately passed embodies their suggestions.

I beg, however, to annex (forming document No. 11.) a copy of a Circular which I addressed to the Assistant Protectors, on the detention of Slaves in the stocks previous to corporal punishment.

Prior to the promulgation of the late Act, I had occasion to draw their attention to the impropriety of such a practice.

I have most urgently to press upon your Excellency's consideration the expediency of allowing suits instituted under the Slave laws to partake in the advantages which the Act for the more speedy enforcement of pecuniary penalties bestows on all suits but those arising from said Slave laws.

The advantages of speedy enforcement of the law at less expense to both the Colony and Party prosecuted, than under the present system, are too apparent to require more than the mere mention.

Respectfully referring your Excellency to the documents accompanying this Report, as affording a more detailed account of the manner in which the duties of this office have been conducted during the last six months;

I have the honour to be,

Your Excellency's most obedient humble servant,

A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 1.)

LIST of OFFENCES committed by MALE and FEMALE PLANTATION SLAVES in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, Districts, from the 1st of January to the 30th of June 1829 inclusive; showing the Nature of the Offences, the Number

NAMES OF DISTRICTS	District of Assistant Protector T. H. Otterbein.		District of Assistant Protector J. V. Waterschootd.		District of Assistant Protector S. C. Spieringshoek.		District of Assistant Protector J. Osborn.		District of Assistant Protector E. H. Dalton.		District of Assistant Protector T. Richardson.		District of Assistant Protector W. W. Kernan.		District of Assistant Protector M. Thierens.		
	No. of Slaves in each District -	1,844	1,533	3,280	2,815	2,393	2,109	3,230	2,627	992	813	45	29	952	780	3,062	2,771
NATURE OF OFFENCES.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	
SERIOUS and Aggravated Offences:																	
Fighting and attempting to murder	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Running away and attempting to stab	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attempting to ravish	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cutting and wounding others with cutlasses, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Attempting to cut others with cutlasses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Attempting to commit arson	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
House-breaking and stealing	1	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Killing and destroying stock	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cruelty to animals	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
THEFT, &c.																	
Theft and running away	2	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Theft	28	5	38	6	36	2	26	4	15	1	-	-	23	8	58	3	
Conniving at theft and attempting to steal	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
Receiving stolen goods, knowing them to be such	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INSUBORDINATION accompanied with Violence:																	
Striking driver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-
Biting driver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Raising cutlass to manager, overseer or driver	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Resisting manager, or others in authority over them, in the discharge of his or their duty	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maliciously breaking or destroying machinery, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
Breaking out of stocks, hospital, &c.	2	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
INSUBORDINATION unaccompanied with Violence:																	
Refusing to do any work, or the work required	1	15	14	35	3	6	2	16	2	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
Conspiring and refusing to do the usual day's work	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Instigating others to neglect duty	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
Not completing day's work, and quitting the field, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Contumacious conduct and neglect of work	8	12	6	17	2	18	-	20	3	6	-	-	6	3	-	-	-
Absconding, running away	10	-	25	2	27	3	40	2	4	3	2	-	4	-	21	-	-
Disobedience of orders	27	23	64	57	13	10	15	18	11	18	-	-	25	15	48	14	
Insolence and abuse	4	10	17	46	7	8	10	13	6	28	-	-	1	5	19	64	
Incouraging others to abscond	2	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
Contemptuous language and behaviour	-	-	1	7	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	-
Quarrelling and insubordinate conduct	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	5	3	3	-
DOMESTIC OFFENCES:																	
Beating and ill-treating parents	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beating and maltreating others	2	1	2	-	5	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
Scalding others	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Biting others	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fighting	5	7	9	19	5	2	12	2	1	-	-	-	2	3	-	-	-
Rioting and disorderly conduct at night	4	3	1	-	2	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	8	-
Quarrelling	-	-	6	5	1	2	8	4	1	2	-	-	3	1	6	3	-
Neglect of work and duty, not finishing day's work, &c.	144	96	455	210	171	120	158	123	74	76	-	1	70	31	324	107	
Bad work	12	19	21	31	8	-	3	17	3	5	-	-	-	-	14	2	
Laziness and idleness	24	98	16	106	38	19	13	16	17	9	-	-	4	-	38	12	

(Enclosure 1.)

made up from the Returns of Punishments forwarded to the Protector of Slaves, by the Assistant Protectors of the several of Slaves committing each particular Offence, in each District of the Colony, and the Total Number of Offences.

District of Assistant Protector E. Bishop.		District of Assistant Protector R. Watson.		District of Assistant Protector J. M'Pherson.		District of Assistant Protector C. Brotherson.		District of Assistant Protector W. M'Keand.		District of Assistant Protector W. Fraser.		District of Assistant Protector A. M'Kenzie.		District of Assistant Protector N. M. Manget.		District of Assistant Protector T. Blake.		TOTAL.		GRAND TOTAL.	
Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.		
1,529	1,261	590	480	4,542	3,730	737	433	3,181	2,955	1,531	1,229	2,685	2,220	1,783	1,562	1,074	878	33,450	28,225	61,675	
.	1
.	1
.	1	1
.	1
.	1
.	1
1	1
10	.	7	.	49	.	14	.	29	17	14	.	32	2	18	1	18	.	19	420	49	469
1	1	1	8	1	9	
.	1	2	1	3	1	4	
.	
.	1	1	.	2	1	.	.	2	1	1	.	1	.	11	9	20	
.	1	1	.	1	
.	2	5	2	7	
.	1	4	.	4	
3	2	.	3	1	1	.	1	24	1	25		
2	5	1	5	14	12	1	.	8	19	6	2	4	11	4	11	8	6	70	170	240	
7	2	.	.	.	56	1	.	.	10	1	.	.	23	59	82	
.	1	.	8	1	9	
.	1	.	.	1	.	1	.	.	5	1	6	
2	4	.	1	10	3	.	.	16	16	3	.	1	21	1	1	2	59	124	183		
10	.	6	1	40	1	7	.	12	.	22	1	18	1	11	4	1	263	16	279		
18	7	21	3	22	8	17	2	28	22	18	3	28	11	13	3	24	392	222	614		
9	7	10	6	12	16	9	5	17	34	4	3	10	23	8	16	8	148	293	440		
.	2	2	.	2	.	4	3	1	.	.	12	.	12		
1	2	2	.	4	2	.	.	1	1	.	2	1	3	3	.	2	17	19	36		
.	.	.	.	2	1	.	1	.	2	20	12	32		
4	1	.	.	1	.	3	.	5	.	1	.	2	1	1	.	1	6	.	4	6	
.	.	.	.	8	1	39	.	4	43	
7	.	1	1	.	1	1	
.	.	.	1	1	1	2		
.	1	.	.	7	3	3	5	4	3	1	2	2	4	1	3	2	62	50	112		
3	1	.	.	2	2	2	2	3	2	.	.	1	1	6	2	9	24	27	51		
60	9	68	12	230	41	57	11	249	87	41	2	143	193	160	45	112	23	42	23	65	
10	2	1	.	9	.	4	.	1	7	3	1	15	9	8	9	8	.	2,516	1,187	3,703	
.	.	2	1	11	7	3	.	31	26	2	.	23	31	7	.	2	238	327	565		

The Minimum of punishment is, one night in bed-stocks.

The Maximum of punishment is, twenty-five lashes.

(continued)

(Enclosure 1.)—List of Offences committed by Male and Female Plantation Slaves

NAMES OF DISTRICTS	District of Assistant Protector T. H. Otterbein.		District of Assistant Protector J. Van Waterschootd.		District of Assistant Protector S. C. Spieringshoek.		District of Assistant Protector J. Osborn.		District of Assistant Protector E. H. Dalton.		District of Assistant Protector T. Richardson.		District of Assistant Protector W. W. Kernan.		District of Assistant Protector M. Thierens.	
	No. of Slaves in each District -															
	1,844	1,533	3,280	2,815	2,393	2,109	3,230	2,627	992	813	45	29	952	780	3,062	2,771
(continued.) NATURE OF OFFENCES.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.
DOMESTIC OFFENCES—continued.																
Absenting from work	22	4	26	17	8	1	20	1	7	7	-	-	8	1	35	11
Neglect of duty, and absenting from posts, as watchmen	24	-	61	-	26	-	15	-	14	-	-	-	4	-	19	-
Neglect of duty, and allowing the gang to idle, as drivers	3	-	5	-	5	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	9	1
Destroying produce	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cutting and destroying canes, plants, &c.	-	-	4	-	2	3	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
Selling or making away with tools, implements, &c.	5	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Neglecting their children	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Neglecting the sick under their care	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Drunkenness, &c.	21	1	22	12	16	2	21	3	4	2	-	-	7	-	17	1
Not coming to work in proper time	-	3	1	18	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Harbouring runaways	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	2	-	3	1
Leaving estate without pass	1	4	15	11	-	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	2	-	5	7
False pretence of sickness	-	6	10	60	1	4	2	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	5	7
Lying, false swearing, &c.	-	1	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-
Seducing or attempting to seduce other men's wives	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Infidelity to husbands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Introducing rum on estate, into hospital, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Carrying fire into megass logies, rum-store, &c.	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Allowing cattle to trespass on cultivation	5	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	5	-	3	-
Neglecting and concealing sores	1	3	1	1	4	-	3	-	4	13	-	-	-	-	1	-
Riding and ill-using horses	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Filthiness and neglect of person	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Breaking boats, punts, carts, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
False complaints	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Practising obeah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dancing and carousing on estate without leave	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carelessness and inattention	2	-	6	-	1	5	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	7	-
TOTAL	368	313	859	664	403	208	375	250	184	194	2	2	182	72	662	257

ABSTRACT of the PUNISHMENTS inflicted for the foregoing Offences :

The Total Number of Punishments is	8,710
Of which are on Males	5,666
Of which are Punishments of—	
From four to five stripes each	8
From six to ten stripes each	352
From eleven to fifteen stripes each	1,332
From sixteen to twenty stripes each	1,108
From twenty-one to twenty-five stripes each	2,554
Total Number of Males punished by Flogging	5,354
Total Number of Males punished by Confinement	312
Total Number of Males punished	5,666
Total Number of Females punished by Confinement	3,044
Total Number of PUNISHMENTS inflicted	8,710

PROTECTORS OF SLAVES.

in the Colony of Demerara and Essequibo—continued.

District of Assistant Protector E. Bishop.		District of Assistant Protector R. Watson.		District of Assistant Protector J. M'Pherson.		District of Assistant Protector C. Brotherson.		District of Assistant Protector W. M'Keand.		District of Assistant Protector W. Fraser.		District of Assistant Protector A. M'Kenzie.		District of Assistant Protector N. M. Manget.		District of Assistant Protector T. Blake.		TOTAL.		GRAND TOTAL.
Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	Males.	Females.	
15	4	6	3	23	5	5	-	8	8	3	1	17	10	28	3	11	1	252	70	322
4	-	3	-	29	-	2	-	12	-	5	-	7	-	15	-	1	-	241	-	241
1	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	6	-	1	-	2	-	4	-	2	-	48	1	49
1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	3
-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	12	4	16
-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	15
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4
6	-	1	-	-	-	16	1	14	-	4	-	27	-	17	-	8	-	222	26	248
9	-	3	-	4	-	1	-	4	-	1	-	10	-	7	-	3	-	24	52	82
3	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	-	7	-	1	-	3	-	13	3	16
-	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	44	34	78
-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	1	-	7	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	23	97	120
-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	5	12
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	7
-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	7
5	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	3	-	1	-	2	-	10	2	12
-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	39	-	39
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	29	17	46
-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	11	-	11
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	3
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	13
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
3	-	-	-	2	-	4	-	5	-	-	-	4	-	7	-	1	-	44	14	58
198	49	139	34	536	170	165	28	482	276	139	27	389	342	345	105	238	53	5,666	3,044	8,710

The Maximum of punishment is, twenty-five lashes. The Minimum of punishment is, one night in bed-stocks.

George Town, Demerara }
1st November 1829.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 2.)

LIST of CASES appearing in the PUNISHMENT RECORD RETURNS of the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, for the Half-year from 1st January to 30th June 1829 inclusive, in which the Offences of Slaves have been referred to his Honour the Fiscal or to the Deputy Fiscals of the Country Districts for Punishment; showing (where recorded by the Managers or others making the Returns) the Nature of the Offences committed by the Slaves, and the Extent of the Punishments inflicted for the same, and which Offences are exclusive of those contained in the List, No. 1, of Offences for that Period.

No.	NAMES OF THE SLAVES, and of the Plantations, &c. to which they belong.	NATURE of the OFFENCES,	NATURE AND EXTENT OF PUNISHMENTS, And by whose Authority inflicted.
District of Assistant Protector T. H. Otterbein.	1. Victoire, female, of Plantation Le Retraite.	Stealing money from the negro Friday, also of this property.	-- This offence being of a serious nature, was referred to his Honour the First Fiscal, who after due examination ordered said woman on the tread mill.—“ Extent of punishment not stated.”
	2. Pickle and Alfred, males, of Plantation Middlesex and Beausejour.	-- Running away for six months, stealing five sheep and three hogs of the manager's, and committing several similar depredations on the neighbouring estates during their absence, and also endeavouring to entice more of the Negroes to run away and join them.	Pickle, 90, and Alfred, 67 lashes; by order of his Honour the First Fiscal.
	3. Welcome and Geggy, males, of Plantation Mes Delices.	-- Breaking open the estate's store, and stealing rum, pork, &c. they being watchmen.	Seventy-five lashes each, by order of his Honour the First Fiscal.
	4. Blacksmith William, of Plantation Nismes.	-- Has been punished in the colony jail, for breaking and entering into the rum store, and stealing from thence, at various times, quantities of rum; the negro Manille was an accomplice, but was forgiven by the attorney.	-- Punished by his Honour the Fiscal. The manager is not aware of the extent of the punishment, not being present.
Dist. of Asst' Prot' J. Van Waterschoot.	5. Annette, female, and Jan, male, of Plantation Goede Ver-wagting.	Running away repeatedly - - - Ditto - - - - -	Eight days on tread mill. Forty lashes; by order of the First Fiscal.
	6. Queco and Charley, males, & Betty Catharina Pamila, and Anne, females of Plantation New Hope.	-- Endeavouring to create among the gang a disobedience and contempt to the manager, and refusing to do their duty - - - - -	} Flogged; “ Extent of punishment not stated;” 48 hours labour on the tread mill, each; 48 hours solitary confinement; By order of the Fiscal.
District of Asst' Protector J. Osborn.	7. Harry Quash, of Anthony Osborn.	-- For coming into the yard betwixt the hours at night with a horsewhip, and making a riot in the yard with his wife, disturbing the neighbours.	30 lashes; by order of Fiscal.
	8. Henry, of Plantation Pleasing Hope.	For absconding from work - - -	-- Punished by M. Thierens, esq. Deputy Fiscal, parish of St. Peter's.—“ Extent of the punishment not stated.”
	9. Tour, Cuffy, Joe, Sidney and Arthur, of Plantation Maryville, males.	Disobedience and riotousness - - -	Punished by Deputy Fiscal.—“ Extent of punishment not stated.”
District of Assis't Protector M. Thierens.	10. John Thomas Boscawen, and Charles, males, of Plantation Waterloo.	{ Refusing to turn out the day after Easter holidays - - - - -	40 lashes; 35 lashes, and 25 lashes; By order of the Deputy Fiscal.
	11. Phillis (Congo), female, of Plantation Retrieve.	-- Refusing to go to work, under pretence of having a stiff neck, notwithstanding the doctor says that there is nothing ailing her.	In solitary confinement for 20 days; by order of his Honour the Fiscal.
District of Ass't Protector E. Bishop.	12. Jessey, female, of Plantation Ouderneeming.	-- Conduct the most riotous and insulting, in instigating the women gang to shout and huzza at me (J. C. Day, the manager), on leaving the field.	-- Solitary confinement from one o'clock P.M. of 8th, till eleven o'clock A.M. 12th April 1829, 94 hours; by order of his Honour the Second Fiscal.
	13. Martha, female, of Plantation Perseverance.	-- For not turning out, and riotous behaviour the day after the holidays, and being one of the worst of the whole gang.	Ten days in solitary confinement; by order of his Honour the Second Fiscal.
	14. Betsey and Harriet, females, of Plantation Perseverance.	For the above offence (say the same as No. 13, Martha).	Ten nights in solitary confinement; by order of his Honour the Second Fiscal.
District of Asst' Prot' J. McPherson.	15. Lena and Laura, females, of Plantation Richmond.	Neglect of duty and running away.	Seven days each in confinement; by order of his Honour the Second Fiscal.
	16. Cooba, female, of Plantation Richmond.	Running away, and making false complaints to his Honour the Second Fiscal.	13 days confinement; by order of his Honour the Second Fiscal.
	17. January, Fortune, Abraham and Trim, males, of Plantation Hyde Park.	Running away - - - - -	25 lashes each; by order of the Fiscal.
	18. Driver William & Bomsen, Hasper, Daniel, Corally, France, males, of Plantation Glasgow.	Offence not stated - - - - -	-- Punished by order of his Honour the First Fiscal.—“ Extent of punishment not stated.”

(Enclosure 3.)

LIST of PLANTATIONS, TASK GANGS, &c. in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, on which no Punishments have been inflicted on the Slaves attached to them, during the Half Year ending 30th June 1829; exhibiting the Names of the Persons swearing to the Returns, and the Numbers of Slaves on each Plantation, &c.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

No.	NAME of PLANTATION, &c.	NAME of PERSON SWEARING TO THE RETURN.	No. of SLAVES attached.
<i>District of Assistant Protector J. Van Waterschoot.</i>			
1.	Beter Verwagting Plantation - - -	H. J. Van Sluytman, manager - - -	36
2.	Plaisance Plantation - - -	E. Kuntzman, manager - - -	94
<i>District of Assistant Protector S. C. Spieringshoek.</i>			
3.	Beter Ver Wachting, place called - - -	R. J. G. Brunel, owner - - -	18
4.	Eekhart, Elizabeth, slaves of - - -	Elizabeth Eekhart, owner - - -	8
5.	Geelhoed, P. J. slaves of - - -	P. J. Geelhoed, owner - - -	11
6.	Hohenkerk, J. W. slaves of - - -	J. W. Hohenkerk, owner - - -	22
7.	Land Canaan, place called - - -	Johanna Thoma, owner - - -	9
8.	Mertens, C. S. slaves of - - -	C. S. Mertens, owner - - -	16
9.	Perret, G. F. place called Klip - - -	G. F. Perret, owner - - -	20
10.	Sastedt, A. W. place called Vryheyd - - -	A. W. Sastedt, owner - - -	6
11.	Thompson, P. H., place called Con- tentment - - - - -	P. H. Thompson, owner - - -	15
12.	Voorzorg, place called - - -	Helena Cuff, owner - - -	10
13.	Wurtemberg, place called - - -	Johannes Merkle, owner - - -	14
14.	Zeelandia Plantation - - -	F. W. Thron, qq. - - -	8
<i>District of Assistant Protector J. Osborn.</i>			
15.	Concordia Plantation - - -	Marrot Duggin, owner - - -	13
16.	Foundery, Demerara - - -	James Miller & Co., owners - - -	19
17.	Kemp, Hector & Co. carpenter's gang of - - -	Hector Kemp, part owner - - -	53
18.	Luthers, A. E., slaves of - - -	A. E. Luthers, owner - - -	20
19.	Urquhart, W., carpenter's gang of - - -	W. Urquhart, owner - - -	87
<i>District of Assistant Protector E. H. Dalton.</i>			
20.	Covent Garden, place called - - -	John Cliff, owner - - -	7
21.	Greenock, place called - - -	D. M'Culloch, owner - - -	15
<i>District of Assistant Protector T. Richardson.</i>			
22.	Dufresne, M. A. slaves of - - -	J. J. Mottet, guardian - - -	8
23.	Itaka Plantation - - -	Wilhelm Bilsteen, owner - - -	34
<i>District of Assistant Protector W. W. Kernan.</i>			
24.	Bushy Park Plantation - - -	John Christie, manager - - -	11
25.	Mercurius Magdalena, slaves of - - -	Magdalena Mercurius, owner - - -	8
26.	Parica Plantation - - -	Alexander Marshall, owner - - -	26
27.	Proctor, M. C., wood-cutting gang of - - -	G. F. Proctor, qq. - - -	8
28.	Proctor, G. F. wood-cutting gang of - - -	G. F. Proctor, owner - - -	25
<i>District of Assistant Protector M. Thierens.</i>			
29.	Widdess, John, working gang of - - -	John Widdess, owner - - -	7
<i>District of Assistant Protector E. Bishop.</i>			
30.	Maria's Lodge Plantation - - -	H. Sessingh, owner - - -	33
<i>District of Assistant Protector R. Watson.</i>			
31.	Cottage Plantation - - -	John M'Hardy, manager - - -	19
32.	Airy Hall Plantation - - -	Alexander M'Kenzie, owner - - -	8
<i>District of Assistant Protector J. M'Pherson.</i>			
33.	Alstein's & Co., task gang of - - -	John Alsteins, part owner - - -	33
34.	Hackney Plantation - - -	James Wilson, owner - - -	17
<i>District of Assistant Protector C. Botherson.</i>			
35.	Charlotte Plantation - - -	John Lees, owner - - -	40
36.	Linkton, Benj., wood-cutting gang of - - -	Benjamin Linkton, owner - - -	8
37.	Semeria Woodland - - -	Elizabeth Galloway, owner - - -	20
38.	Wismar, wood-cutting establishment - - -	W. Allicock, manager - - -	18
39.	Weltevreden Woodland - - -	P. Van Langr, manager - - -	46
<i>District of Assistant Protector W. Fraser.</i>			
40.	Carleton Hall Plantation - - -	Jane Robertson, owner - - -	51
41.	Luby, Elizabeth, slaves of - - -	Elizabeth Luby, owner - - -	10
42.	Mes Delices Plantation - - -	William Moffett, owner - - -	13
<i>District of Assistant Protector A. M'Kenzie.</i>			
43.	Grant, John, task gang of - - -	W. J. Jackson, superintendent - - -	40
<i>District of Assistant Protector T. Blake.</i>			
44.	Browne, Thomas, wood-cutting gang of - - -	Thomas Browne, owner - - -	14
45.	St. Eustatius Plantation - - -	Matilda L'Abbé - - -	10
46.	Jacobas Lust Plantation - - -	Jacoba Rademaker, owner - - -	13
The TOTAL Number of Slaves in this List is - - -			1,021

George Town, Demerara, }
1st November 1829. }

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 4.)

LIST of OFFENCES committed by MALE and FEMALE PLANTATION SLAVES in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, made up from the Returns of Punishments forwarded to the Protector of Slaves, by the Assistant Protectors of the several Districts, from the 1st of July 1828 to the 30th June 1829, inclusive;—showing the nature of the Offences, the Number of Slaves committing each particular Offence in each half of the Year, and their Comparative Decrease and Increase.

For the Half Year ending 31st December 1828.				For the Half Year ending 30th June 1829.			
NATURE OF OFFENCES.	TOTAL.		Grand TOTAL.	NATURE OF OFFENCES.	TOTAL.		Grand TOTAL.
	Male.	Female.			Male.	Female.	
SERIOUS & AGGRAVATED OFFENCES.				SERIOUS & AGGRAVATED OFFENCES.			
Attempting to murder - - -	3	-	3	Fighting & attempting to murder -	1	-	1
Attempting to commit suicide - -	3	-	3	Running away & attempting to stab	1	-	1
Attempting to poison - - -	1	-	1	Attempting to ravish - - -	8	-	8
Attempting to ravish - - -	7	-	7	Cutting & wounding others with cut-	2	2	4
Cutting & wounding others with cut-	15	7	22	lasses, &c. - - -			
Attempting to cut others with cut-				13	3	16	Attempting to cut others with cut-
lasses - - - - -				lasses, &c. - - - - -			
Incendiaries - - - - -	3	1	4	Attempting to commit arson - - -	1	-	1
Cruelty to children - - - - -	5	1	6	Killing and destroying stock - - -	3	-	3
Killing and destroying stock - - -	3	-	3	House breaking and stealing - - -	15	-	15
House-breaking and stealing - - -	38	-	38	Cruelty to animals - - - - -	5	-	5
Cruelty to animals - - - - -	9	1	10				
THEFT, &c.				THEFT &c.			
Theft and running away - - -	30	2	32	Theft and running away - - -	19	-	19
Theft - - - - -	383	48	431	Theft - - - - -	420	49	469
Conniving at Theft - - - - -	2	-	2	Conniving at theft & attempting to steal	8	1	9
Receiving stolen goods knowing them	6	-	6	Receiving stolen goods knowing	3	1	4
to be such - - - - -				them to be such - - - - -			
INSUBORDINATION ACCOMPANIED WITH VIOLENCE.				INSUBORDINATION ACCOMPANIED WITH VIOLENCE.			
Striking manager - - - - -	1	-	1	Raising cutlass to manager, overseer	1	-	1
Striking overseer - - - - -	2	1	3	or driver - - - - -			
Striking driver, raising cutlass to him	17	10	27	Striking driver - - - - -	11	9	20
Biting driver - - - - -	-	1	1	Biting driver - - - - -	-	1	1
Resisting manager, overseer, &c. in	7	8	15	Resisting manager or others in au-	5	2	7
the discharge of his duty - - -				thority over them, in the discharge			
Maliciously breaking or attempting to	5	10	15	of his or their duty - - - - -	4	-	4
break mill or other buildings - -				Maliciously breaking or destroying			
Breaking out of hospital, stocks, &c. -	18	7	25	machinery - - - - -	24	1	25
INSUBORDINATION UNACCOMPANIED WITH VIOLENCE.				INSUBORDINATION UNACCOMPANIED WITH VIOLENCE.			
Refusing to work - - - - -	129	265	394	Refusing to do any work or the work	70	170	240
Refusing to do the usual day's work,	-	2	2	required - - - - -			
threatening language to manager							Instigating others to neglect duty -
and absconding - - - - -				Conspiring and refusing to do the	23	59	82
Mutinous conduct, defying manager -	20	12	32	usual day's work - - - - -			
Seditious conduct, instigating others	14	8	22	Not finishing day's work and quitting	1	5	6
to neglect duty - - - - -				the field - - - - -			
Conspiring & refusing to do the usual	21	40	61	Contumacious conduct and neglect of	59	124	183
day's work - - - - -	the field - - - - -						
Not finishing day's work and quitting	11	6	17	work - - - - -			
Refractory behaviour & neglect of duty	72	90	162	Absconding, running away - - -	263	16	279
Absconding and running away - - -	476	49	525	Disobedience of orders - - -	392	222	614
Disobedience - - - - -	606	264	870	Insolence and abuse - - - - -	148	292	440
Insolence and abusive language to	168	333	501	Encouraging others to abscond -	12	-	12
owner, &c. &c. - - - - -				work - - - - -			
Encouraging others to abscond - - -	5	-	5	Contemptuous language & behaviour	17	19	36
Holding clandestine meetings at night	1	-	1	Quarrelling & insubordinate conduct	20	12	32
Contemptuous language & behaviour	11	11	22				
Quarrelling & insubordinate conduct	13	22	35				
Carried forward - - -	2,118	1,202	3,320	Carried forward - - -	1,544	987	2,531

PROTECTORS OF SLAVES.

33

For the Half Year ending 31st December 1828—*continued.*

For the Half Year ending 30th June 1829—*continued.*

NATURE OF OFFENCES.	TOTAL.		Grand TOTAL.	NATURE OF OFFENCES.	TOTAL.		Grand TOTAL.
	Male.	Female.			Male.	Female.	
Brought forward - -	2,118	1,202	3,320	Brought forward - -	1,544	987	2,531
DOMESTIC OFFENCES.				DOMESTIC OFFENCES.			
Beating and ill-treating parents -	6	4	10	Beating and ill-treating parents -	6	-	6
Beating and mal-treating others -	42	13	55	Beating and mal-treating others -	39	4	43
Fighting and disorderly conduct at night - - - - -	23	25	48	Fighting - - - - -	62	50	112
Quarrelling and fighting - - -	53	35	88	Quarrelling - - - - -	42	23	65
Neglect of duty - - - - -	1,580	475	2,055	Neglect of work & duty, not finishing day's work - - - - -	2,516	1,187	3,703
Not doing day's work - - - - -	1,085	1,084	2,169	Bad work - - - - -	120	102	222
Bad work - - - - -	200	62	262	Laziness and idleness - - - - -	238	327	565
Laziness and idleness - - - - -	298	256	554	Absenting from work - - - - -	252	70	322
Absenting from work - - - - -	177	65	244	Neglect of duty and absenting from posts as watchmen - - - - -	241	-	241
Neglect of duty as watchman - - -	214	-	214	Neglect of duty and allowing the gang to idle, as driver - - - - -	48	1	49
Neglect of duty as driver - - - - -	83	-	83	Destroying produce - - - - -	3	-	3
Destroying produce - - - - -	13	2	15	Cutting & destroying canes, plants, &c. Selling or making away with implements furnished by owner - - - - -	12	4	16
Cutting & destroying canes, plants, &c. Selling or making away with implements furnished by owner - - - - -	7	10	17	Neglecting their children - - - - -	15	-	15
Neglecting their children - - - - -	5	1	6	Biting others - - - - -	-	4	4
Biting others - - - - -	-	2	2	Biting others - - - - -	1	1	2
Rioting and causing disturbance - -	55	54	109	Rioting and disorderly conduct at night - - - - -	24	27	51
Riding and ill-using horses, &c. - -	7	-	7	Riding and ill-using horses - - - - -	11	-	11
Drunkenness - - - - -	227	6	233	Drunkenness, &c. - - - - -	222	26	248
Not coming to work in proper time -	53	209	262	Not coming to work in proper time -	24	58	82
Neglecting stock - - - - -	31	1	32	Neglecting the sick under their care	1	-	1
Harbouring runaways - - - - -	13	2	15	Harbouring runaways - - - - -	13	3	16
Absenting from estate without pass -	43	19	62	Leaving estate without pass - - - - -	44	34	78
False pretence of sickness & refusing to work - - - - -	29	112	141	False pretence of sickness - - - - -	23	97	120
Introducing rum on estate - - - - -	5	-	5	Introducing rum on estate, into hospital, &c. - - - - -	7	-	7
Carelessness carrying fire into megass logie, &c. - - - - -	14	4	18	Scalding others - - - - -	1	-	1
Lying, false swearing, &c. - - - - -	7	2	9	Carrying fire into megass logie, rum store, &c. - - - - -	10	2	12
Practising obeah - - - - -	4	-	4	Lying, false swearing - - - - -	7	5	12
Allowing cattle to trespass on cultivation - - - - -	38	-	38	Practising obeah - - - - -	2	-	2
Seducing and attempting to seduce other men's wives - - - - -	5	-	5	Allowing cattle to trespass on cultivation - - - - -	39	-	39
Infidelity to husbands - - - - -	-	3	3	Seducing and attempting to seduce other men's wives - - - - -	7	-	7
Neglecting and concealing sores - -	42	4	46	Infidelity to husbands - - - - -	-	1	1
Fornication - - - - -	1	-	1	Neglecting and concealing sores - -	29	17	46
False complaints - - - - -	14	1	15	False complaints - - - - -	1	-	1
Breaking boats, carts, &c. - - - - -	10	-	10	Breaking boats, punts, carts, &c. - -	13	-	13
Leaving estate at night - - - - -	12	8	20	Filthiness and neglect of person - -	3	-	3
Filthiness and neglect of person - -	10	-	10	Dancing & carousing on estate without leave - - - - -	2	-	2
Dancing & carousing on estate without leave - - - - -	3	1	4	Eating clay - - - - -	2	1	3
Eating clay - - - - -	2	1	3	Offence unknown, punished by Fiscal	13	-	13
Offence unknown, punished by Fiscal	13	-	13	TOTAL number of Offences - -	6,542	3,665	10,207
TOTAL number of Offences - -	6,542	3,665	10,207	TOTAL number of Offences - -	5,666	3,044	8,710

George Town, Demerara, 1st November 1829.

A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 5.)

RECORD of SLAVES Manumitted in the Colony of *Demerara*

No.	NAMES of S L A V E S.	Colour	Probable Age.	NAME OF OWNER or HIS REPRESENTATIVE.
1.	Louisa - - -	b.	41	L. Fitzgerald, qq. F. Cox -
2.	Maria - - -	c.	4	H. J. Roberts - - -
3.	Charles Henry - - -	c.	1 ½	- - ditto - - -
4.	Edwin - - -	c.	1	- - ditto - - -
5.	Jennet - - -	b.	15	Charles Edmonstone - -
6.	William - - -	b.	13	Free black man - - -
7.	Henrietta - - -	b.	9	- - ditto - - -
8.	Margaret - - -	b.	7	- - ditto - - -
9.	Christian - - -	b.	12	Dorothea Fergusson - -
10.	Sarah - - -	b.	16	George Sutherland - - -
11.	Bennet - - -	b.	23	A. Van Cooten - - -
12.	Maria - - -	c.	2	- - ditto - - -
13.	Henrietta - - -	c.	14	- - ditto - - -
14.	Petronella - - -	c.	8	- - ditto - - -
15.	Mary Brathwaite Ray - -	c.	3	Samuel B. Ray - - -
16.	William - - -	b.	22	Ancilla Gereka - - -
17.	Christina - - -	b.	19	- - ditto - - -
18.	Nancy - - -	c.	28	{M. J. Retemeyer, qq. Plan- tation Hertstelling - -}
19.	Charles - - -	c.	19	A. M'Rae & D. Smith - -
20.	Margaret - - -	c.	19	Executors of J. Stuart, deceased
21.	Petronella - - -	b.	40	J. J. L. Moliere - - -
22.	William - - -	b.	23	{Executors of Mrs. Van Voorst, deceased - - -}
23.	Richard - - -	b.	8	Catherine Wood, f. b. w. -
24.	Edward - - -	b.	5	- - - ditto - - -
25.	Rose - - -	b.	10	Arsley Pearce, f. b. m. - -
26.	Jacobus - - -	b.	25	J. Bakker - - -
27.	William - - -	b.	16	- ditto - - -
28.	Europa - - -	b.	40	- ditto - - -
29.	Henry Cornelius - - -	c.	3	H. R. Suhl's. - - -
30.	Hester - - -	c.	23	{S. W. Gordon, Cro. Ad. and Curator - - -}
31.	Victoire Ouckama - - -	b.	40	- - ditto - - -
32.	James - - -	c.	5	Ann Simon, f. c. w. - - -
33.	Jenny Lennan - - -	c.	30	{S. W. Gordon, Cro. Ad. and Curator - - -}
34.	Ellen - - -	c.	4	- ditto - - -
35.	James - - -	c.	1	- ditto - - -
36.	Samuel Manson - - -	c.	19	- ditto - - -
37.	Colin - - -	c.	7	Roderick M'Farquhar - - -
38.	Anne - - -	c.	5	- - ditto - - -
39.	Ellen - - -	b.	9	Susan de Ridder, f. b. w. -
40.	Tommy - - -	b.	6	- - ditto - - -
41.	Eve - - -	b.	20	{-- Mary Desbrass for herself and as executrix of F. Desbrass, deceased, f. b. w. - -}
42.	Harriet - - -	b.	50	Thomas Williams - - -
43.	Tomsin - - -	b.	49	Alexander Thompson - - -

and *Essequibo*, from the 1st of May to the 31st of October 1829, inclusive.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

DATE When Manumission was		CONSIDERATION.	Number of Manumission.	REMARKS.
Signed.	Recorded.			
1829:	1829:			
May - 8	May - 9	{2,200f. paid for herself in 1824	1,081	Security given.
- - 16	- - 22	Natural affection	817	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	818	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	818	- ditto.
June - 9	June - 10	- ditto	819	No security required.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	820	{The father C. Edmon- stone, being an indus- trious tradesman.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	821	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	822	- ditto.
- - 16	- - 16	Deed of gift	1,001	{Apprenticed to a ship- wright.
- - 30	- - 30	- ditto	81	Security given.
July - 11	July - 13	- ditto	1,123	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,124	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,125	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,126	- ditto.
- - 13	- - 15	Natural affection	1,150	{Her father S. B. R. pos- sessing property.
- - -	- - -	Faithful services	1,172	A carpenter.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,173	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,138	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	Natural affection	1,139	A carpenter.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,140	Possessing property.
- - 14	- - 15	By will of deceased	1,151	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,152	A cooper.
- - -	- - -	Natural affection	1,116	Security given.
- - -	- - -	-	1,117	- ditto.
- - 15	- - -	Natural affection	1,129	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	494	{A blacksmith and car- penter.
- - -	- - 23	- ditto	495	A carpenter.
- - -	- - -	Faithful services	496	Security given.
- - 16	- - 16	Natural affection	409	- ditto.
- - 15	- - 23	{Purchased by her father for freedom	1,178	- ditto.
- - 17	- - -	{800f. paid for herself in 1806	1,181	Possessing property.
- - 21	- - -	Deed of gift	1,149	Security given.
- - 23	- - -	- ditto	1,179	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	{Reputed free from her- birth	1,179	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,180	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	{Reputed free from his birth	1,166	A cooper.
- - -	August - 4	Natural affection	1,019	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,020	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,190	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto	1,191	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	Deed of Gift	1,163	Security given.
- - -	- - -	Natural affection	1,161	- ditto.
- - 28	- - 29	{918f. paid for herself in 1826	1,017	Possessing property.

(continued.)

PART I.
DEMERRARA.
Report from
Protector of Slaves.

No.	NAMES of S L A V E S.	Colour.	Probable Age.	NAME OF OWNER or HIS REPRESENTATIVE.
44.	Eliza Count - - - -	b.	25	{S. W. Gordon, Crown Advo- cate and Curator - - }
45.	Louisa Count - - - -	b.	24	- - - ditto - - -
46.	Calista Count - - - -	b.	20	- - - ditto - - -
47.	Mary Ann Blackman - - - -	c.	13	- - - ditto - - -
48.	Francis Blackman - - - -	c.	11	- - - ditto - - -
49.	Peter Blackman - - - -	c.	6	- - - ditto - - -
50.	Julius Blackman - - - -	c.	5	- - - ditto - - -
51.	James Blackman - - - -	c.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	- - - ditto - - -
52.	Elizabeth - - - -	c.	8	- - - ditto - - -
53.	Edward - - - -	c.	4	- - - ditto - - -
54.	William - - - -	c.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	- - - ditto - - -
55.	Catherine Boyer - - - -	c.	28	- - - ditto - - -
56.	Thomas - - - -	c.	7	Ellen Fitzgerald, f. c. w. -
57.	Suckey Ann - - - -	b.	34	Sarah Elizabeth Jeffery - -
58.	Patience - - - -	b.	2	- - - ditto - - -
59.	Phillis - - - -	b.	29	J. Van Waterschroodt, qq. -
60.	Rosalie - - - -	c.	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	A. Van Waterschoodt - - -
61.	Jenny - - - -	c.	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	- - ditto - - -
62.	Adolphe - - - -	c.	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	- - ditto - - -
63.	Annette - - - -	c.	2	- - ditto - - -
64.	August - - - -	c.	1	- - ditto - - -
65.	Arijantje - - - -	c.	15	- - ditto - - -
66.	John Lawrence - - - -	c.	7	John Lawrence - - -
67.	Gracia (male) - - - -	b.	45	{J. Waddell, junr. executor of Susannah Waddell, deceased }
68.	Sabina - - - -	b.	37	{J. Vowles, executor of Wm. Willians, deceased - - }
69.	Hannah - - - -	b.	45	{John M'Lean, attorney of John Gladstone - - }
70.	Gracia - - - -	b.	35	{S. W. Gordon, Crown Advo- cate and Curator - - }
71.	Cornelius - - - -	c.	20	{N. Van Cooten, executor of N. and L. Van Cooten, deceased }
72.	John - - - -	c.	20	{N. Van Cooten, executor of H. V. Cooten, deceased - }
73.	Edward - - - -	c.	14	- - - ditto - - -
74.	Eve - - - -	b.	54	{-- N. Van Cooten, executor of the estate of F. Van Tiener, deceased - - - }
75.	Mimba - - - -	b.	40	- - - ditto - - -
76.	Eliza - - - -	e.	16	{John Grant, executor of Alex. Munro, deceased - - }
77.	Jane - - - -	c.	14	- - - ditto - - -
78.	Mary - - - -	c.	11	- - - ditto - - -
79.	Sophy - - - -	c.	8	- - - ditto - - -
80.	Jessy - - - -	c.	6	- - - ditto - - -
81.	Eve - - - -	b.	29	Thomas Ward, f. b. m. - -
82.	Anna Maria - - - -	c.	1	- - - ditto - - -
83.	Grace Falconer - - - -	c.	25	{S. W. Gordon, Crown Advo- cate and Curator - - }
84.	Charles Falconer - - - -	c.	9	- - - ditto - - -
85.	Blair - - - -	b.	56	Friday Van Berckel, f. b. m. -
86.	Martha - - - -	b.	21	Edward Bunbury - - -
87.	Robert - - - -	c.	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	- - ditto - - -
88.	Charles - - - -	c.	1	- - ditto - - -
89.	John William - - - -	c.	8	- - ditto - - -
90.	David - - - -	b.	18	{S. W. Gordon, Crown Advo- cate and Curator - - }
91.	Cyrus - - - -	b.	35	Anthony Osborne - - -

DATE When Manumission was		CONSIDERATION.	Number of Manumission.	REMARKS.
Signed.	Recorded.			
1829:	1829:			
July - 28	Sept. - 1	{ Purchased by her father } for freedom - - -	1,194	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,195	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,196	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	{ Reputed free from her } birth - - -	1,197	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,198	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,199	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,200	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,201	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,202	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,203	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,204	- ditto.
- - -	Aug. - 4	Natural affection - - -	1,063	- ditto.
- - 30	Sept. - 1	Deed of gift - - -	1,133	- ditto.
- - 27	Aug. - 4	{ 1,200 f. paid for herself } in 1826 - - -	1,134	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	{ Reputed free from her } birth - - -	1,135	- ditto.
Aug. - 4	Sept. - 1	Deed of gift - - -	1,088	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,089	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,090	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,091	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,092	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,093	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,094	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	Natural affection - - -	1,167	{ His father J. L. possess- ing property.
- - -	- - -	- - ditto - - -	1,162	A carpenter.
- - 12	- - -	By will of deceased - - -	1,131	Security given.
- - 13	- - -	Deed of gift - - -	1,137	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	{ 1,400 f. paid for herself } in 1814 - - -	1,071	- ditto.
- - 14	- - -	By will - - -	1,207	No security required.
- - -	- - -	By will - - -	1,208	A blacksmith.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,209	No security required.
- - -	- - -	{ - ditto, and being re- } puted free for years - - -	1,205	Possessing property.
- - -	- - -	Faithful services - - -	1,206	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	Natural affection - - -	643	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	644	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	645	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	646	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	647	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	Deed of gift - - -	1,168	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	Natural affection - - -	1,169	- ditto.
- - 11	- - -	Faithful services - - -	1,176	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto of his mother - - -	1,177	- ditto.
- - 9	- - -	Natural affection - - -	1,188	No security required.
- - 22	- - -	Deed of gift - - -	841	Security given.
- - -	- - -	Natural affection - - -	842	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	843	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	844	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	By will of Angeletta King - - -	1,193	A carpenter by trade.
- - 26	- - -	{ 3,000 f. paid for herself } in 1829 - - -	1,174	Security given.

PART I.
DEMERRARA.
Report from
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.
DEMERARA.
Report from
Protector of Slaves.

No.	NAMES of S L A V E S.	Colour.	Probable Age.	NAME OF OWNER or HIS REPRESENTATIVE,
92.	Hannah - - - -	b.	45	{ - - J. W. Henry, executor, and Elizabeth Paterson, executrix of Elizabeth Holder, deceased }
93.	Minda - - - -	b.	22	- - ditto - - - -
94.	Jim - - - -	c.	4	- - ditto - - - -
95.	Sarah - - - -	c.	1	- - ditto - - - -
96.	Nancy Cameron - - - -	b.	7	Harriet Cameron, f. b. w. -
97.	Jane - - - -	c.	7	{ - - Evan Fraser & John Pear- son, executors of D. Graham, deceased - - - - }
98.	Mary Moore - - - -	c.	52	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Advo- cate and Curator - - }
99.	Mary - - - -	c.	12	W. Heal - - - -
100.	Mary - - - -	c.	39	P. Wigman - - - -
101.	Caatje - - - -	c.	9	- - ditto - - - -
102.	Abineva - - - -	b.	28	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Advo- cate and Curator - - }
103.	Thomas - - - -	b.	1	- - ditto - - - -
104.	George - - - -	c.	8	John Franken Hill - - -
105.	Phillis Franke - - - -	b.	60	{ S. W. Gordon, Crown Advo- cate and Curator - - }
106.	Jan - - - -	c.	29	- - ditto - - - -
107.	Frederick - - - -	c.	26	- - ditto - - - -
108.	Annatje - - - -	c.	27	- - ditto - - - -
109.	Maria - - - -	c.	30	{ Stephen Cramer, executor of Dr. P. Cramer, deceased - }
110.	Mary - - - -	b.	56	{ - - Benjamin Popplewell and W. A. Claxton, attorneys of H. Quistell - - - - }
111.	Mary Ann - - - -	c.	12	- - ditto - - - -
112.	Catharyntje - - - -	b.	48	{ - - Jas. Dunnett, attorney of plantation De Kinderen and Boodes Rust - - - - }
113.	Aquaciba - - - -	b.	48	J. J. L. Moliere, Curator -
114.	Jerome - - - -	c.	18	- - ditto - - - -
115.	Jonathan - - - -	c.	17	- - ditto - - - -
116.	Hester - - - -	c.	15	- - ditto - - - -
117.	Napoleon - - - -	c.	12	- - ditto - - - -
118.	Hermanus - - - -	c.	6	- - ditto - - - -
119.	Eliza - - - -	c.	3	- - ditto - - - -
120.	John - - - -	b.	2	Johannah G. Bastiaunse -
121.	Pindar - - - -	b.	46	Lucy Nelson - - - -
122.	Alexander - - - -	c.	10	Jane Robertson - - - -
123.	Kitt - - - -	c.	50	J. G. Reed - - - -
124.	Suckey Ann - - - -	b.	32	Hector Kemp - - - -
125.	James - - - -	c.	8	- - ditto - - - -
126.	William - - - -	c.	4	- - ditto - - - -
127.	Elizabeth - - - -	c.	1	- - ditto - - - -
128.	Louis - - - -	b.	32	{ W. A. Claxton, executor of S. Louis, deceased - - }
129.	Elizabeth - - - -	b.	20	- - ditto - - - -
130.	Sarah Christian - - - -	c.	22	S. W. Gordon, Crown Advocate
131.	Charles - - - -	c.	4	- - ditto - - - -

The Number of Males in this List is - 54
The Number of Females is - 77

TOTAL - - 131

DATE When Manumission was		CONSIDERATION.	Number of Manumission.	REMARKS.
Signed.	Recorded.			
1829:	1829:			
Aug. - 31	Sept. - 1	Deed of gift - -	1,110	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- - ditto - - -	1,111	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	- - ditto - - -	1,112	- ditto.
- - -	- - -	{ Reputed free from her birth - - - }	1,113	- ditto.
Sept. - 5	- - 7	Deed of gift - -	1,114	No security required.
- - 15	- - 15	Natural affection - -	1,142	Security given.
- - -	- - -	{ 500 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1809 - - - }	1,141	Possessing property.
- - 15	- - 15	{ 154 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1826 - - - }	1,187	No security required.
Aug. - 22	- - 21	Deed of gift - -	1,164	} Possessing 5,000 <i>f.</i>
- - -	- - -	Natural affection - -	1,165	
Sept. - 22	- - 23	{ 1,200 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1828 - - - }	1,182	Security given.
- - -	- - -	{ Reputed free from his birth - - - }	1,183	- - ditto.
- - 28	- - 29	Natural affection - -	723	Apprenticed to a trade.
- - -	- - -	{ - - Purchased for free- dom by their last owner in 1805 - - - }	1,073	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- - ditto - - -	1,074	A carpenter.
- - -	- - -	- - ditto - - -	1,075	A bricklayer.
- - -	- - -	- - ditto - - -	1,076	Security given.
- - 28	- - 30	{ 2,200 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1823 - - - }	1,132	- - ditto.
- - 22	Oct. - 10	{ 1,000 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1814 - - - }	1,086	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	{ Reputed free from her birth - - - }	1,087	- - ditto.
Oct. - 12	- - 14	{ 800 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1829 - - - }	1,192	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	{ 2,000 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1801 - - - }	1,128	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	{ Reputed free from her birth - - - }	1,143	A carpenter.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,144	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,145	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,146	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,147	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,148	- - ditto.
- - 14	- - 15	{ Purchased by his mother a slave - - - }	1,023	- - ditto.
- - 17	- - 19	{ 1,100 <i>f.</i> paid for herself in 1827 - - - }	1,014	- - ditto.
- - 17	- - 21	Deed of gift - -	1,170	Now in Scotland.
- - 21	- - 22	Faithful services - -	1,171	A shoemaker.
- - 22	- - 24	Deed of gift - -	1,156	Security given.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,157	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,158	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,159	- - ditto.
- - 23	- - 24	- ditto - - -	1,120	A tradesman.
- - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	1,121	No security required.
- - 28	- - 29	Purchased by applicant For freedom - -	1,043	- - ditto.
- - -	- - -	- - -	1,044	- - ditto.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 5.)—continued.

STATEMENT exhibiting the NUMBER of SLAVES MANUMITTED in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, from the 1st of May to the 31st of October 1829, inclusive, for each of the Reasons or Considerations specified in the Record (No. 5) of Manumissions for that period; the Total Amount of Sums paid by them for the purchase of their Freedom, and the Average Price of each Freedom purchased.

The Number of Slaves manumitted from the 1st of May to the 31st of October 1829, inclusive, is - - - - -	131
Of whom received their freedom in consideration of:	
Natural Affection - - - - -	42
Deed of Gift - - - - -	38
Last Will - - - - -	8
Being born in a state of reputed Freedom - - - - -	21
Faithful Services - - - - -	8
Total Number of Slaves who have received their freedom within this period, without any valuable consideration being paid by them to their owners - - - - -	117
Total Number of Slaves, freed within this period, who have purchased their freedom - - - - -	14
Total Sum paid by the above Fourteen Slaves for their Freedom - - - - -	f. 18,472

Which gives an Average for each of the Fourteen Slaves, Manumitted for valuable consideration paid by them, of *f.* 1,319. 8 *stiv.* 9 $\frac{1}{7}$ *pennings* - - or, £. 94. 4 s. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\frac{2}{5}$ sterling.

The Total Number of Slaves Manumitted in this Colony from the 1st of January 1826 to the 31st of October 1829, inclusive - - - - - is, { Males - 523 } 1,402
{ Females - 879 }

The Sum paid by the Colony for recording the above 1,402 Deeds of Manumission in the Colonial Secretary's Office, is, at 22*f.* each deed - *f.* 30,844 - or, £. 2,203. 2 s. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{7}$ *d.* sterling.

George Town, Demerara, }
1st November 1829. }

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 6.)

RETURN of MARRIAGES of SLAVES solemnized in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, from the 10th of January to the 30th of June 1829 inclusive.

	District or Parish in which the Marriages have taken place.	Name of the Clergyman solemnizing The Marriage.	Number of Marriages.	TOTAL.
Church of England.	Parish of St. George's - - -	Robert Fawell - - -	1	48
	Parish of St. Peter's, and - -	John Tucker, rector - - -	2	
	Parish of St. Peter's (for the half-year from 1st July to 31st Dec. 1828, not received in time to be transmitted with Report dated 1st May last) - - -	John Tucker, rector - - -	3	
	Parish of St. Mary - - -	{ Leonard Strong, officiating minister.	42	
Kirk of Scotland.	Parish of St. Luke. The Rev. Mr. Gunn remarks:—"No Slaves were married in this parish during this half-year; one or two applications were made to me; but the parties being the properties of different owners, and therefore daily liable to separation, I refused to solemnize the marriage, from the conviction, that to marry individuals under such circumstances would tend to bring the ordinance into disrepute among the slaves themselves, and render the inviolable laws of religion subordinate to local enactments.	" (signed) <i>Aeneas Gunn</i> , minister."		
	Roman Catholic. London Missionary.	George Town - - -	John Thos. Hynes, R.C. vicar	2
	George Town - - -	{ Joseph Ketley, London Missionary - - -	21	21
Weslyan Missionaries.	George Town - - -	Jonathan Edmondson - - -	1	14
	Parish of St. Mary - - -	{ John Wood, John Edmondson, Thomas Lofthouse and Everit Vigis - - -	13	
Total Number of Marriages - - -			85	

George Town, Demerara, }
1st November 1829. }

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 7.)

RETURN of the Number of BAPTISMS of SLAVES in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, from the 1st of January to the 30th of June 1829, inclusive.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from Protector of Slaves

	Name of the Parish or Place of Abode of the Clergyman administering Baptism.	Adults.	Infants.	TOTAL.	GRAND TOTAL.
Church of England	Parish of St. George - - -	147	185	332	1,792
	Parish of St. Peter, and - - -	531	76	607	
	Parish of St. Peter (for the half-year from 1st July to 31st December 1828, not received in time to be transmitted with Report to 1st May last) - - -	193	53	246	
	Parish of St. John - - -	-	14	14	
	Parish of St. Swithin's - - -	12	59	71	
	Parish of the Trinity - - -	212	151	363	
	Parish of St. Mary - - -	16	90	106	
Kirk of Scotland	Parish of St. Paul's - - -	-	53	53	378
	Parish of St. Andrew's - - -	21	10	31	
	Parish of St. Luke - - -	213	75	288	
Roman Catholic	Parish of St. Mark - - -	37	22	59	171
London Missionary	George Town - - -	-	not stated.	171	
Wesleyan Mission ^{ry}	George Town - - -	34	7	41	128
Ditto	George Town - - -	35	25	60	
Minister Lutheran Congregation	Parish of St. Mary - - -	25	43	68	8
	George Town - - -	3	5	8	
TOTAL - - -		1,479	868	--	2,518

George Town, Demerara, }
1st November 1829. }

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 8.)

RETURN of the Number of SLAVES in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, to whom Certificates have been granted, of their understanding the Nature and Obligation of an Oath, from the 1st of January to the 30th of January 1829, inclusive.

	Parish or Place of Abode of Clergymen granting Certificates.	Name of Clergyman granting Certificates.	No. of Slaves to whom Certificates have been granted.	TOTAL.
Church of England	Parish of St. George -	James Sugar, rector -	1	117
	Parish of St. Peter -	John Tucker - d ^o -	3	
	Parish of St. Mary -	{ Leonard Strong, officiating minister - }	113	
Kirk of Scotland	Parish of St. Andrew -	J. Struthers, D.D. minister -	26	50
	Parish of St. Luke -	A. Gunn, minister -	24	
Roman Catholic	George Town - - -	The Rev. Mr. Haynes remarks—"There are many Slaves in my congregation, who are sufficiently acquainted with the principles of religion to understand the nature and obligation of an Oath. None ever applied to me for certificates." (signed) <i>Jn^r Tho^s Haynes.</i> R. C. Vicar.		
Lutheran Congregation	George Town - - -	F. H. W. Kolb, minister	1	1
TOTAL Number of Slaves reported to the Protector, as understanding the nature and obligation of an Oath, this period				168

George Town, Demerara, }
1st November 1829. }

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure 9.)

PART I.
DEMERARA.

LIST of COMPLAINTS which have been made to the PROTECTOR of SLAVES in the Colony of Demerara and Essequibo, by or on the behalf of SLAVES, from the 1st of May to the 31st of October 1829; inclusive.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Number of Complaints.	DATE of COMPLAINTS.	NAME of COMPLAINANT.	NAME OF PARTY COMPLAINED AGAINST.	Vide Folio of Return.
	1828:			Page.
1.	October - 13	David, of Mr. — Adcock, of George Town - - - }	Orphan Chamber - - -	44
2.	1829: May - 2	James Piggot, registered James George, of Plantation Vertroeven	John Graham, of George Town A. A. White, manager -	45 45
3.	- - 11	Hannibal, of the wood-cutting establishment of A. Edmonstone & Co. - - - }	G. C. Matheson, part-owner	47
4.	- - 19	Rosey, of Plantation Grove -	Henry Chapman, manager -	48
5.	- - 19	Charles - - - - -	Doctor Merchant, owner -	49
6.	- - 19	Goodluck - - - - -	{ J. Mottet, of Fort Island, } owner - - - - -	50
7.	- - 19	Cecilia, of Plantation Industry	{ - Hugh Hughes, q.q. and } manager - - - - -	51
8.	- - 23	Victoria, of Plantation Mon Repos - - - - - }	James Stuart, manager -	52
9.	- - 26	Olivia - - - - -	{ - - J. J. Den Boer, of Essequibo River, executor of her late owner, Elizabeth Christianse, deceased - - - } Elizabeth Crabb, of George Town - - - - -	52
10.	- - 26	Peggy Princess - - - - -	{ - - Robertson, overseer, and } A. Sheppard, manager - }	53
11.	- - 28	Lewis, of Plantation Porter's Hope - - - - - }	W. Perry, manager - - -	54
12.	- - 30	Pollux, of Plantation Annandale	J. C. Thierens, owner - -	55
13.	- - 30	George, of Plantation Nieuw Osterbeck - - - - - }	— Bissett, of Mahaica, owner	58
14.	June - 6	Jacoba - - - - -	— Stroll, f. c. m. - - -	59
15.	- - 9	J. G. De Ryck, of Hog Island, on behalf of slave Sarah, of his minor children - - - }	Henry Dunkin, manager -	59
16.	- - 24	Jeannette, Charlotte and Diana, of Plantation Arcadia - - - }	{ W. M'Intosh, f. c. m. of } George Town - - - - -	60
17.	- - 26	Harriette Lowe, of George Town	Orphan Chamber - - -	61
18.	July - 14	Hanna, of Plantation Walton Hall, on behalf of her child Jane - - - - - }	{ W. E. Carberry, of George } Town, owner - - - - -	62
19.	- - 20	Pompey - - - - -	J. C. Laud, manager - - -	63
20.	- - 21	James, of Plantation Lusignan	{ John Milne, of George Town, } (a carpenter) owner - - -	63
21.	- - 22	Thomas - - - - -	N. J. M'Carthy, a coachmaker	64
22.	- - 22	Frances, of Doctor Webster, of George Town - - - - - }	{ Mrs. Playter, owner, of } George Town - - - - -	65
23.	- - 24	Jane - - - - -	W. Jeffery, of George Town	66
24.	- - 28	Amelia Phippen - - - - -	{ James Gordon, boat builder } at Mahaica, owner - - -	66
25.	- - 28	Adonis, of a boat-building gang	Hugh Hughes, q.q. and manager - - - - -	67
26.	- - 31	Cecilia, of Plantation Industry	{ John Milne, of George Town, } a carpenter, owner - - -	68
27.	Aug. - 3	Joseph - - - - -	A. Sills, of George Town, owner	68
28.	- - 3	Theodore and Acouba - - - - -	{ - - Muss of Demerara River, } owner - - - - -	69
29.	- - 6	Secundo - - - - -	Le Kleyn, owner - - -	70
30.	- - 8	Josinkey - - - - -		71

PROTECTORS OF SLAVES.

Number of Complaints.	DATE of COMPLAINTS.	NAME of COMPLAINANT.	NAME OF PARTY COMPLAINED AGAINST.	Vide Folio of Return.
	1829 :			Page.
32.	August - 17	Betsey, of Plantation Ogle -	James Denchan, manager -	71
33.	- - 21	Slave Present and others -	{ - - Mary Lowe, f. c. w. of Plantation Westbury, Pomer- son River, owner - - } -	72
34.	- - 22	Judy, of Miss B. Levy - -	{ Betsy Blake, f.c.w. of George Town - - - - } -	76
35.	- - 27	Remus and Paris, of Plantation Blankenburg - - - -	George Bascom, manager -	76
36.	- - 28	Judy, Mary Ann and Betty, of Plantation Peter's Hall - }	- M'Lennan, manager -	77
37.	- - 28	Billy - - - - -	{ John Milne, of George Town, carpenter, owner - - } -	78
38.	Sept. - 2	Susan Grundy, reputed free woman of this town - - }	{ Doctor E. Bascom, of George Town - - - - } -	79
39.	- - 3	Dicky, of Plantation Blankenburg - - - - -	George Bascom, manager -	80
40.	- - 7	Harry - - - - -	{ John Milne, owner, a car- penter - - - - } -	85
41.	- - 7	George Rainy, on behalf of his slave - - - - -	{ Manager of Plantation Poc- deroyne - - - - } -	86
42.	- - 8	Luckey - - - - -	{ Evan Fraser, of George Town, owner - - - - } -	86
43.	- - 10	W. Smith, for harbouring his runaway slave, Cæsar - - }	{ Andrew, a baker, of George Town - - - - } -	89
44.	- - 14	Wednesday - - - - -	{ A. Sills, owner, of George Town - - - - } -	90
45.	- - 21	Acouba - - - - -	Idem - - - - -	91
46.	- - 24	Matilda - - - - -	{ J. H. H. Holmes, of George Town, owner - - - - } -	92
47.	- - 25	George - - - - -	{ J. Campbell, of George Town, owner - - - - } -	92
48.	- - 28	Susan Rogers, <i>alias</i> Spooner, of Catherine Brown, of George Town - - - - -	H. M. Tobie, a carpenter, of George Town - - - -	93
49.	- - 29	Sarah Webley, on behalf of her slave - - - - -	{ A Free Black man, of George Town - - - - } -	93
50.	- - 29	His Honor the First Fiscal, on behalf of the slave Harry - }	{ M. P. Massiah, of George Town, q.q. - - - - } -	94
51.	October - 3	Nelly Sue - - - - -	{ Catherine Brown, f. c. w. of George Town, owner - - } -	95
52.	- - 5	Kitty Kiernan, for harbouring her runaway slave, Adriana - }	{ Mrs. Eyman, f.c.w. of George Town - - - - } -	98
53.	- - 6	Mrs. Speed, on behalf of two children (coloured) Francis and William - - - - -	H. O. Seward, merchant, of George Town - - - -	98
54.	- - 12	Thomas - - - - -	{ - - The Orphan Chamber, as representing the boedel of S. Gravesande, deceased - } -	102
55.	- - 14	Diana Spragg, of J. G. Bastianse - - - - -	{ J. C. Scheffers, f. c. m. a car- penter, of George Town - } -	102
56.	- - 16	W. Postlethwaite, on behalf of his slaves, Lena and Charlotte - }	- Gibson, of George Town	103
57.	- - 19	Jacoba, Julia, Dorothea, Una and Effa, of Plantation Le Repentir - - - - -	M. Rush, manager - -	103
58.	- - 20	Beckey and Lydia, of Planta- tion La Penitence - - - }	M. Rush, manager - -	105
59.	- - 21	Maria - - - - -	{ - - J. V. Nedderman, curator to the estate of her late owner Van de Vellen, deceased - } -	108
60.	- - 23	Frances - - - - -	{ A. Sills, of George Town, owner - - - - } -	109
61.	- - 30	Ben. William - - - - -	{ A. F. Harrower, of George Town, owner - - - - } -	111
62.	- - 30	Joe, of - - - - -	{ Estate of the late A. M'Ken- zie, deceased - - - - } -	111

PART I.
DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

George Town, Demarara, }
 the 1st November 1829. }

A. W. Young,
 Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.(Enclosure 9.)—*continued.*

RETURN of COMPLAINTS, &c. which have been made to the PROTECTOR of SLAVES, in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, by or on the behalf of Slaves, with the Proceedings therein, from the 1st of May to the 31st of October 1829 inclusive.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>1828: October 13th.—Appeared, <i>David</i>.—States, that he belongs at present to Mr. Adcock, of this town: that by the will of his late mistress, Mrs. Angeletta King, he was left to be freed, but that he was sold by the Orphan Chamber, in the year 1820, to Mr. Kent, and that since his (Mr. Kent's) death, he has been sold to his present owner, Mr. Adcock; that his cousin, a free black woman, named Eleima Mackenzie, told him to come and complain to the Protector; that he was entitled to his freedom, and which can be ascertained by reference to the said will in the Secretary's office; that the executors to the said will are dead, but that Mr. Buttersworth and Mr. Ward, both at present in George Town, signed it as witnesses.</p>	<p>No. 1.</p> <p>1828: October 15th.—The Protector having obtained a copy of the will of Angeletta King from the Secretary's office, referred the same to the Recorder of the Orphan Chamber for his report. Received in answer the following:—</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Demerara, Orphan Chamber, 28th October 1829.</p> <p>Sir,</p> <p>I have the honour to inform you, that the death of Angeletta King has never been registered in this office.</p> <p>I cannot inform you how the estate came into the Chamber, but I find it has administered. Penelope, David and Angelica were sold at vendue, on the 26th of May 1820. The estate was solvent, and the residue was paid to a Mr. Turney, qq. his wife. I have the honour to be, &c.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) <i>Mark Dyett</i>, Recorder.</p> <p>To Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves.</p>

The Claim of David to Freedom being fully established, the foregoing documents were handed over to the Crown Advocate, by the Protector, to have the same carried into effect.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose a copy of the will of Angeletta King, on the subject of which I spoke to you yesterday.

She died on or about the 23d of August 1818, as I have a certificate of her interment bearing that date.

From a letter of the Recorder, M. Dyett, to Lieutenant-colonel Young, Protector of Slaves, which is also enclosed, it appears that the man David has been sold, 26th May 1820, who now claims his freedom by virtue of said will.

I have the honour to be, &c.

(signed) *Hoytema*, Advocate,
for *S. W. Gordon*, Crown Advocate.
18th November 1828.

To the Hon. Thomas Mewburn,
President of the Orphan Chamber.

The above being communicated to N. M. Manget, late President of the Orphan Chamber, he, to avoid legal proceedings by the Protector on behalf of David, has agreed to settle with the executors of Kent, the purchaser, the amount of the purchase money; which being done, and the Crown Advocate being duly appointed by the President of the Court of Justice, as curator for the purpose of manumitting him, David was accordingly advertised, and received his manumission on the 16th of September 1829. *Vide* No. 1193, Manumission List.

This case has been unavoidably prolonged, from the following circumstances:—

The death of the gentleman who was Recorder of the Board of Orphans at the time of the sale of the complainant; which event, with the change of members forming the Board, caused difficulty in fixing legal responsibility upon any individual:

The caution which the Board, to whom application for complainant's freedom was made, observed, in interfering with the case, as they considered themselves responsible but for their own acts, not for those of their predecessors.

The Protector of Slaves, considering the complainant entitled to remuneration for his services, whilst improperly detained in slavery, his claim to the same is under consideration, and the issue will be reported hereafter.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

16th September 1829.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
No. 2.	
<p>1829: May 2d.—Appeared <i>James Piggot</i>, with the following Complaint in writing:—Says he belongs to John Graham of this town; viz.</p> <p>To A. W. Young, Esq. Protector of Slaves, &c.</p> <p>The Complaint of James Piggot, most humbly sheweth,</p> <p>That your Complainant would not trouble your Honor, without having just occasion so to do.</p> <p>That your Honor will be pleased to notice, that your Complainant was brought from Barbadoes to this colony by Miss Ann Griffin, which is now residing at Barbadoes, and was left by her daughter to be sold at public vendue, which Mr. Williams was guardian at the time; and after finding the business was incorrect, he would have nothing to do with it. That your Honor will be pleased to notice your Complainant is very sickly habit, such as hernia, and also fever and ague in the legs, which prevents being able for to go through any laborious labour, such as what my present master is imposing on me for to do at present; whom bought me in a clandestine manner, for when I was put up at vendue, I spoke my mind to the persons around me; told them my sickness, and no person would bid for me; therefore your Complainant did not know to whom he was belong to, until after he was sent into the country.</p> <p>That your Complainant is so much oppressed by Mr. J. Graham, which is his present owner, occasions him for to claim proper satisfaction and justice, as your Honor will please justify according to the above statement, which can be proved if required.</p> <p>That your Complainant is obliged to be chamber-maid, cook, and all domestic services, and not allowed his yearly clothes, as all other servants is allowed by their owners; and when sick, obliged for to do the same work, and have no doctor to attend him, or any other person to attend him.</p> <p>George Town, 2d May 1829.</p> <p>(signed) <i>Ja' Piggot.</i> His + Mark.</p>	<p>Reference being made to Mr. Heneage Williams, the evidence referred to by Complainant, Mr. Williams certifies as follows; viz.</p> <p>“ I certify I have known the slave man Picket, as belonging to Ann Griffin for the last seventeen years; and I am certain he has not been in Barbadoes since I acted for Miss Ann Griffin, in the year 1825, and hired him out as a tailor.</p> <p>(signed) <i>Heneage Williams.</i></p> <p>The Protector then referred to the Registrar of Slaves for further information, and received the following note of Complainant's registration:—</p> <p>“ James (black) aged 11 years, a domestic, invalid, born in Barbadoes, registered on 21st of August 1817, by Ann Griffin; also registered in her name in 1820, 1823 and 1826, after which he was transferred to, and registered by Graham and Morrison, on 21st August 1829, thus—James (black) aged 23 years, with swelled legs, a domestic, healthy, born in Barbadoes.”</p> <p>Mr. John Graham, the owner, being summoned, appeared on 2d May 1829; and states, that the man (Complainant) <i>himself</i> never complained of being sick; that Doctor Watt is the medical attendant, and is at this moment attending to the relief of his complaint by <i>his</i> (Graham's) desire. That the books [Extracts of which were produced and examined] shew he (Complainant) receives his clothing, and that there is a boy under him (Complainant) in the house; that the work was very light, it being merely as a domestic attending upon himself (Graham) and his partner Mr. Morrison, both bachelors, and in which he is assisted by the boy, as already stated.</p> <p>George Town, 2d May 1829.</p> <p>Complaint Dismissed.</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>
No. 3.	
<p>1829: May 11th.—Received the following Letter from the Assistant Protector of the Island of Leguan, Essequibo:</p> <p>Sir, Leguan, 5th May 1829.</p> <p>I beg leave to call your attention to the case of the negro <i>George</i>, belonging to Plantation Vestroeven, on this island, who came to me yesterday morning, complaining of having been flogged and <i>cuffed</i> by his</p>	<p>1829: May 11th.—The Protector immediately sent for Mr. Jones, the Attorney of Plantation Vertroeven, informing him of the foregoing.</p> <p>Protector of Slaves Office, George Town, 11th May 1829.</p> <p>Sir,</p> <p>I have to acknowledge your Letter of the 5th May, received this morning; and you</p>

PART I.

DEMERARA.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

his manager, Mr. A. A. White, of which I saw ample *appearances*.

The man came to me *without a pass*. I sent him back, with a letter to his manager, couched in the way of craving pardon from any further punishment for the present, because George's complaint was more immediately directed towards the driver of the estate (who had made a false representation of the cause for which he was punished) than the manager. In reply I received the following Note, of which I send you the copy:

"Dear Sir,

"The negro George being a runaway, and having applied to you in an illegal way, without asking for a pass from me, I beg leave to say I shall not attend to the contents of your Letter.

"I am, dear Sir, &c.

(signed) "A. A. White."

"4th May 1829."

I must now beg leave to draw your attention in a particular manner to this subject; that as a case without any degree of provocation on my part, exposes me to receive such communications, I can be of no service to the protection of the slave population which (from my appointment) I consider myself in duty bound to attend to, and unless I receive through your hands the necessary satisfaction, I shall lose no time in giving up *that* situation which his Excellency has done me the honor of filling, as *Protector of Slaves for the Parish of Saint Peter*.

Sic orig.

I wrote to Mr. White yesterday, after the receipt of his Note,—that since matters have come thus far, I *insist* upon his sending me the man George back with a pass, and that I should in due course send for such witnesses as I may require for the investigation of the case: to this, I have received no answer, nor has the man George appeared! I must here also observe, that since my appointment as Assistant Protector of the District, although many the cases are, I have not *but in one* instance, been applied to by a negro, with a regular pass, to state his grievances!! such it would appear being withheld from them; and under such circumstances we can neither afford redress one way or the other, which may tend as an example in future, and expose ourselves to insult.

Sic orig.

Hoping I have stated enough to draw your attention to this matter,

I have the honour to be, &c.

(signed) *Marinus Thierens*,

Assistant Protector of Slaves, Parish of Saint Peter.

To A. W. Young, Esq.
Protector of Slaves.

you will be pleased to let no time elapse after the receipt of this Letter, to call upon the manager of Plantation Vertroeven, to have the man George sent to you, and you will take his statement in writing as to the punishment he states he has received; and you will further examine such evidence as the complaining slave may be desirous of having called to substantiate what he says.

I am, &c.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

To M. Thierens, Esq.
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

1829: May 14th.—Appeared Mr. Jones, Attorney of Plantation Vertroeven.

The Protector stated to Mr. Jones, the impropriety of Mr. White's disrespectful conduct to the Assistant Protector; and required him without delay to instruct the manager not to act in that manner in future, on pain of legal measures being adopted to support the Assistant Protector in the discharge of his duty.

Mr. Jones expressed his disapprobation of the manager, Mr. White's, conduct, and said he had already severely reprimanded him for it.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 14th May 1829.

Sir,

I replied to your Letter of the 5th, received on the 11th inst. relative to the slave George, belonging to Plantation Vertroeven.

I delayed noticing the other part of your Letter regarding the manager, until I had an opportunity of seeing Mr. Jones, the attorney of the estate, which I did this morning. As that gentleman agrees in opinion with me respecting Mr. White's conduct on the occasion, and has already spoken to him on the subject, pointing out the impropriety of it, and the necessity of a more cautious manner in future, it does not appear to me necessary to observe further.

I am, &c.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

To M. Thierens, Esq.
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 23d June 1829.

Sir,

I am desirous of an answer to my Letter of the 11th May, addressed to you in reply to your's to me dated 5th May.

Under the expectation of an answer, I delayed sending the one now enclosed, written, as you will perceive, on the 14th May.

I am, &c.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

To M. Thierens, Esq.
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>Sir, Leguan, 16th July 1829. Your Communication dated 23d June, I now beg leave to reply to, and enclose the depositions taken by me, shortly after the receipt of your former Letter dated 11th May. In reply to the latter, I beg leave to observe, that on examination of the witnesses produced by George of the Vertroeven, you will perceive from the depositions taken, that his account was not altogether correct respecting the ill-treatment he alleged to have received from his manager; this induced me to take no further notice of the case, and now feel satisfied with the contents of your Letter of May 14th. But if a recurrence take place of such proceedings as have been adopted by Mr. White, I shall act in the way I have done before. I am, &c. (signed) <i>Marinus Thierens</i>, Assistant Protector of Slaves. To A. W. Young, Esq. Protector of Slaves.</p>	<p>Prote to 's Office, George Town, 20th July 1829. DECISION:—It appears that the slave George received 25 lashes for not going to the duty he was ordered to perform, and was confined in the stocks for having absented from the estate without a pass, which he ought to have applied to the manager for; and that his statement of excessive corporal punishment (being cuffed) is incorrect. The manager, however, ought to have attended to the suggestion of the Assistant Protector, "not to inflict any further punishment on the slave, even though he left the estate without asking for a pass, and was in duty bound to explain to the slave, quietly, the necessity of asking for a pass to go to make his complaint to the Assistant Protector, if he considered himself ill-used or unjustly punished. The impropriety of the Manager's conduct, and his needless severity to Complainant, was pointed out to him, as also the necessity of a more cautious manner in future, or (with the concurrence of the attorney of the estate) that he would be dismissed. (signed) <i>A. W. Young</i>, Protector of Slaves.</p>
<p>Leguan, 19th May 1829. Appeared <i>George</i>, of Plantation Vertroeven, on this island, with a complaint, as follows:— That on the morning of the 11th May 1829, when in the morning the list of the negroes being called, he was one amongst those who were ordered to cut canes, and on going home to put up his shovel and hoe, having been using these the week before, to get his cutlass, he was asked by driver Samuel, if he George was not going in the Punts. George's only reply was, that he was not ordered to do so; upon this the said driver informed the manager, that George wanted to change his situation in the Punts, and was in consequence cuffed by the manager, and received 25 lashes through the said driver; and when after having complained the same morning to me, and received a note from me to the manager, he returned home, was immediately put in the stocks, hands and feet, for that day; his hands were released about eight o'clock at night, but his feet remained in the stocks all night, and ever since this time (11th May) he has been put in the stocks at night with both legs, until last Sunday morning when he was taken out (17th May). Witnesses examined.—Samuel, the driver, says,—That the manager did not strike the man George, but gave him 25 lashes, and Samuel did not put George to cut canes as he stated.—Examined Limerick: corroborates this statement of Samuel, as also Henry, Smith and Liverpool (also witnesses) know nothing of the case. Samuel and Limerick know that part of George's complaint as regards his confinement in the stocks; and say, that George was Saturday evening let off instead of Sunday, as he states.</p>	<p>(signed) <i>M. Thierens</i>, Assistant Protector of Slaves, Parish of Saint Peter.</p>

No. 4.

Protector of Slaves Office,
19th May 1829.
Appeared *Hannibal*.—Says, Mr. Mathison bought him at vendue; that Mr. Jones of Houstown is willing to buy him, but Mr. Mathison will not sell him; that all his things are at the plantation Nieuwenanleq, from whence he was bought; that Mr. Mathison desired him to leave every thing there

Protector's Office,
19th May 1829.
Mr. Lapslie, one of the partners of the firm, summoned, appeared.—States, that he was present when the man, Hannibal, was bought; that he was perfectly satisfied, and was sold singly; that there is no dark place (house) on the establishment, only stocks adjoining the sick house; that he (Hannibal)

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>there; that he would furnish him with every thing he required; that he is unable to cut timber or wood, the work to which he is to be put; that he gave him but six plantains a day when confined in dark-house. Says that Mr. Mathison beat him about the head, and horse-whipped him; that he belongs to the wood cutting establishment of A. Edmonstone & Co. of which Mr. Mathison is a partner.</p> <p>if he had any bedding, to take it; but as there was always abundance of wood on the place, bedsteads or stools were unnecessary; that he most positively denies having cuffed or beaten him with a horse-whip; that he was confined three days in the sick house, in consequence of a sore upon his leg, to expedite the cure; that he had as much food as he could use; that he had previous to his purchasing him belonged to a coffee estate; and though he has as yet done nothing, he evinces his dislike to the change.</p> <p><i>Question.</i> When did you buy him?—<i>Ans.</i> In March last. At the time, I asked him if there was any of his family he was desirous I should purchase. He said, No; only a boy, a friend of his. The bids for the boy were higher than I could afford. I bid for him four thousand seven hundred guilders. He was purchased afterwards for fifty more, by Mr. M'Keand of the Hope. He was not more than fifteen years of age.</p> <p>Mr. Mathison produced the following certificate from the medical attendant of the establishment:</p> <p>“ I do certify, That the Negro, named Hannibal, belonging to Archibald Edmonstone & Co. is, in my opinion, capable of doing his work equal to most other Negroes.</p> <p>“ Demerara, 20th May 1829. (signed) “<i>W. King, Surgeon.</i>”</p> <p>Complaint Dismissed. (signed) <i>A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves,</i> 20th May 1829.</p>	<p>(Hannibal) left the place without a pass; that he does not know what punishment was inflicted on the man, as he resides in town, but will take care to prevent a recurrence of a punishment, but in a legal manner, and will call for an explanation from Mr. Mathison, who resides on the establishment and superintends it, and send it to this office; and it being required by the Protector, the medical certificate as to his capability of work.</p> <p>Protector's Office, 20th May 1829.</p> <p>Appeared Mr. Mathison.—States, that when he purchased Hannibal, he told him,</p>

No. 5.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 19th May 1829.

Appeared *Rosey*; says she belongs to plantation Grove on the east coast.

States, That on Tuesday last, the 12th May, she got a pain in her bowels while at work in the field; that she lay down, and that Mr. Henry Chapman, the manager of the estate, saw her, and asked her what ailed her? She told him, but he ordered her to go on with her work, and struck her with a small stick, and then with his fist, which knocked her down; he then had her hands tied behind, and sent her home and kept her in the stocks three nights and three days, one foot; and kept her sucking child from her during that time; that in consequence of her child not being given her to give it suck, her breasts swelled very much. The doctor saw her, and gave her some medicine for the bowel complaint. The manager afterwards wanted to confine her at night, but

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 19th May 1829.

The Protector summoned Mr. Henry Chapman to appear at this office, and sent Complainant to the gaol pending investigation.

23d May 1829:—Mr. Chapman appeared, as also Complainant from the gaol.

Mr. Chapman states, That on *Wednesday* morning, 13th May, and not on *Tuesday*, he came to the field and saw the woman (Complainant) sitting down; on asking what was the matter, she would give no reply. Admits that he gave her a slap on the face, in consequence of her great impertinence; that she was not confined in the stocks, but in one of the rooms of the hospital. Her child is 16 months old, and had been previously in the yaws house. The child had been thought fit to be weaned previous to its being sent to the yaws house with the yaws.

Mr.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>but she hid herself. She left the estate last night, but did not ask for a pass.</p>	<p>Mr. Chapman then produced the following certificate from the overseer on the estate :</p>
	<p>“ I certify, under tender of oath, That Mr. Henry Chapman, manager of Plantation Grove, came into the field on Wednesday morning and found the woman Rosey sitting down in the field, and that he inquired what was the matter with her ; and she gave no reply whatever to Mr. Chapman’s frequent inquiries of what was the matter with her. The driver was then asked the reason the woman was not at work ; he replied, that she complained of bad stools. Mr. Chapman ordered her to be carried home and locked up in one of the rooms of the hospital until he returned from aback ; she refused to go, and became very impertinent, using at the same time abusive language, and persisting in not going home. She did all she could to annoy Mr. Chapman, who did not strike her with a whip or stick, nor did he knock her down. She was locked up in one of the rooms of the hospital, but not confined to the stocks. She remained three days in the hospital, and went out on the Saturday to her work. On the Saturday evening she absented herself without any cause whatever ; and on Sunday morning the yaws nurse reported, that the woman Rosey had come to the yaws house and beat her, and took away her child by force. It appears that she was instigated by her husband to complain against Mr. Chapman, for not allowing one of her children to stop at the yaws house to take care of her yaws child. There being a nurse there to take care of the yaws people, and every attention paid to them in respect to food, &c.</p>
	<p>“ The said woman, Rosey, and her husband have always been dissatisfied and disaffected, and Mr. Chapman has always passed over their misconduct.</p>
	<p>(signed) “ William Shand, Overseer.”</p>
	<p>“ Plantation Grove, 22d May 1829.”</p>
	<p>Complaint Dismissed.</p>
<p>23d May 1829.</p>	<p>(signed) A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 6.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 19th May 1829.
Appeared *Charles*.—Says he belongs to Dr. Merchant, who resides on the East coast of Essequibo River ; says he is unable to mind the cows, the work required of him, he being sickly ; that he left the place on Tuesday last (12th instant), but was unable to reach here sooner from weakness.

Protector of Slaves Office,
19th May 1829.
Complainant being asked if he would go back to his master with a letter ; says no, he does not like to go back.
The Protector sent Complainant to gaol until his owner calls here or sends the necessary explanation relative to his complaint ; and wrote to Dr. Merchant, as follows :

Protectors Office, 19th May 1829.
The Protector of Slaves begs to acquaint Dr. Merchants, that a Slave named Charles appeared at this Office this morning, and says he is sick and unequal to attending the cattle. The man, it appears, left the plantation on Tuesday last, the 12th instant ; alledges that from weakness he was unable to arrive here earlier.

His appearance certainly bespeaks great debility, and requiring care.
As the man does not appear willing to return, though offered a letter to Dr. Merchants, the Protector has thought it better to send him to the Barracks (gaol), until Dr. Merchants sends or should be coming to town, or sends the necessary explanation through Mr. Kernan, the Assistant-Protector of his district.

Protector’s Office, 25th May 1829.
Appeared, Dr. Merchant.—States, that every care and attention has been paid by him to the man Charles ; that he is himself a medical man, and has administered such medicines, &c. as were requisite ; that food and clothing had been given to him, the negro, regularly ; and that from the time he purchased him, he has never inflicted any punishment on him ; that for the last two years he has done little or no work,
and

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

and that all he has required of him was merely to look after a few cattle *occasionally*, and tie them up with the calves at night; that the cattle are always about the buildings, so that he, Charles, has no distance to walk; that although he is of a dry spare habit of body, he is perfectly well able to do more than is actually required of him.

Complaint Dismissed.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 7.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 19th May 1829.

Appeared *Goodluck*, aged about 30 years. States, that he belongs to Mr. Mottet, of Fort Island, Essequibo River, where he has been employed cutting fire wood for some months; that he has received no allowance of clothing from his owner, and that he only gets one bunch of plantains every two weeks, and a small bit or piece of fish; that his master flogs him because he does not cut six cords of wood a week; that on Monday fortnight (4th inst.), he had him laid down, and caused the driver Casper to give him 150 lashes with the long whip; that there was no person present as witness besides his master and the driver at the time; that the same day he asked for a pass to come to the Protector to complain, but it was refused by his master; that he left the estate the same day without a pass, but was prevented from coming to this office sooner for want of a passage.

Protector of Slaves Office,
19th May 1829.

The Protector wrote same day to Mr. Mottet, to appear at this Office, to reply to the foregoing; and directed Complainant to be detained in gaol pending investigation.

Complainant appears sufficiently well clad and bears no marks of punishment.

June 30th, 1829.—Appeared Mr. Mottet, and also Complainant, who was sent for to the gaol.

Mr. Mottet, on the foregoing complaint being read to him, states,—That the clothing for the present year has not yet been given to the negro *Goodluck*, in consequence of his (Mottet's) not having the means of purchasing it for him; but that it has been given to him regularly heretofore; that an allowance of one good bunch of plantains, and two pounds of salt fish has been given to him every week regularly, and that the clothes previously given him were still pretty good; that as soon as he can dispose of a quantity of fuel wood which he has on hand, he will purchase their years clothing

for his negroes; that in twenty-four days he *carried* only ten cords of fire wood from the place it was *packed up* at, to the river side, a distance of about 20 rods, or 240 feet, and having good weather and a proper path for the purpose; that the usual task in carrying wood is one cord per day, with him (Mottet); that he gave him *twenty-five lashes* with a whip; that there was no person present as witness, as he does not keep a Punishment Record Book, having only five Slaves altogether on the place; that the punishment of twenty-five lashes was inflicted by the negro Casper; that he never asked for a pass to come to the Protector or any other person to complain of ill-treatment; that he is ready to make oath to the correctness of the above Statement, if required.

Sworn to before me, at my Office in George Town, this 30th June 1829.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

30th June 1829.—Appeared, Mr. *Swam*, and being questioned, states,—That he lives with Mr. Mottet; that he has always seen the customary allowance of two pounds of salt fish per week to each, served out to Mr. Mottet's negroes; that he does not see the plantains given them, because they are disembarked from the courial at the landing place, which is a short distance from the dwelling-house, where the negroes go themselves and take them away, each his own allowance to his house; that he has never seen, nor does he believe that any of Mottet's negroes have received any ill treatment whatsoever; that he was not at home when *Goodluck* was flogged.

DECISION :—With respect to the punishment, the Protector considers it impossible that Complainant could have received 150 lashes, and a fortnight afterwards be free from the marks; nor indeed perhaps had the twenty-five lashes been severely inflicted, would he be free from marks, which latter is the extent of punishment sworn to by Mr. Mottet,

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

as inflicted on Complainant, and therefore, both this part of his complaint and that regarding food are dismissed; but respecting clothing, the Protector directed that this year's clothing should be issued to him with as little delay as possible; admonishing Complainant for his having left his owner without a pass, particularly as he resided at such a distance from town, and does not appear to have any extraordinary cause of complaint to justify his departing from the regular course to be followed.

(signed) A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 8.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 23d May 1829.

Appeared *Cecilia*, of Plantation Industry, East coast of Demerara.—States, that Mr. Hughes, the manager, locked her up in the hospital for two months, and told her she should not be let out until she was delivered, and that he would then sell her with her children. That she requested to be allowed to go to the negro houses to be delivered, but Mr. Hughes would not permit her, and that she was forced to stay in the hospital among all the sick negroes; that he allowed a woman to attend her for one week only, and that when the woman was taken away she was obliged to stay three days in the hospital without water to bathe, or any thing to eat; that the women Renuetta and Phillis were allowed an attendant for five weeks; that Mr. Hughes then asked her, if she would stay with him, but she replied no; that she wished to be sold; that he sent her a jacket, but she refused to take it, saying that the person who would buy her would give her clothes.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 23d May 1829.

Protector wrote to J. Van Waterschoodt, Assistant Protector of the district, to investigate *Cecilia's* complaint, enclosing him a copy of the same, and directed Complainant to be detained in gaol pending investigation.

Sir, Plaisance, 26th May 1829.

In conformity with your request of the 23d instant, I have repaired to Plantation Industry, and investigated the complaint made to you by the woman *Cecilia*.

I now take the liberty of transmitting the same to you.

I have the honour to be, &c.

(signed) J. Van Waterschoodt,
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

To Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves.

Examined Stancey, the sick nurse of Plantation Industry.—Says, that *Cecilia* was locked up on account of going to complain (on former occasions) of being unwilling to remain on the estate; that to her recollection *Cecilia* was about six weeks in confinement, but not in the stocks; that there was no other person in the room when she was delivered, than the girls Catherina, Bethzie and Louisa.

Examined Sally, the midwife of the estate.—Says, that she has been attending on *Cecilia* for two weeks, and that after that period Mr. Hughes told *Cecilia* that she could now go to the negro houses, if she would promise him to behave herself well, but she refused to do so; that during her confinement she had every thing necessary as sugar, rice and good attendance.

Examined George Moulien, the overseer.—Says, that he was present when *Cecilia* refused to go to the Negro houses.

Examined Thomas, the driver of the women gang.—Says, that the women of Industry are generally well disposed and do not complain; that they have not too much work, and that they get their allowances very regularly.

Examined Bob, the husband of *Cecilia*.—Says, that he cannot account for his wife's behaviour; he says, as well as Thomas, and the rest of the people present, that since Mr. Hughes bought her at Coldingen vendue, about ten months ago, she never worked in the field; and she (*Cecilia*) says, that the reason of it is, that she would not belong to Plantation Industry, and would not work there.

The sick-house room where *Cecilia* has been confined, is nineteen feet square, has three windows to the windward, and three to the leeward.

Mr. Chichester says, that he repeatedly heard Mr. Hughes, (who is the attorney as well as manager of the estate) saying that he would never sell that woman.

Plantation Industry, 23d May 1829.

(signed) J. Van Waterschoodt, Assistant Protector of Slaves.

Witness, (signed) John Laurie.

Complaint Dismissed. (signed) A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 9.

Protector of Slaves Office,
George Town, 26th May 1829.

Appeared *Victoria*, belonging to Plantation Mon Repos, east coast of Demerara.—States, that she is required to spread out the megass to dry, and to pull it down off the heaps in the megass yard; that owing to her leg being off she cannot do this, and that she cannot stoop down; that she wishes to do some light work with the Creoles (children); that she fell in going over a board over a trench, and hurt her side; went to the manager, and told him she was not able to work, he then locked her up three days and three nights in the stocks; she was released, and tried to go to work, but was unable to stand from the confinement and pain in her side; she again went to the manager, and he confined her for three days more. The doctor saw her during that time, but ordered no medicine for her; she asked for a pass, and on Monday morning one was given her to come and complain: says, that the manager's name is James Stewart.

Protector of Slaves Office, 26 May 1829.
Mr. Stewart, manager of Plantation Mon Repos, was summoned to appear, and Complainant sent to gaol pending investigation. She appears to be about eighteen years of age, and is a Creole.

29th May 1829.

Michael O'Laughlan, head overseer on Plantation Mon Repos, appeared on behalf of the manager Mr. Stewart, who is unable to attend from indisposition. Also the Complainant, being sent to the gaol for, Mr. O'Laughlan, states, That all the work that is required of *Victoria*, is merely to attend the liquor-strainer, through which the liquor or cane juice runs from the engine, and remove the particles of the cane or trash, which may accumulate in the gutter and obstruct the passage of the liquor through the strainer; this she can do sitting down on a bench, which has been put at the spot for the purpose. When she does not wish to remain sitting at this work, she is allowed to pull down the megass from the heaps, but not asked to carry or spread it, as the little Creoles do that. She refused to do any work whatever, saying,

she was unable, and was put in the stocks until the doctor saw her. He said there was nothing the matter with her, and desired her to be sent to her work.

The Protector directed the doctor's certificate as to her capability of doing the work required of her, to be sent to this office, and Complainant sent back to the gaol.

1st June 1829.—Appeared Mr. O'Laughlan again, with the Medical Certificate required, as also Complainant from the gaol.

I the undersigned Medical attendant of Plantation Mon Repos, do hereby certify, That I consider the woman *Victoria* belonging to said estate, perfectly capable of doing the work required of her by the manager—and also that the day she came into the hospital she had no appearance of sickness.

(signed) J. Merry, Surgeon.

Complaint Dismissed. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.

No. 10.

Protector of Slaves Office,
26th May 1829.

Appeared *Olivia*.—States, that she belonged to Mr. John Den Boer in Essequibo: that she has three children who now belong to him, and that he has lately sold her to Mr. G. F. Perret, without them, although they are too young to be separated from her. Their names are Cyrus, Figland and Leonardo; that she does not know their ages, but they are very young; that she is willing to be sold to Mr. Perret, provided her children are sold with her; that she went to Mr. George Bagot, second Fiscal, to complain, and he sent her to this office.

26th May 1829.—Wrote to Mr. Perret to come to this office to explain. Complainant sent to jail, pending investigation.

2d June 1829.—Appeared Mr. G. F. Perret, with the following written statement; also Complainant from the jail.

In obedience to a requisition from his Honour the Protector of Slaves and for his better information, the undersigned has the honour to submit the following particulars:—

On the 19th of October 1824, Mrs. Elizabeth Christianse, of Essequibo, made her last will and testament; she departed this life on or about July 1825.

By that will she bequeathed to Donald Tobias Jan Rose, the negro boy Vigilant; to Marcus Jacobus Wittenberg, the negro boy Cyrus, and to Frederick Christian Wittenberg, the negro boy Rinaldo; which three boys, Vigilant, Cyrus and Rinaldo, being children of the woman *Olivia* in question.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>question, and now about eleven, thirteen and sixteen years of age, have all been given over to the respective legatees aforementioned, soon after the death of said Mrs. E. Christianse, without any complaint or representation from their said mother Olivia, who thus remained single and alone to be disposed of as the property of this estate. Nor have any of these legatees the means of purchasing the said woman.</p>	<p>And lastly, it was for the sole and exclusive purpose of paying off a debt of this estate, (for which otherwise the woman Olivia must have been levied upon and sold,) that the undersigned lately purchased her from the executor Mr. J. J. Den Boer, by which means the said woman Olivia in fact remains with her children, as the undersigned lives next neighbour to the several owners of her boys.</p>
<p>George Town, Demerara, 2d June 1829.</p>	<p>(signed) <i>G. F. Perret.</i></p>
<p>The testatrix died in 1825, and the children were disposed of in that year, agreeably to the will, which was produced in support of the above statement.</p>	<p>Dismissed. (signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 11.

Referred to the Protector of Slaves for Investigation, 25th May 1829.

(signed) *B. D'Urban.*

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th May 1829.

To His Excellency Major General Sir Benjamin D'Urban, K. C. B. K. C. H. &c. &c. Lieutenant Governor in and over the United Colony of Demerara and Essequibo, &c. &c.

The humble Petition of *Peggy Princess*,
Most respectfully sheweth;

That your Excellency's Petitioner was brought to the colony by Mrs. Elizabeth Crabb, during the government of his Excellency General Murray, under the restriction of not being sold in the colony, but to be returned to Barbadoes, of which island she is a native:

That previous to leaving Barbadoes, said Elizabeth Crabb (then Mrs. Scott) had to make oath before Dr. Gill (the then sitting magistrate,) that your Excellency's petitioner was not her property, and made a similar oath on her arrival in this colony:

That on the arrival of the vessel in this river, petitioner was conducted to King's House, when Mr. Chapman, Government Secretary, gave strict and positive orders that she was to be sent back to Barbadoes, instead of which Mr. Crabb transferred her, totally unknown to herself, to Miss Eliza Harris who was a child at the time, and incompetent to act for herself, and whose mother was quite averse to such proceeding:

That during the time petitioner has been under the controul of Mrs. Crabb, she has never furnished her with either clothing, house-room or food, or even paid for a midwife to deliver her of either of her two children; and when one of the said children died and she asked Mrs. Crabb for a coffin,

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th May 1829.

Mrs. Crabb summoned.—Appeared, and being questioned, states:—"In the year 1818, I was in Barbadoes, this girl (Complainant) did not then belong to me, and I could not bring her to Demerara; the girl's mother was free and in this colony; the girl in question went to Barbadoes previously for her health. I then bought her in Barbadoes, she gave me no rest until I did so, as her aunt and sister were also here. Miss Eliza Harris then bought her in Barbadoes from me, and she was brought here by Miss E. Harris in November 1818, and was entered at the custom-house as a domestic.

Eliza Harris, being summoned.—Appeared, and states, That she purchased the woman Peggy Princess from E. Crabb *alias* Scott in Barbadoes, and brought her here as a domestic; that she will not remain with her (Miss Harris) and that she wishes to work out. That she has no idea of parting with her. That when she, Miss Harris, was in the country, say out of town, she left Complainant in charge of Mrs. Scott *alias* Crabb: that she has told her (Miss Harris) she lost her child, but of the allowances she (Harris) cannot say; that she asked Mrs. Scott, if Peggy had received allowance, she said yes, the same as her own people.

Mrs. Crabb again says, she always was fed and clothed as the others; but she absented herself and never paid any wages; in four years and a half she only paid seven joes.

28th May 1829.—The Protector finds the statements of Mrs. Crabb and Miss Harris,

PART I.

DEMERARA.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

coffin, she received for answer the cruel and mortifying observation, that she may bury it in a *candle box* in the yard where she lived; though petitioner begs to add, that she gave her child a decent funeral in the regular burial ground, and have Mr. Williams' (the sexton) receipt for to shew

*Sic. orig.**Sic. orig.*

for:
That your Excellency's petitioner has been accustomed to work out under a pass, and has regularly paid her wages to said Mrs. Crabb; but from the pass for the present month by said Elizabeth Harris, and at the same time from Mrs.

Sic. orig.

Mrs. Crabb applying to her for wages, and as the month was not expired, petitioner refused to pay; and she (Mrs. Crabb) has threatened to put petitioner in jail and have her properly punished:

Under all these circumstances, she begs leave humbly to state her case to your Excellency, conscious that she will meet with proper attention and redress: And under this conviction she

Most humbly prays that your Excellency will be pleased to take this Petition into your humane and candid consideration, and to afford to your poor Petitioner such redress as to your Excellency may seem just and proper:

And Petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

(signed) *Peggy Princess.*

George Town, the 11th May 1829.

No. 12.

Protector of Slaves Office,
30th May 1829.

Appeared *Lewis*, belonging to Plantation Porter's Hope, east coast of Demerara.

Complains that Mr. Robertson, the overseer, does not allow him time to eat his dinner; that he belongs to the gang employed in cutting cane plants at Mahaica; that yesterday morning the overseer gave him about twelve lashes; he then complained to Mr. M'Keand, the Assistant-Protector, and he referred him to Mr. M'Arthur, the attorney; that he then came down to Enmore to Mr. M'Arthur, and not finding him at home, he went to Mr. Shepherd on Plantation Porter's Hope. Mr. Shepherd would not listen to his complaint, and had him put in the stocks, hands and feet, at two o'clock, and kept him there until seven o'clock at night; that the next morning he received fifteen lashes.

Protector of Slaves' Office,
30th May 1829.

Appeared Mr. Shepherd, Manager of Plantation Porter's Hope.—States, that part of the gang of Plantation Porter's Hope is employed in cutting cane plants for Porter's Hope, at Mahaica, it being the desire of the proprietors to change the cultivation from cotton to sugar; that the detached gang so employed is under the immediate control of Mr. Robertson, the overseer; that the Complainant was punished by Mr. Robertson for laziness, and not doing the same proportion of work as the other negroes had individually performed—the punishment he received was twelve stripes; after which he left his work altogether, without permission, and came down to the Hope (Porter's); that he (Shepherd) was from home that day, and returned about seven o'clock in the evening, when he found Lewis was at Porter's Hope, and hearing of his behaviour, had him confined with

one foot in the stocks for *that night*; he was taken out the next morning and desired by him to return to his work at Mahaica, but refusing to do that work, which he (Shepherd) knew was not more than he ought to do, and knowing that his dissatisfaction arose solely from the additional labour required on sugar properties, which, however, as he has before said, was not too much for him, or more than the others were doing, he again ordered him to return to his work, and on his again refusing, punished him with fifteen lashes; that he was then sent to his work, but withdrew clandestinely, and came here to complain.

That Complainant has the regular time, say from eleven to one o'clock, for his meals; that many of the negroes are dissatisfied at the change from cotton to sugar cultivation.

Questioned.—

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—continued.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p><i>Questioned.</i>—That Lewis was not put in the stocks or at all confined until about seven o'clock in the evening of the 29th instant; that the first punishment was very slight, and that he bore no marks whatsoever of it; the second also was slightly inflicted.—</p>	
<p>Complaint Dismissed. (signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>	

No. 13.

Protector of Slaves Office,
 30th May 1829.

Received the following Letter from
 A. M'Rae, esq. dated Demerara, 30th May
 1829.

Sir,

I beg to enclose for your perusal and consideration a Letter which I have received from William Perry, manager of Plantation Annandale, for which estate I act as attorney, detailing the particulars of an investigation held by Mr. Bishop, as Deputy Protector of Slaves on that estate, on the 21st instant. What I particularly wish to draw your attention to, is the circumstance of Mr. Bishop exacting money from Mr. Perry, for the expressed purpose of paying it over to the negro Pollux as a *reward!!!* this is a principle, which I consider of such dangerous tendency to the colony generally, and in this instance holding out an example to the Slaves belonging to the Annandale, which I consider likely to be subversive of all subordination, that I cannot pass it over in silence; I, therefore, respectfully request that you will be pleased to have the matter investigated, and if you should find Mr. Perry to be borne out in his assertions, I trust that such measures will be taken as will prevent a recurrence of such proceedings in future.

Sic orig.

I have, &c. &c.

(signed) *A. Mack Rae.*

A. W. Young, Esq.
 Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure.)

Annandale, May 23d, 1829.

Dear Sir,

I beg leave to lay before you a statement of the investigation of the complaint of the man, *Pollux*, who I mentioned to you as having gone to the Assistant-Protector of Slaves when last here. The man, *Pollux*, was employed on the 8th and 9th instant with the rest of the gang weeding light grass and planting canes. Having only finished twenty-one rods each day, as a punishment I ordered him to be confined during the nights of the 8th and 9th in the hospital. On the 11th instant the gang were employed cutting plants in an abandoned field; when the said man having left his work, and gone into an adjoining field of canes and cut some of them down, I again ordered him to be confined for the night. On the morning

Protector of Slaves Office,
 2d June 1829.

The Protector of Slaves wrote to Assistant-Protector, Bishop, enclosing copies of Messrs. M'Rae and Perry's Letters; and directing him to forward to this office the complaint of the slave *Pollux*, with his proceedings therein.

13th June 1829.—Received the following in answer; *viz.*

Plantation Zorg, 10th June 1829.

Sir,

The intervening holy days prevented me from paying the necessary attention to your despatch of the 2d instant sooner. I send you hereby my remarks on W. Perry's statement, as far as I think they deserve any notice. In doing so, however, I must now call upon you for that support, without which protection to the slaves in remote country districts becomes a mere farce, and no one of sufficient independent station and spirit to withstand the faults of neighbouring managers, could deal out even justice. The present case before you, I consider to be one of considerable interest, perhaps of consequence to the colony at large; from the circumstance of the attorney supporting the manager in his transgressions against the laws, by the very mischievous attempt of perverting the intentions of the Assistant-Protector, who in the main complaint actually *favoured* the master; the wide distinction between compensation for injury received, and reward for benefit conferred, can in this case not be mistaken, nor any motives of compassion to the manager, in consenting to the compensation in preference to the rigid course of the law. Nothing but the intention of debarring a slave from future application for protection, could have warranted the confinement even without any caution from me! Reasons for absconding there could be none: had Complainant wished to do so, the indefinite pass "in search of laws," gave him the fairest opportunity to roam at large. On your decision the following rests:—

Whether Assistant Protector, not wishing to cause loss of labour to estates, has a right to act as I did, accompanied with the injunction to the manager "not to molest complainant."

Sic orig.

Whether close confinement in the hospital, though out of stocks, during several nights

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves,RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

morning of the 12th instant the man came to me, in a most insolent manner, and desired me to give him satisfaction, as he could not submit to be confined in this way any longer. On my telling him I had no satisfaction for him, he demanded "a pass to go and look for law;" I repeatedly asked him where he wished to go, but he would give me no other answer than that "he wanted a pass to go and look for law." Finding him obstinate, I gave him a pass in the form he had asked it. In the course of six hours he returned, with a Note from Captain Bishop, saying, the man, Pollux, had been to him, but that he was going to town, and could not investigate the complaint until his return, and requesting me not to molest the negro in the mean while. I desired the man to go to his work, and ordered the driver to see that he slept in one of the chambers of the hospital, as I did not think it would be proper to allow the man to be at large until his complaint had been investigated.

On the 21st, Captain Bishop came on the estate, and before the man made his appearance, accused me of treating the authorities with levity, and said he would write my attorney to know if he allowed me to do so, or not. After having heard the complaint of the man, Pollux, and gone to a field for the man to show him the quantity of work I exacted, he told him he had no cause to complain on account of his work; the man then said he had slept in the hospital since the day of his complaint. Captain Bishop then exclaimed, "Now you have committed yourself, you have punished the man before he was tried. *I will give you law. I will show you law. I will first write to Mr. M'Rae to know* if he authorizes you to act in this manner, and I will then prosecute you. You gentlemen seem to treat the Protector of Slaves with a great deal of levity."

On Captain Bishop retiring to the door to withdraw, I said, "Captain Bishop, if I have acted wrong, I have not done so intentionally; I was not aware my ordering the man to sleep in the hospital was doing so: could the matter not be dropped?" Captain Bishop answered, "No, unless you will give the man a reward." I said "No, I will not; you know, Captain Bishop, it would be the ruin of the gang." Captain Bishop then said, "Give me a trifle, two dollars, and I will call the man to me aside, and give it to him, as a present from myself. On the impulse of the moment, wishing to get rid of the affair, I gave to Captain Bishop the sum of two dollars; he then went through the back of the house into the yard, and inquired for the man, who had returned to his work. Captain Bishop then came to me, and asked where he was; I said, "working in the field close the road. Captain Bishop then went away.

Sic orig.

From

PROCEEDINGS.

nights and Sunday, is by the "Ordinance" to be considered as punishment?

Whether a slight compensation of money to *mutual satisfaction* does not come within your wish, repeatedly expressed to me, of arranging matters of complaint in the most satisfactory and least troublesome manner?

As regards myself in this matter, I shall await the notice it will receive from you; but as to Mr. M'Rae he may rest assured that such measures will be taken as will prevent a recurrence of such proceedings in future, by a more uncompromising observance on my part, of the laws of protection to the Annandale slaves.

I have, &c.

(signed) E. Bishop, jun.

Assistant-Protector of Slaves.

To Lieut.-Col. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure.)

Remarks on Pollux's Case *v.* W. Perry.

Lieutenant-Colonel Young, as Protector of Slaves, directs proper passes to be given complaining slaves to Assistant-Protector. The slave, Pollux, however is sent with a pass.

"Pass bearer, Pollux, in search of laws."
"Annandale, 12th May 1829."

(signed) W. Perry."

The Assistant-Protector being obliged to defer Pollux's complaint, returned him immediately to the Annandale, with directions to the manager, Perry, *not to be molested meanwhile.* W. Perry, however, in the same spirit of derision and contempt of the Protector's office, treats Complainant like a criminal, and after each day of hard labour locks him up in the hospital during nine successive nights and all Sunday the 17th May. Only on the 21st of May the Assistant-Protector could find time to call at Plantation Annandale. He investigated Pollux's complaint of being locked up in hospital during the night of the 11th May, on the pretence of having been seen to cut a cane out of an adjoining field and suck it; and also of being frequently so locked up, deprived of his home and friends for trifling matters, (for instance the previous Sunday, the 10th, the 9th, and 8th of May) which appeared not altogether unfounded, nevertheless passed it over with a slight admonition to the slave. On the subject, however, of the manager daring to punish Complainant from the 12th to the 21st of May (Sunday the 17th included), the Assistant-Protector could not but threaten him with consequences, which, in defiance of law and reason, he, W. Perry, had thus brought upon himself; named however the attorney of the estate as the first channel he would report to, previous to more coercive measures. W. Perry then appeared convinced of his misconduct; resorted

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>From the hasty manner in which Captain Bishop addressed me, I was thrown into a little confusion at the time, which alone induced me to give him the money; since which, on closer and deliberate reflection, I consider I have acted very wrong in giving a bonus, and if I have erred, I am conscious I have done so from no contempt of his authority.</p> <p>As you are far more experienced in the world than myself, I beg to lay this statement before you, which I aver to be correct, and your opinion of it will be a guide to my future conduct.</p> <p>I am, &c. (signed) <i>William Perry.</i> To A. Mac Rae, Esq.</p>	<p>resorted to entreaties, and prevailed at last on the Assistant-Protector to take the man, then at work near the road, two dollars as a compensation for the injury, which in his way home were delivered to Pollux, privately and in the least objectionable manner in presence of a friend; Complainant expressing himself quite satisfied therewith.</p> <p>Zorg, 10th June 1829. Extracted from my Notes, (signed) <i>E. Bishop, jun.</i> Assistant-Protector of Slaves.</p> <p>Office of Protector of Slaves, Sir, 15th June, 1829. I have had under my attentive consideration your Letter of the 10th, received on the 13th, relative to the case of Pollux, of Plantation Annandale; and most entirely</p>

agree in the just view you took of it, so far as regards the complaint itself; and though differing with you as to its final disposal, I beg to assure you, that in giving you the following directions for your future guidance, it is not my intention to attribute to you improper motives for the course you adopted in the above case, but simply act upon this principle:

That it is most advisable in all such instances, to adopt such a cool dispassionate manner as to prevent *even the suspicion* of exerting authority more for the purpose of resenting an affront to our own official character, than for the redress of another's grievance.

1st.—When you are of opinion that the case merits the infliction of a penalty, refer it to me, with your opinion and all the proceedings therewith connected.

2d.—When you have not time at once to investigate a complaint, and particularly when you are going to town, where your stay is uncertain, to prevent delay, refer the matter to Colonel Dougan or Mr. Dalton if on the coast.

I enclose a copy of my Opinion on the subject.

I have, &c. &c.

Captain Bishop,
Assistant-Protector of Slaves.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

Office of Protector of Slaves,
15th June 1829.

DECISION :

The Protector of Slaves having, in consequence of Mr. M'Rae's Letter of the 30th ultimo, investigated the case of the slave, Pollux, and the measures pursued by Assistant-Protector Bishop, and by Mr. Perry the manager of Plantation Annandale, has no doubt that Mr. M'Rae, on examination of the papers on the subject now in this office, and which are open to his perusal, will agree with the Protector on the following observations and necessary directions.

It was Mr. Perry's duty to obey the orders which were given by the Assistant Protector, viz. not to molest the Complainant pending the investigation of his complaint.

Had Mr. Perry adhered to this legal and equitable order, he would have avoided all the proceedings subsequent to the decision of the man's original complaint.

The man's confinement at night was illegal and unjust. The Assistant Protector, in exacting, to the mutual satisfaction of the parties, a fine of two dollars, as a *compensation (not reward)* to the slave for having been shut out from his house and connexions, after *having performed too his daily task*,—did that which was certainly unauthorized, since the Protector alone is the proper officer for recovery of fines; yet the penalty was most disproportionate to the offence.

In future, the specific manner in which fines are to be recovered will be strictly adhered to, so that whilst on the one hand no fear need be entertained that the discipline of the estate will be impaired by any irregular

PART I.

DEMERARA.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

irregular mode of administering justice ; on the other, it must ever be recollected that no supposition of that kind (erroneous as it must be) will prevent ample compensation to an injured party.

The Protector of Slaves requests Mr. M^cRae will be good enough to communicate to Mr. Perry the foregoing observations, and give him such directions as are evidently necessary ; warning him that it will become the duty and is the determination of the Protector, to bring similar conduct in future at once before the Court of Justice.

(signed)

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 14.

Office of Protector of Slaves,
May 29th, 1829.

Appeared *George*, of Plantation Nieuw Osterbeek, with a complaint against his master, but being drunk was detained until the following day in the gaol: the complaint heard, but not taken down in writing.

30th May 1829.

Appeared *George* again.—States, that he is from Plantation Nieuw Osterbeek, belonging to J. C. Thierens ; that his mother *Laura* was the daughter of the Indian woman *Urima*, of the *Warao* tribe ; that his father's name was *Ziptari*, a slave belonging to Mr. Trotts, and head driver on Plantation *Laurencia*, where his mother lived, and was always considered as a free woman ; that after her death, which happened while he was a child, Mr. Trotts took him and his sister *Stoffinkey*, and that they have since been considered as slaves ; that his sister has a son named *Remey*, now alive : that after Mr. Trotts died, they belonged to his wife, and subsequent to her death became the property of Mr. Thierens, her nephew ; that there are two free women living now on Fort Island, who can prove that he and his family are the descendants of the free Indian woman *Laura* ; and he therefore prays that the Protector will obtain for them their liberty.

That about five years ago they claimed their freedom, and were assisted in doing so by the Crown Advocate, Mr. Gordon ; that it was then decided that they should return to the estate Nieuw Osterbeek, and remain there six months, at the expiration of which time Mr. Gordon told them they should be manumitted, but that this has not yet been done ; that the names of the women he refers to are *Greeky* and *Christina*.

Protector of Slaves Office,
30th May 1829.

Mr. John C. Thierens, the proprietor of *George*, appeared also ; and states, that the claim of *George* to freedom was altogether unfounded ; that he (*Thierens*) was then on the eve of his departure for Europe, but that satisfactory proof of the invalidity of the claim of *George* and his family would be adduced.

June 10th, 1829.—Wrote to the attorney of J. C. Thierens, to afford the necessary explanation and evidence respecting the above claim.

Received in answer :

Sir, Leguan, 16th July 1829.

Respecting the case of the man *George*, belonging to Plantation Nieuw Osterbeek, I beg leave to enclose some certificates, from what the woman *Stoffinkey* (his sister) and *George* himself had stated.

You must be aware that when *George* last appeared to you, he was in such a state of intoxication that my brother told me you ordered him to the barracks (jail), where he remained for several days, until after my brother's departure. I took him out, and brought him back on the estate. He had received a pass from my brother for a week, to see some friends in town. When on the estate, his sister *Stoffinkey* and the rest of his family were glad to see him back, and *Stoffinkey* begged me to take no notice of his claim to freedom, as he only states it when in liquor, and never thinks of it otherwise ; and that she and the rest of her family were all contented and satisfied under the present administration of the estate.

I remember this family, from alleged ill treatment from Mr. Vander Paut, absconded some years ago, but I believe they returned to the estate from their own accord, not being able to subsist from their own industry.

The witnesses mentioned by the man *George* are, as far as I can learn, not to be found in *Essequibo*.

(signed)

M. Thierens, qq. *J. C. Thierens*,
and Assistant Protector of Slaves.

To Lieutenant-colonel Young,
Protector of Slaves.

I do hereby certify, That two negroes on Plantation Nieuw Osterbeek, situate on the island of Leguan, have been examined in my presence by
the

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

the Assistant Protector of Slaves, M. Thierens, esq.; that they disclaimed any pretensions to freedom, and professed themselves perfectly satisfied with their state; and acknowledged that it was in a moment of intoxication that the man George made application to the Protector of Slaves in George Town.

July 11th, 1829.

(signed) *M. Warner.*

Stofflinkey } I do hereby certify, That two negroes on Plantation
and } Nieuw Osterbeck, situate on the island of Leguan, have
George. } been examined in my presence by the Assistant Protector,
M. Thierens, esq.; that they disclaimed any pretensions to freedom, and professed themselves perfectly satisfied with their state; and acknowledged that it was in a moment of intoxication that the man George made application to the Protector of Slaves in George Town.

July 11th, 1829.

(signed) *Thos P. Simpson.*

Stofflinkey } DECISION:—Dismissed; the Claim being withdrawn
and } by the parties themselves, and acknowledged by them to
George. } be unfounded, and that it was only made whilst under
the influence of spirituous liquor.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 15.

Protector of Slaves Office,
6th June 1829.

Appeared *Jacoba*.—States, that she and her four children belonged to Mr. Gravesande of Mahaica; that he hired herself, two of her children and her husband, to Mr. M'Kenzie, of George Town; that her husband has since run away, and Mr. M'Kenzie wants to send her back to Mahaica (but wishes to keep two of her children with him as domestics), because he thinks she knows where her husband is, and will not tell him.

That she does not wish to be separated from her children. Says, that lately she has heard that Mr. Gravesande has sold her to Mr. Bissett with her children, but she does not wish to belong to Mr. Bissett.

Protector of Slaves Office,
6th June 1829.

Mr. M'Kenzie being summoned, appeared; and states, That about twelve months ago he hired the woman *Jacoba* and her children from Mr. Bissett, to whom they belong; that she has been sick for about three months, and that for the last nine weeks she has done nothing for him; that in consequence of this, he wrote to her owner to take her back, but that he would still hire her two children as domestics, to which the owner has agreed.

DECISION:—Directed the woman to return to her master, having explained to her that her children were not sold, but merely hired to Mr. M'Kenzie, which I cannot prevent, and that consequently their separation was only temporary.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 16.

Protector of Slaves Office,
9th June 1829.

To Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves, &c.

The respectful Statement of *J. G. De Ryck*, an inhabitant of this colony, for and in behalf of his minor children residing on Hog Island, Essequibo.

That the negro woman, named Sarah, a slave, belonging to his children, was in a most horrid manner beaten with a tar rope by a coloured man named Stoll, on or about the 25th June last, on Hog Island, Essequibo, at the place of residence of a certain Mr. Bohem, without said slave having given any the least provocation to him the said Mr. Stoll, or being hired out to him the aforesaid Mr. Stoll, residing in Charles Town,

Protector of Slaves Office,
10th June 1829.

Mr. De Ryck summoned, as also the witnesses Trotts, Bohem, and Sarah herself; also Stoll, the defendant.

11th July 1829.—Appeared Mr. Bohem. Being questioned, states, That the woman Sarah was in his house when a quarrel took place between the young man Stoll and the woman Sarah; that he heard the woman Sarah abusing Stoll, in presence, and in his passion he (Stoll) seized a small cat that he (Bohem) has to whip the children, and ran after her and drove her away from the place. She went to her mistress, who was in another house, but near to his (Bohem's.) The mistress came over, and said that if he (Stoll) had any thing against the woman, he ought

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of SlavesRETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>Town, George Town, the fact of which can be proved by a Mr. Trotts, a coloured man, also residing on Hog Island, Essequibo, who was present when the aforesaid slave was so beaten by the aforesaid Mr. Stoll.</p> <p>The undersigned has considered it his duty to bring this to the knowledge of the Protector, in order that the case may be investigated.</p> <p>(signed) <i>J. G. De Ryck</i>, Guardian of his minor children.</p> <p>Demerara, July 8th, 1829.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">29th July 1829.</p> <p>Appeared De Ryck again (having been sent for), and swore to his statement before me, at my office in George Town, this day.</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. W. Young</i>, Protector of Slaves.</p> <p>29th July 1829.—Appeared <i>Sarah</i>—Says she belongs to Mr. De Ryck; that Mr. Stoll licked her with a tar rope; that she had done nothing to him; that it was about two months ago, and that he held her while beating her.</p> <p><i>Questioned.</i>—Did you complain to any one?—Yes; I told my mistress the same day I was beat.</p> <p>Who saw him beat you?—Mr. Trotts.</p> <p>at the time, and said nothing, even when she was beaten; and that he supposes Mr. Stoll beat her on account of a dispute which he (Trotts) was told had occurred some days previously, between Mr. and Mrs. De Ryck, Sarah's owners, in consequence of some news or reports carried to Mrs. De Ryck, by Sarah, about Stoll.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Demarara, 29th July 1829.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">The foregoing Complaint has not been proved, and is not therefore referred to his Honor the Fiscal.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) <i>A. W. Young</i>, Protector of Slaves.</p>	<p>ought to have complained to her. Stoll begged her pardon, and said he had not beaten the girl. She (the mistress) was satisfied, and went away, and that was all that passed.</p> <p>Can you swear he did not strike the woman with a tar rope?—Certainly I can.</p> <p>When did this happen?—On the 23d of May, and he left the house on the 29th May, and never said any thing of the matter (meaning Stoll).</p> <p>Stoll, f. c. man, appeared.—Denies having struck the woman. States, that he chased her with a small cat, but never touched her; that the woman was very abusive, and said that he had cursed her mistress; admitting even that he had done so, he begged the mistress's pardon for the dispute that occurred.</p> <p>11th July 1829.—Protector wrote Mr. De Ryck to attend in support of his statement by Mr. Bohem.</p> <p>29th July 1829.—Appeared Mr. J. L. Trotts, f. c. man—States, that he was in the house of Mr. Bohem, an uncle of Mr. Stoll's, when the latter beat the woman Sarah with a cat; that to the best of his recollection it happened about two months ago; that as well as he can recollect, Mr. Stoll gave her about six, or perhaps eight, but not more; that the stripes were by no means severe; that the girl was in the house of Mr. Bohem</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) <i>J. L. Trotts</i>.</p>

No. 17.

Protector of Slaves Office,
24th June 1829.Appeared *Jennette*.—Says she belongs to Plantation Arcadia.

That on Monday she and three others, named Sophia, Juba and Ritta, were sent to work on the King's Road, say to weed grass; that the dam was very bad and wet, and therefore they could not do as much of it as was required of them by the manager, Mr. Dunkin; that they were locked up at night (not in the stocks); that the next day and four days following they were employed on the dam and were confined every night; that they were not able to do as much work as the manager required of them.

Charlotte, also of Plantation Arcadia, appeared; and states, that every night she is confined in the stocks because her work is not finished.

Charlotte also says, that she is locked up every

Protector of Slaves Office,
24th June 1829.

Wrote Mr. Dunkin to appear at this office.

Appeared Mr. Henry Dunkin, manager of Plantation Arcadia.—States, that Jennette, who is now here, had a pass at her request; that the others also applied for one; but Mr. Dunkin told them that one was sufficient to go to complain; that there were four, as above stated, to do the work given on the dam; that the work was forty-eight rods long and three rods wide among the four; that they did not finish it, and were locked up that night and the two successive nights, as the work above allotted them was not finished.

That on Thursday last they had a fresh piece of ground, the same quantity, which they did not finish until Saturday night, and were locked up on Sunday, in one

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I,
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>every night in consequence of losing one day's work in the week. <i>Diana</i>, also of Plantation Arcadia, complains of her work, and also that plantains and water were not given her when confined in the evening.</p>	<p>one chamber; on Monday they were absent in the evening from pulping coffee, and in consequence they were locked up last night, and that has brought them to complain. The work on the dam is simply cutting grass. Mr. Dunkin, in reply to Charlotte's complaints, says the woman Charlotte was not locked up for not finishing her work; that she had done her work, but was locked up for absenting herself for three days; viz. from 17th to 19th instant. That Mr. Koert, the Assistant Protector of the district, met her wandering about, and confined her in his hospital until he sent for him (Dunkin); that on Monday evening last she was absent from pulping coffee, and consequently was locked up last night; that last month she was also absent for a week. <i>Questioned</i>—When they are locked up, are they supplied with water and victuals?—Yes; either myself or the overseer see it given to them, at noon and in the evening. Mr. Dunkin denies her (Charlotte) being confined for a longer time than that above stated; viz. first confined for three days and nights, for absenting herself; and 2dly, one night confined, for having been absent from coffee pulping in the evening. Mr. Dunkin further states, that he offered the first mentioned complainant, as well as others of the women who had not completed their work, not to lock them up if they made up the deficiency on the following days; some did so, but others would not, and therefore they were confined. Mr. Dunkin, in reply to the complaint of Diana, says, that during the week she completed her work, with the exception of one bed; that he would have pardoned her, but that several of them having left their work unfinished, he was obliged to notice her deficiency also; that plantains and water were given her in the manner already mentioned; that the task allotted them was but a fair and moderate day's work for each. DECISION:—The Protector having referred to other planters whose slaves were in the habit of doing similar work, to the same extent, without complaint, satisfactorily ascertained that the Complainants were not required to do more than a moderate and reasonable day's work each, and that they had no just grounds of complaint. Dismissed their Complaints accordingly.</p>

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 18.

Protector of Slaves Office,
26th June 1829.

Appeared *Harriette Lowe*, coloured slave, aged about twenty-four years.—Says she is a creole; lives in George Town:

That she belongs to John Alstrum; that her reputed husband, a free mulatto man, named William M'Intosh, sold her bedstead to his sister for two joes; that he did so at her (Harriette's) own request, to make up some money due to her owner, as she is in the habit of working out; that he (M'Intosh) has not yet paid her any part of the money, and that her owner is pressing her for her wages; that she has repeatedly asked M'Intosh to pay her the two joes or to return to her the bedstead, but he will do neither.

Protector of Slaves Office,
26th June 1829.

W. M'Intosh being summoned, appeared; and acknowledged that he had sold the bedstead at Harriette's request, to his sister, but that he had not yet received payment for it; he therefore requests to be allowed four weeks time, and that he would pay the two joes to Harriette, and he would sign an obligation to that effect. Harriette having signified her assent to this arrangement, the following obligation was taken:—

"I promise to pay to the slave, Harriette Lowe, the sum of forty-four guilders, Hollands currency, on or before the 10th day of July 1829."

Demerara, 26th June 1829,

Witness (signed) *W^m M'Intosh,*
(signed) *P. Power.*

10 July 1829.—Appeared Harriette Lowe again; states, that William M'Intosh had returned her her bedstead; that she had no further claim on him, and that she was perfectly satisfied.—Thus settled.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 19.

Protector of Slaves Office,
July 14th, 1829.

Appeared *Hannah* and her child, from Plantation Walton-Hall, with a pass from the attorney of the said estate:

States, that Mr. Anderson, formerly manager of plantation Walton-Hall, was the father of her child. Mr. Anderson died in 1825, leaving, by will, two slaves and a sum of money to the child, with directions to the executor to purchase the child from the estate and obtain its manumission. The executor neglected doing so, and died some time ago; the property of the deceased is in the hands of the Orphan Chamber, and is perfectly solvent.

Protector of Slaves Office,
July 14th, 1829.

The Protector having obtained, from the Secretary's office, a copy of the will of Mr. Anderson, by which it appears, that two slaves, named Amour and Mimba, and a sum of six hundred guilders to purchase her (Jane) from plantation Walton-Hall, were bequeathed to said slave child (Jean), by said George Anderson her father, and then manager of that estate. Referred the same with the above statement to the Orphan Chamber, and that Board acknowledging the correctness of the statement of *Hannah*, as regards its being in the administration of the deceased;—

The Protector made application to the Board to take the necessary steps to carry into effect the will of the deceased, in as far as it concerned the child *Jean*.

31st July 1829.—Received in Answer:—Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board of Orphans and Unadministered Estates of the Colony of Demerara and Essequibo:—At an extraordinary Assembly, held at the Orphan Chamber, Cumingburg, 28th July 1829, was read, a Letter from the Protector of Slaves, respecting a sum of money bequeathed to a female slave by George Anderson, deceased, her father, with which the freedom of said slave was to be purchased; and also respecting other property bequeathed to said slave, more particularly described in the will of the deceased; whereupon the Board directed the acting Recorder to reply to said Letter, and inform the Protector, that the Board would lose no time in taking the subject into its consideration, and make such inquiries with respect thereto as would most probably tend to the attainment of the object of the Protector's Letter.

A true Extract.

(signed)

H. E. F. Young,
Acting Recorder, O. C.

15th October 1829.—The Protector having received no further communication from the Orphan Chamber on the subject of the foregoing claim, up to this date, addressed the following Letter to the Acting Recorder.

Office of Protector of Slaves,
15th October 1829.

In reference to the Minute of the Proceedings of the Board of Orphans and Unadministered Estates, transmitted to the Protector of Slaves, and dated 28th July 1829, the Protector is desirous of being informed (that he may be enabled to close his half-yearly report) whether the Board are prepared to apply for the freedom of the daughter of the late George Anderson, and to carry into effect the desire expressed in the will of said George Anderson, deceased; it being apparent that the estate is solvent and in possession of the Chamber.

(signed)

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.To *H. E. F. Young, Esq.*
Acting Recorder, O. C.

In answer to which the Protector was informed, that the Board, with a view of complying with the provisions of the will of the said George Anderson, deceased, applied to the attorneys of Plantation Walton-Hall, offering to purchase the slave, *Jean*, for the purpose of manumission; that the attorneys are willing to do so, but require the permission of their constituents in England, for which they have accordingly written.

(signed)

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 20.

Protector of Slaves Office,
20th July 1829.

Appeared *Pompey*.—Says he belongs to Mr. Carberry of this town; that for the last two weeks his master has given him nothing to eat.

Protector of Slaves Office,
20th July 1829.

The Protector summoned Mr. Carberry. 20th July 1829.—Appeared Mr. W. E. Carberry:—Says, that the slave, Pompey, belongs to him. Admits stopping his allowance, in consequence of his refusing to work.

The Protector directed his back allowance to be given to him forthwith, and cautioned Mr. Carberry not to adopt such a method of punishment in future.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 21.

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st July 1829.

Appeared *James*.—Says he belongs to Plantation Lusignan, T. C. Laud, manager; states having been unjustly punished; he says, that on Friday last, he was throwing green megass out of doors, the megass logies being filled up; that on the Saturday he was ordered to the field, and left the green megass of the preceding day out of doors, which he was to carry to the megass logie on the Sunday morning, but that his row in the field not being finished, he was ordered to go and finish it, previous to his receiving his allowance of fish; that he went as he was ordered, and did the work that he had left in the field on Saturday, by eleven o'clock next morning; that on coming home he went to eat, and was ordered to put up in the logies the megass which he had left out of doors on Friday, that he carried megass until six o'clock at night, and carried the heap which was his own, then went with the rest of the people to throw grass; that the buildings driver seeing some of the megass left close the heap that he had to carry, told him that he should go in the stocks; that he (James) had carried his share, and that what was left, was for the man Kervoss, who had been taken away from his work to be sent to Mr. Spencer's with a letter; however, that he got away and did not go to the stocks; the driver reported his conduct to the manager, who sent for him to the field on Monday morning, had him put in the stocks and flogged on the ensuing day.

James says, that he did not deserve that punishment, having worked as much as he could, and having carried his share of megass.

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st July 1829.

The Protector referred the above complaint to Mr. Van Waterschoodt the Assistant Protector of the district, for investigation and report, as also to Mr. M' Rae, the attorney of the estate, residing in George Town, who took James back pending investigation.

Sir, 23d July 1829.

I have the honour to transmit you herewith, according to your request, the complaint of the man, James, of Plantation Lusignan, and the evidence given thereon by Abercrombie, the buildings driver, and Howes, the head field driver of the above estate.

It appears to me, that James's complaint is ill founded, for his punishment is not to be imputed to the cause he has given in his complaint, but to his disobeying the orders that he had received, to be at the mill on Monday morning, which will appear by the evidence of both drivers.

The same evidence will also show, that he stated a falsehood in his complaint, which is, that their allowance of fish was stopped whenever the work was left unfinished.

The drivers declare to me, that it was not the case, but that whenever any one had left his work undone on the Saturday, he was punished on the Monday; and that when any of the people happened not to have finished the task of the Saturday, they preferred finishing it on Sunday, than to be punished on Monday morning.

I must also conclude, from what the drivers say, that James is not a very good character, and has often been punished by his Honor the Fiscal.

I have, &c.

(signed) *J. Van Waterschoodt,*
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

To Colonel Young,
Protector of Slaves,

Examined Abercrombie, the buildings driver of plantation Lusignan; Says, that James was one of the men that were employed from Tuesday to

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

to Friday, to carry the green megass from the mill; that there is six people allowed for that work to each set of coppers; that if they have not by the Saturday put up under the logies all the megass, they are punished on the Monday, and whenever any one leaves megass on Saturday, he finished carrying it to the logies on Sunday morning: that he did not see James the whole Sunday; that when the negroes came to throw grass at night, he asked James the reason why he did not carry megass the Friday previous; that James was insolent to him, and that he told James he would put him in the stocks, and that he was to go back again to the mill on Monday morning to carry megass, and then called out to the man Nicholas to put James in the stocks, but James got away; that the next morning the mill could not be put about, James not being there as he was ordered, and that in consequence they lost time, until he sent another man in his room.

Abercrombie declares, that the allowance of fish is never stopped on account of the field work or any other work not being finished.

Examined Howes, the head field driver of plantation Lusignan; Says, that James was one of the men ordered to carry megass from the mill from Tuesday to Friday; that he was ordered to the field with the rest of the gang on Saturday; that some of the megass was left out of doors, and that they had to put it under the logie on Sunday morning; that James did not do it, was consequently ordered in the stocks by the building driver, but got away; that he had at same time orders to carry megass again on Monday ensuing, but went in the field, and his absence from the mill caused it to be stopped.

Howes says, that James was not punished on account of the megass, but for not being at the mill on Monday morning as he was ordered.

Howes says, further, that James never finishes his work in the field like the others, and whenever spoken to about it, is always insolent; that he had left his work unfinished on Saturday, went to finish it on Sunday, and had done it at seven o'clock in the morning; that he deserved the punishment he received, because his not being at the mill caused it to be stopped.

He says, that six people are allowed to a set of coppers, to carry the megass from the mill.

23d July 1829.

Appeared Mr. M'Rae, the attorney of plantation Lusignan; and states, that having repaired to the estate, to investigate the complaint of James; that the man in question was directed to go as one of the mill gang on Monday morning, instead of which he went a long way aback to the field, in consequence the mill gang was one hand short, and before a person could be had to replace him, the accumulation of megass took place at the mill, which it was left optional with him to carry away or be punished. With respect to the plantation walk on the Saturday previous, the whole gang finished the same task, each individually, as that given to James, by three o'clock, P. M., therefore, there could be no cause for his not doing the same as the others on the day in question.—

Complaint Dismissed.

(signed)

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 22.

Protector of Slaves Office,
22d July 1829.

Appeared *Thomas*.—Says he belongs to Mr. John Milne, of this town, carpenter; that on Sunday last, he was going away with two fowls to his wife, when his master called him, and desired to see the fowls; he then took them from him, and cut off their heads, and threw them in the public road; that he had also two bits worth of yams, which he cut and threw away in the same manner; that he kicked him afterwards in his private parts, "that appears swelled;" and

Protector of Slaves Office,
22d July 1829.

The Protector sent *Thomas* to the gaol, with directions to the medical attendant to examine him; and summoned Mr. Milne the owner.

23d July 1829.

Appeared Mr. John Milne.—Says, that he is the owner of *Thomas*; denies ever having kicked or touched him; that the fowls he states his having taken away, belonged to *Thomas's* wife; that he has repeatedly ordered her away from his premises in consequence

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>and then gave him a dose of salts, and locked him up in the stocks, and otherwise ill-used him by tearing off his hair, "which he, Thomas, produced;" that in consequence he has come to complain.</p> <p>That Billy, Harry, Joseph, Primus, and his (Mr. Milne's) housekeeper, witnessed the above treatment.</p> <p>Thomas complains of pain.</p>	<p>consequence of her trafficking by day and night in his yard.</p> <p>Primus being called; says he belongs to Mr. John Milne.</p> <p>Examined as to what he knows respecting Thomas; says he knows nothing of the matter, and was upon the stelling at the time the circumstance occurred.</p> <p>Harry being called, and examined; says he was not at home on Sunday, the day alluded to by Thomas; that he did not return until seven o'clock at night.</p>

Joseph being called; says he was also absent, and neither saw nor knows any thing of the circumstance alluded to.

Billy states, that he came home on Sunday evening, when his master desired him to put Thomas in the stocks, and take off his wooden leg, and that his master then went away.

Mr. Milne being questioned as to Thomas's hair, which he had produced, and stated to have been pulled off by him; Milne denies having on that occasion, or ever, pulled his hair; that Thomas is a notorious bad character, and is in the habit of absenting himself; that he went away on Monday between eleven and one o'clock, and that he knew nothing of him until he appeared at this office yesterday 22d July.

The medical attendant of the gaol having examined the swelling in Thomas's private parts; states, "that the swelling has been of long standing, and not produced by any kick."

The Protector having reprimanded Thomas for preferring such a false statement against his owner, and for having absented himself without any just cause, recommended him to return to his duty, and conduct himself better for the future.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 23.

Protector of Slaves Office,
24th July 1829.

Appeared *Frances*, a coloured slave.— Says she belongs to Dr. Webster; is a creole, aged about thirty-four years.

Produced the following good, and says she cannot get payment of it from Mr. M'Carty:

Dear Sir, March 28, 1829.

I am owing *Frances*, for washing for myself and workmen, the sum of one hundred and sixteen guilders seven stivers and eight pennings, and the further sum of thirty-six guilders, balance due her from W. Garey, which makes the amount in all one hundred and fifty-two guilders seven stivers and eight pennings (H. cy.)

(signed) *Nath. J. M'Carty.*

To Dr. Webster.

Protector of Slaves Office,
24th July 1829.

Mr. M'Carty summoned, appeared.— Admitted the debt, and promised to pay it as soon as he could collect some money which is due to him.

12th October 1829.

Mr. M'Carty again summoned;— but could not appear, and is now sick in bed; and declared to the messenger of the office, he had been so for a considerable time past, and has not the means of paying the debt at present.

20th October 1829.

Mr. M'Carty was again sent to, and payment demanded under pain of a suit being commenced against him.

Received in answer the following Note:

George Town, 21st October 1829.

Sir,

I am extremely sorry that it is not (in consequence of severe ill health) in my power to pay the amount of the demand you have against me, on behalf of the woman *Frances*, belonging to Dr. Webster; but I trust that in a short time I shall be able to settle it. Hoping you will grant me further indulgence,

I am, &c.

(signed) *N. J. M'Carty.*

This case is, with the consent of the Complainant, who is aware of the inability of Mr. M'Carty to pay at this moment, allowed to lay over for a little time longer.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
No. 24.	
<p style="text-align: center;">Protector of Slaves Office, 28th July 1829.</p> <p>Appeared <i>Jane</i>.—Says she belongs to Mr. Playter of George Town; that she is a creole, aged about 18 years; that she is employed as a washerwoman.</p> <p>Complains that on Saturday night her mistress boxed her, and then put her in the stocks for not having carried the child (her mistress) up stairs after she had washed it; that she did not carry it, as her sister Francina has been in the habit of doing so; and on Sunday morning she was taken out and desired not to go down stairs; she went down to ease herself, and her mistress in consequence put her in the stocks at six o'clock on Monday morning, and kept her there until after one o'clock. "Jane being asked, acknowledges that she did not return to the house on Sunday, after having gone down on pretence of easing herself, but returned early on Monday morning;" that the reason why she did not return on Sunday was, that her owners gave her no allowance of food, and only five yards of cloth for the year's clothing.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Protector of Slaves Office, 28th July 1829.</p> <p>Mr. Playter being summoned, appeared; and states, that the woman in question was very insolent, and in consequence he put her in the stocks, but that she was not there six hours; that she was absent on Sunday without leave; that she gets as much fish and plantains as she chooses, and clothing as much as is necessary.</p>
<p>Complaint Dismissed. (signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i></p>	

No. 25.

<p style="text-align: center;">Protector of Slaves Office, 28th July 1829.</p> <p>Received from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, the following Petition to investigate.</p> <p>To His Excellency Major-general Sir B. D'Urban, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Military Order, &c. &c. &c. Governor, &c. &c. &c.</p> <p>The humble Petition of the black woman, <i>Amelia Phippin</i>, most humbly sheweth, before your Excellency,</p> <p>That she was the first slave that the deceased Doctor Samuel Phippin owned in this colony; I had two boys, children, with him: the two were sent to England by his attorneys here, in this colony, a Mr. Campbell, and Mr. W. Bishop now deceased. I was sent home with them, and got my manumission in England; it was taken out there, and given to me, your Excellency, by master's brother, Mr. Thomas Phippin, and his first cousin, Mr. Samuel Gillen. I came out to this colony again, and remained for the space of one year, and then I returned back to England, as a servant to lawyer Holmes and his lady. When I returned back to this colony, I found Mr. Jeffery here, appointed attorney over Doctor Samuel Phippin's affairs, by his mother in England, to act here. I came to him: he asked me for my free paper; I gave it to him; he read it, and kept it ever since, and would not give it to me back again, your Excellency. He employed me as a domestic about his house, to mind and keep it clean, his furniture, and wash his flannel shirts and drawers, and to feed his feathered stock about his yard; he employed</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Protector of Slaves Office, 28th July 1829.</p> <p>Mr. Jeffery summoned. 29th July 1829.</p> <p>Appeared Mr. Jeffery; and states, that the woman in question had previously applied to the Fiscal, and subsequently to the Crown Advocate, both of whom had dismissed her application for redresses unfounded.</p> <p>The will having been produced this day by Mr. Jeffery, it appears that she was left a legacy of 25<i>l.</i> sterling, or 350<i>f.</i>, not 2,000<i>f.</i>, as she states in her petition to his Excellency.</p> <p>By the account current between Mr. Jeffery and the executors, [produced] in April 1826, she had received the said legacy in England.</p> <p>Amelia Phippin being questioned, acknowledged having received the said sum of 25<i>l.</i> sterling. Mr. Jeffery states further, that with respect to the bedstead, she absented herself, otherwise it would have been given to her; and that it will be given to her upon her going to the house for it.</p> <p>Mr. Jeffery's servant, who also appeared, corroborates this statement as to the bedstead, it being in accordance with the orders given by his master.</p> <p>Mr. Jeffery further states, that the manumission deed executed in Bristol, had been shewn to Mr. Herbert, First Fiscal, and then Protector of Slaves, and that his signature as to its correctness is attached. That when she comes for the bedstead the paper will be given to her, or previous to his departure. That it was retained in his possession until now, only for safety of it.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">That</p>
---	---

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

employed me at twenty-two guilders per month; when he employed me, he told me I was to do nothing for myself. I was obliged to work for him, and to find myself in eating and drinking, and doctors' charges and medicine whenever I required it; he took from me my bedstead, and put it up stairs in his house, and will not give it to me. I beg of your Excellency's interference, and put a stop to his going off this colony, as he has advertised to go to England, and sold off all his furniture, and his house and slaves. I made application since to his Honor the First Fiscal, when he was then Crown Advocate, but never had any redress, your Excellency. I humbly pray and beg, that your Excellency will make him give up my manumission paper, and pay me off my wages. I was living with him for four months, and only had ten guilders for two pieces of checks, and five guilders for one piece of gingham. I was left two thousand guilders by my master in his will, and he will not give me that sum neither. I beg of your Excellency to put me in a way to obtain these articles, as Mr. Jeffery is going off in two days or three from this date. Your petitioner is in duty bound, and ever pray.

(signed) *Amelia Phippin.*
July 27th, 1829.

PROCEEDINGS.

That he (Jeffery) does not owe her one stiver.

Mr. Holmes, with whom Amelia has gone to Europe, appeared; and says, that she conducted herself exceedingly bad, and that she is the worst-conducted woman he ever met with on board ship.

The manumission deed referred to, given up to her this day in my presence.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

The Protector having submitted the foregoing to his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, his Excellency was pleased to make the following Appointment on the same; viz.

Appointment:
This matter having been duly investigated, upon evidence produced before the Protector of Slaves, and Will referred to having been there exhibited: it appears—

1st. Her papers of manumission were then and there delivered to the petitioner; that they had only been kept by Mr. Jeffery for their security, and would have been given to her before his departure.

2d. That the legacy left to the petitioner had been 25*l.* sterling, instead of 2,000 guilders, and that she acknowledged having received it in the year 1826.

3d. That with regard to the bedstead, the petitioner absented herself from Mr. Jeffery's house without notice, or it would have been given to her, and that it is now at her disposal.

4th. That there is no proof of any thing being due to her by Mr. Jeffery, who denies that there is any thing due to her.

(signed) *B. D'Urban,*
Lieutenant Governor.

30th July 1829.

The Protector having read and explained the foregoing to Amelia Phippin, Dismissed the Complaint.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 26.

Protector of Slaves Office,
31st July 1829.

Appeared *Adonis.* Says he belongs to Mr. Gordon, boat-builder at Mahaicony; states, that he belonged formerly to Mr. Rogers' sister; that he does not wish to belong to Mr. Gordon, or to be separated from his wife; that Mr. Gordon bought him about six years ago.

Protector of Slaves Office,
31st July 1829.

Wrote to Mr. Watson, the Assistant Protector of the District, to investigate and report upon this complaint.

Abary, 4th August 1829.

To Lieutenant Colonel Young,
Protector of Slaves.

Sir,

About three weeks past a negro man, named Adonis, belonging to Mr. James Gordon, who resides on Plantation Park called on me, and complained that he had been separated from his wife, who had been sent from the Park to work on Plantation Clonbrock. I sent immediately a note to Mr. Gordon, requesting his attendance; I then heard both slave and master, and after maturely examining into the business, I could not perceive that the said negro had the least cause of complaint. I remonstrated with him on the impropriety of his conduct, and his master told him, that if he was not satisfied, he

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued*.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

he would either give him a pass, or request me to do so, to wait on you. He appeared satisfied, and went to his work. Mr. Gordon has just informed me, that the said man has complained to you, and I think it my duty to state the circumstances, as I now do.

I shall not enter into further details, as Mr. Gordon will wait on you himself. I have, &c.

(signed) *Richard Watson*,
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

6th August 1829.

Appeared Mr. Gordon. Says Adonis belongs to him; that he purchased him about six years ago; that he, Adonis, was never dissatisfied before, nor had he, Mr. Gordon, any cause to be dissatisfied with him. That the woman to whom Adonis alludes, as being his wife, belongs to Mr. Rogers, and lives at Mahaica. That he, Adonis, formed a connection with her, without Mr. Rogers' permission, as she had a husband in town at the time; that, however, Adonis had, and still has, permission from him (Gordon) to go to see her at proper times.

The Protector dismissed the complaint, explaining to Adonis, that he could not interfere, as the woman had another husband before him, and as they (Adonis and the woman) did not belong to the same owner.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 27.

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d August 1829.

Appeared *Cecilia*, belonging to Plantation Industry. That she is a creole, aged about 28 years; says she does not wish to belong to the estate, and wishes to be sold; that she is willing to go anywhere else, but cannot stay on Plantation Industry; and on being questioned, says she has no further cause of complaint.

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d August 1829.

Appeared Mr. Hughes, the attorney and manager of Plantation Industry. States, that since *Cecilia* was last here (on the 23d May last) she had done her work, and that he had no fault to find with her; that she started off this morning and came to this office without any cause whatsoever and that there had not been one word said to her to cause her doing so.

The Protector explained to Complainant that he had no power to cause Mr. Hughes to sell her contrary to his wish; that, as it appeared by her own admission, that she had not the slightest cause of complaint against Mr. Hughes, or any other person on the estate, her conduct in quitting her work was very improper, and that she had rendered herself liable to punishment.

Directed her to return to her duty.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 28.

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d August 1829.

Appeared *Joseph*, belonging to Mr. John Milne, of George Town. Says he is a carpenter; was born in Africa; is aged about 32 years. Complains that last night, about 10 o'clock, his master came home and called him, and on his coming to him, his master said, "the people are to go in the morning down to the saw mill," (which is close by;) that, after asking him, if he (Joseph) had heard what he said, Joseph replied "Yes;" his master then said, "Go away, sir, you are drunk." Joseph admits he had been drinking, but says he was not drunk.

That

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d August 1829.

The Complainant appears to the Protector, to be in liquor at this moment; he was desired to return home, and come back next day.

Mr. Milne summoned.

4th August 1829.

Appeared Mr. Milne and Complainant. Mr. Milne states, that on Sunday night he came home about half past eight o'clock and called all the negroes, as is customary for him to do always, and gave them their orders relative to their next day's work; that Joseph was drunk then, and had been

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>That he, Joseph, saw Billy and his master walking together after he went away; that this morning he (his master) took him to the dock-yard and gave him 25 lashes; that his master says he was insolent to him, but that all the insolence he can allege against him (Joseph) is, that Joseph said, that if he did not like him he could sell him.</p> <p>of this mischief; and that, on account of this and Joseph's excessive insolence and abuse to him, he carried him over in the morning to the dock-yard and gave him twenty-five lashes in the presence of Mr. Stoddard as witness.</p> <p>Appeared <i>Billy</i>, belonging to Mr. Milne, and corroborates the statement of Milne, as to the bad conduct and drunkenness of Joseph, and the punishment he received for the same.</p> <p>Complaint Dismissed.</p>	<p>so from the morning. He (Milne) awoke about 12 o'clock that night, and asked again if every body was in the yard; that he then heard Joseph abusing him, and calling him a damned rascal; that he found that a new pailing had been broken down, and the store broken open and a great quantity of salt fish and plantains strewed about the yard, and that he is certain that Joseph and the others were the perpetrators</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 29.

Protector of Slaves Office,
6th August 1829.

Appeared *Theodore* and his wife *Acouba*, both Africans.—State, that they belong to Mr. Sills, of George Town; that he purchased them lately from Doctor Waddell's vendue.

Theodore says, that his master hired him out to work on Mr. Massey's estate; that he got sick and swelled; and that the manager, Mr. Stennis, brought him home to his master as he was unable to work; that the doctor who attended the estate saw him and gave him some medicine, but it did not cure him; that since his return home, his master has never called a doctor to see him, nor has he given him any medicine, but is always beating and kicking him; that when he first bought him, he told him to go and cut grass and pay two guilders a day; but he told his master, that he had been a fisherman on Doctor Waddell's estate, and was not able to do such work; but that if he would give him a courial and a boy to go with him, he would do better; that his master had him flogged twice in the barracks (jail); the first time he got 10 lashes, and the second 25 lashes; that since he has returned from Massey's Place he has received no allowance of food from his master; but that when he first purchased them, he used to give them two bunches of plantains each a week and plenty of salt fish; that his master gave him a trowsers and jacket, and that he was obliged to sell them to make up his wages, as he could not sell the grass he was sent to cut. Is aged about 40 years.

Acouba says, that her master beats and kicks her; that he gives her fish enough, but only one bunch of plantains does he give for every one in the yard, say five people,

Protector of Slaves Office,
6th August 1829.

Acouba appears to be sickly, and has her nose much injured from disease, apparently of long standing, scrofula.

Mr. Sills summoned to appear the next day, and Complainants desired to go home and return the next day.

7th August 1829.

Appeared Mr. Sills.—Says, that Complainants are his property; that he bought Theodore, Acouba, and their family, from the vendue of Doctor Waddell, about five months ago; that when he found that Theodore would not cut sufficient grass for his horse, he sent him over the river on an estate to attend a distillery, but that from his excessive laziness he was returned to him; he then put him to clean and pull up the grass in the yard, but he would not even do this; that he has frequently cut down the young trees and shrubs in the yard when he was ordered to pull up the grass about them; that as he asked for a courial *to fish*, the work he said he preferred, he gave him one and a boy to assist him, and also a net; and that, after being away for a week, he sold the net and brought home a few fishes on Sunday, which he eat himself; that he has never paid any wages at any time, except four guilders, since he has had him; that they have always had their full allowance of clothes and food; that when he (Sills) had no plantains in the house, he gave them money to purchase them; and that frequently they were too lazy to look for any for themselves, and spent the money as they pleased.

That he has never beaten or kicked either Theodore or Acouba; that Theodore was flogged in the barracks or gaol by order of His

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>people, including her child, about three and a half years old. That her master gave her clothes, but took them away again, saying, that she did not work; that he puts her to pull up the grass in the yard, and that she does as much as she is able, but he is never satisfied; that she is sickly, and not able to do any work.</p> <p>Both Theodore and Acouba say, that when they ask for more food, (the one bunch of plantains not being sufficient for them all,) their master tells them that he does not care whether they eat or not, as they will not work; that they have told him repeatedly they would complain to the Protector of the ill treatment they receive, and he always says, he does not care, that he is Governor and Fiscal himself, and cares for nobody.</p> <p>Acouba further states, that she has a brother who belongs also to Mr. Sills, and that he is sickly, and full of sores; that Mr. Sills bought him so, and that he forces him to work, and puts him in the stocks every night; that Mr. Sills had given him medicine, and had nearly cured him of a sore which he has in his throat, but it broke out again; that from the ill-treatment he ran away, but came back, having got a gentleman to beg for him; that her master carried him to the barracks' gaol to flog him, but Mr. Thompson the Cipier said, he would get into trouble if he flogged him, because he was too sick and weak; that no doctor has been called to him.</p>	<p>His Honor the Fiscal, for his insolence and bad conduct.</p> <p>That they never complained of being sick, although Doctor Smith was attending a child in the yard at the time.</p> <p>That Acouba's brother (Wednesday) has sores, and that he purchased him with them; that he has them dressed, and every care taken of him, but that he runs away, and in consequence he was obliged to confine him for two days in the stocks upon one occasion, and for one night at another time; and that for his insolence he was forced to complain to the Fiscal, who had him confined in the barracks (or gaol) and that as soon as he came out he ran away for a month; that all the work he requires of him is, merely to look after his horse, and tie it up at night, and occasionally to take a basket, and cut a little grass about the dams, which he is perfectly well able to do; that he (Wednesday) has told him (Sills) that if he does not sell him, he will kill him.</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. Sills.</i></p> <p>Sworn to before me, at my office in George Town, this 7th day of August 1829.</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p> <p>The Protector having found the statements of the Complainants, as to insufficiency of food and allowances, and as to their being kicked or beaten, incorrect, dismissed the Complaints accordingly; directing Mr. Sills, however, to provide them with such medical attendance and care as they stood in need of.</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 30.

Protector of Slaves Office,
8th August 1829.

Appeared *Secundo*, an African, aged about fifty years, an invalid.—Says he belongs to Mr. Muss of Demerara River, that he has belonged to him for the last three years, that he has a large sore on his foot (seen) and cannot do the work required of him, viz. to cut shingles; that his foot has not been seen by a doctor, and that he had the sore before Mr. Muss bought him; that Mr. Muss gives him something to wash his sore with. That he requires a thousand shingles a week of him; wishes to be sold to another person. Says the sore has eaten into the bone, and that he cannot walk in the bush; that when he complains of his foot being painful, his master puts him in the stocks for the night.

Protector of Slaves Office,
8th August 1829.

Wrote Mr. Muss to appear, and reply to the above complaint; directing Complainant to be detained in the gaol pending investigation.

13th August 1829.—Appeared Mr. Muss.—Says that the man has been an invalid for the last sixteen years; that he has owned him near four years, that his work is *splitting* shingles, which he sits down to do. That he bought him on purpose for that employment, being an old wood-cutter. His sore is incurable. That he did not put him in the stocks; nor had he ever complained of his sore being worse or more painful; that the doctor has seen him repeatedly, and that the dressing now applied is by order of Doctor Schiermeister.

Sworn to before me.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

Appeared

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>Appeared Liberty, also belonging to Mr. Muss; states, that on Friday Secundo went away with the courial without permission; that the courial is not to be found; and that Secundo was never asked nor did he carry a shingle, but merely split them sitting down.</p>	<p>Complaint Dismissed. (signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 31.

Protector of Slaves Office,
12th August 1829.

Appeared *Josinke*.—Says she is a creole, is aged about forty years; that she belongs to L. Kleyn. That he got possession of her from the boedel of Mr. Berg, deceased, about five months ago. That Mr. Kleyn wishes to put her in the field as he cannot sell her for the sum of eight thousand guilders; that she has always been a house servant, and is not at all used to field work and thinks she is unable to perform it. That she has had four children, one of whom is now free; that she requested her owner either to sell her or to give her house-work, but not to put her in the field. But he has told her, that if nobody will give him 8,000*f.* for herself and her three children she must go in the field.

She requests the Protector to cause Mr. Kleyn either to sell her for something less, or to employ her as a domestic; that two or three people have offered Mr. Kleyn 7,000*f.* for herself and the children, but he will not take it.

Protector of Slaves Office,
12th August 1829.

The Protector wrote to Mr. Kleyn, requesting his attendance in reply to the above, and directed Complainant to be detained in gaol until settled.

20th August 1829.—Appeared Mr. Kleyn. States, that at the request of Mr. Kersting, who was desirous of purchasing *Josinke* and her children, Mr. Kersting had her on trial; that they disagreed about the price, and in consequence *Josinke* being told she must return to the estate, she absented herself for about five weeks, and her coming to this office was the first he heard of her; further, he says, he never intended to put her in the field, as she had always been a house-servant and is pregnant; but as an example, when she is well and the doctor considers her fit, he will put her in the field.

(signed) *L. Kleyn.*

The Protector explained to Complainant, that he could not oblige Mr. Kleyn to sell her; cautioned her against absconding herself in future, and told her that she must merit indulgence by good conduct.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 32.

Protector of Slaves Office,
17th August 1829.

Appeared *Betsy*.—Says she is a creole of Dominica; is aged about twenty-eight years; belongs to Plantation Ogle, east coast. Complains, that the manager, Mr. Deuchar, obliges her to do as much work as any of the strong hands of the women-gang; that she is sickly and unable to do so much; that she is troubled with pains in her head; that the doctor of the estate has seen her, and afterwards the manager said she should go to her work; that being unable to do as much as the others she is locked up every night in the dark room, from Sunday until Friday; that she wishes to be put to work with the weak gang, because she is able to do the work given to them; that when she had been in the dark room on former occasions she only got three plantains and a bottle of water a day.

Protector of Slaves Office,
17th August 1829.

The Protector wrote to Mr. Deuchar, the manager, to call and explain; directing him to bring the certificate of the medical attendant of the estate, as to the ability of Complainant to do the work required of her. The Complainant detained in gaol pending investigation.

21st August 1829.—Appeared Mr. Deuchar, manager of Plantation Ogle, as also Complainant from the gaol.

Mr. Deuchar states, that the woman Bess or Betsy, sometime ago refused to do any work at all, saying she was sick; the doctor saw her, and said there was nothing the matter with her; that she was then allowed to work with the weak gang, but would not even perform the task usually given to the other women of that gang; that she was then sent to work with the strong gang, being perfectly well able to do as much as any of the women of that gang,

PART I.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

gang, as will more fully appear by the certificate of the medical attendant of the estate [here produced]; that as she was frequently lazy and refractory, he (Mr. Deuchar) had her confined on these occasions in the solitary cell, and that the period of her confinement never exceeded two and a half days at a time. That whenever she was thus confined she received nine plantains a day, which were given her three different times in the day, and as much water as she could make use of. That this allowance was fixed for her by the doctor as quite sufficient.

(signed) *James Deuchar*, Manager.

Sworn to before me, at my office in George Town, this 21st August 1829.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

On close questioning the woman Betsey, she admits having received nine plantains a day while in confinement.

Plantation Ogle, 21st August 1829.

The negro slave, Betsey, belonging to this estate, up to the day of her absenting herself, was in good health, and in every respect capable of performing the quantity of work usually required.

(signed) *G. Smith Crawford*, M.D. T.C.D.

The complaint being unfounded and Betsey being able to perform the work required of her, as appears by the medical certificate attached, she was directed to return to her duty, and recommended to be more obedient and regular in future.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 33.

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st August 1829.

Received the following Letter from his Honour C. Wray, President:—

Plantation Richmond, Essequibo,
Sir, 20th August 1829.

I have the honour to enclose to you certain documents which have been laid before me in support of a petition. It has appeared to me proper to lay them before you for your consideration, as they contain statements which, if true, may perhaps call for your interference.

I have, &c.
(signed) *Cha. Wray*.

To Lieutenant-colonel Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure.)

I hereby certify, That I have been residing with my aunt, Mary Lowe, of Lot No. 17 on this coast, since December last, and am ready to depone thereto, if necessary, that I have not seen her since that time one single day sober; indeed she was never sober when she could obtain spirits or money. About two months ago she purchased at the store of Messrs. Adams & Chapman, Plantation Henrietta, *ten joes* worth of different kinds of liquors, and for three weeks after she was constantly drunk, both night and day, until she finished the whole. I have also had an opportunity of noticing her cruelty to her negroes. I will detail a few instances

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st August 1829.

Various other certificates of the same tendency as the foregoing were received; and one stating that Mary Lowe seemed to be deranged.

Protector of Slaves Office,
Sir, 21st August 1829.

I request you will, as early as possible, inquire into the character and habits of Mary Lowe, residing on Plantation Westbury (Lot No. 17.), Essequibo, as it has been reported to me that she is an improper person to have the charge of negroes, and has been guilty of many acts of cruelty towards her slaves, and that she does not provide them with provisions or clothing.

I have further to request, that Maria Johanna Lowe, residing with her aunt, Mary Lowe, be directed to appear at this office, as also a girl named Elvira.

It would be most satisfactory if you could personally ascertain the state and appearance of the negroes, and all evidence relative to their treatment, and, together with your report, be transmitted to this office.

I have, &c.
(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

To Captain M'Pherson,
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

22d August 1829.—Appeared Mr. Bunbury, residing on Plantation Devonshire Castle,

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*PART I.
DEMERARA.Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

instances that came under my own observation:—

In February last she cut the wrist of her female slave Present's right hand with a broken cup, and afterwards unmercifully beat her for having gone to a neighbouring estate to get it dressed; the woman's hand is still so very bad, that it is likely she will never have the use of it again.

In June last she tied up a little girl, called Elvira, by both her hands to the beam of the gallery, from eight o'clock A.M. to one o'clock P.M. and flogged her unmercifully while thus suspended; the girl fainted three times before she was cut down; her hands still bear the marks of it, and her fingers are contracted in consequence. A few months previously she tied up a little boy, called Shigh, in a similar manner, from about nine o'clock A.M. to six P.M. and the boy lost the use of his hands for several days afterwards.

I have seen her repeatedly take a female child about seven months old, belonging to Present, by the neck like a kitten, and throw her a distance of two or three yards on the floor, and over the gallery, to the imminent danger of her life. In fact, there is no species of cruelty which she does not exercise towards her negroes and the little creoles.

I have often seen her chase them with a knife to stab them, and which she would actually have done had they not run out of the way.

Further, for many years back she has not given her slaves any allowance, either in clothes or provisions; the former they obtain by their own industry, and for the latter they are indebted to their neighbours, otherwise they would starve.

In conclusion, I may mention that my aunt has been in town for several weeks past, and her slaves in the house, five in number, have had nothing to live upon since she went away, except what they can get in the way I have mentioned, besides any fish they may catch about the trenches; and it is in consequence of the influence which my aunt's family have over her slaves, that prevents them from complaining to the Protector, of her cruelty and bad treatment.

(signed) *Maria Johanna Lowe.*

Lot No. 17, Essequibo,
10th August 1829.

I hereby certify, and am ready to depone thereto, if necessary, that I have known Miss Mary Lowe, of Lot No. 17, called Westbury, on this coast, for several years past; that she has always (since I knew her) been addicted to excessive intoxication, and when she is in this state, her conduct towards her negroes is such as frequently to place them in imminent danger of their lives; that they have been repeatedly obliged

Castle, of which he is manager; says, he is well acquainted with Mary Lowe for the last twenty-five years; that Mary Lowe resides at Westbury, Lot No. 17; says, that Mary Lowe is a great drunkard; that he has seen her so frequently; that she had a number of slaves, but has lost a great many of them; that from his knowledge of her, it would be a charity to take the slaves away from her; that she sold one some time ago, and has been constantly drunk since, and she does not know what she has done with the money, some she gave to her son, and the rest, he has understood, she spent in liquor.

Question.—Do you think her deranged?
—*Answer.*—No. When sober she is a very good woman; you would not believe it was the same person.

24th August 1829.—The Protector having made inquiry of the medical attendant of the Colonial Hospital, to know whether Mary Lowe had ever been admitted there as a deranged person, received the following certificate from the medical attendant:

“The free coloured woman Mary Lowe was admitted into the Colonial Hospital on the 14th February 1823, by an order from his Honor T. A. Heyleger, First Fiscal, in a state of insanity, and discharged on the 25th of the same month; the cause of her derangement was attributed to frequent intoxication from strong drink.

(signed) “*F. Webster.*”

25th August 1829.—Appeared Mr. John M'Pherson, son of the said Mary Lowe, who came up yesterday from the estate of Mary Lowe. States, That it is a fact she is always drunk; that her negroes, five in number, at Westbury, three attending herself in town, and one working with his brother, who is a mason; that when he left the place, Mary Lowe had made no provision for their maintenance, and that they are dependent upon a niece, who feeds them, and what they can get from other negroes; that they are constantly complaining to him (M'Pherson); that he did not send them to this office, as he was in hopes of getting her placed under curators, and had applied to that effect.

That some years ago there was, as he had understood, a report made to the Fiscal relative to her, and that she was in hospital in consequence, but discharged, as when she cannot obtain liquor she is always very regular; that he is aware that she is, even when sober, a very bad mistress, and that the negroes have complained to him to that effect.

That the woman, Present, complained to him that she had been very ill treated, her mistress doing every thing in her power to make her life unhappy; that she is now obliged to carry her wrist in a sling; that she

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>obliged to take refuge on Plantation Dartmouth, where I was then residing; that she has come to Dartmouth in a state of intoxication in pursuit of them, and chased them round the yard, throwing bricks, broken bottles and other missiles at them; and on those occasions particularly, she abused not only myself, but every person about the place, to such an extent, that I have been obliged to order her off the place.</p> <p>I further certify, that for the last six or eight months I have not seen her one single day sober, and her cruelty to her negroes has increased so much as to call for the immediate interference of the proper authorities.</p> <p>Further, she has no out-buildings, and her negroes sleep in her own house; that in rainy weather she has been in the habit of driving them out of the house (some of them were infants) in the middle of the night to wander about the dams, and after have come over to me for refuge. I may also state, that on recent occasions her behaviour to myself was so gross, that I was on the eve of binding her over to keep the peace.</p> <p>What is herein stated I am ready to make oath to.</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. Mackintosh,</i> Lot No. 18, West Coast, 2d July 1829. Essequibo.</p>	<p>she told Mr. M'Pherson it was occasioned by a broken cup thrown at her, which cut her wrist.</p> <p>Sworn to before me at my office in George Town, this 25th August 1829.</p> <p>(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p> <p>29th August 1829.—Appeared Mr. H. Burton, proprietor of a gang of slaves on the Arabian coast Essequibo. Says, that he knows Mary Lowe, and that whenever she can obtain drink she always gets drunk; knows nothing of her ill treatment to her slaves, but has heard that when she is in that state she is brutal to her slaves; that when drunk, she is wandering about the coast in a most shameful manner.</p> <p>(signed) <i>H. Burton.</i></p> <p>29th August 1829.—Appeared again this day Mr. John M'Pherson, one of the sons of Mary Lowe, and declares that both himself and his brother will go down to-morrow, and take charge of the negroes (his mother's) until proper persons are appointed to take charge of them by the court.</p> <p>(signed) <i>John M'Pherson.</i></p> <p>5th September 1829.—Appeared Elvira. Says she belongs to Mary Lowe; is a young negress; does not know her age; is a creole of this colony; states, that she thinks, about six months ago, her mistress would not allow her to come into the house</p>
<p>to sleep for the night; that she then went to the negro houses to sleep, and next morning her mistress took a hammock rope and beat her with it, first tying her hands behind her back, and fastening her to a beam in the room; that this was soon in the morning, and that she did not untie her until one o'clock; that her mother and Miss Maria were present.</p> <p>Appeared Present, a slave belonging to Mary Lowe, and mother of Elvira.</p> <p>Examined.—<i>Question.</i> Did you see your mistress flog Elvira.—<i>Answer.</i> Yes. She tied her two hands behind her, and flogged her with a rope.</p> <p>Appeared Maria Johanna Lowe, free coloured woman, niece of Mary Lowe, and swore to her certificate of the 10th August last; says, she was present when her aunt punished Elvira; that it is about three months ago.</p> <p>Examined.—<i>Question.</i> How did she punish Elvira?—<i>Ans.</i> She tied her hands behind her, and flogged her with a rope; she (Elvira) was fastened to a beam swinging backward and forward; her head was low, and the rope fastened round the beam; the girl fainted away, and when she recovered she beat her again.</p> <p><i>Q.</i> Was the girl taken down when she fainted away?—<i>A.</i> No. She (Mary Lowe) stopped, and when the girl recovered she beat her again, and the girl again fainted; she was never loosened or taken down till about one o'clock; that the punishment commenced about eight o'clock in the morning.</p> <p><i>Q.</i> Did you make any remonstrance with your aunt for such conduct towards the girl?—<i>A.</i> I did. She told me I had no business with it.</p> <p>Present again questioned. States, that some months ago her mistress, at twelve o'clock in the night, ordered her to come out, and when she was standing by the step, she (her mistress) threw a coffee-cup at her, and cut her wrist with it; that her mistress gives no allowance either to herself or to her children; and that she (Present) is obliged to beg from the neighbours.</p>	<p><i>Q. Was</i></p>

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

Q. Was there ever any complaint made to the Assistant Protector of the district?—*A.* Yes; but that he always desired them (Mary Lowe's slaves) to go away.

Appeared Mr. M'Pherson.—States, that his mother is now in town sick, from drunkenness; that the people are now provided with provisions and clothing, and that his brother remains on the place (Westbury); that when she (his mother) was with them, it was useless to give the people clothes, as she tore them off their backs.

Office of Protector of Slaves,
7th September 1829.

Sir,

In reply to your Letter of the 21st of August, enclosing some certificates relative to the conduct of the free coloured woman named Mary Lowe, I have the honour to report to you, that, from all the documents that have been laid before me, and from the statement of her niece Maria Johanna Lowe, confirmed by her oath, and others, that I consider the woman Mary Lowe to be, from frequent aberration of intellect, however produced, an improper person to be entrusted with the charge of negroes; and that unless some steps are immediately taken by her friends to place her slaves under curatorship, it will be my duty to institute legal proceedings against her for the various breaches of the ordinance for the religious instruction of slaves committed by her.

I have, &c.

To his Honor Charles Wray, Esq.
President.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Received at this office on the 11th September 1829.)

(signed) *A. W. Young,* Protector of Slaves.

Sir,

Essequibo, 2d September 1829.

I received your Letter of the 21st ultimo a few days ago, desiring information respecting the character and habits of Mary Lowe, residing on Lot No. 17, Essequibo; and further, that her niece Maria Johanna Lowe, living at her house, be directed to appear at your office as soon as possible, with the girl named Elvira.

For a great length of time back have had indeed no communication, directly or indirectly, with Mary Lowe. I would certainly like to have no words with her.

I have, agreeably to your orders, directed her niece Maria Johanna Lowe to appear at your office, and the girl Elvira.

I have, &c.

To Colonel Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(signed) *J. M'Pherson,*
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

Protector of Slaves Office, 12th September 1829.

Mary Lowe appeared at this office; and on her being informed of the nature of the charges preferred against her, she declared that they were wholly false and unfounded, and that she would produce a statement and certificates to that effect.—On the 15th September she again appeared with the statement alluded to by her, but unaccompanied with any certificate. She was then again directed to forward to this office, as soon as possible, any certificates or evidence which she may wish to bring forward in refutation of the charges against her: but which she has not done up to this date—25th September 1829.

25th September 1829.—It was this day communicated to the Protector, that in consequence of his Letter dated 7th September 1829, his Honor the President had ordered curators to be appointed over the slaves of Mary Lowe, and that the Protector was requested to ascertain whether Mr. Bunbury (a resident on the Arabian coast) would himself undertake the charge, or name some fit person unconnected with the parties upon whom that trust could with propriety devolve. The following Letter was accordingly addressed to Mr. Bunbury:—

Protector of Slaves Office, George Town,
25th September 1829.

Sir,

It being expedient for the comfort and security of the slaves belonging to Mary Lowe, that they should be placed under the care and direction of some

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>some respectable gentlemen, I am directed by his Honor the President to know if you would have the kindness to undertake the office of guardian over them.</p> <p>Should this be inconvenient, he requests me to say that he would thank you to name any person in that neighbourhood, unconnected with the parties, to whom that trust could with propriety devolve.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">I have, &c.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p> <p>—— Bunbury, Esq. Plantation Devonshire Castle.</p> <p>12th October 1829.—Appeared Mr. Bunbury; says, that in pursuance of the above Letter, and the President's order, he had taken the slaves of Mary Lowe under his care and direction as guardian.</p> <p>The Protector then directed Mr. Bunbury to wait upon his Honor the President for any further instructions he may require relative to his charge.</p> <p>22d October 1829.—The certified copy of the order of his Honor the President, appointing Edward Bunbury, of Plantation Devonshire Castle, curator over the slaves of Mary Lowe, was, on the application of the Protector, exhibited and retained in this office.</p> <p>The order is dated 2d October 1829.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>	

No. 34.

Protector of Slaves Office,
22d Aug. 1829.Appeared *Judy*, with the following Letter from *M. Levy*—

To Col. Young, Protector of Slaves.

Sir,—The bearer is the woman *Judie*, which *Miss Betsy Blake* sold to *Mr. Baynes*, and transferred her and her child over to my daughter, as the woman was purchased by *Mr. Baynes*, on account *Miss Betsey Blake* thought my daughter too good as mistress for the woman *Judie*; and after the signing of the receipt, the woman asked for her bed and bedstead, tables, &c. and which *Miss Betsy Blake* refused to give her, on account of a debt the woman *Judie* owes her.

I beg your kind interference to assist *Judie* in getting her things. Please to give particular orders to the person whom you please to send with her, that she don't beat the woman *Judy* in such cruel way as she did when *Mr. Baynes* asked for her articles. If *Mr. Baynes* had not stopped her, she would, I believe, have broken *Judy's* head. By granting my request, you will, &c.

(signed) *Al^m M. Levy.*

22d Aug. 1829.

Protector of Slaves Office,
22d Aug. 1829.

Judy, being questioned as to *Miss Blake's* beating her, says, no; that she did not beat her; that she, *Blake*, wished to do so, but was prevented by *Mr. Baynes*; but that she will not give up her articles. Acknowledges that she owes *Miss Betsy Blake* about three joes, for goods which she *Judy* trusted out while selling for *Miss Blake*, and that she will pay it as soon as she can collect the money from the people.

Miss Betsey Blake summoned.

29th Aug. 1829.—Appeared *Miss Betsey Blake*.—Says she does not wish to keep the bedstead and tables, &c. and that *Mr. Baynes* told her to let them remain, as they even were not sufficient to pay the money due; that she sold the woman at her own request, and that *Mr. Baynes* promised to see her paid; and that was the reason she signed the bill of sale.

The Protector directed the bedstead, tables, &c. to be given up to the woman *Judy*, who will return to this office, if this order is not complied with.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 35.

Protector of Slaves Office,
27th Aug. 1829.Appeared *Remus* and *Paris*.—Say they belong to Plantation *Blankenburg*.

Paris states, that the task required of him daily is too much, being thirty beds in planting canes; that he endeavours to finish it, but is unable; that the manager, *Mr. Bascom*,

Protector of Slaves Office,
27th Aug. 1829.

Paris questioned.—Says that if they leave off at two or three o'clock, P.M., the time at which the rest of the gang leave off, sometimes they are put in the stocks for not finishing their tasks altogether (say wholly.)

Remus questioned.—Says the beds are in number

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>Bascom, confines him every night in the stocks, if the thirty beds are not finished; that the bell rings every morning at seven o'clock for the gang to go to work; that they are allowed until seven o'clock in the morning to get their breakfast, previous to going in the field; that each bed is one rod; the beds run across.</p> <p>Remus corroborates the above, and says further, that in consequence of the task given him being too much, he has no time to eat his victuals, and that he is often flogged in the morning after having been confined during the night previous.</p> <p>Both also state, that the bell rings at twelve o'clock for the gang to come to their dinner, and it rings again at two o'clock to return to their work; that they do not avail themselves of the time allowed them for dinner because they are afraid, if they did so, they would not be able to complete their tasks; that they did not ask for a pass to come to complain because they knew the manager would not have given them one; that they crossed the river last night in the steam-boat, paying two bits each for their passage.</p>	<p>number twelve, each bed being two and a half wide (a rod is twelve feet), which makes the thirty rods.</p> <p>Appeared Mr. Bascom, manager of Plantation Blankenburg.—States, that the work exacted from complainants was ninety rods, to supply hole cane stumps, the trash being ready hauled through the field for them; the beds are two rods and a few inches wide; that the men did one day fifty-six rods and the second day forty rods; that in consequence he locked them all up in one large room, without stocks, in the top of a large logie; the gang consisted of forty-five persons (males); that since last Monday they have not done more than a day and a half's work.</p> <p><i>Question.</i>—Do you ever refuse a pass when asked for one?—<i>Answer.</i> This is the first instance of their coming here, and consequently I have never been applied for one.</p> <p>Mr. Bascom states further, that formerly they did thirty-four beds, the common work being about 100 rods.</p> <p>The Protector directed the overseer to be sent to this office, to be examined, as also the driver.</p>
<p>States, that thirty beds was the task ordered; Complainants have been in the habit of doing thirty-four beds each per day; that the trash was taken to the spot for them; that it was not planting, but supplying canes.</p>	<p>29th Aug. 1829.—Appeared Mr. Farrell, overseer on Plantation Blankenburg.—</p>
<p><i>Question.</i>—How much did they do?—<i>Answer.</i>—Seventeen beds was what the best did, others not more than fourteen or fifteen; the work was diminished by the manager's orders, in consequence of the weather becoming dryer. Mr. Farrell says further, that five men, who were sent the following morning to finish what the whole gang had left undone in the field, completed twenty-four beds each, without any person ever looking after them.</p>	<p>States, that thirty beds was the task ordered; Complainants have been in the habit of doing thirty-four beds each per day; that the trash was taken to the spot for them; that it was not planting, but supplying canes.</p> <p><i>Question.</i>—How much did they do?—<i>Answer.</i>—Seventeen beds was what the best did, others not more than fourteen or fifteen; the work was diminished by the manager's orders, in consequence of the weather becoming dryer. Mr. Farrell says further, that five men, who were sent the following morning to finish what the whole gang had left undone in the field, completed twenty-four beds each, without any person ever looking after them.</p>
<p>Appeared John, the driver.—Says, that the task ordered on Monday was thirty beds; and the best of the gang did only seventeen beds, and the others fourteen beds; that they have done thirty-four beds each man per day; that the trash was hauled into rows throughout the field for them, previously to their commencing work; that the work is no more than they can do and have done before.</p>	<p>Appeared John, the driver.—Says, that the task ordered on Monday was thirty beds; and the best of the gang did only seventeen beds, and the others fourteen beds; that they have done thirty-four beds each man per day; that the trash was hauled into rows throughout the field for them, previously to their commencing work; that the work is no more than they can do and have done before.</p>
<p>The Protector having investigated the complaint, finds it incorrect as to the work being excessive and the nature of it; and in which opinion (as to the extent of it) he is confirmed by the opinion of an old planter, to whom the Protector made reference; he also finds the complaint incorrect as to the punishment inflicted on Complainants, and with regard to their asking for a pass to come to complain.</p>	<p>The Protector having investigated the complaint, finds it incorrect as to the work being excessive and the nature of it; and in which opinion (as to the extent of it) he is confirmed by the opinion of an old planter, to whom the Protector made reference; he also finds the complaint incorrect as to the punishment inflicted on Complainants, and with regard to their asking for a pass to come to complain.</p>
<p>The Complaint is accordingly dismissed.</p>	<p>(signed) A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 36.

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th August 1829.

Appeared *Judy, Mary-Ann* and *Betsy*.—Say they belong to Plantation Peter's Hall; are creoles, aged from eighteen to twenty-one years.

Judy states, that on Monday morning they complained to the manager that they were sick and unable to go to work; the manager then told them to wait for the Doctor to see them, that when Doctor Smith saw

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th August 1829.

Complainants being questioned, say that they got eight plantains a day each, and a bottle of water, while they were in the dark rooms, but no fish or any thing else.

That the manager's name is M'Lennan. *Mary-Ann* and *Betsy* corroborate the statement of *Judy*.

Appeared Doctor Smith, the medical attendant of the estate.—States, that on Tuesday

PART I.

DEMERARA.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*Report from
Protector of Slaves.

saw them, he said there was nothing the matter with them. The overseer then told them to go to work, but they still said they were sick, and the manager ordered them into the dark room; the next morning the doctor saw them again, and directed the manager to give them salts and barley-water. The manager had salts and barley-water boiled up for them, and gave them a calabash full each twice a day, but they would not drink it (the last calabash full) because this was not a proper way to give them salts; that they ought to have got a dose each with a little water, and then they would have drank it. That the sick nurse, Harriette, and the overseer, Mr. Griffith, brought the salts to them; that they were confined in the dark rooms from Monday morning at seven o'clock until Friday morning at seven o'clock; that the manager wished to put them back into the dark room this morning, but they asked for a pass to come to the Protector to complain, he then told them to go, that he would not give them a pass.

Tuesday the three women in question came to the sick house making ridiculous complaints of sickness; that he examined them and found nothing the matter with them, and ordered them to be sent out from the sick house; that they refused to go; that yesterday morning he was again called to see them, they still complained of being sick. That he then asked the manager what he had given them, he said plantains and water; that he (Dr. Smith) then told the manager, if they would not go out, and persisted still in saying they were sick, they had better be kept on barley-water, and each have a dose of salts.

That Judy was excessively impertinent, and for a length of time he could not get her to let him feel her hand, and that he knows her to be a most turbulent and bad character.

Mr. M'Lennan summoned to appear. Complainant directed to return to the estate.

29th August 1829. — Appeared Mr. M'Lennan, manager of Plantation Peter's Hall; produced certificates that the doctor's prescriptions had been attended to, and

that two of them, Judy and Mary-Ann, were very insolent; and they concluded by saying that neither the doctor nor the attorney could do any thing to them.

States, that they were never put in the stocks but from insolence; two of them, viz. Mary-Ann and Judy, were put in solitary confinement, and that he attended them himself to see that they were provided with what was necessary for them, and that he did give them a pass; he further says that they threw away the barley-water which was offered them.

The Protector finds the Complaint incorrect, and dismissed it accordingly.

(signed) A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 37.

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th August 1829.

Appeared *Billy*, belonging to John Milne, carpenter; is a creole, aged about thirty-six years.—States, that the day before yesterday he was flogged for a bunch of plantains, his own allowance, which he sold to buy tobacco, as he was going to the country, and had no money; that he was flogged the moment he told his master about the plantains: this was on Wednesday at twelve o'clock in the day, at the dock-yard; that it was in the yard of the house (his master's) that he told his master about the plantains, and he then took him to the dock-yard and gave him ninety-one lashes. That he was not tied down, but lay down himself; that hardly a day passes but his master cuffs him, and therefore he prays to be sold.

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th August 1829.

Billy Questioned.—Who was present?—*Ans.* Mr. Johnson, a coloured man, who works there; Mr. James, a carpenter in the yard, a white man, and all the negroes; Francis, Robin (the driver) who punished him, and William.

Mr. Milne summoned to appear.

His housekeeper stated, that he was in the country, and that she would send for him. The other witnesses also summoned. Mr. James was also absent at the time.—Complainant sent to gaol pending investigation.

31st August 1829.—Appeared Robin, says he is driver to Mr. Stoddard of the dock-yard;—States, that he flogged Billy by Mr. Milne's orders; cannot say how many lashes Billy got; Mr. Milne counted them himself.

Examined.—*Ques.* How many do you think he got?—*Ans.* I cannot say, I thought he got plenty.

Appeared Mr. James, a white man, carpenter in the dock-yard.

Examined.—*Ques.* Did you see Billy flogged?—*Ans.* No, I did not see him flogged, I saw Mr. Milne bring him there.

Appeared Mr. Johnstone, a free coloured man, and boat-builder in the dock-yard of Mr. Stoddard.

Examined—

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
—
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

Examined.—*Ques.* Did you see Billy flogged?—*Ans.* No, I knew nothing of it, I was attending my work.

Ques. Were you near enough to hear the whip?—*Ans.* Yes, I could see if I choose, but paid no attention to it.

Ques. Did it appear to you that the man was getting many lashes?—*Ans.* I dont think more than fifteen or twenty.

Sworn to before me this 31st August 1829.

(signed *A. W. Young*, Protector of Slaves.)

Appeared Francis, a Slave belonging to Mr. Stoddard.

Examined.—*Ques.* Did you see Billy flogged?—*Ans.* I was present working.

Ques. How near were you?—*Ans.* I was in the shed, Mr. Milne was on the dam flogging him.

Ques. Were you near enough to hear the lashes?—*Ans.* Yes, and I saw them.

Ques. How many did he get?—*Ans.* I cannot say, I cant understand to reckon.

Appeared William, a slave belonging to Mr. Stoddard.

Examined.—*Ques.* Did you see Billy flogged?—*Ans.* No.

Ques. Were you in the yard?—*Ans.* No, I knew nothing about it.

7th September 1829.—Appeared Mr. Milne; and the complaint of Billy being read to him, he states that as he was going to the country, he issued their week's allowance to the negroes; that he punished Billy for selling his allowance, and breaking open the back of his own room to get out; that he counted the stripes himself, and is ready to swear that he received not one more than twenty-five lashes; that after he ordered Billy to the boat to go to the country, he (Billy) took his things away and put them (his tools and clothing) into the boat, and that he has never seen him (Billy) since, nor another man who was with him, named Thomas; that Mr. Stoddard, the owner of the dock-yard was from home, that when he took Billy to the dock-yard to be punished, he mentioned aloud, I am going to punish a man, you will all see it.

Sworn to before me at my Office in George Town, this 7th September 1829.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

Dismissed.

No. 38.

Protector of Slaves Office,
2d September 1829,

Sir,

With due respect I beg leave to inform you, the boy *Thomas Parkinson*, my son, were employed by Mr. Sangevin as brick-layer; during that period he absconded himself from his employer, went off the colony without my approbation; however, finding his situation rather different to what his expectations were, he understood the 25th regiment were destined for this Colony; he immediately made application to Major Chambers, of said regiment, who employed him, or rather had compassion on him, after relating his distresses to him; through his ungratefulness caused Major Chambers to discharge him without giving him a character; he has employed himself to Dr. Bascom, which is much against my inclination of his being there, knowing of his former treatment of him—having bound him with a cord to send to the barracks (gaol), unknown what his crime were; without giving him any remuneration for his

Protector of Slaves Office,
2d September 1829.

The foregoing was brought to this office by Susan Grundy, who with her children and family have been living in a state of reputed freedom for many years, and for whom regular letters of manumission are in progress in this office, the Crown Advocate being appointed curator over them for that purpose.

Complainant produced the following account against Dr. Bascom:—Thomas employed by Dr. Bascom, 21st Aug. 1829, to 3d Sept. being 12 days, at 2*f.* 10 *stivers* per day, is 30*f.* She says that Thomas does not wish to pay his hire to her.

Dr. Bascom summoned—

4th August 1829.—Appeared Dr. *Bascom*.—states, that Thomas was first employed by him about 12 or 18 months ago; he left his employ and was very insolent; that about a fortnight ago he met him, Thomas,
as

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>his services; recently, Dr. Bascom has employed him, and by his request I have been waiting upon him day after day, repeatedly, and to no purpose; seemingly not inclined to pay the hire of the boy Thomas, and his insulting language to me, yesterday, saying he did not care for any person of the office I should bring, as I cautioned him of bringing a dienaar to have him out of the yard.</p> <p>Dr. Bascom is indebted to him about twenty months ago, for hire as a domestic, 8 dollars; and not being able to pay so long a time, how can he pay the latter debt, which is twelve days from this date.</p> <p>You will oblige me to have him brought forthwith, and correct him as he deserves, as what he earns is to buy clothing for his own use, and I should esteem it a favour done.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">I am, &c.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) Susan Grundy.</p> <p>To Lieut.-Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves.</p> <p>P. S.—It is against my inclination going to his honor the Fiscal, or giving him trouble about the matter.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) S. G.</p>	<p>as a porter, and employed him to go to the country; that after paying him he asked him if he had any objection to return to his employ, which he agreed to do; that previous to leaving him (Bascom) in the first instance, he had half a month's hire due, which he, Bascom, has paid; that the mother is desirous of having the wages paid to her, which Thomas is unwilling to do, but would give her part; that she has a husband, and he, Thomas, thinks it hard he should be compelled to give her his money.</p> <p>On inquiry it appears that Complainant lives with a coloured man; that they are drunken characters, and would squander the hire of her son, if given to her; it also appears that Thomas's hire is paid to him regularly; that he is old enough to do for himself, and earns his own livelihood.—The Complaint is therefore dismissed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(signed) A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 39.

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d September 1829.

Appeared *Dickey*.—Says he belongs to Plantation Blankenburg, Mr. Bascom manager; that he is an African, aged about 30 years; is a punt captain.

States, that about three weeks ago Mr. Bascom found fault with him for not having brought the last punt load of canes home from the field in proper time. This was on Saturday, and the reason why he did not bring the punt home in good time was, because the people had not done cutting the canes and loading the punts until eight o'clock at night; that when the gun fired they (the gang) were still in the field carrying the canes they had cut that day, to the punt to be brought home; that Mr. Bascom put him in the stocks in the dark room that night, both feet, and kept him there until Monday morning; that he then brought him out to be flogged, but Dickey tried to excuse himself by saying that it was not his fault that the punt was not home soon enough; the manager then caused the driver Edward to give him two lashes only, and then had him confined in the sick house, saying, that he, Dickey, was drunk, and that he would flog him when sober; that he was kept in the stocks in the sick house until Wednesday morning, then brought out and flogged by the driver John, in presence of the overseer; does not know how many lashes he got, nor the name of the

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d September 1829.

The Protector directed the Complainant to be detained in the gaol pending investigation, and to be seen by the medical attendant of the gaol, Dr. Webster, in order to have such remedies applied (his back being sore) as the doctor may deem necessary; and wrote to Mr. Bascom to appear in reply to the complaint.

5th September 1829.

Appeared Mr. Bascom, manager of Plantation Blankenburg.—States, that the gang did not work after the usual hour, six o'clock, as can be proved by the overseer on the estate; that on the 8th of August last, Dickey was acting as punt driver, and that from his idleness and neglect the mill was obliged to be stopped, and, consequently, two sets of boilers, by his not bringing home canes in proper time; that for this offence he received twelve stripes on Tuesday following, the 11th August, as per Punishment Record Book, (produced) in presence of S. L. Bascom; that Dickey was very insolent at the time, and that in consequence of this he received seventeen stripes over his shoulders with a cat on the 26th August, in presence of J. G. Horsham, V. D. Punishment Record Book; that Dickey was then sent to his work, and that between that period, 26th August, and Tuesday last, he has been guilty of great neglect of duty in two particular instances, namely,

as

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>the overseer, because he, the overseer, is a new comer; that he was then carried back to the sick house, and put one foot in the stocks, where he was kept two weeks until he was healed; that on Monday last week he had him taken out again, and flogged with a cat over the shoulders, and gave as a reason for doing so, that Dickey was insolent to him; says he was not insolent to the manager, but merely said that he was unjustly punished, for that whenever any of the other negroes committed an offence they were not punished with the long whip, but only switched; the manager then sent him to his work in the field; he worked for one week and got fever; he went to the manager and told him of it; the manager asked what gave him fever, he replied, the sore back he had from the licks he had received, with the effects of the hot sun and rain upon it. The manager then called the sick nurse, and desired him to give him, Dickey, a dose of salts, and put him in the stocks; this occurred yesterday morning; that he was taken out this morning to clean the hospital pots, and made his escape to come here to lodge his complaint; that he was flogged over the shoulders by the driver Edward, in presence of the overseer before mentioned.</p>	<p>as liner of the estate, and again, as punt driver, as will fully appear by the two certificates produced; that on Wednesday morning Dickey complained of being sick, and he, the manager, ordered him to the sick house; that on visiting the sick house sometime afterwards, he asked Dickey what the matter was with him, upon which he replied in a most rude and unbecoming manner, that he had fever from the licking he gave him. Mr. B. then inquired of the sick nurse if he, Dickey, had fever, he said, no; that he, Bascom, then directed Dickey to be confined, intending when the doctor came he should see him; that the next morning when the doctor came, Dickey had absconded, and was not to be found, having been let out by a man who was in the sick house with sores, and who also absconded; that after the first flogging on the 11th, Dickey being sore from the stripes then inflicted, he was kept in confinement in the sick house until they were cured.</p> <p>That in the first instance, Dickey was confined in the stocks on Sunday morning the 9th inst. to prevent his escaping, and for the purpose of being flogged on Monday morning. He made violent resistance, so that the driver could only give him two stripes, which, added to the very rude language he made use of, led the manager to</p>

suppose that he was intoxicated; he therefore had him taken back to the stocks until Tuesday morning, when the twelve stripes were inflicted; that he has good reason to believe that on bringing Dickey from the place of confinement on Monday morning, the man who had charge of him allowed him to get some rum, as they both went into the cooper's shop on their way to the manager's house.

Quest. Was Dickey well of the first flogging previous to the second being inflicted?—*Ans.* Yes; he was perfectly well of the first punishment before the second was inflicted; that the first was on the breech, and the second over the shoulders.

Blankenburg, 5th September 1829.

I, the undersigned, hereby declare, that I saw the negro man, Dickey, belonging to this estate, receive, on Wednesday the 26th of last month, seventeen stripes across his shoulders with a cat, for being extremely rude to the manager.

(signed) *John G. Horsham,*
Head Overseer.

Plantation Blankenburg, 5th September 1829.

I, the undersigned, declare, that the man Dickey, belonging to this estate, was so neglectful of his duty on Saturday the 8th of August last past, while acting as superintendent of or driver of punts, as to cause the mill to be stopped for canes, and both sets of boilers for want of liquor. I further declare, that Dickey, who is also liner of the estate, spoiled the lining of a field of land last week, by which the work of that field could not go on; and I further declare, that as superintendent of punts Dickey did not do his duty on Saturday and Monday last.

(signed) *Bernard Farrell,*
Field Overseer.

5th September 1829.

(Received from Doctor Webster.)

I certify, having carefully examined the negro man Dickey, belonging to Plantation Blankenburg, by order of Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves, and find that he has received a very moderate punishment on his posteriors, and it also appears that he has received a few stripes on his back, which I think was inflicted with a cat of nine tails.

(signed) *F. Webster,*
Jail Surgeon.

Demerara, 4th September 1829.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

Protector of Slaves Office,
 8th September 1829.

Sir,
 In reference to the complaint of the Slave Dickey, of Plantation Blankenburg, herewith transmitted, with your reply thereto, the following observations occur thereupon:—

- 1st. Working in the field until eight o'clock, if true, is contrary to the 23d Clause of the Ordinance; it is denied by the Manager; but further proof of its not having been the case is required. Field Overseer to appear, and be examined on oath, and also one or two of the negroes, who had been working that day in the field.
- 2d. If necessary to confine Complainant, to prevent his absconding through the fear of deserved punishment, it, the confinement, should have not been accompanied by punishment, it being contrary to the 1st provision of the amended Slave Ordinance. The only difference between Complainant and the Manager, on the point of having united two punishments; viz. feet in stocks in black hole; and the corporal punishment, is as regards the date of the first; for the former says, he was confined on Saturday evening in that manner until Monday; the latter says from Sunday; but the blending of two punishments for the same offence in either case is admitted.
- 3d. If it was necessary to place Complainant in hospital for cure of the flogging, it should not have been accompanied with punishment by stocks; for since both the old and amended Ordinance declare stocks to be a punishment, consequently there was an illegal continuation of punishment, which comes under the first provision of the amended Slave Law, more especially when after being so confined he received a second flogging.
- 4th. The observation on No. 3, applies also to his confinement after he complained of being sick.

GENERAL REMARKS.—There appears an over-severity in the above punishments, independent of their being, in the instances above noted, illegal.

If necessary to place Complainant in the sick house for the cure of the first punishment (twelve stripes), it would appear also necessary to have placed him there for the cure of the second, which exceeded the first by five lashes; and therefore it is probable that the fever of which Dickey complained, was caused by exposure to the weather.

To M. Bascom, (signed) *A. W. Young*,
 Manager of Plantation Blankenburg. Protector of Slaves.

Sir, Blankenburg, 10th September 1829.
 Your Letter to me of the 8th instant, with enclosure, I received yesterday in town, and hasten to reply to the question arising out of Dickey's complaint to you of the 3d instant, and my replies thereto of the 5th instant.

If any of my answers now appear to you obscure or unsatisfactory, I shall feel obliged by your pointing them out.

I do not for a moment deny, that Dickey was locked up in the stocks from Sunday morning until Monday morning, when he was taken out to be flogged. I had no other way of securing the man from absconding than by adopting the measures I did.

I am, &c. (signed) *Geo. Bascom.*
 To Lieut.-Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves.

Blankenburg, 10th September 1829.

Reply to Observations by the Protector of Slaves:—

- 1st. It will be proved by the overseer and negroes now sent to your office, that the people employed here cutting canes, on the 8th of August last, were not in the field later than the hour prescribed by law.
- 2d. We have no "black hole" on the estate, and are now fitting up a new sick-house, the bottom part of which is intended to have rooms of confinement for offenders. The present place of confinement is in one of the coffee logies, formed by nailing up deal boards,

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*PART I.
DEMERARA.Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

boards, but in so temporary a way that a negro who was lately confined there (by merely locking the outside door) forced the boards away, with his *hands only*. It will be proved by the overseer, that from the resistance made by Dickey on Monday the 10th ultimo, it was impossible to have flogged him without marking his whole body; and his violence and rudeness added to the causes already assigned, induced me to think the man tipsy. The object of punishment is with the hope of preventing a recurrence of the offence, at least with the same individual; and such a result cannot reasonably be expected if a man is flogged while under the influence of spirituous liquor. It was under this impression that Dickey was sent back to confinement on Monday, and afterwards received a dozen stripes with a *long whip* on his breech, as already stated.

- 3d. The effects of *this* flogging was visible, and therefore Dickey was sent to the room where men who have sores are confined; and it shall be proved he was placed under no other constraint than any of the other sore people.

It may be proper here to observe, that from the unfinished state of our sick-house, people with sores occupy part of one of the *coffee logies*, and the rooms would not be sufficiently ventilated without leaving some of the windows open; and where the people within had the power of doing so, they were discovered taking in at the open windows messes of food highly seasoned with pepper, salt, &c. to the manifest retarding of their cure; of this fact I can also furnish a certificate if required. That Dickey made use of improper language to me on the morning of the 10th August, will be fully proved by the overseer. One of his expressions to me was particularly unpleasant; he said, "Those people on the estate who I ought to flog, I would not," by which it would appear that negroes here are not impartially treated; an opinion which if once entertained by the gang, would be productive of the most serious consequences to us. It will be proved to you, that Dickey's being flogged over his shoulders with a cat on the 26th ultimo, was because he would not name those people who he thought ought to have been flogged and were not.

I declare, that Dickey never mentioned to me a word about "switching," or offered the slightest excuse for the offences he had committed.

After being flogged with a cat, he was sent—not as stated by him, to "the field,"—but was sent to a field, to line for plantains, which is done by sticking a piece of half-decayed cane in the ground, at twelve feet by eighteen feet; at this work he was employed some days, and spoiled it, from neglect or design—the lining of said field. We then went to sugar making, and he was sent as punt driver, when he *again committed himself as before*, but in neither of the above cases was he punished.

4th. Dickey acknowledges, when he reported himself to me on Tuesday morning as sick, I sent him to the sick house, and *after* going there I ordered him to confinement.

It was some time after sending him to the hospital, that in visiting the sick, and inquiring of each as I went round, what ailed them, that Dickey's rudeness burst forth, but not in the language reported to you; he never said a word to me of his shoulders being sore, nor did he say any thing of the effects of sun or rain; nor did I order him salts, as he states. After the unprovoked rudeness of the man, I inquired of the sick nurse (who is an equally good and capable man) if Dickey had symptoms of fever, he said he had not; and I then desired him to be put in confinement, intending when the doctor came he should see him; however, before the doctor came he had made his escape. Amongst the other falsehoods told by this man is, his being taken to clean the hospital pots; I suppose he concluded, had he told the truth you would at once have seen the little chance we have of detaining those who have made up their minds to escape; and I do assure you, his is one instance of many, and until the completion of the new sick house, I cannot remedy the evil.

I regret the illness of our sick nurse prevents his attending to-morrow, as he can prove all the particulars of this statement, which relates to the sick house, &c. however, if you require this man's evidence in the business, he shall attend so soon as his health will permit; for I feel assured,

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

assured, that on the closest scrutiny into all the circumstances of the case, it will be found I could do nothing less than I have.

It appears to me, that Dickey has preserved a line of conduct which he hoped would at last furnish him with grounds for a complaint. For be it remembered, when he was to be flogged for deranging the whole of our sugar-making, he was rude; he then spoiled the lining of a field for plantains, which is the most simple of all that kind of work, and as he has been the *head liner* of this estate for several years, there is no want of experience; and the very fault for which he had been so recently punished, namely, as punt driver, was again repeated, without the shadow of an excuse for his conduct; and for neither of the two last offences was the man punished. He then reports himself sick, and is sent to the sick house, without a question from me which could imply a supposition of his not being so; after being in the sick house, I merely inquire what ails him, when his answers and his manner is rude in the extreme.

In reply to your remark under article 4th, I beg leave to say, when Dickey was flogged over his shoulders, I did not observe the *slightest* bruise, and therefore the man was sent to his work. You may readily conceive, that having been sent to the sick house, in the first instance, the same measure should have been adopted again, had I for a moment conceived it necessary; and had he, when reporting himself sick, said to me, my shoulders are bruised or sore, I should have felt it a duty to have him seen to immediately.

(signed) G. Bascom

Protector of Slaves Office.
10th September 1829.

Appeared Mr. Bernard Farrell, overseer on Plantation Blankenburg. Says, that the people must have left the field about six o'clock, as they were on the droghery at a quarter past seven with their grass. That he was not in the field on that day; that he was the only overseer employed then; the other two having been discharged previous to this occurrence; that on returning from the field, they, the negroes, are in the habit of stopping in their houses before throwing the grass.

Question. When was Dickey confined?—*Answer.* Next morning, Sunday.

Question. Was he put in the hands or feet stocks?—*Answer.* No; he was put in the top of the logie; there is no stocks there.

Sworn to before me,

(signed) A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

Appeared John, field driver on the estate. Says, that they broke off work at seven o'clock; it was gun-fire when they appeared on the droghery, they had the grass with them.

Question. Did you come from the field with them?—*Answer.* Yes.

Question. Did they stop by the way?—*Answer.* Yes; to look for wood and grass; they had not all collected it, and I told them to go away, and bring it in the morning.

The overseer says, it was in consequence of Dickey's neglect, that there was any detention in not being home at the usual hour; that the two sets of boilers were stopped in consequence of the canes not coming home in time.

Driver Questioned. What is the usual time the people break off work in the field?—*Answer.* They have always task work: the strong hands are all done by three o'clock, and the weaker by five o'clock.

Appeared Lucy, woman driver.—Says, when the sun goes down (six o'clock) they leave off work; being Saturday night they were obliged to bring the canes; the people were late in cutting the canes during the day.

Sir,

Blankenburg, 11th September 1829.

I regret extremely to have been the cause of so much trouble to you, however unintentional.

When I wrote you yesterday that Dickey had been put in the stocks previous to his being flogged, I stated what I concluded to be the case, having given an order to that effect, not thinking the man otherwise secure.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*PART I.
DEMERARA.Report from
Protector of Slaves

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

secure. On the bearer (Mr. Farrel's) return here last night I mentioned to him your observation to me, of its being contrary to law to confine a man in the stocks and flog him afterwards. Mr. Farrel remarked to me in reply, that there was no such infringement of the law, as relates to Dickey; and I now find, that the stocks in the room where Dickey was confined are unfinished, and have not any fastening to them whatever. You may conclude from the circumstances before you, that our system of discipline is not the most rigid; as far as intention goes, I certainly intended that Dickey should be confined in stocks; it is now clear he was not, and I am glad the matter so stands.

I am, &c.

To Col. Young,
Protector of Slaves.(signed) *George Bascom.*

Sir,

Office of Protector of Slaves,
George Town, 22d September 1829.

I have had under attentive consideration your replies to the complaint of the slave Dickey, and after examination of the evidence do not consider that it is a case which calls for further interference on my part. I cannot conclude, however, without drawing your attention to the amended Slave law, which so clearly forbids, under a penalty, the union of two modes of punishment for the same offence; and would therefore recommend, that some means, unattended with confinement in the stocks, be adopted for securing an offender previous to punishment. I regret that illness has prevented my giving a decision on this matter before the present moment; but I was anxious to see the Complainant again, and so expressed myself to your overseer, who was to have brought him here on the following Monday, (it was on Saturday previous that the overseer was at my office) and explain to him what that decision was, and endeavour to excite him to better conduct in future, which I had not an opportunity of doing until to-day.

I have, &c.

G. Bascom, Esq.
Plantation Blankenburg.(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 40.

Protector of Slaves Office,
7th September 1829.

Appeared *Harry*.—Says, he belongs to John Milne of George Town, a carpenter; is a creole of Berbice, aged about twenty-eight years.

Says, he has been runaway for about four weeks; that Mr. Chisholm caught him this morning, and at his (Harry's) request brought him here. That his reason for running away was, that his owner flogged him twice for having remained out of the yard from the hour of six o'clock until eight o'clock P. M.; that he thinks it very hard when he has finished his day's work, and leaves off at six o'clock P. M. his owner will not allow him to go to see his friends between that hour and eight o'clock, at which time he always comes home to sleep; that on the occasions above alluded to, he received twenty-five stripes each time with a cat; that the first flogging was inflicted by Billy in the morning, in presence of Mr. Heyleger of the dock-yard, and the second flogging by Joseph, in the evening at seven o'clock, in presence of Mr. Miller, a carpenter; after this last flogging his master made Billy tie his hands behind, and confined

Protector of Slaves Office,
7th September 1829.

"Complainant appears to be tipsy."

Mr. Milne being summoned, appeared, and states;—that they (his slaves) are allowed to be out until half an hour after gun fire, (half-past eight o'clock) every night; that about eleven o'clock at night he heard him coming in, having previously asked for him; that he always calls the roll at half-past eight o'clock; that when Harry came home he was drunk, and he (Milne) ordered him into the stocks, from which he got out, and has been absent ever since, now six weeks ago; that the punishment he alludes to was some time previous; that he went up to Mr. M'Keand to beg him off, and that Mr. M'Keand gave him a Letter to that effect, which he lost and never brought.

Question. Was he ever punished two days running?—*Answer.* Never; he was punished on the 19th June last for laziness, disobedience of orders, selling his clothes and getting drunk, with fifteen stripes, as per Punishment Record to the 30th June last, sworn to in this office by me on this day; and again on the 15th July last, as per Punishment Record Book. These were the only

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—continued.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>fined him in the stocks both feet for the night.</p> <p>Complainant directed to return to his duty, the impropriety of his conduct being explained to him, and being exhorted to behave better in future.</p>	<p>only punishments by flogging inflicted upon him, from the beginning of this year to this day.</p> <p>The complaint is found incorrect; the conduct being explained to him, and being exhorted to behave better in future.</p> <p>(signed) A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.</p>

No. 41.

Protector of Slaves Office,
 7th September 1829.

Appeared Mr. *Rainy* of George Town:— States, that a woman belonging to him had, for no alledged crime, been placed forty-eight hours in solitary confinement by the manager of Plantation Poederoyne, west coast River Demerara.

The woman is a huckstress, and stopped on the estate Poederoyne.

Protector of Slaves Office,
 7th September 1829.

The Protector considering Mr. *Rainy* the natural protector of his own slave, who had been injured by a *free person*, referred him to his Honor the Fiscal for redress.

(signed) A. W. Young,
 Protector of Slaves.

No. 42.

Protector of Slaves Office,
 8th September 1829.

Received the following; viz.
 To His Honour A. W. Young,
 Protector of Slaves, &c.

Sir,

A woman slave named Suckey, belonging to Mr. Evan Fraser, formerly the property of his late housekeeper, whom I was informed was a native of New Providence, and was brought here and was sold. I became acquainted with her in 1823, she was then a fine healthy looking woman, so much so, that I thought her a free woman by her appearance, and from the expensive dresses she used to bring my daughter to make up for her. I was much surprized when my daughter told me she was a slave, and begged that I would wait upon her mistress in her behalf, to hire her, as she was told the said woman was very ill treated, and was in the stocks to be sent to the country; that she pitied her very much, and had a great liking for her, as she was a very civil and modest person; and to save her from trouble, bid me offer two joes per month for her; that she would pay two months in advance if her mistress would do her the favour to hire her, as she had a good deal of needle work on hand, and knew this person to be a very able seamstress. Her mistress replied, that she was very sorry to disoblige Miss Tinne, but that she meant to punish her, as she was getting too great a lady, and pointed to a room in the yard, saying, my lady is there in the stocks now, waiting till the boat comes down to send her in the country; and she would not hire her to any one for ten joes a month. From that

Protector of Slaves Office,
 8th September 1829.

Mr. Fraser summoned to appear.
 9th September 1829.—Appeared Mr. Fraser.—States, that the woman Suckey is at present in his yard, under the medical charge of Doctor Alleyne; and when the doctor considers her well enough, she is to be taken to his estate in the country. That he is just going to Leguan, and will detail the conduct of this woman on his return.

Sir, 16th September 1829.

I beg leave to state, that the negro slave Suckey, in whose name a complaint is made to you, although I believe without her authority or desire, is of a most stubborn and insolent temper, and altogether a very bad character.

Upwards of two years ago her owner was obliged to send her before his Honor the Fiscal, on a charge of insolence and contempt; and she then gave his Honor such ample proof of these qualifications, that he ordered her on the treadmill, which unfortunately did not produce the desired effect, and she has since been a perfect runaway, wandering character; skulking and secreting herself chiefly about the fort, where she was harboured sometimes by her mother, a worthless drunken character; at others by discharged old soldiers. Her irregular conduct and bad vicious life brought on occasional attacks of sickness; when traced out and brought home in such state, and afterwards brought round by medical and domestic attention and care, and fit to do some duty, she disappeared and resorted to her former bad habits and skulking. She was

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*PART I.
DEMERARA.Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

that time I never saw her or had any communication with her, but heard of her ill-treatment; and in April last the said girl Suckey called at my house to see her mother whom I hired. She looked quite wretched, and was the picture of death itself; she could hardly stand, and in this sickly state she went away that night in the rain, and said if she stopped, her master would report her as runaway; and told, that she was starved and obliged to come out to beg for something to eat. When I told her to tell her master, that if he will let her stop with me, I would cure her for nothing, as she said her master will not pay any money to cure here, nor will not allow her to stop with her mother, who would look after her, and in that state she is obliged to work at her needle. After this, I never saw her again, as her mother had gone from me, but heard she still continued very poorly, and it was not possible she could live. About two Sundays ago, she came in the morning, was sitting in my yard, when my son told me, that poor creature (the daughter of Ann Caiz) was there; when I desired him to tell her to come in, he said he told her; and she said she was not able, and begged me to come to her; when I went I was shocked to see her, and I thought she was dying. I made her some hot sangaree, and made her drink it, but she could hardly swallow. I asked why she came out in that state, when she said, as soon as she came a little to herself, she would state her reasons: she remained all that day, I boiled her some nourishment, which she eat very greedily, and said she was half-starved. I asked her for her mother, and if she was stopping with her, she said she was allowed to stop with her mother for a fortnight, and was just beginning to be much better, when her master sent and fetched her away, and now is going to send her in the country against her will, and leave her mother and her daughter, who is in the family way; and that she would be sure to die if she went there, and will never see them again, therefore she crept away in the night time from her master's house, and came to beg Mr. Bagaly, who, she was informed, is doing writings for people, to write a petition to your Honor stating her case, that your Honor might put a stop to her master sending her in the country, which Mr. B. promised to do, and had commenced, but his having so much other business to do, he could not then finish her's, especially as she was in such a weak state, she would not be able to reach your Honor's house. Mr. B. told her she had better remain a few days until she was stronger to walk to your Honor, for she was in a dreadful state in the bowels. I proposed sending to her owner, when she cried and begged I would not, as he would immediately send for her, and that the very sight of their coming for her, would frighten her to death; and that I was not aware what a bad man he was, and perhaps he would bring me in trouble for harbouring her. I considered what she said was correct, and I thought better of it; it was my intention to write your Honor on the subject, fearing the poor creature might die in the interval; this she

PROCEEDINGS,

was attempted to be reclaimed by great care and nursing, both as to health and habits, at one time by Miss Eliza Ross, and latterly by Miss Fanny Dallas, who had kindly taken the charge of her; but she would not be restrained, and proved quite incorrigible, taking herself off as formerly, when able to do so. After one of the last instances of this kind, a report was brought me that she had been seen in some miserable place at the fort in a low state, and I immediately got Doctor Alleyne to see her; this led to the discovery of one of her hiding places, and she decamped, aided and countenanced by the worthless mother and other such characters, not however to return home, or yet to make application to you, but leaving me again without the means of tracing her; and it was then that I applied for the aid of the police, and by whom she was found on the premises, and harboured by Maria Tinne, who I am told treated Mr. Padmore very shamefully in the discharge of his duty on that occasion.

Sukey's excuse for withdrawing herself from my own yard, was a knowledge of my intention of sending her to my estate on Leguan, which I determined on in the hope of her benefiting in health, and keeping her away from her mischievous society and haunts, and this is still my intention; in the meantime she continues here under the medical charge of Doctor Alleyne, with every necessary domestic attention, which she always had to resort to, and never in any instance signified to me any want or neglect; as soon as she has sufficiently recovered her health, it is my intention to afford her an opportunity of selecting a purchaser for herself, at present she is the property of minor children.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Evan Fraser.*

To A. W. Young, Esq. Protector of Slaves.

Mr. Padmore, the scout, summoned.

Appeared, and being questioned.—Says, that a copy of Maria Tinne's statement has been sent to the Fiscal, complaining of him; declares that the woman Suckey was taken carefully by two Dienaars, and carried to the hospital, and was next morning carried on a cart to her master's.

16th September 1829.

Complaint unfounded. Dismissed.

(signed)

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

also begged I would not do, as she felt herself getting a good deal better to appear before your Honor in a few days, and tell her own story; and as I found she was improving in her health, I approved of what she said; and on the next day, say yesterday, Mr. Padmore and two Dienaars called at my residence in plain dress, accompanied by the hangman and chain negroes.

Mr. Padmore came to the kitchen door where I was busy, and enquired if there was not a woman belonging to Mr. Fraser, by the name of Suckey. I answered him there was a sickly woman come to get a petition wrote to the Protector; when he called out to the Dienaars to take that woman out of the house, and carry her to gaol, which they immediately obeyed; she was then sitting on the upper steps, say ten in number, reclining her head on the bannister, when they tore her down and carried her in the yard, where she got a fit. I told the scout, Mr. Padmore, that he acted very inconsistent in regard to the regular rules of his situation; that if he came on duty he should have been in the dress of a scout, also his Dienaars in their uniform, and should have shewed his warrant, authorizing him to act as he did, and that I would certainly represent his conduct to the Fiscal. On my endeavouring to prevent the Dienaars from handling the poor sick creature so roughly, as she was to all appearance dead, in their hands, having from fright fainted, and was stiff, and hearing every one about cry out, Oh she is dead! I entreated him to leave her, and perhaps she would recover; when Mr. Padmore pushed me away, and told the Dienaars to take this woman to gaol; when I told him, it was more than he dare do in justice without the Fiscal's order, and that if he shewed me that, I would walk with him, and that I was acquainted with the laws. I entreated him to leave the woman, that I would stand the consequences, which he refused, although I had mentioned to Mr. Padmore the very delicate situation she was then in, and was exposed to the eyes of the spectators; and even one of the Dienaars cried out, W'ont some of you women give her something to cover her shame, as she is a female like one of yourselves; when a free coloured woman named Charlotte Jaimason gave her a gown to wrap round her, and in this manner they carried her head and feet by the Dienaars and chain negroes to the gaol; and at the same time I addressed the Rev. Mr. Hynes, who was passing, and begged him as priest that he would follow and enquire into her state, and represent it to justice. I also addressed a Mr. Lawrence, who was looking on, and begged him to witness the disgraceful manner they were taking the poor creature to gaol. I respectfully beg leave to annex part of her own statement to your Honor, which, owing to her situation above-mentioned, was the reason of its not being complete.

I beg to apologize for this long detail, but I consider it a duty I owe to the poor negro, and to exculpate myself for thus interfering.

I have, &c. (signed) *Maria Tinne.*

Demerara, Friday morning, 4th September 1829.

(Enclosure.)

To his Honour Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves, &c.

The Humble Petition of Suckey Fraser,

Most respectfully showeth,

That your Petitioner is a native of New Providence, and was sold here to a coloured woman, named ———, who lived housekeeper with Mr. Evan Fraser; that her mistress allowing her to work out, your petitioner met with a friend in a Mr. Daley, the lawyer, now residing in Berbice, who paid her hire, and was very kind to her; and gave her money to purchase merchandize, which she might sell and profit thereby, as she kept his house. He hired persons to sell her goods, such as cakes, bread &c. and was doing very well, when her mistress desired her to come home, stating, that as she can work for herself, she can do so for her. When she begged and prayed her mistress to allow her a little time longer to sell off her goods which she had on hand, as some of them were perishable, which her mistress considered to be a great offence, and had her brought home, and said she was getting to be too great a lady, and that she would abate her pride; and sent your petitioner to the tread mill,

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

mill, where she was punished severely, and for upwards of a week went on it three times a day, during which she fainted away several times; and one day they worked her so severely that she got fits, and Dr. Webster said, if they worked her any more she would die; that they were obliged to carry her in the barracks (jail) hospital, where she lay ill for a week and upwards, and afterwards she was put back again on the tread mill, and flogged severely each time; as she was so very weak that she fell several times. That Dr. Webster happened one day to see her when she again got fits, and was in a shocking state, and in a situation not to be expressed but to be understood; he said, that if they worked your petitioner any more she would certainly die, when she was again sent in the hospital; and when she was able to come out, she was kept in the stocks in the jail for a length of time. She still continued very poorly, when her mistress took her out, cut her hair, as she had long hair, and put her in the stocks, and would not suffer her mother or child, or any one to see her; from thence she was sent in the country, tied, without seeing either her mother or child, (both free,) and was put in the field, with orders to be kept very strict; and orders given that neither her mother or daughter should be suffered on the plantation. From her weakly habit, and in the field where she was put, not being accustomed to be exposed to the weather, she took a cold, so that she got an obstruction, and was again at death's door; and what she suffered on the tread mill quite deadened her limbs, and was put in the stocks. She got away, and came to town, and knowing Mr. Robinson, the collector, she went and stated her grievances to him, who gave her a Letter to your Honor. At this time her cruel mistress died, and Mr. Fraser treated her just as bad, for which she was obliged to complain.

Demerara, September 1829.

No. 43.

Protector of Slaves Office,
10th Sept. 1829.

Received the following Letter:

Demerara, 9th Sept. 1829.

To Colonel Young, Protector of Slaves, &c.
Sir,

I am informed by my slave *Cæsar*, who is now confined in the colonial jail for having absented himself from my service, that he has been employed for about eleven weeks by a baker, who lives near the fort; and his Honour the Fiscal having referred me to you for redress, I beg to bring it before you, requesting you will be good enough to summon the negro to your office, when the name of the person who hired him can be ascertained.

I have, &c.

(signed) *William Smith.*

Protector of Slaves Office,
10th Sept. 1829.

Mr. Smith attended, and says, that his slave stated to him; that he had been employed by a man named Andrew, and that he has no further proof of it than what the slave himself says. Directed Mr. Smith to call in the morning with the slave. Summoned Andrew.

11th September 1829.—Appeared Mr. Smith, with the slave *Cæsar*.

Cæsar says, that Andrew hired him at the rate of six bits a day; and that he worked with him making bread; and that he made a peel for him; that he is a carpenter by trade; that Andrew's own people are witnesses, and can prove it.

Appeared Andrew, a white man, a baker.—Says he is employed by the contractor for baking for the troops; that he receives

four guilders a day wages; and that the contractors find two men (their own slaves) to assist him; declares that he never hired or had any thing to say to the man, *Cæsar*; and brought the two men, who assert the same as Andrew.

The Protector dismissed the Complaint of *W. Smith*, there being no proof that Andrew hired or harboured the slave, *Cæsar*.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 44.

Protector of Slaves Office,
14th Sept. 1829.

Appeared *Wednesday*, an invalid, with sores.—Says he belongs to Mr. Sills, of George Town; is an African, aged about twenty-eight years.

Says, that yesterday about eleven o'clock his master desired him to go and buy plantains, and gave him the money; that the plantains were for his own allowance; but that he told his master, that from the sores on his head and body he could not bring the plantains home; that his master then laid hold of him by the hand and cuffed him once, and then put him in the stocks; upon which he said to his master, that he put him in the stocks for no cause; that his master then gave him a kick, saying he was insolent to him. That on Friday the doctor saw him, and said his sores were bad enough, and sent some dressing for him; that his master dressed his sores himself on Friday, but since that has given him no more of the dressing; that he has had sores since he belonged to Dr. Waddell, from whom Mr. Sills bought him.

Protector of Slaves Office,
14th Sept. 1829.

Mr. Sills being summoned, is reported sick and unable to attend; was called upon at his house, and states,

That he gave *Wednesday* money to go for plantains for his allowance, but which he positively refused to do, and told him (Sills) to send his (*Wednesday's*) sister; he replied, no; that she must attend to her husband's remains (who was dead); and that he was able to seek his plantains. Says, that Dr. Smith saw him on Saturday, and that he dressed him himself; and that being impertinent he had to put him in the stocks, and on his return from church found the stocks broken and *Wednesday* off.

Reference being made to Dr. Smith, as to *Wednesday's* state of health:

Dr. Smith states, he was visiting another man belonging to Mr. Sills, who was sick, when Mr. Sills asked him to see the man in question (*Wednesday*) also, as he having a few small sores. That he saw him and desired particular attention to be paid to him, and every indulgence granted, as he considered him in a very bad state of health,

and ordered him to be put under a course of medicine. That on going to see the other man yesterday, he learnt *Wednesday* was in the barracks (jail), in consequence of having broken out of the stocks, where he had been put for not carrying plantains; that he immediately advised he should be released, as he considered him unfit for any labour.

And as Mr. Sills has no hospital or means of taking proper care of him, recommends he (Complainant) should be put in the jail hospital.

The Protector wrote Mr. Sills, as follows:

Protector of Slaves Office, 14th Sept. 1829.

The Protector of Slaves has sent the slave, *Wednesday*, to the jail hospital, with directions that he be attended by the medical attendant, as his situation requires immediate and proper care, and which has been previously signified by a medical gentleman to Mr. Sills. Mr. Sills' attendance at this office, when he is equal to it, is required.

22d Sept. 1829.—Appeared Mr. Sills.—States, that the man in question was only required to carry his own plantains, for which purpose he gave him the money, and that he refused doing so, and came to this office to complain; that he saw *Wednesday* subsequently to this carrying a large tray upon his head, for some person or other, which was very heavy, so much so that he (Sills) could scarcely lift it. That he pays him every attention, and that he has his sores dressed.

Desired Mr. Sills to call next day.

Demerara, 23d September 1829.

I certify having carefully examined the negro, *Wednesday*, by order of the Protector of Slaves, and find that he is in a deplorable state with scrofulous ulcers, particularly his head and neck; and from the rapidity with which the ulcers have spread, I much fear that he will never be of any service to his owner.

(signed) *F. Webster.*

Appeared Mr. Sills.

The Protector directed Complainant to be left in the gaol hospital for the present, with a view to his bettercare.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 45.

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st September 1829.

Appeared *Acouba*, belonging to Mr. Sills.—States, that her master is too bad; that Saturday night he went out and locked up the rooms of his house; when he returned he said he had lost his money, two joes; he desired her to search, and said she must find it; she did search, and told him she could not find his money; he then said he would put her in the stocks and go for people to carry her to the barracks (jail); that on Sunday he wanted to carry her there, (to the barracks); that she got away from him and is come here to complain:

That on Friday night he beat her with a stick; that Goodluck saw him beat her and several people heard her crying; that Mr. Walker (a neighbour) and the doctor said, if she did not make a complaint she would be killed; that she is sick now:

That Saturday night he took his pistols down, loaded them and said he would kill her:

That Miss C. Philips saw him beat her.

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st September 1829.

Complainant appears to be in the same state as when here before on the 6th August last, with sores. Mr. Sills summoned to appear; also the witnesses, Mr. Walker and C. Phillips.—Complainant sent to the jail hospital.

22d September 1829.—Appeared Mr. Sills.—Says he went to sleep in the hall on Saturday night; when he awoke he went to his room, and on Sunday morning missed the money, and told *Acouba* as there was no person in the house but herself, she must bring the money or go to the barracks; says he never beat her with a stick or any thing else; that he merely touched her with a whip, but did not beat her; says he never took down or loaded his pistols, or touched her life:

That after he was dressed and going to church on Sunday, he found the two joes lying on the step of the gallery; that a gentleman who had called for him and came up the steps of the gallery, a little time previously, declared that he did not see the two joe paper on the step when he came up;

so that the woman must have put it there, in order to its being found by him (Sills,) when she found it had been missed by him.

Appeared Mr. Walker, and being questioned; states, that he is not aware that the woman *Acouba* was beaten by Mr. Sills, and never told her any thing about going to complain.

22d September 1829.

Sir, To the Protector of Slaves.

In obedience to a summons received from you yesterday afternoon at five o'clock, to give my statement of what I know concerning the woman *Acouba*, belonging to Mr. Sills, I take this method, being very lame from rheumatic affection, merely to add, that I am totally ignorant of any difference between the woman and her master, nor was I witness to any punishment on his part.

I am, &c.

(signed) *Christina Philips.*

23d September 1829.

I certify having carefully examined the negress *Acouba* by order of the Protector of Slaves, and find that her right cheek with that part of her nose, are very much deformed, owing to severe ulceration; her right eye is in a very high state of inflammation, and without great care is observed she will certainly lose it.

(signed) *F. Webster,*
Jail Surgeon.

29th September 1829.—Appeared Mr. Sills, who having engaged to have his slaves Wednesday and *Acouba* properly attended by a medical attendant in his own house; and stated, that the expense of keeping them in the jail hospital was too much for him to pay. The Protector directed them to be given over to him under these conditions, provided the medical attendant of the gaol considered them fit to leave the hospital.

The slaves were given over to Mr. Sills, he being directed to comply strictly with the above engagement, and to take every care of them.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

October 13th, 1829.—The Protector having made reference to Doctor Smith, who attends Mr. Sills' negroes, Doctor Smith states, that he attends them regularly, and that they receive every necessary care and attention.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 46.

Protector of Slaves Office,
24th September 1829.

Appeared *Matilda*.—Says she belongs to Mr. Holmes of George Town; is a domestic.—States, that her master licked her yesterday with an umbrella stick, across her shoulders, arms and head, for not having the dinner cooked in proper time; he then stripped her of her clothes and burnt them, and left her quite naked; that he has put her in the stocks with her two feet every night for the last week, in order to prevent her from leaving the yard, and that he only gives her one bit a week for allowance.

Protector of Slaves Office,
24th September 1829.

M. Holmes summoned,
25th September 1829.—Appeared Mr. Holmes.—States, that on his return home the day before yesterday, his white servant told him that *Matilda* was worse than ever; they locked her up in her room until he (Holmes) came home; that he did then, for reasons which he will explain, break a bit of twig from off one lying in the yard to stick round plants, go to her and reprimand her for her continued bad conduct, and did with that switch hit her two or three times upon the arm; that as to the umbrella stick it was perfectly false. Mr. Holmes also states,

that complaints continually and justly existed against her for indolence, filthiness and running away; and that the reason she gave for not attending the kitchen that day was, that she went to work her frock; that he told her she was always filthy, that every thing he gave her was either sold or destroyed or burnt; and that he burnt that frock, and said that when she behaved better, she would again receive the treatment she had been accustomed to; that she has lately set her face determinedly against working, feigning sickness, as the doctor can prove; has twice run away and hid herself in the bush, avowing, as her own daughter can prove, that she had no reason whatsoever; and on both occasions he (Holmes) had only admonished her to conduct herself better; that one of her daughters, *Amelia*, had been corrupted by her mother's example; that she frequently went away for several days together, and in consequence he had been obliged to hire her upon an estate; that she, *Matilda*, was never stripped of her clothes, as she relates; that she was not put in the stocks every night, but only when refractory, otherwise locked up in a room; that the doctor who had attended her, said her illness was occasioned by eating trash, and that it was necessary to confine her to prevent that; but that she had every thing that was requisite, as her own daughter can testify. That with the exception of the last week or two, she has invariably had six bits a week as her allowance; that when she did not receive money for her allowance she got a sufficiency of food in lieu.

Appeared *Maria*, daughter of Complainant.—States, that when her mother went away, her master did not punish her on her return, but advised her; that the day her master came home when her mother was complained of, and dinner was not ready in time, he beat her a little with the switch.

The Protector dismissed the Complaint, pointing out to Mr. Holmes the impropriety of striking a woman, even with a slight switch, however great the provocation might be, and admonished Mr. Holmes against such a proceeding in future.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 47.

Protector of Slaves Office,
25th September 1829.

Appeared *George*, an African, aged about sixty-five years, belonging to Mr. Campbell of George Town.—States, that Mrs. Campbell gave him several blows with her hand this morning for nothing at all, and that he never receives any allowance; that he never has a holiday all the year round.

Protector of Slaves Office,
25th September 1829.

Mr. Campbell being summoned, appeared; and states, that *George* was asked by his mistress to pull up the grass in a small garden of about fifteen feet long by five feet wide this morning; that he positively refused to do so and was very insolent, upon which his mistress gave him a slap; that *George* then took up a knife to his mistress; that he, Campbell, was then looking out of the

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

the window up stairs at him, and called out to him to desist, and that he would be down to him immediately, that George then walked out of the yard.

That for the last two or three years George has done nothing for him; and that in consideration of his age he allows him to do as he pleases; that he gives him twice every day as much plantains and fish ready dressed as he can eat; but that George wants his allowance in money. That he resides near the church, and that as often as the bell rings George is off thither, and that he is never prevented going.

The complaint is considered incorrect and frovolous and is dismissed, the same being explained to Complainant, and he being recommended to be more civil in future.

(signed) *A. W. Young.*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 48.

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th September 1829.

Appeared *Susana Rogers alias Spooner.*
—States, that Mr. H. M. Tobie f. c. man, a carpenter, owes her the sum of 588*f.* as per account and vouchers herewith; that she has repeatedly demanded payment of the same from him, but cannot obtain any part of the amount; and prays the Protector to enforce payment for her.

H. M. Tobie, Esq.

To Quashy Spooner, Dr.
1829.—To your accepted account, dated 7th Sept. 1827, in my favour - *f.* 598
To amount of your good or order in my favour of same date - - 62

f.660

Contra, Cr.

16th October 1827:
By Cash received - *f.* 25
Ditto ditto - 25
By an order in favour of
Mr. L. Adams - - 22

72

Balance due Quashy Spooner *f.* 588

I hereby indorse and give over to Susana Rogers all my right, title and claims of the above amount, due me by Mr. H. M. Tobie, and do grant and give her all authority to reclaim the same.

(signed) ^{his} *Quashy x Spooner.*
Mark

Witness. (signed) *W^m Savory.*

Susana declares, that Quashy Spooner is her husband; produced the accepted account of Mr. H. M. Tobie, as also the good, both dated 7th September 1827, and attached to the above account.

That Quashy Spooner is himself a slave and a carpenter by trade.

Protector of Slaves Office,
28th September 1829.

Mr. Tobie summoned.

1st October 1829.—Appeared Mr. Tobie, and payment being demanded, he acknowledges the debt and declares his willingness to pay it; that he has been prevented doing so sooner by severe illness.

Promises to pay part of it in one month; says he has no means of doing so at this moment.

Susan Rogers *alias* Spooner consents to allow him (Tobie) one month to pay.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 49.

Protector of Slaves Office,
29th September 1829.

Appeared *Sarah Webley f. c. woman* of this town.—States, that a female slave of her's had been beaten last night by a free black man, the husband of said slave.

Complainant says she wishes to have some

Protector of Slaves Office,
29th September 1829.

The Protector considering this a matter in which it was the duty of the Fiscal to interfere, informed Complainant of the same; directing her to lay her complaint before his Honour the Fiscal.

Protector

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>some redress for the beating of her slave, and that she has been at the Fiscal's office but got none, and was directed to come here; that her complaint was not listened to there.</p> <p>She stated, her complaint was not listened to, and that she had been sent from your office to me for redress.</p> <p>As this is a matter not falling under my jurisdiction, but appears to me exclusively belonging to the police, and can only be taken cognizance of by you, as the head of it, I directed the woman to return to you for redress.</p> <p>To His Honour, C. Herbert, First Fiscal.</p> <p>Sir,</p> <p>I am much obliged by your Letter of the 30th, in which you inform me that a woman named Webley had applied to you for redress against a black man, who had beaten her slave; and had also stated, that her complaint preferred at this office on the preceding day had not been attended to.</p> <p>It is fit I should state to you in reply, that no complaint has been lodged at this office, until a late hour yesterday; and that your Letter and the complaint made were received within a half hour of each other. I merely mention this, to shew the incorrectness of the statement made to you.</p> <p>A. W. Young, Esq. Protector of Slaves.</p>	<p>Protector of Slaves Office, Sir, 30th September 1829.</p> <p>A woman named Sarah Webley, with her female slave, came to my office yesterday, stating she had been at your office to complain of a free black man having assaulted and beaten the slave in question.</p> <p>I have, &c.</p> <p>(signed) A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.</p> <p>Fiscal's Office, 1st October 1829.</p> <p>I have, &c.</p> <p>(signed) C. Herbert. F. F.</p>

No. 50.

Protector of Slaves Office,
29th September 1829.

Received the following:

Fiscal's Office,
Sir,
29th September 1829.

I am directed by his Honour the First Fiscal, to refer to you a negro, belonging to Mr. P. Massiah who complains of his master not providing for him, and seems to be deranged.

I have, &c.

(signed) W. St. Heintzen,
Fiscal's Clerk.

A. W. Young, Esq.
Protector of Slaves.

Protector of Slaves Office,
29th September 1829.

Harry, the man above alluded to, appeared and was questioned, but would not speak. The Protector same day sent him to the jail hospital, to be attended by the doctor until Mr. Massiah appeared.

Mr. Massiah summoned.

3d Oct. 1829.—Appeared Mr. Massiah. —States, that Harry is deranged, and has always been taken care of at his house; that he is very quiet, but by some means made his escape; that he has been attended by doctors Waddell and Chapman.

The Protector directed Harry to be left in the jail hospital, until the report of the medical attendant should be received respecting him.

9th October 1829.—Mr. Thompson, cipier, appeared at this office, and states, that the man Harry has been for some time a nuisance about town, and has been two or three times in the barracks (jail); that when he first came there, he spoke and said he did not belong to any one and was free; that neither at the present time or the time previous would he speak, and that he eats little or nothing.

The medical attendant of the jail being called upon by the Protector, gave the following certificate.

I certify having examined the negro man Harry, the property of Mr. Sam. Massiah, by order of the Protector of Slaves, and find that he has for some time past been labouring under mental derangement, which he is not likely to get the better of; I therefore consider him as an improper person to be going about the streets.

(signed) F. Webster,
Jail Surgeon.

10th October 1829.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. Massiah again summoned.

16th October 1829.—Mr. Massiah appeared, and the statement of the cipier and the certificate of the medical attendant of the jail being shown to him; and the necessity of providing in a sufficient manner for the care and maintenance of the slave Harry, being pointed out to him, he declares,

That the negro in question is the property of a nephew of his, who resides at present in Barbadoes; that he proposes to petition his Excellency to have him received into the colonial hospital, where there are some insane persons, and that he will pay the expenses.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 51.

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d of October 1829.

Received the following from the hand of
Quashy Spooner, a slave; viz.

To Colonel Young,
Protector of Slaves, &c. &c.

The Complaint of *Quashy Spooner*, who
humbly prayeth for redress:—

That some time past, Miss Catharine Brown and your Complainant's wife came under certain agreements, as respecting the purchase of herself, Nelly Sue, which agreement now lays in your Honor's hands; Miss Catharine Brown becoming very hard on said Nelly Sue, demanding her to pay her wages at one guilder per day, and also holding in possession Nelly Sue's son Henry, and hiring the said boy out at a guilder, and in many cases above that sum, per day; but Nelly Sue refusing to pay that sum, and also to give up the assistance of her son, Miss Catharine Brown, with her daughter, beat Nelly Sue, and have put her in the gaol.

Your Complainant now humbly begs your Honor's interference and investigation of the matter; and as in duty bound will ever pray.

(signed) *Quashy Spooner.*

(Enclosures.)

I, the undersigned, request, in case any thing should happen to me, before the woman Nelly Sue, and her son Henry, that I purchased for the good of themselves on the 29th of June 1826, for the sum of three thousand six hundred guilders, which sum when paid me by the woman Nelly Sue, in full, was then to be manumitted by me; but in case of my death before this sum of three thousand six hundred guilders is paid, I request that it be paid to no other person but Walter Urquhart esquire, who is appointed as an executor to my will. I request that no person is to interfere with the woman Nelly Sue but W. Urquhart esquire, whom the woman Nelly Sue will then pay the sum of three thousand six hundred guilders, according as she can make payments from time to time. At the full payment

Protector of Slaves Office,
3d October 1829.

Miss Catharine Brown summoned; as also Mr. Urquhart.

Appeared Catharine Brown.—Declares, that the nature of the agreement made with Nelly Sue was, that when she had fully paid the amount of her purchase-money, say three thousand six hundred guilders, she and her son should be freed; that she (Catharine Brown) did not specify that wages were not to be paid her in the mean time, until the purchase-money was paid, and that it was understood that wages should be paid until the agreement was fulfilled; that if Nelly Sue has produced any other agreement, it is fictitious; that the agreement she signed was written by a Mr. Yard; that she cannot read nor write, but that the agreement was read over to her, and she put her cross to it; that in consequence of her being insolent, she gave her a slap with her hand; that she will not work at all, and that in consequence, and being much distressed, she was obliged to put her in the gaol; that she never received any money more than twenty joes from her, for which she gave a receipt; that she is now sued, and cannot afford to lay out of her money; that she only required a guilder a day from her for wages; that she was insolent to her in presence of Mr. Padmore in the Fiscal's office.

That Mr. Urquhart bought the woman for her; that there was nothing said about her freedom at the time (*vide* bill of sale produced, and again returned to Catharine Brown) there being no stipulation as to freedom of the slaves therein mentioned.

Mr. Padmore summoned; appeared, and corroborates the statement of Catharine Brown, as to the insolence of Nelly Sue in his presence.

8th October 1829.

Appeared Mr. Urquhart.—States, that he purchased the woman Nelly Sue for Catharine Brown, as also Nelly Sue's son, and that there was no stipulation as to freedom between them at the time.

Mr.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.																														
<p>payment of the three thousand six hundred guilders, I request that W. Urquhart esq. will then manumit the woman Nelly Sue, and her son Henry.</p>	<p>Mr. Yard summoned. 15th October 1829. Appeared Mr. Yard.—States, that Catharine Brown sent for him to draw up a paper between the slave Nelly Sue and herself, which he did, and can swear to it.</p>																														
<p>Demerara, August 16th, 1826. (signed) <i>Catharine ^{her} x Brown.</i> Mark.</p>	<p><i>Question.</i> Did you read and explain to Catharine Brown the paper alluded to?— <i>Answer.</i> Yes, I read it over to her, and she was quite satisfied, and put her cross to it, and I witnessed it.</p>																														
<p>Witness (signed) <i>Edward Yard.</i></p>	<p>The said agreement being exhibited to Yard, he declared it to be the same he had drawn up; acknowledged his signature to it, and swore to the same before me, in presence of the slave Nelly Sue.</p>																														
<p>The Account of Sums stated to have been paid by Nelly Sue to Catherine Browne, is as follows; viz.</p>	<p>(signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves.</p>																														
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>To hire of Henry from 27th July 1827 to 31st July 1829 at</td> <td>f.</td> <td>st.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f. 1 per diem - - - - -</td> <td>735</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cash paid her 6th July 1829 -</td> <td>286</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dieting for five weeks, at 1 f. 5 st.</td> <td>43</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Paid Miss Jane Newton - - - -</td> <td>23</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Paid Gaol Fees - - - - -</td> <td>18</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cash f. 6, Chocolate f. 1. - - - -</td> <td>7</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pew Rent - - - - -</td> <td>18</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cash - - - - -</td> <td>36</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: right;">Total f. 1,166 15</td> </tr> </table>	To hire of Henry from 27th July 1827 to 31st July 1829 at	f.	st.	f. 1 per diem - - - - -	735	-	Cash paid her 6th July 1829 -	286	-	Dieting for five weeks, at 1 f. 5 st.	43	15	Paid Miss Jane Newton - - - -	23	-	Paid Gaol Fees - - - - -	18	-	Cash f. 6, Chocolate f. 1. - - - -	7	-	Pew Rent - - - - -	18	-	Cash - - - - -	36	-	Total f. 1,166 15			<p>Witness to the Oath, (signed) <i>G. F. Fraskini,</i> Messenger of the Protector's Office.</p>
To hire of Henry from 27th July 1827 to 31st July 1829 at	f.	st.																													
f. 1 per diem - - - - -	735	-																													
Cash paid her 6th July 1829 -	286	-																													
Dieting for five weeks, at 1 f. 5 st.	43	15																													
Paid Miss Jane Newton - - - -	23	-																													
Paid Gaol Fees - - - - -	18	-																													
Cash f. 6, Chocolate f. 1. - - - -	7	-																													
Pew Rent - - - - -	18	-																													
Cash - - - - -	36	-																													
Total f. 1,166 15																															
<p>Quashy Spooner says, he is the husband of Nelly Sue; that she is the same woman to whom he transferred the good and account of H. M. Tobie, respecting which she (Nelly Sue) came to this office to complain on the 28th ultimo, under the name of Susannah Rogers <i>alias</i> Spooner.</p>	<p>Nelly Sue having been sent for, appeared, and stated, that she received two agreements, both of the same tendency, and made out by Mr. Yard; one of which she was to send to her husband, a slave belonging to Mr. Rogers of Anne's Grove, father of the boy Henry, her son; that Miss Catharine Brown ordered her to send one to him, to assist in buying the boy, and that the father not being able, he said, to assist her, she kept the agreement; that she has a receipt [produced] from Miss C. Brown for thirteen joes, for money paid her on account of her purchase; that she has paid more, as per account, but has not obtained a receipt for it, and that she has paid one joe more than is entered in the said account furnished against her mistress; that her mistress has put her in confinement for these two weeks past in the colony jail, and for what reason she (Nelly Sue) is at a loss to know, unless it may be on account of her not paying in wages, although not according to agreement. That she had given up</p>																														
<p>That her Agreement with Catharine Brown specified, that only the purchase-money should be paid to Catharine Brown, but no hire; that Catharine Brown bought her through Mr. Urquhart, under this condition; prays reference to the account enclosed in the above, and says, that the receipt for the money paid by Nelly Sue for herself cannot be had, on account of her being in the jail, and his not being allowed to go to her.</p>	<p>her son Henry, who has been working for wages on account of Miss C. Brown for these two years and upwards, although she (Nelly Sue) did not intend to charge any wages for him; she does so now, as her mistress wishes to demand hire from her; that she (Nelly Sue) is still willing to allow the boy to remain with her mistress to work, until she is able to fulfil the agreement, having several promises made her to assist her in a short time; that the reason she had delayed so long to pay her purchase-money is, that she has been sick for upwards of two years.</p>																														
<p>"The slave does not appear to be by any means sickly, but, on the contrary, seems a strong healthy woman."</p>	<p>Nelly Sue states, that her mistress did not before require wages of her; but desired her to go and try to make up the purchase-money of herself and her son Henry, and that she has never paid any wages to her mistress.</p>																														
<p>Catharine Brown declares, that she never told the woman that she was not to pay hire; that she has never received any, because she could not get her to work; that therefore, and for her insolence, she was put in the barracks (jail); that she requires the wages.</p>	<p>Nelly Sue further states, that the day she came to this office (28th September) to complain of the man Tobie, for recovery of a debt due her; she met her mistress on her return, opposite the Fiscal's office; she (Nelly</p>																														

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

(Nelly Sue) had then a tray of vegetables on her head for sale, and her mistress having heard that she had been at this office, and supposing she had been complaining against her, said, "I will put you in the gaol for going to the Protector, and I will make you dance the tread-mill." That her mistress then took her to Mr. Padmore, the scout, and told him, that she had given her a paper to work and buy herself and child, and that she had only given her twenty joes, and no more; that she then said, "Mistress you are going to put me in the gaol, I have done nothing;" that she (Nelly Sue) never saw the Fiscal, and was put then into the gaol. That about three days after, her mistress went to the man Collet, who locks up the prisoners at night, and told him to keep her (Nelly Sue) strict, and put her in the stocks; that she was then confined in the stocks and kept so confined for three days and nights; that Mr. Thompson, the cipier, took her out then, and put her to clean out the gaol; that she has been every night in the stocks since she has been in the gaol.

15th October 1829.

Mr. Padmore summoned.—Appeared, and being questioned, says, that the woman was confined for insolence to her mistress and misconduct; that her confinement and punishment was by order of the Fiscal.

"The same was communicated to the Complainant, and she was directed to state her grievance, as to the confinement, to the Fiscal, by whose approbation it was inflicted."

It appearing probable that the supposition of Nelly Sue's having been at this office on the 28th ultimo to complain against her mistress, urged said mistress to have her confined in the jail;—the Protector thinks fit to acquaint his Honor the Fiscal, that the mistress' complaint so far, is unfounded. The same was accordingly communicated to his Honor the Fiscal.

16th October 1829.

The Protector, desirous to ascertain satisfactorily whether Catharine Brown was entitled to the services of the Complainants until the full payment of their purchase money should be made; and as it appears that Catharine Brown did not until now insist upon hire being paid her by Complainant;—referred the foregoing documents and statements to the Crown Advocate, for opinion and report.

Received in answer, *viz.*

17th October 1829.

"Case of Nelly Sue otherwise Brown, and her son Henry.

"Having read the petition of the Complainant Nelly Sue, with the declaration of an agreement by Cath. Brown, her owner, dated Aug. 16th, 1826, and the receipt of Cath. Brown of 13 joes in part payment for the said Nelly Sue, and the other papers laid over, with the petition in explanation, together with the statement made by Catharine Brown on the other side; it appears to me,—That in June 1826 Catharine Brown purchased Nelly Sue and her son Henry for three thousand six hundred guilders, which sum when paid to her, or her executors in case of her death, was to be in full of their manumission:

"That of this sum payments or lodgments have been made to the amount of 20 joes:

"That the agreement between the parties is express, that until the repayment of the *f.* 3,600. by Nelly Sue and her son, that they remain the property of Catharine Brown, and are only in that case to be manumitted by her; from which I infer, that she is in the interval entitled to their services, as she would otherwise lose the interest of her money and her ultimate security in case of their death:

"I would therefore advise, that the monies paid over to Cath. Brown be placed in the Savings Bank for the use of the Complainants, as well as all further monies which they may be able to collect, until there is a sufficiency to attain their object; and in the mean time, I am of opinion, that Cath. Brown may not dispose of these persons but under the same stipulations as are contained in her declaration of the 16th August 1826; and with regard to the complaint of ill treatment in the gaol, that the same be remitted to his Honor the Fiscal, for his information.

(signed) "S. W. Gordon, Crown Ad."

"17th Oct. 1829."

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 52.

Protector of Slaves Office,
5th October 1829.

Appeared Miss *Kitty Kernan*, F. C. w. of this town.—States, that a slave girl of her's, aged about 14 years, has been run-away and harboured by Mrs. Eyman, a coloured woman, for the last four weeks; that the said Mrs. Eyman encouraged the girl to leave Complainant and stay with her; that about eighteen months ago she also harboured her for a considerable time; the Complainant therefore requests, that the law may be enforced against Mrs. Eyman.

Appeared *Adriana*, the girl who had been runaway.—Examined. Corroborates the above statement.

harboured as above stated; the Protector does not feel authorized to institute proceedings for recovery of the penalty, but warns Mrs. Eyman against harbouring or having any thing to do with the girl *Adriana*; acquainting her with the consequences, should such a fact be proven against her.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

Protector of Slaves Office,
6th October 1829.

Appeared Mrs. Eyman:—Denies the whole of the foregoing charge; and produced the following certificate:—

“*Mary Richards* hereby certifies, that having lived constantly in the house with Mrs. Eyman, for at least the last nine months, she never, during the whole of that time, noticed the girl *Adriana* ever being harboured, or encouraged, by Mrs. Eyman.

“Demerara, 6th October 1829.
her
(signed) “*Mary × Richards.*”
Mark.

The Complainant being unable to bring forward satisfactory proof of her slave being

No. 53.

Protector of Slaves Office,
6th October 1829.

Appeared Mrs. *Speed*, of this town, accompanied by two coloured children, named *Frances* or *Fanny*, aged about ten and a half years; and *William*, aged seven years.

Mrs. *Speed* states, that these children are the offspring of the slave *Mary Ann*, formerly the property of H. O. Seward, of this colony; that she was sold by him in 1822, to a Mr. *Edward Lovett*, a cooper, who lived in the employ of Seward, and who formed a connexion with said woman, and had said child, *William*, by her. The girl *Fanny* being the child of Captain *Gordon*, late of this colony, by said woman, *Mary Ann*, then his property, and whom he sold in a state of pregnancy, with said child *Fanny*, to Mr. Seward; that the said *Edward Lovett* died in 1827, in the colonial hospital, leaving part of the purchase money of said slaves unpaid; that he, *Lovett*, never registered the said slaves, as he intended to manumit them; that the mother, *Mary Ann*, is dead, and that she, Mrs. *Speed*, has, through compassion, taken the children to live with her, and has, since their mother's death, provided for them, and is willing to continue doing so, until they are able to provide for themselves; that said *Lovett* died without any property, and without making a will, and that in consequence of the balance of their purchase-money due to Seward, as above mentioned, and the notes of hand of *Lovett* for the same to Seward,

Protector of Slaves Office,
6th October 1829.

William Davison, attorney of Seward, who is at present in Europe, being summoned, appeared; and states, that Mr. Seward has a just claim against these children; that by the terms of the sale, and the notes of *Lovett*, they are reclaimable until fully paid for; that they were consequently registered by special permission of his Excellency the Governor, as will appear by reference to the office of the Registrar of Slaves.

The Protector, on application to the Registrar, received the following documents; viz.

STATEMENT of Mr. Seward's Claim against Mr. *Edward Lovett*, for purchase of the woman *Mary Ann*, and her children.

Purchase-money of said woman and children, sold him 1st June 1822	- f.3,000
For which was received on 1st June 1822, cash	- f.1,500
30th June 1822, his note payable in six months	- 500
His ditto, payable in nine months	- - - 500
His ditto, payable in twelve months	- - - 500
	—f. 3,000

STATEMENT

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA,

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
Seward, making said slaves reclaimable until fully paid for; he, Seward, has petitioned the Governor to allow him to register them as slaves, in order, as she understands, to have them sold by the Orphan Chamber, to satisfy his claim; that the Governor has granted his petition accordingly; that she thinks it very hard that they should be sold as slaves, when the greater part of their purchase money has been paid; and as Mr. Seward has never looked after them, or given them the smallest allowance for their maintenance since he sold them.	<p>STATEMENT of Claim of Mr. Seward against Mr. Edward Lovett, for his notes as before mentioned, made up to 30th June 1829.</p> <p>1824:</p> <p>Nov. 10.—To amount his note, dated 30th June 1822, payable in six months - - - f.500 - - Interest thereon, from 31st Dec. 1822 to date - 55 18 6 <u>f.555 18 6</u></p> <p>Nov. 10.—By cash received from H. O. Seward & Co. - - - f.555 18 6</p> <p>1825:</p> <p>September 7.—To his note, payable on 30th March 1823 - f.500 - - Interest thereon, from that date to this - - - 73 3 5 <u>f.573 3 5</u></p> <p>Sept. 7.—By this sum received from H. O. Seward & Co. in part payment - - - f.228 7 3 <u>f.344 16 2</u></p> <p>Interest thereon, from 7th Sept. 1825, to 30th June 1829 - - - 79 7 14 <u>f.424 4 -</u></p> <p>To his note due 30th June 1823 - f.500 Interest thereon, from that date to 30th June 1829 - - - 180 <u>680 - -</u></p> <p>Due 30th June 1829 - f.1,104 4 - <u>f.1,104 4 -</u></p> <p>(signed) <i>Wm. Davison, qq.</i> <i>H. O. Seward.</i></p>

Demerara and Essequibo.—Triennial Registration.
1829. (No. 1,400.)

Parish of St. George's.

RETURN of Slaves belonging to the Estate of Edward Lovett, deceased, specially registered by William Davison, attorney of H. O. Seward, a creditor of the estate of the deceased, in conformity with permission obtained from his Excellency Sir Benjamin D'Urban, K. C. B. & C. & C. as will appear by an order on a petition of the said H. O. Seward, dated 15th July 1829, having reference to another petition, dated 11th July 1829; both of which, as well as a Statement of Mr. Seward's Claim against the deceased, are herewith annexed.

SEX.	NAMES.	Colour.	AGE.	Bodily Marks.	Employment.	Condition.	Country.
Female	Frances or Fanny.	Mustee	10½	None -	None -	Healthy -	Demerara.
Male	William	ditto	7	- -	- -	- -	ditto.

(signed) *Wm. Davison,*
Attorney of H. O. Seward.

Sworn before me, this 7th day of August 1829.
(signed) *James Robertson, Registrar.*

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

To His Excellency Major-General Sir Benjamin D'Urban, K. C. B.
&c. &c.

The Petition of Henry Osborne Seward, merchant, residing in this colony,

Humbly sheweth,

That your Petitioner left this colony for England in the year 1829, and that amongst other slaves he possessed at that time was a woman named Mary-Ann, a mulatto, and her female child, Frances or Fanny, a mustee; that on the 31st of May 1821, your Petitioner's attorney, William Davison, esq. also a merchant of this colony, registered the above slaves, Mary-Ann, a mulatto, and her female child he named Fanny, and called her a mulatto; that after which time the said Mary-Ann had another mustee child a boy, named William:

That on the 30th June 1822, your Petitioner's said attorney sold to Edward Lovett, a cooper in this colony and gave him legal possession of the said Mary-Ann and her children, calling the one Frances and the other William; holding them reclaimable by your Petitioner until fully paid for:

That there is a considerable balance still due to your Petitioner, of the purchase money of the said slaves, and for which he holds the notes of Edward Lovett aforesaid, making the said slaves reclaimable; that the said Edward Lovett is since dead, and, as your Petitioner is informed, without having made a will; and that during his possession of the said slaves he omitted to register them; that the error in the registration has only come to the knowledge of your Petitioner within a few days:

That the woman, Mary, is dead:

Your Petitioner humbly prays, that your Excellency will be pleased to take the matter into your consideration, and grant your Petitioner an order that he may be allowed to register the girl, Frances or Fanny, a mustee, and the boy, William, also a mustee, who was born since the registration of May 1821.

And your Petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(signed) *Hen. O. Seward,*

Demerara, July 9, 1829.

Referred to James Robertson, esq. Registrar of Slaves, for report and opinion.

By command.

(signed) *T. C. Hammill,*
Act^s Gov^t Sec^y.

9th July 1829.

It is not made to appear that the property and legal possession of these slaves is in the Petitioner.

The petition is returned, that this point may be established.

(signed) *B. D'Urban.*

I certify the foregoing to be a true copy from the original, remaining at the Government Secretary's office.

(signed) *T. C. Hammill,*
Act^s Gov^t Sec^y.To His Excellency, Major-General Sir Benjamin D'Urban, K. C. B.
&c. &c.

The Petition of Henry Osborne Seward, merchant, residing in this colony,

Humbly sheweth,

That your Petitioner, in reference to his petition to your Excellency, of the 9th instant, which your Petitioner respectfully encloses, praying to be allowed to register the girl, Frances or Fanny, a mustee, and the boy, William, also a mustee, sold by his attorney, William Davison, on the 30th June 1822, to Edward Lovett, since dead; representing that your Petitioner holds the notes or obligations of the deceased, making those slaves reclaimable; and praying that in consideration thereof your Excellency would be pleased to allow your Petitioner to register them, in order to preserve his right of property in said slaves; the purchaser, previous to his death, having neglected to register them:

That

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

That your Excellency's order of the 11th instant, on the petition, states:—

“ That it does not appear that the property and legal possession of those slaves was in the Petitioner; the petition is returned that this point may be established:”

That, in obedience to the order of your Excellency, your Petitioner states, that he is not in legal possession of those slaves, but that he holds his right of property in them according to the sale made by his attorney, and according to the notes and obligations of the purchaser, making them reclaimable till fully paid for. That your Petitioner is not the representative to the boedel of Edward Lovett, nor does he believe there is any representative, the deceased having died, as your Petitioner heard and believes, intestate:

Your Petitioner, therefore, prays, that your Excellency will be pleased to take into your consideration the right of property your Petitioner has in the said slaves, Frances or Fanny, and William, both mustees, until paid for; and that your Excellency will be pleased to allow your Petitioner to register the same.

And your Petitioner will, as in duty bound, ever pray.

(signed) *Hen. Osbn Seward.*

Demerara, 13th July 1829.

Referred to his Honour the acting first Fiscal for opinion.

I apprehend that I am not competent to authorize the desired registration. Is not the Board of Orphans in the administration of property so situated?

(signed) *B. D'Urban.*

15th July 1829.

The Registrar of Slaves is authorized to admit these slaves to a special registration by the Petitioner, upon his satisfying the Registrar that he holds the security he mentions; and that the fact of non-registration has come to his knowledge within nine months.

(signed) *B. D'Urban.*

16th July 1829.

True copy from the Original, remaining in the Government Secretary's office.

(signed) *T. C. Hammill.*

Act^r Gov^t Secr.

The Protector, anxious to ascertain how far he could interfere on behalf of these children, referred the matter, with the foregoing documents, to the Crown Advocate, for opinion and report; and directed Mrs. Speed to keep the children with her in the mean time.

14th October 1829.—Received in answer from the Crown Advocate.

Case of the Children of Lovett and Captain Gordon.

From the circumstances appearing in this case, that Mr. Seward has not received the whole of his purchase money, I recommend that the case should lie over; the children being unable to pay the balance due to Mr. Seward. Should Mr. Seward resort to legal process, an interdict must be obtained to prevent these children from being molested.

(signed) *S. W. Gordon.*

Crown Advocate.

Mrs. Speed summoned.— Appeared, and was desired, in case of the children being molested, to give information of the same to this office.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*

Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 54.

Protector of Slaves Office,
12th October 1829.

Appeared *Thomas*, a coloured slave, aged about twenty-three years; creole of this colony; belonging to the estate of S. Gravesande, deceased.

Says that he is the son of his master's brother; that his master, during his lifetime, never required him to do any work, nor did he claim his services in any way, neither did he give him any allowances of food or clothing, but allowed him to stay constantly with his father, who has brought him up and given him a trade (carpenter); that he, *Thomas*, believes he has never been registered, and that he was always led to believe that he would be freed; that some time previous to his master's death, his master and his father had a quarrel about him, the former wishing to include him in a certain contract between them, as a slave; that on this account and some other causes of disagreement between them, his master left the Orphan Chamber to administer his estate by his will; and that they have recently made a claim upon him, *Thomas*, as a slave belonging to the estate of said S. Gravesande.

He therefore solicits the Protector to interfere in his behalf, and obtain his manumission.

Thomas produced a letter from his father, (his master's brother,) which letter corroborates the foregoing statement.

Protector of Slaves Office,
12 October 1829.

The Protector immediately referred to the office of the Registrar of Slaves, and finds that it does not appear that *Thomas* has ever been registered as a slave; his mother is registered in 1829, by the Orphan Chamber, (her name is *Susette*) as representing the estate of S. Gravesande, deceased; and his brother *Mentor*, who had been sold previous to S. Gravesande's death, is registered by *Kenneth M'Kenzie* in 1829.

16th October 1829.—The Protector made the following application to the Board of Orphans.

The Protector of Slaves having had an application from the slave *Thomas*, belonging to the estate of S. Gravesande, deceased, for freedom; and it appearing that the Orphan Chamber have been left administrators of the deceased,—requests that the necessary application for freedom may be made in his behalf.

It appears that the man *Thomas* alluded to, has never been registered.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

To *H. E. F. Young, Esq.*
Acting Recorder O. C.

31st October 1829.—No answer has been received from the Board of Orphans up to this date, on the subject of this claim; but the Protector hopes to establish, it on the ground that the applicant has never been registered. Measures will be adopted without delay, to effect his manumission.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 55.

Protector of Slaves Office,
14th October 1829.

Appeared *Diana Spragg*, an African, aged about thirty-eight years; belonging to *Johanna G. Bastiaanse* of this town.—States, that she works out, and has paid her wages regularly to her mistress, at the rate of a guilder a day; that she has been in the habit of taking goods from merchants to sell for her own benefit; that *Mr. Scheffers f. c. man*, bought some of these goods from her to the amount of 76*f.* which he promised to pay her in a short time; that she has repeatedly demanded payment of him, but cannot get it; declares that the money is exclusively for her own benefit, and forms no part of her hire to her owner; and prays that the Protector will oblige *Scheffers* to pay her the amount.

Protector of Slaves Office,
14th October 1829.

Scheffers summoned.

16th October 1829.—Appeared *J. C. Scheffers*, and the foregoing claim being read to him and payment demanded, he acknowledges the debt, but declares that he is unable to pay any part of it at present; that he is now working out a debt of much longer standing; and prays to be allowed until the 1st of February next to pay *Diana*. *Scheffers* was required to pay in two months, but he still declaring his inability to do so, and the slave *Diana* expressing herself satisfied to allow him until the 1st of February to pay, his good for the amount was accordingly taken by the Protector.

Protector's Office, Demerara,
October 16th, 1829.

Good to the woman *Diana*, a slave, for seventy-six guilders, which I promise to pay on or before the 1st February 1830.

(signed) *J. C. Scheffers*.

Witness,
(signed) *P. Power*.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

No. 56.

Protector of Slaves Office,
16th October 1829.

Appeared Mr. *Postlethwaite*. — States, that two female slaves of his, named *Lena*, a creole of this colony, aged about thirty-five years, and her niece *Charlotte*, also a creole, aged about twelve years, were beaten yesterday with a rope by a Mr. *Gibson* of this town; Mr. *Gibson* is a young man, aged about fifteen or sixteen years; that two of *Gibson's* negroes assisted him in holding the slaves, *Lena* and *Charlotte*, while he, *Gibson*, beat them; that they, *Gibson* and his slaves, waylaid *Lena* and *Charlotte* in the brush-wood near the Colonial Negro-houses, *Brick Dam*.

Protector of Slaves Office,
16th October 1829.

The Protector referred Mr. *Postlethwaite* to his Honor the Fiscal, as Chief of Police.

(signed) *A. W. Young*,
Protector of Slaves.

No. 57.

Protector of Slaves Office,
19th October 1829.

Appeared *Jacoba, Julia, Dorothea, Una*, and *Effa*, belonging to Plantation *Le Repentir*, and working on Plantation *La Penitence*, both places belonging to Mr. *Albrug*, Mr. *Rush* manager of both places.

Jacoba states, that they, Complainants, were ordered to carry megass from the mill on Thursday; that they did so, and on Friday were ordered to carry it again; that they were directed to have all the megass away by nine o'clock at night, which they did; that on Saturday they were again ordered to carry megass, but they said to the manager, that another set of carriers ought to be appointed for that day, as it was the custom that those who carried megass should, after doing that duty for two days running, be sent to some other work, because carrying megass from the mill is the hardest work on the estate; that they told the manager that he was harder upon them than upon the other people, and that he did not do fairly; that he should not give some light work, and kill others with the heaviest work; that they then, without being ordered, went to the field to cut canes, whither the manager sent for them, and had them confined both hands and feet in the stocks, because they would not carry megass that day also; that they were confined in this manner at seven o'clock in the morning of Saturday, and kept in until one o'clock on Saturday; they were then taken out of the stocks and put in the black hole, where they were kept until seven o'clock on Sunday morning; they were then put in the hands and feet stocks again, and kept there until three o'clock P.M.: they were then carried back to the dark room, and were kept there until one o'clock this morning (Monday); they were then let out, and desired to go back to carry megass, but they got out on the public road, where they staid until day-light, when they came to lodge their complaint.

That they only got four half-boiled plantains in the twenty-four hours each, and water,

Protector of Slaves Office,
19th October 1829.

Mr. *Rush*, the Manager, and the Overseer and other witnesses, summoned.

Mr. *Rush* appeared.—Says, that six women were appointed to carry away the megass from the mill on Thursday; that Complainants were of the number; that they did not take away the megass as fast as they ought to have done, and consequently it accumulated, to the great danger of the machinery; that they persisted in the same conduct the following day (Friday), and carried away less than the day before, and were on that account ordered to the same duty on Saturday, which they positively refused to do, and went to the field contrary to his express orders; that they thus committed three different offences, and that he had them brought home from the field on Saturday, and confined six hours in hands and feet stocks for their neglect on Thursday; they were then locked up two and two in rooms, and for their perverseness, on Friday; and were put again for six hours in the hands and feet stocks on Sunday, for disobedience and obstinacy on Saturday; and continuing still obstinate, were put back into the rooms as before, until this morning (Monday); that if they had carried away the megass on the first day (Thursday), another party would have been ordered for the work on Friday, and in like manner a different party on Saturday; that the six of them might have taken away the megass regularly, with the greatest ease; that they had sufficient time to eat their victuals, as the mill always stopped for nearly three hours every day, and the victuals were given them ready dressed; that while confined they received three plantains in the morning and three in the evening each, and a sufficiency of water, which will be proved by the overseer and sick nurse.

(signed) *M. Rush*.

20th October—*continued*

Mr. *Rush* says, that five women could carry away the megass with ease, but as, previous

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>water, while they were confined ; that they commenced carrying megass in the morning at three o'clock, and kept on carrying until nine o'clock at night, without stopping. They say, that the bell rings at twelve o'clock, but that it was for the carpenters and other people to get their meals, but not for them ; that they, Complainants, had no time to eat until after nine o'clock at night, although plantains were boiled and brought to them ; that Mr. Thornton, the overseer, can prove this statement to be correct, and also the Engineer Nelson.</p>	<p>previous to his taking charge, six had been the number, he continued it so ; that it is much easier work taking away the megass than piling it up in the logie. (signed) <i>M. Rush.</i> Sworn to before me, this 20th October 1829. (signed) <i>A. W. Young,</i> Protector of Slaves. 19th October 1829. Appeared Mr. Thornton, Overseer of Plantations La Penitence and Le Repentir : States, that the complainants and another woman, named Fatima, six in number, were ordered to take their spell to carry megass</p>
<p>from the mill on Thursday last ; that they did not carry away the whole of the megass that day, and consequently the mill was not kept clean. In consequence of this they received orders for the same duty next day (Friday), when they carried away less, and were on that account ordered to carry again on Saturday ; this they refused to do, and went to the field contrary to the manager's express orders. The manager then had them brought home by the driver Peter, and confined six hours in hands and feet stocks ; that they were then merely locked up two and two in rooms until eight o'clock on Sunday morning ; they were then taken out and put in the hands and feet stocks again for six hours, after which they were put back into the same rooms. That the foregoing punishments were inflicted on them for three several offences :—1st, For not doing their duty on Thursday, in allowing the megass to accumulate, so as to endanger the machinery and keep back the work ; 2d, For obstinacy, by a repetition of the same conduct on Friday ; 3d, For disobeying orders on Saturday, in positively refusing to carry megass that day, and going to the field contrary to the express orders of the manager ; that when they were released from the stocks on Sunday, they still evinced great obstinacy, and were therefore again returned to the rooms until this morning (Monday), as before mentioned ; that there was no partiality shown to any of the gang, and that if the Complainants had carried away the megass fast enough, which they might have done with ease, they would have been required to do this duty only for the one day (Thursday) ; that the victuals was brought to them ready cooked, and therefore they could, if they chose, have had time enough to eat at the different intervals at which the mill stopped during the day ; that the mill always stops between two and three hours in the day ; that while confined they received, regularly, three plantains in the morning and three in the evening, with a sufficiency of water, in his presence, from the hands of the sick-nurse, Theresia.</p>	<p>(signed) <i>R. Thornton.</i></p>
<p>Appeared Nelson : Examined.—Says he is the engineer, and was always at the mill. <i>Ques.</i> Did the women carry the megass away as fast as they ought to have done on Thursday ?—<i>Ans.</i> No ; they allowed the mill to choak up with it. <i>Ques.</i> Do you think the women were able to keep the mill clear ?—<i>Ans.</i> No ; the megass comes from the mill too fast ; it is a large mill ; while I looked after them and hurried them, they worked as fast as they could ; but I do not know if they did so when I turned away. <i>Ques.</i> Did the mill stop on Thursday at all during the day ?—<i>Ans.</i> Yes ; it stopped twice, an hour each time, and the women then had, if they chose, time enough to clear away the megass and eat their victuals. <i>Ques.</i> Did it stop on Friday ?—<i>Ans.</i> Yes ; two hours and a half, to give time for the megass to be cleared away ; the women were very slow on that day. <i>Ques.</i> Did the women go to the field on Saturday, contrary to the manager's orders ?—<i>Ans.</i> Yes ; the manager sent me on Friday night to tell them to carry megass that day (the Saturday) also ; but they said, no, they could not carry megass, that they carried it for two days and were tired.</p>	

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

tired. I told the manager what they said; he desired me to go back, and tell them that they should come the following morning, Saturday, to carry again; that these were his, the manager's, orders; but in the morning they went off to the field.

Appeared Peter, field driver.—Being questioned, says, that on Saturday morning before he went to the field, the manager ordered him, if the Complainants went to the field to tie them, and send them back; because they had refused the previous evening to carry megass that day, Saturday; and that he accordingly tied them on Saturday morning in the field, and sent them home; knows no more about them.

30th October 1829.

Mr. Rush, upon being asked at what hour they were let out on Monday morning; says, that it was at an early hour, it might have been between one and two o'clock A. M., but not for the purpose of carrying megass; that we never go about until between three and four in the morning; that when the megass carriers are active in carrying from the mill, the work is over at five o'clock, as far as relates to the grinding of the canes.

Ques. How late do they continue boiling?—*Ans.* Generally till nine o'clock P. M. sometimes eight o'clock, sometimes ten o'clock.

27th October 1829.

DECISION.—As regards the Complaints of the women slaves that appeared at this office on the 19th October, viz. Jacoba, Julia, Dorothea, Una, and Effa, belonging to Plantation La Penitence; it appears that the manager has acted in contravention of the 14th Article of the Slave Ordinance, and 1st Article of the Amended Act; and that he has rendered himself liable to a fine accordingly. 1st. For having on Saturday, the 17th, confined them in the hands and feet stocks from seven o'clock in the morning till one o'clock of that day, being the extent of time limited; afterwards confining them two and two in dark rooms until Sunday morning eight o'clock.—Taken from the above confinement, and again placed hands and feet in the stocks till one o'clock of Sunday. Carried back from thence, and confined again till Monday morning one o'clock, when they were let out to carry megass.

The first Article of the Amended Act expressly provides for payment of such fines, in every case in which two modes of punishments are resorted to.

The Protector calls upon the manager for the lowest penalty provided, viz. two hundred guilders for each slave thus punished, to be paid into the Colonial Receiver's office, and the receipt to be deposited in this office.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

31st October 1829.

The Protector has received no answer from Mr. Rush, the manager of Plantation La Penitence, to the foregoing demand of the fine incurred by him; but measures will be immediately adopted to enforce the same by legal process, if necessary.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 58.

Protector of Slaves Office,
20th October 1829.

Appeared *Beckey* and *Lydia*, of Plantation La Penitence.—*Beckey* states, that for the last three weeks she has been every night in the dark room, and her child was taken away from her every night; that she works with the weak gang, the task is two rows each, weeding young canes; that she begged the manager to lessen the work; but he said, no, that she must do as much as the others;

Protector of Slaves Office,
20th October 1829.

Appeared Mr. Rush.—Says in reply to the first part of *Beckey's* statement, that she has been put in confinement, on Monday week last, for coming to town without a pass, and, of course, leaving their work; that they were again put in confinement on Wednesday, for not finishing their work, which is not more than is allotted to the weak gang and creoles, viz. two rows, or twenty-four

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
<p>others; that she is put in the dark room as soon as she comes from the field at sun-down; and that she is not allowed time to get her supper.</p> <p>Lydia states, that she has been put in the dark room every night constantly for three weeks past, because she is not able to weed two rows of young canes, the task given her every day; and that her child is taken away from her every night, and it gets no suck; that the milk sours in her breasts, and that when she gives the child suck next morning it purges it; that she is put in the dark room as soon as she comes from the field at six o'clock P. M.; that her child is given to an old woman to mind out on the dam; that there is no watch-house or any other place for the old woman to carry the child to; that the old woman, named Betty, who minds the children, can be evidence for her, and the driver Johannes.</p> <p>They say that they turn out to work at seven o'clock in the morning.</p>	<p>twenty-four beds; that continuing every day since only to finish half the work, occasionally a little more, they have been confined in a dark room; that the children are separated at night, they are let out in the morning at five o'clock, but not required to go to work until seven o'clock, but can never get them out before nine o'clock A. M.</p> <p><i>Quest.</i> Are they allowed their supper previous to being confined?—<i>Ans.</i> They are allowed to go into the negro houses until seven o'clock before being locked up.</p> <p><i>Quest.</i> When do they return from the field?—<i>Ans.</i> Generally about five o'clock.</p> <p><i>Quest.</i> During the night how are the children provided, as they are separated from their mothers?—<i>Ans.</i> A nurse is appointed to take care of them, and two other young women to suckle them.</p> <p><i>Quest.</i> Has Lydia, or the other woman, made any complaint to you of suffering from over-abundance of milk, and its affecting the children when given to them in the morning?—<i>Ans.</i> No; or have they ever asked me to lessen the work.</p>

Quest. Why do you take the children from them during the night, and give them to other women to suckle?—*Ans.* To prevent their injuring them through malice.

Quest. Why do you suppose so?—*Ans.* An instance occurred lately, about ten days ago, of two women attempting to strangle their children when the overseer was taking them from them.

Quest. Are you, from your own knowledge, aware of any occurrence such as alluded to, having actually taken place, when the children have not been taken away at night?—*Ans.* No; but I am satisfied they are capable of doing so. I would rather pass over an offence altogether than not separate them.

Quest. During the day, when in the field, has the nurse in charge a covered place, or do they remain on the dam?—*Ans.* There is a large tree; in this weather it is not necessary, as it affords shade.

Quest. During the day are they allowed to go to their children?—*Ans.* Yes; they are taken by a woman in order that they may go to them.

(signed) M. Rush.

Sworn to before me, }
this 20th October 1829.(signed) A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

Johannes appeared. *Asked* what time the people return from the field in the evening?—*Ans.* At half-past five o'clock.

Quest. During the day, they that have young children, how are they taken care of when the mothers are at work?—*Ans.* The old woman goes to the field to mind the children.

Quest. Where does she stop?—*Ans.* Upon the dams near at hand.

Quest. Are the mothers allowed to go to them to give them suck?—*Ans.* Yes.

Quest. Are they under a shed, or where?—*Ans.* Under a tree.

Quest. Do you lock up those that are to be confined; if so, state how many nights these women have been so locked up?—*Ans.* For three weeks every night, by the manager's orders.

Quest. Are you certain?—*Ans.* Quite certain.

Quest. What is done with the children?—*Ans.* They are given to the sick nurse; and two other women that have children stop with them to suckle them.

Quest. Where do they remain at night?—*Ans.* In sick-house.

Quest. Is it always the custom to separate the children from the mothers, when confined by the manager?—*Ans.* To tell the truth, I never saw it done before. They were formerly locked up in a rig chamber up stairs with their infants.

Patty,

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.	PROCEEDINGS.
------------	--------------

Patty, the sick-nurse, called.—*Quest.* How many nights have the children of Beckey and Lydia been taken away at night?—*Ans.* Three weeks. I lay in the house with the children, two women gave them suck. They stay until morning, when the mothers take them; about five o'clock in the morning.

Quest. Do you mind them in the field?—*Ans.* Yes, upon the dam, under a tree.

Quest. Did Beckey or Lydia ever complain that their milk was bad in the morning, from being retained so long?—*Ans.* I saw myself that the children suffered; their stools shewed it; and I told the mother so.

Johannes being recalled, and again questioned; says, that he began to lock them up last Tuesday; that he mistook, saying three weeks, but meant two; because he began again last night (Monday), which being the beginning of another week, makes him count two weeks.

Frances, the head sick-nurse, being called; *questioned*—How long have these women been locked up at night?—*Ans.* I believe a week; cannot say exactly; but take the two children no more.

Quest. What do you do with the children?—*Ans.* Carry them up stairs to two young women to suck.

Quest. Do you stop in the room during the night?—*Ans.* Yes, and also Patty.

Quest. Did you ever hear, or are you aware, that the children suffer from change of milk?—*Ans.* The mothers tell me so this morning, but I did not see it.

Quest. Did the mothers complain to you of themselves?—*Ans.* Yes; they tell me the milk sours.

Quest. Is Patty under your orders?—*Ans.* Only at night.

Quest. Did she ever remark to you about the children?—*Ans.* No; it was only this morning I heard any complaint; they said the milk worked the child. One is three months old, Beckey's; Lydia's is two months old.

The Protector desired Mr. Rush not to separate the children from their mothers during the night.

On this Observation Mr. Rush says, that for ten years he has always known it the case in the colony.

21st October 1829.—The manager of Plantation La Penitence, subsequent to the above examination, left the paper; a copy of which is as follows:

“The undersigned having understood that his testimony of yesterday to the Protector of Slaves, requires explanations on some points, begs to state as follows:—

1st.—With respect to taking away the infants from the mothers when locked up at night, as a punishment for neglect of work, I have always seen it done in cases where the tempers and violence of the mothers, under the excitement of angry feelings against the manager, give indications of injury to the infant, in order to bring into trouble the author of their punishment; which would doubtless be the case were the infants to be locked up with the mothers, and taken unwell or in any way neglected during the night. It is a precaution against vindictive feelings, which might be exercised upon the infants, to the prejudice of the manager. It is not done as a punishment to the mother, but as a precaution for the security and safety of all parties. I would forego a punishment altogether rather than risk the well-being of an infant with the mother of violent temper, under irascible and vindictive feelings.

2d.—With regard to putting such women as did not finish their task in carrying away megass, to the same work a second and even the third day: six of the strongest women were put to do what five might have done, and did so; the work was to tie up and carry the megass of three hogsheads of sugar a few yards from the mill, not to the megass-house, but to put it down in the yard on the ground, not to stock it up in the yard; though I cannot consider continuing these women at the same work for more than a day, and until they did the task assigned to them, would have the effect of punishment on them. Still it was no punishment at all as regards the Ordinance, under which I beg leave to answer with respect to locking them up for two days and nights, and taking them

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

them out for six hours each day;—surely such is an alleviation of the punishments allowed by the Ordinance; giving them an opportunity of begging off, by promises of better behaviour, at each time that they were taken out. This was done for the very purpose of avoiding the full extent of locking up, without intermission, as allowed by the Ordinance. The whole of my proceeding was regulated by an endeavour to avoid the full extent of punishment, and to conquer the obstinacy of these people, by showing them my determination to punish them; at same time exhibiting, by the intermission I allowed them, my wish that they should voluntarily come forward as penitents to avoid the full extent of punishment hanging over them.

(signed) *M. Rush,*

Manager of Plantations, La Penitence and Le Repentir.

21st October, 1829.

DECISION on Complaint of Beckey and Lydia.—The Protector having considered the complaints of the women, Beckey and Lydia, of Plantation La Penitence, against the manager, does not conceive the work is oppressive. But the Protector deems it his duty to express his decided opinion, that the custom of separating the infants from the mothers, if it be a practice upon the estate, should be discontinued. The Protector does not consider the manager justified in so doing; for he cannot, as he admits, adduce a single instance of its having occurred that injury or death to their infants has taken place from malice on being confined, or spite towards the manager; or does it appear to the Protector, upon inquiry, that it is a general practice, or has it indeed ever before been brought before his attention.

That the women may have displayed violent feeling and much passion at being locked up, is not unreasonable to expect, particularly when under the impression that their infants are to be taken from them and given to other women to suckle.

It is altogether unnatural, and more than probable injurious to the infants, the change of nurses; for it is but fair to suppose that the women to whom they are given to be suckled, will consider their own first—the stranger ones most likely suffer; or is the real mother's milk improved by retention, or the irritation that may fairly be supposed to have existed in the mothers during confinement and separation from their infants. If the practice continue, the attorney will be spoken to, to order a discontinuance.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 59.

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st October 1829.

Appeared *Maria*.—Says, that she belonged to Mr. Vande Velleen, who kept a grog-shop in Charles Town, and died about seven or eight years ago; that Mr. Nedderman came and took his things and sold them at vendue; that she was there, but being sick, he would not let her come near him; he said, that if he caught her there he would kick her down; that since that she has been staying with a Mr. Stoddart's wife in the dock-yard, but that as she has been getting much worse, she said she could not keep her any longer, and not knowing what to do, came to this office.

Protector of Slaves Office,
21st October 1829.

Sent for Mr. Nedderman.—Appeared Mr. Nedderman.—Says he was appointed Curator by the court to the boedel of Van de Velleen; that when he took over the estate, he, Mr. Nedderman, advertised the two invalid negroes, and what further appeared for sale; previous to the sale went to the Registrar's office to take up the Registry Bill, and found that they were not registered, and therefore could not sell them. Names, Azore (since dead) and this woman, Maria. The amount of the other property, as per vendue bill, [*produced*] amounted to 17*f.* 15*st.*; that he reported to the court, those negroes not being registered, he could not sell them, and begged

to know what was to be done; upon which he got an order from the court to refer to the Court of Policy; that he presented a petition to the Court of Policy. The reply was, they had nothing to do with it. This occurred in 1827; that afterwards he reported again to the Court of Justice the answer of the Court of Policy, upon which petition an order is from the Court of Justice to apply to the Poor's Fund to take charge

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART
—
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

of the woman, Maria; that the said order was not taken out by him on account of the expense being 28*f.*, and he having only 17*f.* 15*st.* in his hands belonging to the estate.

The Protector referred to the Registrar's Office; finds that the slave in question had not been registered in 1817 by Van de Velleen, who died in 1825.

Wrote to have the woman received into the colony hospital; she was admitted by the surgeon, Doctor Waddell, until a regular order is produced, which will be applied for.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 60.

Protector of Slaves Office,
23d October 1829.

Appeared, *Frances*.—Says she belongs to Mr. Sills, of George Town; is an Eebo, aged about forty-five years; states, that last night she had a light in her room in the negro houses; that her child was sick with a cold, and she kept the candle lighted to grease its stomach; that about eleven o'clock her master came to her room with a chaise whip and beat her with it; that he gave her four stripes with it; that this morning she told him her child was sick, and that she wished to stay with it to mind it; her master then said, she did not wish to work, and gave her two licks with the handle of the chaise whip, which was then in his hand; that the woman Acouba was present last night and this morning when he beat her.

Protector of Slaves Office,
23d October 1829.

"The marks of the whip are visible on the shoulders of Complainant." She was sent to gaol pending investigation; Mr. Sills and witness Acouba summoned to attend the next day.

24th October 1829.—Appeared Acouba, a slave belonging to Mr. Sills; says she has been christened, (appears very ignorant;) says she knows there is a God who will punish her if she tells a lie.

Question.—Did you see Mr. Sills whip *Frances*?—*Ans.*—Yes, in the night; she believes about twelve o'clock; he beat her with a whip, because she had a light in the house top; said it was because her child was sick; that in the morning he desired her to get coffee and clean the house; that she went out to the kitchen; Mr. Sills went into the kitchen; he began licking her with the hunter (whip) chaise whip; she

had the child in her arms; that she ran away; he asked Acouba where she was gone, as he understood she was come here to complain. *Frances* was sleeping in the pantry and I was in the negro house, not far off; hearing the noise, I ran out to take up my two children that were in the room, by Mr. Sills' orders; one is a year old, can walk; the other is about three or four years old.

Question.—Did he beat her often with the whip?—*Ans.*—Three cuts in the night and four in the morning.

27th October 1829.—Mr. Sills appeared.—States, that on the night of the 21st he thought she, Complainant, was going to sleep in the pantry and the other girl in the negro house; he was sickly and lying in his hammock, when two gentlemen came to visit him; he desired to have some glasses, but no one was to be found, neither woman or child; at eleven o'clock they returned, and seeing the light he told her, Complainant, to put it out. She said the child was sick; he replied, he did not believe that, as she had been running out; the next morning he got up and found the light still burning in the hall; he asked her for his coffee, when she began abusing him and crying out at the same moment. *Frances* ran away, and the other woman Acouba told him that a woman named Rosetta had taken away *Frances*' child; Rosetta is a slave to a Miss *Frances*, a coloured woman.

Question.—Did you during the night strike her with a whip?—*Ans.*—No.

Question.—Did you strike or beat her in the morning with the whip?—*Ans.*—I gave her one lick in the morning, as I called her for the purpose of taking her to the barracks; she ran away; I am sure she did not receive more than one stripe from me.

Question.—What time was it that the gentlemen you mention came to visit you?—*Ans.*—About eight o'clock.

Sworn to before me. (signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

28th October 1829

Miss Frances Sills appeared.—States, that on Friday morning 23d, the woman Frances came to her with her child; that when she came to her, the back of Frances was all cut, and she told her that her master had done that, and of his flogging her two nights before; that on that occasion she had gone to Mr. Thompson to tell him, who desired her to come to this office; that she said, she would have done so, but was afraid to come, as she could not explain herself; that she (witness) told her also to come here, which she did.

Question.—What did she tell you was the cause of Mr. Sills' beating her?—*Ans.*—She did not tell me why he beat her, but that he had done so: that in the morning she carried the child to shew him, when he again beat her; that since I left the house, she has frequently had the appearance of being flogged; that having lived with her brother, she (witness) knew much of the people, and had taken Frances' child to take care of it at the request of the father, a negro belonging to a boat establishment.

Question.—The two nights previous that he flogged her, was Tuesday and Wednesday nights. State what reason she told you Mr. Sills had for doing so?—*Ans.*—She did not tell me, further than that he had company dining with him, and after they were gone, he got up in the night with a sword, flourishing and chopping about the rooms; that she, Frances, and the other woman, Acouba, stole out of the room, and hid themselves in the yard; that it was on that night he flogged her, as she told me, *before* she escaped.

Sworn to before me.

(signed) A. W. Young,
 Protector of Slaves.

28th October 1829.

Rosetta, a creole, belonging to Miss Frances Sills.—Says, she met Frances on the dam, crying, and said that her master beat her the whole night; that she saw the marks on her back.

Question.—Did you see her at your mistress's house?—*Ans.*—I did not return, I was going out to sell things.

Question.—Did you ever hear her complain before?—*Ans.*—Yes; that her master often beat her in the night.

Question.—Do you see Frances, belonging to Mr. Sills, often?—*Ans.*—Yes, very often, and they always complain of him (meaning Frances and Acouba).

Question.—Did you take Frances' child from her in the morning, she said she had been beaten over night by Mr. Sills?—*Ans.*—Yes; the child cried to come to me, but I gave it back to the mother after a little.

28th October 1829.

Mr. Thompson being called.—Says, that two women of Mr. Sills came to him to complain; that seeing they had been flogged by Mr. Sills, [Frances showed the marks to Mr. Thompson] he directed them here, as the Fiscal could not interfere; Mr. Thompson was acting for Mr. Padmore. The woman Frances said, Mr. Sills had fired a pistol, and was flourishing a sword during the night, which made them run away.

29th October 1829.

It appears to the Protector, that the slave Frances has established the truth of her master having inflicted corporal punishment upon her, the marks of which were visible when she came to this office to complain; and it further appears, that two or three days previous the same woman had complained to Mr. Thompson of the Fiscal's office (acting in the absence of Mr. Padmore) of similar chastisement, the effects of which were visible.

RETURN of Complaints, &c. made to Protector, from 1 May to 31 Oct. 1829—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

COMPLAINT.

PROCEEDINGS.

The Protector, in obedience to the 14th clause of the Slave Ordinance, intimates to Mr. Sills that he has incurred a fine of 1,400*f.* which must be paid into this office.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

31st October 1829.—No answer has yet been received from Mr. Sills, and if the fine is not immediately paid, a prosecution will be commenced against him.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 61.

Protector of Slaves Office,
30th October 1829.

Appeared *Ben William*, a Barbadian, aged about twenty-eight years; says, that he belonged to Mr. Neil Swinson, deceased.—States, that his master left him to be freed by his last will. Mr. John Alstrom, the executor, can produce the will to prove it; his master was a blacksmith, working at Messrs. Harrower & Donvin's. Complainant was also working at same shop; that Mr. Harrower told him, that he has a bill of sale for him, which he, Ben, declares to be false. Mr. Alstrom will prove that the bill of sale is incorrect; says further, that his master and himself were working with Mr. Harrower; that his master and Mr. Harrower quarrelled, and they left the place; and that he remained with his master till he died; that Mr. Donvin took him up on the Stelling, and sent him to the barracks (gaol); that he was on the tread-mill; he, Donvin, said, Complainant belongs to Mr. Harrower, and that he has been working there ever since; his master's death is upwards of two years ago.

Protector of Slaves Office,
30th October 1829.

The Protector summoned Mr. Alstrom. 31st October 1829.—Mr. Alstrom has not yet appeared.

This case will be investigated, and the result reported hereafter.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

No. 62.

Protector of Slaves Office,
30th October 1829.

Appeared *Joe*, servant and slave of the late A. Mackenzie, deceased—Says, that he was left free by his master's will, and claims his freedom in consequence.

their intention to state at the vendue the circumstances of the case, and to buy him in for the good of himself, and then to be manumitted; that a subscription has been made amounting to 14 or 1500 *guilders*, for the purpose.

Thus Settled.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

George Town, Demerara, the 1st of November 1829.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure No. 10.)

LIST of SUITS and PROSECUTIONS instituted by the PROTECTOR of SLAVES, on behalf of SLAVES, in the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, and the Proceedings therein, as far as they have gone, up to the 31st of October 1829 inclusive.

No.	NAMES OF THE PARTIES.	PROCEEDINGS.
1	Protector, for certain slaves belonging to Plantation Zeelugt, <i>v.</i> Johannes Saurman, manager, for unlawful punishment of said slaves.	-- Citation issued 29th May 1828; still pending, on account of the great number of witnesses, and the difficulty of procuring the evidence of Slaves. The Crown Advocate for the prosecutor has closed his evidence. The counsel for the defendant is now summoning his witnesses.
2	Protector, for the slave Secundo, belonging to L. Breda, <i>v.</i> Philida Gertsen, for unlawfully harbouring the slave Secundo, belonging to L. Breda.	-- Citation issued 28th February 1829; still pending. The Crown Advocate for the prosecutor has closed his evidence. The counsel for the defendant is now hearing his witnesses.
3	Protector, for the slave James, belonging to A. Simpson, <i>v.</i> A. Simpson, for improper punishment of his slave James.	-- Imposed a fine of <i>f.</i> 220, or <i>£.</i> 15. 14. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ sterling; to be paid into the Colony chest; which if not paid in a stipulated time, to be prosecuted for the offence.
4	Protector, for the mulatto slave Cootje, the property of the minors De Witt, <i>v.</i> W. D. Rochemont, Nom. Uxo. & qq. the minors De Witt, for manumission of said slave Cootje.	-- Citation issued 26th September 1829; now pending. The Crown Advocate, for the prosecutor, proceeds for evidence.
5	Protector, for the negro Charles Hynd, a slave belonging to T. Rooth, an inhabitant of this Colony, <i>v.</i> John Knights, <i>f. b.</i> man, for the recovery of a debt of <i>f.</i> 47. 15 st.	-- Citation issued July 1829. The Crown Advocate, for the prosecutor, has obtained, on the 8th October, first, default; and second, citation.
6	Protector, for the negro Charles Hynd, a slave belonging to T. Rooth, of this Colony, <i>v.</i> James Pyne, a carpenter, for the recovery of a debt of <i>f.</i> 40. 10 st. balance of account.	In the hands of the Crown Advocate, to proceed.
7	Protector, for the woman Harriet M'Intosh, belonging to Rosaline M'Leod, <i>v.</i> Damon Brotherson, <i>f. b.</i> man, for the recovery of a debt of <i>f.</i> 59, balance due her on a good of <i>f.</i> 76.	In the hands of Crown Advocate, to proceed.
8	Protector, for the woman Mary, a slave, belonging to G. F. Fraskini, <i>v.</i> Anu Campbell, <i>f. c.</i> woman, for recovery of a good of <i>f.</i> 60. 10 st.	In the hands of the Crown Advocate, to proceed.
9	Protector, for the negro man Bob Harrower, a slave belonging A. F. Harrower, <i>v.</i> T. Setty Stewart, <i>f. b.</i> man, for the recovery of a good for <i>f.</i> 55.	In the hands of the Crown Advocate, to proceed.
10	Protector, for the slaves Kitty and children, belonging to ———, <i>v.</i> Joseph Hubbard, for freedom, on the ground that said Hubbard had agreed to free her on payment of <i>f.</i> 1,500.	-- The Crown Advocate is appointed <i>Curator ad lites</i> , and has commenced proceedings, now pending before the Court, to interdict the sale of her person by Hubbard; citation issued 7th & 9th Oct. 1829.
11	Protector, for the slaves Hendrich, Cornelis, and Betsy, children of the col. woman Nelletje Segatees, in the will of Hermanus Moll, deceased, and at the date of that will belonging to Plantation Johanna Wilhelmina, of Messrs. Rhodius, <i>v.</i> the Heir or Heirs, Hermanus Moll, deceased, or his other	-- The Crown Advocate is appointed <i>curator ad lites</i> , and has commenced proceedings, now pending before the Court, for the recovery of said legacy; citation issued 21st of May 1829.
12	Protector, for the woman Eleanor Blair, <i>alias</i> Eleanor, a slave belonging to John R ^t M'Burnie, <i>v.</i> John R ^t M'Burnie, to compel defendant to sign the deed of manumission, and to execute the security requisite for the maintenance, in case of need, of said Eleanor.	Executor or Executors, of the Estate of Representatives, for a legacy of <i>f.</i> 900. -- In the hands of the Crown Advocate, to compel M'Burnie to execute the security requisite for the deed of manumission, and to sign the deed of manumission. This woman has received letters of manumission in London from M'Burnie.

LIST of Suits and Prosecutions instituted by the Protector of Slaves—*continued.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Return from
Protector of Slaves.

No.	NAMES OF THE PARTIES.	PROCEEDINGS.
13	Protector, for the slave Cato, belonging to J. Paul, <i>v.</i> John Williams, for recovery of a debt of <i>f.</i> 15, acknowledged by Williams to be due to said slave.	In the hands of the Crown Advocate, to proceed.
14	Protector, for the slave Sampson M'Alpine, claiming freedom on being able to pay <i>f.</i> 1,500, the sum stated by him to have been agreed upon between himself and his master, who is now absent from the Colony, and by whose attorney here Sampson has lately been sold to another person.	-- In the hands of the Crown Advocate, to investigate whether he has any grounds to support a claim for manumission.
15	Protector, for the slave Harry, son of Hester Alstrom, sold by L. M'Intosh, Curator minor Duncan M'Bean, as appointed by the court, to H. O. Seward. His mother Hester, stating that Miss Betty Game, the mother of said Duncan M'Bean, became possessed of this slave in an unjust manner, her (Hester's) late mistress having died many years ago intestate, upon which said Betty Game took over some of her slaves, without having any just claim to them.	-- In the hands of the Crown Advocate, to investigate whether he has any grounds to support a claim for manumission.

George Town, Demerara, }
1st November 1829. }

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

(Enclosure No. 11.)

Office of Protector of Slaves, Demerara,
September 25, 1829.

SIR,

IN drawing your attention to the amended Slave Act, passed on the 1st August last, my object (and you will readily conceive I can have no other) is, by warning those concerned against a practice which I have reason to believe prevails generally on estates, to avoid, as much as may be, the necessity of enforcing the penalties against it, which the law provides; and as few will probably be found bold enough to contravene the law, when fully explained to them, I trust that with your assistance this object will be attained.

The practice I mean, is that of confining culprits in the stocks, previous to the expiration of the legal time for inflicting corporal punishment.

The 14th Clause of the Ordinance of January 1826 did not expressly forbid this practice, though its impropriety would seem to be implied in the words which follow the description of punishments to be substituted for flogging, *viz.* in all cases where it shall seem proper to any owner or manager to impose *any* or *either* of the foregoing punishments upon any male slave or slaves to be hereafter committed by such male slave or slaves, in lieu of the punishment, it shall be lawful to do so.

But all doubt on the subject is done away by the amended Act in its first provision; and from your experience of the carelessness of persons in general to the meaning of a law, however plain, I shall hope to find an excuse for the trouble I impose on you, in requesting that no one individual having charge of negroes, within your district, remain ignorant of his being amenable to law for his continuance of this practice; that no discretionary power, either by the old or new Act, rests with me; and that, as an officer specially charged to watch over their due observance, and punish any act contrary to them, should an infringement of any of their provisions be, in my mind, proved, I have but one duty to perform, which, however unpleasant, is imperative.

In conclusion, I cannot deny the difficulties which Planters have to contend with, in complying with this law, unless some means be adopted to secure the offender until the legal time of corporal punishment, since he would, in many instances, most probably effect his escape; but I should suggest that he be confined, without punishment, by stocks, taking care always that this confinement does not become, from unnecessary severity, equal to the punishment of solitary confinement described in the 14th Clause of the Ordinance of January 1826; for in that case two punishments for the same offence would be inflicted, contrary to the first provision of the amended Slave Law.

I have the honour to be, &c. &c.

To Assistant Protector.
A true Copy,
A. W. Y.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

N^o 5.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

DESPATCH from Sir *George Murray* to Sir *B. D'Urban*, &c. &c. &c.

SIR,

Downing Street, 30th November 1830.

I HAVE received your Despatch of the 15th December 1829, enclosing the Report of the Protector of Slaves for the six months ending on the 31st October 1829, with the various documents annexed to it. Some of those documents imperfectly describe the proceedings to which they relate, because those proceedings have in their progress come within the jurisdiction of the Fiscal. In future, it will be desirable that the Fiscal should send copies of the records of proceedings before him on complaint by or against Slaves, at the same time that the Protector's Reports are sent, and embracing the same half-yearly periods.

No. 6.

In the Return, No. 6, of Slave Marriages, from 1st January to 30th June 1829, I find the following note: "Parish of St. Luke. The Rev. Mr. Gunn remarks, " " No Slaves were married in this parish during this half year; one or two applications were made to me, but the parties being the properties of different " " owners, and therefore daily liable to separation, I refused to solemnize the " " marriage, from conviction that too many individuals under such circumstances " " would tend to bring the ordinance into disrepute among the Slaves themselves, " " and render the inviolable laws of religion subordinate to local enactments." " No clergyman or presbyterian minister in the United Kingdom would think himself justified in refusing to solemnize a marriage, to which there was no distinct legal impediment, merely on the ground of circumstances which in his own individual judgment would be likely to render the marriage productive of evil consequences. This is a responsibility which it cannot be fitting to impose upon any private person. I think it proper Mr. Gunn should be distinctly apprised, that, under the present law, the circumstances to which he alludes would not exempt him from the obligation of marrying any parties who should apply to him for that purpose. I have not before me any detailed information respecting the " one or " two " cases in which parties applied to Mr. Gunn to marry them; but I have no reason to believe that the mere circumstance of the man and woman belonging to different owners would render the marriage exceptionable, even if the right of taking such exceptions were supposed to exist. I have been credibly informed, that in some West India Colonies the general practice of the negroes is to take their wives, or reputed wives, from other gangs than those to which they belong; and the motives which have been assigned for such a choice appears to be a sufficient justification of it. But whatever may be the conclusion arrived at respecting the expediency of unions between Slaves of different gangs, I cannot admit that an impediment should be created to them upon the judgment of a private individual. You will therefore inform Mr. Gunn, that it is incumbent upon him to solemnize every marriage, upon application duly made to him for that purpose; and you will take care that your injunction be observed.

On application to the Protector for the recovery of debts due to Slaves, I observe that it is the practice of the Protector to give time to the debtor, with the acquiescence of the applicant. I will take this opportunity of observing, that such acquiescence should, in all cases, be considered as an indispensable condition of this indulgence to the debtor.

The Protector has also recommended, that the colonial enactment for the more speedy enforcement of the pecuniary penalties should be extended to suits arising out of the Slave Laws. You have not taken any notice of this recommendation in your despatch, and I therefore request to be informed, whether such an extension of the law has been proposed to the Court of Policy, or whether you see any cause to object to the proposal.

No. 2.

In the Return of Complaints made by Slaves to the Protector, the second case is that of a Slave named James Piggot, or Picket. His principal ground of complaint is, that he was afflicted with hernia, fever and ague in the legs; that he was required by his owner, Mr. John Graham, to do work to which the pressure of these complaints made him unequal; and that he was not provided with the usual

usual clothing, or with medical attendance. In the registration of this Slave, in 1817, at the age of eleven years, by his then owner, he is described as a domestic, and as *invalid*. His registration, in August 1829, by his present owners, describes him "*with swelled legs, a domestic, healthy.*" Mr. Graham's answer to the complaint is, first, by the production of extracts from his books, which showed, it is said, that the Slave had received his clothing. The Slave's complaint was, that he was "not allowed his yearly clothes the same as all other servants." As the Protector was satisfied with the extracts produced from the books, I conclude that the clothing which he had received was sufficient; but I do not know whether the amount which constitutes sufficiency is so distinctly defined in practice as to convict the Slave of a direct misrepresentation on this point, such as would discredit the rest of his statement. Mr. Graham meets the complaint of want of medical attendance by saying, that the Slave had not himself complained of being sick; but that "Dr. Watt is the medical attendant, and is at this moment attending to the relief of his complaints." Upon this statement of Mr. Graham, accompanied by a description of the sort of work required from the Slave, the complaint was dismissed by the Protector. It appears to me, that the Slave should have been called upon to state whether he had or had not complained to his owner of sickness, and made known to him his want of medical attendance, and that Dr. Watt should have been questioned as to the actual state of health of the Slave, and the degree of labour to which he might be fairly subjected. You will, therefore, desire the Protector to make these inquiries in case of the Slave continuing to think himself aggrieved.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

In the course of the correspondence which took place on complaint No. 3, it has been stated by the Assistant Protector for the district of Leguan, Mr. Thierens, that though the applications to him have been many since his appointment, in no one instance has the complaining negro been provided with a pass, such as is said to be required by law, "such, it would appear, being withheld from them." I have to request that you will cause the strictest inquiry to be made into the real state of the case in this respect, both in the district of Leguan and generally throughout the Colony; and you will be pleased to signify to me your own personal opinion, whether there be any new enactment required to secure to the negroes the proper facilities for preferring their complaints. It is obvious that the efficacy of the institution of Protectors must entirely depend upon the ease and safety of the access to them. The complainant in this case, No. 3, had received the utmost amount of lashes which the manager was allowed by law to inflict; and the only offence imputed to him, as far as appears by the proceedings, was that of preparing to go to one species of labour instead of another; the point in dispute being, to which he had been ordered. He came to complain without a pass. It does not appear, although the minutes of the investigation ought to have exhibited this fact, whether or not he asserted that he had applied for one. He was for this reason sent back by the Assistant Protector with a letter to the manager, desiring that he might not be punished, but that a pass might be given to him to return. The manager's answer was, "The negro George, being a runaway, and having applied to you in an illegal way, without asking for a pass from me, I beg leave to say I shall not attend to the contents of your letter." The Slave was put into the stocks immediately on his return to the plantation, 11th May, both hands and feet. His hands were released at eight o'clock at night; but from that time he was kept in the stocks every night till the 16th, or, as he asserts, the 17th May. On the 19th, the authority of the attorney for the property having been invoked, the manager appears to have been brought to submit to an investigation of the case, and received an admonition. This case appears to me to show, that if the Protector and the Assistant Protectors be not armed with power to compel an immediate attendance, both of complainants, of those complained against, and of witnesses, their office will be unregarded and nugatory.

No. 3.

On the case No. 5, I must make a remark which might be applied to the majority of these investigations, that the only parties examined are those from whom the truth is least likely to be elicited, the party complaining, and the party against whom the complaint is brought. It does not appear to be denied, however, in this case, that the woman who complains was sick, and that she was struck by the manager. The degree of violence used is disputed, and this is, no doubt, a point which always will be disputed, and cannot be ascertained, and the law is therefore the more necessary to be enforced which forbids that a woman should

No. 5.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

No. 14.

be struck at all. The woman's allegation, that she was confined *in the stocks*, is disputed; but it is not denied that she was confined three days and nights, and that during this confinement an infant at the breast was not admitted to her. I am unable to discover on what ground the Protector dismissed the complaint.

The Complaint No. 14. is that of the negro George against Mr. John Thierens, for detaining him in slavery, he being free by birth. This negro was drunk when he first appeared to make his complaint, but he stated his case on the following day, when he was sober. His statement is, "That his mother, Laura, was the daughter of the Indian woman Urina, of the Harno tribe; that his father's name was Ziptari, a Slave belonging to Mr. Trotts, and head driver on Plantation Laurencia, where his mother lived, and was always considered as a free woman; that after her death, which happened whilst he was a child, Mr. Trotts took him and his sister Stofflinkey, and that they have since been considered as Slaves; that his sister has a son, named Remy, now alive; that after Mr. Trotts died they belonged to his wife, and subsequent to her death, became the property of Mr. Thierens her nephew; that there are two free women living now on Fort Island, who can prove that he and his family are the descendants of the free Indian woman Laura; and he therefore prays that the Protector will obtain for them their liberty; that about five years ago they claimed their liberty, and were assisted in doing so by the Crown Advocate, Mr. Gordon; that it was then decided that they should return to the estate Nieuw Osterbeck, and remain there six months, at the expiration of which time, Mr. Gordon told them, they should be manumitted; but that this has not yet been done; that the names of the women he refers to are Greeky and Christina." The answer to this complaint is made by Mr. M. Thierens, who appears to be the brother and the attorney of Mr. John Thierens, and also to hold the office of Assistant Protector of Slaves. Mr. M. Thierens's statement is in substance, that Stofflinkey, the sister of George, was glad to see George back upon the estate, and begged him (Thierens) to take no notice of George's claim to freedom, as he only states it when in liquor, and never thinks of it otherwise, and she and the rest of her family were all contented and satisfied under the present administration of the estate. Mr. Thierens adds, that this family absconded some years back on account of alleged ill-treatment by a Mr. Van du Punt, but he believes returned to the estate of their own accord, as they were not able to subsist by their own industry; and he says that the witnesses mentioned by George are, as far as he can learn, not to be found in Essequibo. This statement must of course be understood as being made by Mr. Thierens as attorney for his brother, and not as Assistant Protector of Slaves. It is accompanied by two certificates, the one signed "M. Warner," the other signed "Thos. P. Simpson," which are each of them in the following words: "I do hereby certify, that two negroes on Plantation Nieuw Osterbeck, situate on the Island of Leguna, have been examined in my presence by the Assistant Protector of Slaves, M. Thierens, Esq.; that they disclaimed any pretensions to freedom, and professed themselves perfectly satisfied with their state, and acknowledged that it was in a moment of intoxication that the man George made application to the Protector of Slaves in George Town." It is to be observed, that in neither of these certificates are the two negroes who made the disavowal in question named or described in the body of the document. The names George and Stofflinkey are appended in a marginal note. I remark this circumstance, not as constituting a probable ground of suspicion that deception has been practised, but merely as an irregularity in the transaction of business which would be better avoided. The decision upon this case is, "Dismissed, the claim being withdrawn by the parties themselves, and acknowledged by them to be unfounded, and that it was only made whilst under the influence of spirituous liquors." It appears to me that this case has been disposed of in too summary a manner. The statement of alleged facts upon which the claims to freedom were founded, is distinct and specific. It is in no single particular disproved or even contradicted by the opposite party. Considering the presumable ignorance of the negroes, and the means of persuasion which the master may be supposed to possess, the abandonment of their claims on former occasions may be accounted for without any necessary inference of invalidity. One of the principal motives for the establishment of a Protector of Slaves is deduced from the apprehension that Slaves may not be capable of forming a just judgment of their own interests, or in a condition to act for themselves. I have to observe, moreover, that the two negroes George and

and Stofflinkey, who are certified to have disavowed their pretensions to freedom, are not the only persons whose freedom was in question. Remy, the son of Stofflinkey, would be equally entitled to freedom if the statement of George could be substantiated. It was the duty of the Protector, therefore, in this case, to take every means for substantiating that statement, and obtaining the freedoms which would result from its substantiation. If any individuals who might be so made free should desire to remain on the property of Mr. Thierens, and work for him in the same manner as they now do, it would of course be in their power to offer him their services. With reference, however, to the statement of Mr. M. Thierens's belief that the negroes returned some time ago to the estate because they could not subsist by their own industry, I must remark that any exercise of industry which can make a negro of value to his master, must be over and above that which is necessary to procure his own subsistence. You will direct the Protector of Slaves to resume the case in conformity with this view of it, and you will also require from Mr. Gordon, the Crown Advocate, a report upon the allegation of George, respecting the proceedings said to have been adopted by Mr. Gordon, and their result.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Correspondence.

The Complaint No. 16. is made on behalf of a Slave named Sarah, against a free coloured man named Stoel, for beating her with a tar rope. The witness Bolam, who is an uncle of Stoel's, and who gives the account of the matter which appears the least unfavourable to Stoel, states, that he (Stoel) in his passion seized a small cat, kept by the witness to whip the children, and drove her away from the place. The question then put to him is not, "Can you swear he did not strike the woman?" but, "Can you swear he did not strike her *'with a tar rope?'*" and to this he answers, "Certainly, I can." The material question, whether the woman was struck at all, is not put to this witness. But another (Mr. Trotts) states distinctly, that she was beaten by Stoel with a cat; and there is no statement to the contrary but that of the accused himself. The decision of the Protector is given thus: "The foregoing complaint has not been proved, and is not therefore referred to the Fiscal." It may be clear, that the precise assault complained of, being an assault with a tar rope, was not proved; but it seems equally clear that an assault had been committed; and it is therefore difficult to understand on what grounds the Protector felt himself justified in dismissing the case.

No. 16.
 —

Mr. N. E. Carberry, complained against in No. 20, for withholding his Slave's allowance of food for two weeks, was liable to the penalty of £.150, under the twenty-second clause of the Slave Ordinance, then in force. I wish to know under what authority the Protector omitted to enforce this penalty.

No. 20.
 —

The following case, No. 21, exhibits evidence of an habitual violation of a most important provision of the Slave Ordinance, that, namely, which exempts the Slave from labour on the Sunday; and yet it appears to have entirely escaped the notice of the Protector of Slaves, whose only note upon the case is, in two words, at the end of the proceedings,—"*Complaint dismissed.*" The statement of the complainant, James, is as follows: "He belongs to Plantation Lusignan, S. C. Land Manager. States, having been unjustly punished; he says, that on Friday last he was throwing green megass out of doors, the megass logies being filled up; that on the Saturday he was ordered to the field, and left the green megass of the preceding day out of doors, *which he was to carry to the megass logie on Sunday morning*, but that his row in the field not being finished he was ordered to go and finish it previous to his receiving his allowance of fish; that he went as he was ordered, and did the work he had left in the field on Saturday by eleven o'clock next morning; that on coming home [this, he it observed, is on Sunday] he went to eat, *and was ordered to put up in the logies the megass which he had left out of doors on Friday; that he carried megass until six o'clock at night, and carried the heap which was his own, then went with the rest of the people to throw grass*; that the Buildings Driver, seeing some of the megass left close to the heap that he had to carry, told him that he should go in the stocks; that he (James) had carried his share, and that what was left was for the man Keross, who had been taken away from his work to be sent to Mr. Spemier's with a letter; however, that he got away, and did not go to the stocks; the drivers reported his conduct to the manager, who sent for him to the field on Monday morning, had him put in the stocks, and flogged on the ensuing day." The direct matter of complaint in this case, and consequently the answer to it, are

No. 21.
 —

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

of less consequence than the practice incidentally disclosed by it. I shall, however, advert to the matter of complaint, in the first place. I observe in this as in other instances, that the only parties applied to on the plantation by the Assistant Protector to elucidate the case are the drivers, who are generally, and in this case especially, involved in the proceedings which give rise to the complaints. This mode of investigation cannot tend to elicit the truth. The substance of the answer is, that James was not punished for failing to carry the megass, which he asserts that he had carried on the Sunday, but for going to the field instead of to the mill, to which he had been ordered on Monday morning. It appears, however, from the examination of Abercrombie, the buildings driver, that on the Sunday night he asked James why he had not carried the megass; that James was insolent, and that he ordered him to be put in the stocks that night, and to go to the mill on the Monday morning. James got away, and thus escaped the stocks; he went to the field, instead of the mill, in the morning, and then he was flogged. Whatever was the precise cause of the flogging on Monday, it is admitted that he was to have been put in the stocks on Sunday if he had not escaped; and an offence therefore was imputed to him on that day, and a punishment intended for him, on account of his being supposed (incorrectly, according to his account) not to have carried his share of megass. It is thus the more necessary to trace a transaction which shows that negroes are considered punishable for not having completed on the Sunday tasks which they had been either unwilling or unable to perform on previous days. The driver Abercrombie states, that "if they (the negroes) have not by the Saturday put up under the logies all the megass, they are punished on the Monday; and whenever any one leaves megass on Saturday, *he finishes carrying it to the logies on Sunday morning*; that he did not see James the whole Sunday; that when the negroes came to throw grass at night, he asked James the reason why he did not carry megass the Friday previous." The head field driver says, that James was one of the men ordered to carry megass from the mill from Tuesday to Friday; that he was ordered to the field with the rest of the gang on Saturday; that some of the megass was left out of doors, and that *they had to put it under the logie on Sunday morning*; that *James did not do it*, was consequently ordered into the stocks by the buildings driver, but got away. The Assistant Protector, having taken these examinations of the drivers, observes: "The drivers declare to me, that whenever any one had left his work undone on the Saturday, he was punished on the Monday, and that whenever any of the people happened not to have finished the task of the Saturday, they preferred finishing it on Sunday than to be punished on Monday morning." It is obvious, that if this practice be suffered to prevail with impunity, any quantity of labour may be exacted from the Slave on the Sunday, by nominally assigning it to the Saturday. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that, either under the existing law, or by a supplementary enactment, (if, in your judgment, such be required,) this practice be totally and effectually put down. I cannot close my remarks upon this, without calling your attention to the negligence in the administration of the Slave Ordinance, by which such a system has been allowed to escape notice, although by the examinations consequent upon this complaint it had been thus distinctly brought within the view of the Protector.

No. 33.

It is with extreme pain that I have perused the proceedings on the Complaint No. 33, and I am compelled to express my most serious displeasure at their result. The woman complained against, Mary Lowe, was unable to bring forward a single witness to negative any of the circumstances which are proved against her on the evidence of her nearest relatives and others. It is proved that she was an habitual drunkard, and her Slaves appear to have been continually suffering from her cruelty and violence, and sometimes in imminent danger of their lives. One of the offences proved against Mary Lowe is thus described in the examination of her niece, Maria J. Lowe:—"Says, she was present when her aunt punished Elvira, that it is about three months ago. *Quest.* How did she punish Elvira?—*Ans.* She tied her hands behind her, and flogged her with a rope. She, Elvira was fastened to a beam, swinging backwards and forwards; her head was low, and the rope fastened round the beam. The girl fainted away, and when she recovered, she beat her again. *Quest.* Was the girl taken down when she fainted away?—No, she (Mrs. Lowe) stopped, and when the girl recovered, she beat her again, and the girl again fainted. She was never loosened or taken down till about one o'clock; that the punishment commenced about

" eight

“ eight o'clock in the morning. *Quest.* Did you make any remonstrance with your aunt for such conduct towards the girl?—*Ans.* I did: she told me I had no business with it.” The witness, Maria Lowe, proceeds—“ A few months previously she tied up a little boy, called Shigh, in a similar manner, from about nine o'clock A.M. to six P.M., and the boy lost the use of his hands for several days afterwards.” To the question, whether complaints were made to the Assistant Protector, Mr. M'Pherson, it is answered, that such complaints were made, but Mr. M'Pherson always desired Mary Lowe's slaves to go away when they came to complain. This account of the Assistant Protector's conduct is but too well supported by the written answer which he returned, when the complaints having at length reached the Protector, that officer desired him to make personal inquiry into the case. That answer is, “ that for a great length of time back he had had no communication, directly or indirectly, with Mary Lowe, and he would certainly like to have no words with her.” It is unnecessary to advert to the other heavy offences which are in evidence against this woman; and I will now proceed to consider whether, as appears to have suggested itself to the Protector, (for whose manner of proceeding I can in no other way account,) there was any grounds for attributing the woman's conduct to insanity. The certificates from Maria J. Lowe and A. Mackintosh attribute to her excessive drunkenness, violence, and cruelty, but make no mention of insanity. The Protector states, that various other certificates of the same tendency as these were received, and “ one stating that Mary Lowe *seemed* to be deranged.” Mr. Bunbury, manager of Devonshire Castle Estate, deposes, that he is well acquainted with Mary Lowe for the last twenty-five years, and states her to be a great drunkard; and when asked if he thinks her deranged, his answer is, “ No, when sober she is a very good woman: you would not believe it was the same person.” Mary Lowe's son, Mr. J. M'Pherson, agrees with this witness as to Mary Lowe's drunkenness, and as to her being “ always very regular when she cannot obtain liquor;” but he adds, “ that he is aware that she is, even when sober, a very bad mistress.” Mr. H. Burton deposes to the drunkenness, but says nothing of derangement. Mr. M'Pherson states that Mary Lowe (who is his mother) “ is now in town, sick from drunkenness;” but neither does he attribute to her any mental disease. The medical attendant of the Colonial Hospital states, that she was admitted into that establishment on the 14th February 1823, in a state of insanity, but that she was discharged in ten days, and the cause of her derangement was attributed to frequent intoxication. This is the whole of the testimony upon the point, and it exhibits no proof of other mental alienation than that which, in any case, excessive drunkenness may be expected to produce. But mere drunkenness cannot be admitted as any plea to protect this woman from the punishment due to her crimes. Nothing but distinct evidence of contemporaneous insanity could justify the exemption of such an offender from the severest punishment which the law awards upon conviction of such offences; and the proof of insanity, which, if it exist, might justify such an exemption, would equally justify, and indeed render imperatively necessary, her confinement for life as a criminal lunatic. All that has been done in this case is, to take away from Mary Lowe the care of her Slaves, and place them in the hands of a curator. I confess myself totally at a loss to account for the appearance of insensibility to the claims of justice which is presented by this result. The omission to bring this woman to trial is grounded upon a mere conjectural inference, which is not supported by even a single allegation of her having been deranged *at the time* when the crimes were committed, and which is deduced only from the circumstance of her having been considered deranged six years ago, for a period of ten days, from previous intemperance. You will lose no time in causing any steps which may be consistent with the laws of the Colony, to be taken for prosecuting Mary Lowe. You will also institute the strictest inquiry into the conduct of the Assistant Protector, Mr. M'Pherson, who is stated to have refused to receive the complaints of Mary Lowe's Slaves, and who wrote to the Protector, on the 2d September 1829, the Letter recorded in these proceedings in answer to the Protector's Letter of the 24th August 1829, also recorded; and unless he explain his conduct to you in a satisfactory manner, you will supersede him without further reference to me.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

In the proceedings on Complaint No. 39, it is stated that the gang on Plantation Blankenburg, Mr. Bascum, manager, “ had not done cutting the canes and loading the punts until eight o'clock at night; that when the gun fired they

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

“ were still in the field, carrying the canes they had cut that day to the punt to be brought home.” The Ordinance then in force, Clause 23, requires, under a penalty of *f.* 300, that field work shall cease at six o'clock in the evening. The manager undertook to show, that on the day in question the field work ceased at the proper hour; but the only witnesses he produced were his own overseer and drivers; and even they fail him, for the overseer only deposes, that “ the people “ must have left the field *about* six o'clock, as they were upon the droghery at a “ quarter past seven with the grass;” whilst the driver says, that “ they broke off “ work at seven o'clock; and it was gun-fire when they appeared on the droghery.” The woman driver, Lucy, speaking of the usual time of leaving off work, states it to be six o'clock; but she adds, “ being Saturday night, that they were obliged “ to bring the canes; the people were late in cutting the canes that day.” No one who reads this testimony of the overseers and drivers can doubt that the Ordinance had been violated in this point, whatever might have been the state of the case on the other ground of complaint to which the Protector has adverted in his admonition to the manager. But this violation of the Ordinance was wholly overlooked by the Protector in his decision, and no penalty whatever was enforced.

No. 42.

With reference to the Complaint No. 42, I am to request that you will make inquiry respecting the punishment which is alleged to have been inflicted on the woman Suckey, in the gaol, by flogging and working on the tread-mill; and you will call for the records of any proceedings before the Fiscal, or otherwise, which may have led to such punishment, and for the report of the medical attendant of the gaol upon the case, and for the journal in which the punishment is entered. You will then report to me your opinion of the propriety of what may be found to have taken place.

No. 44.

Complaint No. 44. is that of a negro named Wednesday against his owner, Mr. Sills, who had beaten and kicked him, and put him in the stocks, for not carrying plantains, although he was unable to carry them from sickness and sores on his head and body. A medical man, Dr. Smith, who had attended the negro, deposes, that he desired particular attention to be paid to him, and every indulgence granted, as he considered him in a very bad state of health; that he ordered him to be put under a course of medicine; that, on going to see another man belonging to the same owner, he learned that Wednesday was in the gaol in consequence of having broken out of the stocks, where he had been put for not carrying plantains; that he immediately advised he should be released, as he considered him unfit for any labour. Mr. Webster, the medical attendant of the gaol, certifies, that the negro “ is in a deplorable state with scrofulous ulcers, *particularly his “ head and neck; and from the rapidity with which the ulcers have spread, he “ much fears that he will never be of any service to his owner.”* The negro also complains that his owner, after dressing his sores once, gave him no more of the dressing which Dr. Smith had sent for him. The only allegations which Mr. Sills has to make in his defence are, that the plantains which the sick negro was required to carry were to be for his own consumption, and that after his refusal to carry them, he (Sills) saw him carrying a large tray *upon his head*, for some person or other, which was very heavy, so much so that Sills could scarcely lift it; that he pays him every attention, and has his sores dressed. Bearing in mind the certificate of Dr. Webster, that the negro was in a deplorable state with scrofulous ulcers, “ *particularly on his head and neck,*” it is scarcely possible to believe the statement of Mr. Sills; at all events, there is no denial of the negro's having been both beaten and put in the stocks for the same alleged offence, and this was an illegality which subjected Mr. Sills to a penalty under the 1st Clause of the Ordinance of the 1st August 1829. I am unable to discover the slightest ground for omitting to impose this penalty.

No. 45.

The very next case, No. 45, is a Complaint against the same owner, Mr. Sills, by a female Slave, Acomba, who is also sickly and has scrofulous sores, and who states that Mr. Sills suspected her of theft, and beat her with a stick. Mr. Sills, in answer, states, that he “ merely touched her with a whip.” The gaol surgeon certifies, that she is afflicted with severe ulceration of the right cheek, and that her right eye is in a very high state of inflammation, and that without great care is observed she will certainly lose it. The only result of this case is, that Mr. Sills engages to have his Slaves Wednesday and Acomba properly attended to in his own house, stating that the expense of keeping them in the gaol hospital was too

too much for him to pay; and that hereupon they were delivered up to him, with a direction to comply strictly with his engagement, and take every care of them. On reverting to the case No. 29, I find that this same woman Acomba, in her own behalf and that of her brother, afflicted like herself with sores, and that of her husband, Theodore, also stated to be diseased, complained on this previous occasion of being kicked and beaten by Mr. Sills, and of no medical attendance being afforded them. The issue of that case was, that "the Protector having found " the statements of the complainants as to insufficiency of food and allowances, " and as to their being kicked or beaten, incorrect,"—(how they were found to be so does not appear, unless by the mere denial of Mr. Sills)—"dismissed the " complaints accordingly, directing Mr. Sills, however, to provide them with such " medical attendance and care as they stood in need of." The inefficacy of this direction of the 7th of August might have taught the Protector that something more was required than a repetition of it on the 29th September; and if the beating of the sick woman was denied in the former case, the Protector cannot have attached any weight to the denial in the latter, which was accompanied with an admission that he had "merely touched her with a whip." The protection afforded by such proceedings as these must be all but nugatory.

The result of the next case, No. 46, is another mere admonition for an admitted violation of the law, by beating a female Slave with a stick.

No. 46.

In proceedings on Complaint No. 51, there is also an admitted beating or striking of the female Slave, Nelly Sue, by her mistress, Catherine Brown, which does not appear to have in any manner attracted the notice of the Protector.

No. 51.

In this case I have to request that you will call for a copy of the warrant under which Nelly Sue was confined in the gaol, and of the Record of the proceedings which led to her confinement there. You will also desire the Protector to state whether the arrangement advised by the Crown Advocate of the matters of account between this Slave and her mistress has been duly carried into effect.

On the case No. 53, I have to observe, that I entertain doubts whether, under the Registration Law of Demerara, the woman Mary Ann and her children Francis and William had not become entitled to their freedom, by the omission to register them before the application to the Lieutenant Governor to allow this omission to be supplied. You will call for a special report upon this point, and upon the case generally, from the Crown Advocate, which when received you will have the goodness to transmit for my information.

No. 53.

The Protector will report whether the necessary measures have been yet taken for assuring freedom to the unregistered boy Thomas, in case No. 54, and for recovering the penalties in cases Nos. 57 and 60.

No. 54, 57, 60.

The observations which I here close upon these proceedings of the Protector in the Complaints of Slaves are far from being the whole which the Record has suggested; for I have avoided adding to the length of this despatch by the frequent repetition of remarks which, although especially applicable to some particular cases that have been selected for comment, may be justly used to characterize the proceedings generally. The witnesses examined are in general few, and they are not those from whom the most impartial testimony was to be expected; points essential to a correct understanding of the case remain without elucidation; there is no appearance of assistance or of advice, or indeed of opportunity, having been afforded to the Slaves to substantiate their allegations; and even when apparently substantiated, it is in very few instances that the claims of justice and the provisions of the law seem to have been satisfied in the result.

On a review of this general character of the proceedings, if I am compelled to comment upon them with severity, I am not the less anxious that my comments should be understood as having reference to Colonel Young solely in his quality of Protector. The office is an extremely arduous one, and very peculiar qualifications are required for it. I would much rather attribute Colonel Young's decisions in many of the cases which have come before him to the want of a habit of weighing evidence, and of the penetration which such a habit generates, than to the want of an equitable mind. But from whatever cause the inefficiency proceeds, and whatever be the value which might attach to the services of Colonel Young in other situations, I cannot consent that he should continue in the office of Protector whilst I remain under the conviction of his unfitness for it, to which

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

his recent proceedings have led me. Under such an administration of the Slave Ordinance as these proceedings appear to evince, I cannot indeed but entertain the most serious doubts whether, in the many important provisions depending for their execution upon the Protector, that Ordinance be not almost devoid of practical effect. Some of the details to which it has been my painful duty to advert in this Despatch, present sufficient indications of the responsibility which I should assume, were I not to require either that these doubts be forthwith removed, or that the office of Protector be entrusted to other hands. You will therefore grant the Protector six months' leave of absence, in order that he may return to this country for the purpose of explaining his conduct; and until a final decision be taken as to his resumption of the office, you will make the best selection in your power of a person to execute the duties provisionally.

You must allow me, in conclusion, to advert to the Despatches from yourself which have accompanied the Protector's Reports. These Despatches have in general notified the transmission of the Reports, and have contained little or no comment upon them. Sensible as I am of the vigour and penetration with which every inquiry is pursued which it devolves upon yourself personally to conduct, I cannot suppose that the imperfections of those which have been conducted by the Protector would have escaped your observation had you conceived yourself called upon to revise them; and I am thus induced to believe that you have considered such a revision as not having been intended to constitute any part of a Governor's duty. I take this occasion, therefore, to request from you, as one of the most important functions of your Government, the exercise of such a superintendence of your own as shall ensure the proper execution of the office of Protector of Slaves. Without the most watchful performance of this duty, it is not to be hoped that the law for bettering the condition of the Slaves will be effectually administered. It is obvious that an immediate revision by the Governor, followed by a prompt resumption of imperfect investigations, must obviate many evils which are beyond the reach of remedy after such a lapse of time as must unavoidably intervene before the final revision by the Secretary of State.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Goderich.*

N° 6.

DESPATCH from Sir *B. D'Urban* to Sir *George Murray*, &c. &c. &c.

King's House, Demerara.

26 July 1830.

SIR,

I HAVE the honour to transmit the Report of the Protector of Slaves of this Colony, for the half year ending 30th April last, prepared according to the 80th Clause of the Order in Council of the 20th February last.

I have, &c.

(signed) *B. D'Urban.*

REPORT of the PROTECTOR of SLAVES of the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, made to his Excellency Sir *Benjamin D'Urban*, Lieutenant Governor of the said Colony, in pursuance of an Order of His Majesty in Council, dated 2d day of February 1830.

Nota.—The following Report is from 1st November 1829 to 1st May 1830, agreeably to the recently repealed Slave Laws, and its various Returns were nearly completed when the present Form arrived in this Colony. But the Protector deemed it would be more consonant to the wish of His Majesty's Government to shape this Report conformably to the present approved Form, which has therefore been adopted, and the proceedings in several of the Cases continued to the 24th of June 1830, the day prescribed by the Order in Council for closing his Report.

SCHEDULE

SCHEDULE.

TABLE (A.)

TABLE (A.) contains the Returns of Punishments, &c. from the 1st July to the 31st December 1829 inclusive.

No. I.—Particular Returns	- - - - -	124
No. II.—General Results	- - - - -	132
No. III.—Offences committed	- - - - -	134
No. IV.—Total absence of Punishment	- - - - -	135
No. V.—Defaulters	- - - - -	136

TABLE (B.)—*Complaints of Injuries.*

TABLE (B.), with its Appendix, contains all the Complaints of Slaves made to the Protector of Slaves, from the 1st of November 1829 to the 30th of April 1830 inclusive, agreeably to the lately repealed Slave Ordinance.

No. 1.—Name, Age, Sex, &c. of Complainant	- - - - -	} 136 to 186
No. 2.—Name of the Owner, &c.	- - - - -	
No. 3.—Time of preferring the Complaint, &c.	- - - - -	
No. 4.—Substance of Complaint	- - - - -	
No. 5.—Proceedings thereupon	- - - - -	
No. 6.—Evidence	- - - - -	
No. 7.—Defence	- - - - -	
No. 8.—Evidence	- - - - -	
No. 9.—Result of Proceedings	- - - - -	
No. 10.—Explanatory Remarks	- - - - -	

TABLE (C.)

Employment of Slaves on Sunday	- - - - -	186
--------------------------------	-----------	-----

TABLE (D.)

TABLE (D.) contains the Marriages of Slaves reported to the Protector as having been solemnized during the half-year, from 1st July to 31st December 1829 inclusive.

Marriages	- - - - -	186
-----------	-----------	-----

TABLE (E.)

TABLE (E.) contains the Separations of Slaves which have taken place during the half-year, from the 1st of November 1829 to the 30th of April 1830 inclusive, in accordance with the lately repealed amended Slave Act.

Separations of Slaves	- - - - -	187
-----------------------	-----------	-----

TABLE (F.)

TABLE (F.) contains all the Manumissions effected during the half-year, from the 1st of November 1829 to the 30th of April 1830 inclusive. The Order in Council took effect here on the 14th of April 1830; but no compulsory Manumissions took place up to the 30th of same month.

No. I.—Voluntary Manumissions	- - - - -	} 188
No. II.—Compulsory Manumissions	- Results - - - - -	
No. III.—Ditto	- ditto - - - Cases - - - - -	

TABLE (G.)

Property	- - - - -	189
----------	-----------	-----

TABLE (H.)—*Actions, Prosecutions, &c.*

No. 1.—In what Court, and commenced	- - - - -	} 189 to 198
No. 2.—When commenced	- - - - -	
No. 3.—By and against whom commenced	- - - - -	
No. 4.—Object of Action or Prosecution	- - - - -	
No. 5.—Date and Nature of each successive Proceeding	- - - - -	
No. 6.—Result of Action or Prosecution	- - - - -	
No. 7.—State of the Process, if not brought to a close	- - - - -	
No. 8.—Amount of Costs and Expenses	- - - - -	

TABLE (I.)—*Actions and Prosecutions depending.*

No. 1.—Number of Actions, &c. depending	- - - - -	} 198
No. 2.—Names of the Parties in such Actions, &c.	- - - - -	
No. 3.—Cause of delay in each case	- - - - -	

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS	- - - - -	199
----------------------	-----------	-----

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

TABLE (A.)

EXHIBITING the NUMBER and EFFECT of the RETURNS of PUNISHMENTS
1st day of July to the

No. I.—PARTICULAR RETURNS.

NAME of the M A N A G E R.	Name of the Estate, if any, to which the Slaves are attached.	THE DATE of the Return.	The Name of the Protector, or Assistant Protector, to whom the Return was made.
Arbman, L.	L'Heureuse Avanture	5 Jan. 1830	J. H. Otterbein, A. P.
Bareghems, J. P.	Vauxhall and Westminster	ditto	ditto
Bach, U. J. F.	Vredeand Vriendschap and Jacoba Constantia	ditto	ditto
Blagrove, J. H. F.	Nooit Gedacht	ditto	ditto
Butcher, R. G.	Belle Vue	15 Jan. 1830	ditto
Bryden, John	Task Gang	ditto	ditto
Cantzlaar, Gilles	Java and Richt door Zee	5 Jan. 1830	ditto
Deeges, L. C. W.	Le Desir	ditto	ditto
Gordon, John	Tenez Ferme	ditto	ditto
Green, J.	Wales	ditto	ditto
Inniss, J.	Orange Field	ditto	ditto
Lindsay, P. J.	Mindenburg	ditto	ditto
M'Kenzie, John	Nismes	1 Jan. 1830	ditto
Manserok, M. J.	La Parfaite Harmonie	5 Jan. 1830	ditto
Otterbein, J. H.	La Retraite	31 Dec. 1829	Thomas E. Blake, A. P.
Parke, George	Ostend	15 Jan. 1830	J. H. Otterbein, A. P.
Rogers, J. L.	Good Intent	5 Jan. 1830	ditto
Schoones, N. B.	Toevlucht	ditto	ditto
Smith, William	Carpenter Gang	ditto	ditto
Sebastiane, F. C.	Beauvoisin	ditto	ditto
Snock, Edward	De Kinderen	ditto	ditto
Tighe, G.	Mes Delices	ditto	ditto
Van Eeten, A.	Anna Catherina	ditto	ditto
Wortman, H.	Onderneemirg	1 Jan. 1830	ditto
Wright, Francis	L'Oratoire	15 Jan. 1830	ditto
Blair, William	Felicity	12 Jan. 1830	A. Van Waterschoodt, A.P.
Bock, J. H.	Goedverwagting	ditto	ditto
Clarke, D.	Vryheid's Lust	13 Jan. 1830	ditto
Cruikshank, L. M.	Bel Air	12 Jan. 1830	ditto
Danket, G.	La Bonne Intention	13 Jan. 1830	ditto
Deuchar, James	Ogle	12 Jan. 1830	ditto
Grant, Alexander	Better Hope	13 Jan. 1830	ditto
Hughes, H.	Industry	16 Jan. 1830	ditto
Hillman, Charles	Cuming's Lodge	14 Jan. 1830	ditto
Jones, John	Chateau Margo	11 Jan. 1830	ditto
Knight, J. S.	Turkeyen	ditto	ditto
Laurie, John	Good Hope	12 Jan. 1830	ditto
Land, T. C.	Lusignan	ditto	ditto
Mackenzie, Robert	Success	11 Jan. 1830	ditto
Macdonald, A.	Brothers	12 Jan. 1830	ditto
Robertson, George	Kitty	15 Jan. 1830	ditto
Simpson, A.	Montrose	13 Jan. 1830	ditto
Stuart, James	Eendragt and Mon Repos	11 Jan. 1830	ditto
Schmidt, C. J.	Sophia	12 Jan. 1830	ditto
Trotman, Robert	Thomas	11 Jan. 1830	ditto
Verschmer, C. A.	Le Resouvenir	13 Jan. 1830	ditto
Briggs, Daniel	Marionville	2 Jan. 1830	S. C. Spieringshoek, A.P.
Briggs, J. W.	Domburg	5 Jan. 1830	ditto
Collymore, Robert	Maria's Pleasure	8 Jan. 1830	ditto
Fleming, C. A.	New Bendorff	ditto	ditto
Glasgow, James	Bank Hall	7 Jan. 1830	ditto
Grant, Peter	Ridge	8 Jan. 1830	ditto
Greaves, J. W.	Friendship	7 Jan. 1830	ditto
Gordon, J. R.	Zeelandia	8 Jan. 1830	ditto
Hood, John	New Tyle	12 Jan. 1830	ditto
Haly, Richard	Sarah	8 Jan. 1830	ditto
Johnson, R. S.	Palmyra	6 Jan. 1830	ditto
M'Lennan, A. S.	Good Success	7 Jan. 1830	ditto
Napier, Walter	Amersfoort	8 Jan. 1830	ditto

TABLE (A.)

PART I.
DEMERARA.

received by the PROTECTOR from the Managers of Plantation Slaves, from the 31st day of December 1829.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

No. I.—PARTICULAR RETURNS.

Whether such Return was sent back for Correction.	TOTAL NUMBER of Slaves comprised in the Return.	TOTAL NUMBER of Punishments inflicted.	TOTAL NUMBER of Males punished.	TOTAL NUMBER of Females punished.	
- Not -	38	4	3	1	
- ditto -	174	44	3	41	
- ditto -	72	22	9	13	
- ditto -	78	21	8	13	
- ditto -	259	36	29	7	
- ditto -	26	2	2	-	
- ditto -	292	40	21	19	
- ditto -	71	14	13	1	
- ditto -	59	52	19	33	
- ditto -	349	62	46	16	
- ditto -	27	7	6	1	
- ditto -	47	1	1	-	
- ditto -	309	44	12	32	
- ditto -	90	16	15	1	
- ditto -	317	35	18	17	
- ditto -	24	21	11	10	
- ditto -	234	22	14	8	
- ditto -	78	11	6	5	
- ditto -	42	1	1	-	
- ditto -	86	37	14	23	
- ditto -	53	12	5	7	
- ditto -	13	11	10	1	
- ditto -	78	4	4	-	
- ditto -	60	21	9	12	
- ditto -	83	3	3	-	
- ditto -	152	14	11	3	
- ditto -	343	32	17	15	
- ditto -	311	47	41	6	
- ditto -	215	5	4	1	
- ditto -	290	129	96	33	
- ditto -	294	49	25	24	
- ditto -	206	39	36	3	
- ditto -	248	51	30	21	
- ditto -	342	45	23	22	
- ditto -	243	20	13	7	
- ditto -	188	48	29	19	
- ditto -	435	89	11	78	
- ditto -	439	188	72	116	
- ditto -	481	37	30	7	
- ditto -	205	77	44	33	
- ditto -	307	24	21	3	
- ditto -	292	7	3	4	
- ditto -	464	292	102	190	
- ditto -	86	10	8	2	
- ditto -	220	28	28	-	
- ditto -	372	56	39	17	
- ditto -	189	16	11	5	
- ditto -	86	15	11	4	
- ditto -	342	22	15	7	
- ditto -	128	10	6	4	
- ditto -	190	11	8	3	
- ditto -	191	34	28	6	
- ditto -	364	13	11	2	
- ditto -	262	12	9	3	
- ditto -	95	57	19	38	
- ditto -	209	17	14	3	
- ditto -	183	58	58	-	
- ditto -	216	29	20	9	
- ditto -	99	11	9	2	

(continued.)

PART I.

TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—continued.

DEMERRARA.
Report from
Protector of Slaves.

NAME of the M A N A G E R.	Name of the Estate, if any, to which the Slaves are attached.	THE DATE of the Return.	The Name of the Protector, or Assistant Protector, to whom the Return was made.
Noble, J. F. - - -	Concordia - - -	8 Jan. 1830	S. C. Spierinshoek, A. P.
Pearson, John - - -	Meerzorg - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Ross, John - - -	Caledonia and Doordrecht	20 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Rock, Thomas - - -	Buck Hall - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Rose, P. - - -	Task Gang - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Shaw, Alexander - - -	Ditto - - -	7 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Simson, Colin - - -	Sans Souci - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Seeman, Conrad - - -	Maria Johanna - - -	8 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Thomson, P. H. - - -	Working Gang - - -	27 Jan. 1830	E. Bishop, jun. A. P.
Tapp, W. G. - - -	Arthurville - - -	8 Jan. 1830	S. C. Spierinshoek - - -
Whitehead, Joseph - - -	Belle Plaine - - -	7 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Armstrong, T. L. - - -	Great Diamond - - -	- ditto - - -	John T. Osborn, A. P. - - -
Brand, J. R. - - -	Two Friends - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Bowerbank, John - - -	Task Gang - - -	14 Jan. 1830	A. W. Young, P. S.
Baynes, P. H. - - -	Farm and Vrede en Rust - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn, A. P. - - -
Dunkin, Henry - - -	Covent Garden - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
De Ryck, J. G. - - -	Task Gang - - -	- ditto - - -	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
Dunkin, Henry - - -	Arcadia - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn, A. P. - - -
Gilchrist, John - - -	Henry - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Grant, Peter - - -	Mason Gang - - -	- ditto - - -	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
Goppy, J. R. - - -	Perseverance - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn - - -
Habermehl, H. - - -	Herstelling - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Halton, H. - - -	Phoenix Saw-Mill - - -	- ditto - - -	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
Koert, Jan - - -	Velserhoofd - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn - - -
Levy, Charles - - -	New Hope - - -	- ditto - - -	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
Le Forrestier, F. M. - - -	Ruimveld - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn - - -
Loof, C. L. J. - - -	Little Diamond - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Macarthur, A. - - -	Golden Grove - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
M'Lennan, K. - - -	Peters Hall - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
M'Kenzie, George - - -	Haag's Bosch - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Mortimer, E. - - -	Dock Yard - - -	- ditto - - -	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
M'Pherson, J. - - -	Task Gang - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Russell, J. B. - - -	Houston - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn - - -
Rush, M. - - -	La Penitence - - -	- ditto - - -	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
Ditto - - -	Le Repenter - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Reid, William - - -	Providence and Sage Pond - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn - - -
Robertson, George - - -	Kissengen - - -	- ditto - - -	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
Sayer, G. A. - - -	Prosperity - - -	- ditto - - -	J. T. Osborn - - -
Sandiford, J. B. - - -	Profit - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Agard, Thomas - - -	Hamburg - - -	16 Jan. 1830	Henry Halket, A. P. - - -
Beatty, William - - -	Huis t'Dieren - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Bracey, J. - - -	Good Intent - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Cantzar, E. V. - - -	Hibernia - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Cliff, John - - -	Covent Garden - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Davies, J. W. - - -	Industry - - -	20 Jan. 1830	S. C. Spierinshoek - - -
Dagg, J. - - -	Carpenter Gang - - -	15 Jan. 1830	H. Halket - - -
Johnston, R. - - -	{ Aurora Johanna and Make Shift - - - }	13 Jan. 1820	Thomas Dougan - - -
Lamertz, C. - - -	Spring Garden - - -	14 Jan. 1830	Henry Halket - - -
M'Culloch, D. - - -	Greenock, place called - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Moller, G. H. - - -	Solitude - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Robinson, R. - - -	Middlesex - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Shaw, E. - - -	Hoff van Holland - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Symes, J. - - -	Sophienburg - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Van Eeden, P. - - -	Vilvoorden - - -	17 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Wotherspoon, Robert - - -	Pomona - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
M'Kie, David - - -	Ampa, Wood-cutting Establishment	25 Feb. 1830	Thomas Richardson, A. P.
Christie, John - - -	Bushy Park - - -	18 Jan. 1830	W. W. Kernan, A. P. - - -
Conway, T. - - -	Zulught - - -	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
De Groot, A. & R. - - -	Het Vergenoegen - - -	4 Feb. 1830	- ditto - - -
Henry, Isaac - - -	Philadelphia - - -	26 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Kernan, W. W. - - -	Orangestein - - -	15 Jan. 1830	A. W. Young, P. S. - - -
M'Leod, H. - - -	Good Hope - - -	14 Jan. 1830	W. W. Kernan - - -
Ditto - - -	Greenwich Park - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
O'Flanagan, Peter - - -	St. Christopher - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Tait, G. - - -	Tuschen de Vrienden - - -	28 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Taite, George - - -	Het Vergenoegen - - -	20 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Ansdell, James - - -	Waterloo - - -	11 Jan. 1830	T. Frankland, A. P. - - -
Archer, A. C. - - -	Uniform - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Barkey, D. J. C. - - -	Ruimzigt - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Bayne, Henry - - -	Maryville - - -	9 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -

TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—continued.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

Whether such Return was sent back for Correction.	TOTAL NUMBER of Slaves comprised in the Return.	TOTAL NUMBER of Punishments inflicted.	TOTAL NUMBER of Males punished.	TOTAL NUMBER of Females punished.
- Not	133	24	24	-
- ditto	397	20	17	3
- ditto	265	13	12	1
- ditto	44	3	3	-
- ditto	40	13	12	1
- ditto	31	9	9	-
- ditto	170	31	29	2
- ditto	265	15	10	5
- ditto	15	2	2	-
- ditto	272	49	31	18
- ditto	293	7	7	-
- ditto	277	111	92	19
- ditto	46	3	3	-
- ditto	54	13	12	1
- ditto	280	18	12	6
- ditto	78	51	31	20
- ditto	15	3	3	-
- ditto	88	30	22	8
- ditto	153	14	13	1
- ditto	15	3	3	-
- ditto	148	16	8	8
- ditto	219	54	45	9
- ditto	43	6	6	-
- ditto	172	6	6	-
- ditto	125	11	9	2
- ditto	506	49	24	25
- ditto	240	100	53	47
- ditto	141	15	14	1
- ditto	242	22	9	13
- ditto	240	29	29	-
- ditto	25	15	15	-
- ditto	45	63	35	28
- ditto	857	14	14	-
- ditto	315	148	123	25
- ditto	129	74	34	40
- ditto	651	15	10	5
- ditto	50	10	8	2
- ditto	84	12	11	1
- ditto	171	5	5	-
- ditto	258	8	6	2
- ditto	276	149	36	113
- ditto	122	30	11	19
- ditto	116	27	7	20
- ditto	10	1	1	-
- ditto	23	2	2	-
- ditto	17	6	6	-
- ditto	226	28	25	3
- ditto	162	34	30	4
- ditto	20	1	1	-
- ditto	17	3	3	-
- ditto	106	8	2	6
- ditto	154	26	23	3
- ditto	139	39	25	14
- ditto	149	72	21	51
- ditto	18	13	11	2
- ditto	29	1	1	-
- ditto	12	1	1	-
- ditto	344	75	71	4
- ditto	226	25	17	8
- ditto	145	18	18	-
- ditto	141	29	23	6
- ditto	38	4	4	-
- ditto	195	45	15	30
- ditto	156	14	6	8
- ditto	175	19	16	3
- ditto	221	23	23	-
- ditto	332	56	39	17
- ditto	259	18	3	15
- ditto	141	19	11	8
- ditto	192	83	51	32

(continued.)

TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—*continued.*

PART I. DEMERARA. Report from Protector of Slaves.	NAME of the M A N A G E R.	Name of the Estate, if any, to which the Slaves are attached.	THE DATE of the Return.	The Name of the Protector, or Assistant Protector, to whom the Return was made.
	Bolton, John	Task Gang	13 Jan. 1830	T. Frankland, A. P.
	Cox, W. S.	Blenheim	8 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Frankland, T.	Amsterdam	15 Jan. 1830	A. W. Young, P. S.
	Gibson, J.	Anna Maria	9 Jan. 1830	T. Frankland, A. P.
	Haly, J. H.	Cane Garden	- ditto	- ditto
	Hart, John	Richmond Hill	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Jardine, Robert	Enterprise	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Jeffrey, George	Endeavour	10 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Kilgour, John	Vrouw Anna	9 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Marshall, John	Clairmont	8 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	M'Farquhar, R.	Endeavour	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Mackay, John	Pleasing Hope	9 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Perret, G. F.	Klip, place called	20 Jan. 1830	S. C. Spierinshoek
	Robertson, H.	Wisselvalligheid	10 Jan. 1830	T. Frankland, A. P.
	Ross, Donald	Task Gang	9 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Roach, Thomas	Henrietta	- ditto	- ditto
	Read, W. F.	Hoop en Vries	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Smith, J.	Johanna	- ditto	- ditto
	Shaw, A.	Elizabeth Ann	9 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Simson, John	Retrieve	8 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Tulloch, A.	Maria Elizabeth	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	White, A. A.	Vertrouwen	- ditto	- ditto
	Wrong, J.	Success	9 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Warner, M.	Nieuw Osterbeck	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Widders, John	Camfields	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Wright, Hugh	Doornhaag	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Yarwood, H.	Belfield	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Bishop, jun.	Zorg	12 Jan. 1830	J. H. Otterbein, A. P.
	Bruton, William	Golden Fleece	13 Jan. 1830	E. Bishop, jun. A. P.
	Day, J. C.	Onderneeming	- ditto	- ditto
	Easton, William	Belfield	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Fowler, A. G.	Union and Alliance	1 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Gray, J. B.	Batseba's Lust	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Hoesoner, C.	Perseverance	- ditto	- ditto
	Kork, D. C.	Dagerdad and Mocha	- ditto	- ditto
	Mackie, A.	Cullen	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	M'Kenzie, G.	Adventure	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Martin, Alexander	Task Gang	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Perry, William	Annandale	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Prouse, James	Carpenter Gang	- ditto	- ditto
	Ross, A.	Abram's Zuil	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Wood, Henry	Hoff van Anrich	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Young, Colin	Working Gang	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Baker, James	Farm and Taymoth Manor	20 Jan. 1830	R. Watson, A. P.
	Birkett, W.	Woodcutting Gang	19 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Gordon, James	Boat-building Establishment	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Gilmore, M. J.	Letter T.	20 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Gardner, Robert	Drill and Yorkshire Hall	18 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Morris, Richard	Zealand	- ditto	- ditto
	Munro, John	Bushy Park	19 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	M'Hardy, J.	Airy Hall	20 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Waddell, John	Bath and Kenderen	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Watson, E. H.	Fellowship	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Austin, R. B.	Land of Plenty	13 Jan. 1830	J. M'Pherson, A. P.
	Alleyne, R.	Columbia	- ditto	- ditto
	Ankers, J.	Coffee Grove	- ditto	- ditto
	Alstein, J.	Task Gang	5 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Bunbury, E.	Devonshire Castle	7 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Bayley, F. G.	La Belle Alliance	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Barry, Robert	Aberdeen	1 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Brown, John	Task Gang	7 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Chapman, John	Mainstay	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Cox, J.	Fear Not	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Elliot, D.	Land of Promise	5 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Fetherston, J.	Affiance	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Hunter, J.	Richmond	- ditto	- ditto
	Hopkins, Robert	Anna Regina	- ditto	- ditto
	Hignall, G.	Better Success	7 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Hale, William	Exmouth	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
	Henderson, A.	Henrietta	- ditto	- ditto
	Keane, S.	Walton Hall	7 Jan. 1830	- ditto

TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—*continued.*

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

Whether such Return was sent back for Correction.	TOTAL NUMBER of Slaves comprised in the Return.	TOTAL NUMBER of Punishments inflicted.	TOTAL NUMBER of Males punished.	TOTAL NUMBER of Females punished.
- Not -	7	2	2	-
- ditto -	337	7	7	-
- ditto -	278	64	60	4
- ditto -	84	9	9	-
- ditto -	123	6	6	-
- ditto -	320	9	8	1
- ditto -	150	24	24	-
- ditto -	218	68	39	29
- ditto -	312	18	17	1
- ditto -	176	57	26	31
- ditto -	130	2	2	-
- ditto -	135	15	11	4
- ditto -	19	1	1	-
- ditto -	187	51	49	2
- ditto -	47	12	12	-
- ditto -	71	29	29	-
- ditto -	171	71	57	14
- ditto -	137	14	13	1
- ditto -	312	31	27	4
- ditto -	186	56	50	6
- ditto -	46	4	1	3
- ditto -	290	39	28	11
- ditto -	297	17	17	-
- ditto -	124	9	8	1
- ditto -	309	19	12	7
- ditto -	255	11	11	-
- ditto -	182	31	26	5
- ditto -	285	8	8	-
- ditto -	444	2	2	-
- ditto -	172	16	5	11
- ditto -	23	11	11	-
- ditto -	105	21	13	8
- ditto -	234	19	14	5
- ditto -	326	24	20	4
- ditto -	102	11	6	5
- ditto -	252	15	15	-
- ditto -	115	15	14	1
- ditto -	39	5	5	-
- ditto -	207	20	16	4
- ditto -	13	4	4	-
- ditto -	116	3	2	1
- ditto -	220	32	19	13
- ditto -	13	4	1	3
- ditto -	407	57	35	22
- ditto -	22	3	3	-
- ditto -	42	16	13	3
- ditto -	18	1	1	-
- ditto -	103	38	24	14
- ditto -	9	10	7	3
- ditto -	106	19	3	16
- ditto -	21	1	1	-
- ditto -	130	8	8	-
- ditto -	59	7	7	-
- ditto -	396	28	25	3
- ditto -	360	13	10	3
- ditto -	325	20	20	-
- ditto -	33	4	4	-
- ditto -	486	10	8	2
- ditto -	436	43	43	-
- ditto -	180	33	24	9
- ditto -	30	44	41	3
- ditto -	386	18	16	2
- ditto -	157	5	5	-
- ditto -	27	3	2	1
- ditto -	317	13	5	8
- ditto -	384	37	22	15
- ditto -	777	52	32	20
- ditto -	219	18	18	-
- ditto -	166	10	10	-
- ditto -	171	20	18	2
- ditto -	325	94	38	56

(continued.)

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—*continued.*

NAME of the MANAGER.	Name of the Estate, if any, to which the Slaves are attached.	THE DATE of the Return.	The Name of the Protector, or, Assistant Protector, to whom the Return was made.
M'Pherson, M.	Hampton Court	15 Jan. 1830	J. M'Pherson
M'Intosh, D.	Reliance	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
M'Lennan, A.	Sparta	- ditto	- ditto
M'Lean, A.	Windsor Castle	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
M'Pherson, J.	Perth	29 Mar. 1830	A. W. Young, P. S.
Orford, S.	Taymouth Manor	15 Jan. 1830	J. M'Pherson
Ross, J.	Three Friends	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Smith, J.	Caledonia	- ditto	- ditto
Steele, J.	Lima	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Anderson, T.	Amsterdam	15 Jan. 1830	J. D. Paterson
Bakker, John	Wood-cutting gang	13 Jan. 1830	J. C. Peate
Brotherson	Ayaqua	- ditto	J. D. Paterson
Couchman, W. D.	Byadany	16 Jan. 1830	C. Brotherson
Fraser, James	Wood-cutting establishment	15 Jan. 1830	J. D. Paterson
Hubbard, J.	Aurora	- ditto	- ditto
Hendricks, G.	Glasgow	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Knights, Aaron	Sans Souci	13 Jan. 1830	J. C. Peate
M'Kinnon, N.	Nerva Saw-mill	15 Jan. 1830	J. D. Paterson
Paterson, J. D.	Christianburgh	21 Jan. 1830	J. C. Peate
Pollard, T. M'I.	Better Hope	16 Jan. 1830	A. W. Young
Peate, J. C.	Berlyn	26 Jan. 1830	J. D. Paterson
Reid, Charles	Sans Souci	15 Jan. 1830	J. C. Peate
Ross, H.	Wood-cutting establishment	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Schirmeister, H. P. J.	Hyde Park	2 Feb. 1830	A. W. Young
Siebo, H.	Mablissa	15 Jan. 1830	J. D. Paterson
Van Lange, P. M.	Wiltvreeden	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Birnie, Andrew	Non Pareil	11 Jan. 1830	W. M'Keand
Baird, Henry J.	New Orange Nassau	5 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Bonyan, George	Greenfield	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Chapman, Henry	Grove and Orange Nassau	- ditto	- ditto
Christiani, E. L.	Friendship	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Davison, John	John Cove and Craig Miln	- ditto	- ditto
Gainfort, A. G.	Golden Grove	4 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Hughes, William	Bladen Hall	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Innes, G. D.	Enmore	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto
M'Innis, M.	North Brook	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Muir, William	Lowlands	8 Jan. 1830	- ditto
M'Laine, D.	Clonbrock	4 Jan. 1830	- ditto
M'Keand, W.	Hope	22 Jan. 1830	A. W. Young
Munro, John	{ Ann's Grove, Two Friends } and Triumph	4 Jan. 1830	W. M'Keand
Nicholson, A.	Annandale	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Perry, John	Vigilance	- ditto	- ditto
Paterson, Charles	Dochfour	6 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Payne, John	Paradise	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Smith, John	{ Bachelor's Adventure, Elizabeth Hall, and Enterprise	- ditto	- ditto
Squires, William	Haslenton	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Shipperd, S.	Porter's Hope	18 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Williams, Philip	New Bee-hive	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Burke, D.	{ Melville Ormsary, and Strath Campbell	- ditto	W. Fraser
Bissett, John	Cane Grove	- ditto	- ditto
Booker, William, qq.	Carleton Hall	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Booker, William	Broom Hall	- ditto	- ditto
Douglas, Sholto	Belmont	- ditto	- ditto
Douglas, John	Ver Eeniging	- ditto	- ditto
Edwards, John	Essex and Batavier	- ditto	- ditto
Grant, Donald	Strathavon	- ditto	- ditto
Hood, Thomas	Task Gang	- ditto	- ditto
Hackson, Andrew	La Bonne Mere	- ditto	- ditto
Kirkwood, James	Good Hope	- ditto	- ditto
Mann, J. B.	Spring Hall	- ditto	- ditto
Mitchell, John	Woodlands	- ditto	- ditto
M'Laren, Alexander	Helena	- ditto	- ditto
S'Gravesande, D. S. V.	Voorzigtigheid	- ditto	- ditto
Barclay, Robert	Hague	12 Jan. 1830	James Douglas
Bascom, Griffin	Blankenburg	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto
Barton, J. B.	Cornelia Ida	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto

TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—continued.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from Protector of Slaves.

Whether such Return was sent back for Correction.	TOTAL NUMBER of Slaves comprised in the Return.	TOTAL NUMBER of Punishments inflicted.	TOTAL NUMBER of Males punished.	TOTAL NUMBER of Females punished.
Not	459	22	18	4
ditto	498	20	9	11
ditto	278	71	44	27
ditto	360	30	29	1
ditto	128	2	2	—
ditto	210	22	20	2
ditto	155	11	9	2
ditto	109	3	2	1
ditto	508	28	24	4
ditto	39	2	2	—
ditto	15	2	2	—
ditto	43	21	2	19
ditto	67	8	5	3
ditto	46	23	22	1
ditto	41	5	5	—
ditto	173	13	13	—
ditto	15	3	3	—
ditto	50	12	12	—
ditto	206	8	8	—
ditto	97	15	15	—
ditto	41	7	5	2
ditto	30	17	11	6
ditto	55	7	5	2
ditto	16	5	5	—
ditto	31	8	2	6
ditto	46	4	4	—
ditto	208	9	9	—
ditto	185	12	10	2
ditto	250	10	10	—
ditto	125	29	25	4
ditto	52	20	12	8
ditto	301	23	19	4
ditto	270	51	8	43
ditto	98	21	18	3
ditto	304	19	10	9
ditto	145	8	7	1
ditto	215	16	16	—
ditto	357	18	9	9
ditto	310	16	12	4
ditto	383	13	13	—
ditto	249	53	53	—
ditto	201	22	13	9
ditto	360	54	21	33
ditto	369	61	30	31
ditto	694	44	27	17
ditto	24	9	8	1
ditto	329	14	6	8
ditto	192	10	7	3
ditto	213	24	14	10
ditto	215	24	19	5
ditto	56	2	2	—
ditto	189	9	9	—
ditto	146	21	17	4
ditto	118	29	16	13
ditto	220	4	4	—
ditto	117	6	5	1
ditto	33	3	3	—
ditto	371	19	18	1
ditto	150	12	9	3
ditto	300	38	33	5
ditto	282	9	—	9
ditto	371	5	4	1
ditto	40	8	7	1
ditto	477	50	25	25
ditto	350	44	32	12
ditto	218	13	11	2

(continued.)

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—*continued.*

NAME of the MANAGER.	Name of the Estate, if any, to which the Slaves are attached.	THE DATE of the Return.	The Name of the Protector, or Assistant Protector, to whom the Return was made.
Edward, Joseph - -	La Jalousie and Fellowship	13 Jan. 1830	James Douglas - -
Hunter, R. - - -	Edinburgh - - -	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Kleyn, Laurens - -	Groenveld - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
M'Donald, G. - - -	Vrees en Hoop - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
M'Neil, W. - - -	Windsor Forest - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Mackay, R. - - -	Uitvlucht - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Murdock, Alexander	{ De Kinderen and Boodes Rust - - }	13 Jan. 1830	A. W. Young - - -
Ogle, Richard - - -	William - - -	12 Jan. 1830	James Douglas - - -
Osborne, Edwin - -	Task Gang - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Ross, Hugh - - -	Met en Meerzorg - - -	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Schultz, Edward - -	Anna Catharina - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Skel, A. - - -	Engineer Gang - - -	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Schruder, J. P. L.	Zeeburg - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Willis, James - - -	Den Amstel - - -	12 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Young, Peter - - -	Leonora - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
De Ridder, F. - - -	{ Versailles, Lust and Rust, and Alliance - - }	15 Jan. 1830	N. M. Manget - - -
Forbes, James - - -	Task Gang - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Grant, D. - - -	Vreed en Hoop - - -	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Murray, John - - -	Nouvelle Flandre - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Milne, C. F. - - -	Malgre Tout - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
M'Pherson, A. - - -	Harlem and Rotterdam - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Oudkerk, E. J. - - -	Goed Fortuin - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Ross, John - - -	Schoonord and Meerzorg	11 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Tew, John L. - - -	{ Best, Phoenix, and Waller's Delight - - }	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Vollerelde, J. - - -	Kleyn Pouderoeyen - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Webster, D. - - -	La Grange - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Blake, J. E. - - -	Vive la Force - - -	28 Jan. 1830	J. H. Otterbein - - -
Coventry, J. B. - - -	Vriesland - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Dealey, S. - - -	L'Harmonie - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Donaldson, George	Chantilly - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Estwick, R. - - -	Bath Place - - -	26 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Jellicoe, A. - - -	Vreedistin - - -	14 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Leslie, John - - -	Reinsteijn - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
M'Donald, D. - - -	Maria's Lodge - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -
Mathison, G. C. - - -	Wood-cutting Gang - - -	29 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Petrie, John - - -	Garden of Eden - - -	13 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Roberts, H. J. - - -	Hermitage - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -
Reid, Donald - - -	Potosi - - -	14 Jan. 1830	T. E. Blake - - -
Van der Pant, M. G	Friendship - - -	15 Jan. 1830	- ditto - - -

No. II.—GENERAL RESULTS. - - -

TOTAL NUMBER of Slaves to whom the Returns of Punishments throughout the Colony relate.	TOTAL NUMBER of Punishments inflicted on those Slaves.	TOTAL NUMBER of Males punished.
59,492	8,649	5,682

TABLE (A.)—No. 1.—PARTICULAR RETURNS—continued.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

Whether such Return was sent back for Correction.	TOTAL NUMBER of Slaves comprised in the Return.	TOTAL NUMBER of Punishments inflicted.	TOTAL NUMBER of Males punished.	TOTAL NUMBER of Females punished.	—
- Not -	386	19	11	8	
- ditto -	50	4	1	3	
- ditto -	215	181	73	108	
- ditto -	351	64	44	20	
- ditto -	491	11	7	4	
- ditto -	324	100	51	49	
- ditto -	271	18	12	6	
- ditto -	251	63	45	18	
- ditto -	59	8	7	1	
- ditto -	420	52	31	21	
- ditto -	266	114	23	91	
- ditto -	25	2	2	-	
- ditto -	212	34	28	6	
- ditto -	104	8	4	4	
- ditto -	445	44	26	18	
- ditto -	406	39	32	7	
- ditto -	54	4	4	-	
- ditto -	550	157	139	18	
- ditto -	222	63	42	21	
- ditto -	244	22	15	7	
- ditto -	288	50	33	17	
- ditto -	173	32	16	16	
- ditto -	374	80	70	10	
- ditto -	406	62	49	13	
- ditto -	330	185	100	85	
- ditto -	282	6	5	1	
- ditto -	243	25	19	6	
- ditto -	289	58	55	3	
- ditto -	15	2	2	-	
- ditto -	50	15	8	7	
- ditto -	19	1	-	1	
- ditto -	222	79	58	21	
- ditto -	105	56	54	2	
- ditto -	99	34	31	3	
- ditto -	118	3	2	1	
- ditto -	210	21	19	2	
- ditto -	107	35	26	9	
- ditto -	108	31	22	9	
- ditto -	325	27	19	8	
TOTAL - -	59,492	8,649	5,682	2,967	—

No. II.—GENERAL RESULTS.

TOTAL NUMBER of Females punished.	The average Number of Stripes inflicted in cases of Punishment by whipping.	The Number of Returns made by Persons unable to write.
2,967	19 $\frac{1}{4}$	—

TABLE (A.)—continued.

No. III.—OFFENCES COMMITTED.

Attempting to poison - - - - -	1	Neglecting their watches on sluices, provision grounds, buildings, &c. - - - - -	163
Committing a rape - - - - -	2	Neglect of duty as drivers, allowing the gang under their direction to idle and to do bad work - - -	68
Attempting to ravish - - - - -	1	Neglect of duty and work in the field, &c.; not finishing the usual day's work; not finishing their tasks, &c. - - - - -	3,387
Stabbing and cutting others with knives, &c. -	10	Neglect of their duty and work as engineers -	17
Attempting to cut others with cutlasses, &c. -	3	Ditto - ditto, as firemen, making bad fire, &c.	43
Killing and stealing horned cattle - - - - -	6	Ditto - ditto, as boat and punt people, not bringing home canes, &c. - - - - -	151
Killing and destroying stock—sheep, hogs, &c. -	8	Ditto - ditto, as boilers, spoiling sugar, &c. -	43
Cutting and wounding cattle - - - - -	2	Laziness, idleness and indolence at their work -	429
Cruelty to animals - - - - -	1	Doing bad work, and picking unripe coffee, &c. -	171
House-breaking and stealing - - - - -	13	Absconding and skulking from work - - - - -	320
Sheep-stealing - - - - -	9	Absenting and leaving their post as watchmen -	27
Theft of produce, plantains, hogs, poultry, &c. -	406	Causing others to neglect their work - - - - -	11
Theft of - ditto - and absconding from estate	16	Cutting young canes; destroying and hiding canes under trash banks; burning lumber, staves, &c. -	33
Embezzling and making away with goods put under their charge - - - - -	11	Allowing cattle to trespass on cultivation - - -	33
Receiving stolen goods - - - - -	4	Endangering buildings by carrying fire into the megass logies, rum stores, &c. and carelessness -	18
Conniving at theft, and attempting to steal - -	13	Neglecting cattle, horses, stock, &c. - - - - -	50
Striking the driver, and insubordination - - -	21	Harbouring runaways and absentees - - - - -	20
Fighting the driver, and ditto - - - - -	25	Ill-using cattle; riding horses at night, &c. -	7
Attempting to strike his master - - - - -	1	Trying to cause sores on persons to avoid work -	13
Spitting in the overseer's face - - - - -	1	Neglecting and concealing sores - - - - -	61
Striking the overseer - - - - -	1	Eating charcoal - - - - -	2
Refusing to do any work or description of work required - - - - -	249	Neglecting the sick under their care - - - - -	16
Instigating others not to go to, and not to do their work - - - - -	7	Neglecting children - - - - -	8
Contumacy and stubbornness, and neglect of duty and work - - - - -	135	False pretences of sickness - - - - -	211
Absconding and running away from the estate -	390	Not turning out to work at the usual time - - -	137
Conniving at and aiding others to escape and get out of stocks, &c. - - - - -	13	Breaking and injuring punts, boats, &c. - - - - -	3
Threatening violence to drivers, overseers, &c. in the discharge of their duty - - - - -	18	Breaking and injuring buildings - - - - -	12
Disobedience and contempt of orders; refusing to go out of hospital when ordered by doctor, &c. -	672	Drunkenness, and thereby causing loss of labour, riots, &c. - - - - -	228
Insolence and abuse to managers in the discharge of their duty - - - - -	337	Absenting themselves from hospital - - - - -	15
Refusing to do the customary day's work - - -	39	Ditto - - - - from estate without permission	81
Breaking out of stocks, hospitals, &c. - - - - -	13	Introducing rum on estate - - - - -	10
Combining and determining not to do the usual day's work - - - - -	10	Telling lies and falsehoods on others - - - - -	23
Striking and beating others - - - - -	50	Introducing rum, tobacco, &c. into hospital -	3
Fighting - - - - -	118	Throwing stones at others, and mischievous behaviour - - - - -	12
Quarrelling and causing disturbance, and rioting at night, &c. - - - - -	143	Practising obeah - - - - -	4
Seducing and attempting to seduce other men's wives - - - - -	10	Taking coffee out of other negro's baskets to make up deficiency in their own - - - - -	3
Infidelity to husbands - - - - -	1	Trying to seduce young females - - - - -	3
Beating and ill-treating wives - - - - -	14	Indecent language and behaviour - - - - -	22
Abusing, striking and provoking husbands - - -	6	Dancing on estate without leave on the Sabbath-day - - - - -	10
		Confining others in stocks without manager's orders	1

TABLE (A.)—continued.

No. IV.—TOTAL ABSENCE OF PUNISHMENT.

The Name of each Manager by whom no Punishment has been inflicted or authorized during the Half-year.	Name of the Estate, if any, to which the Slaves are attached.	Date of the Return.	Name of the Protector, or Assistant Protector, to whom such Return was made.	Total Number of Slaves comprised in the Return.
1830:				
Kuntzman, E.	Plaisance	13 January	A. Van Waterschoodt	99
Van Sluytman, H. J.	Beterverwagting	13 —	- ditto	36
Brunel, R. J. G.	Beterverwachting	3 —	S. C. Spieringshoek	18
Cuff, Helena	Voorzorg, place called	3 —	- ditto	10
Juhlfs, H. R. & J. A. C. Brand	Saripapa saw-mill	13 —	- ditto	38
Merkle Johannes	Wurtemberg, place called	14 —	- ditto	15
Thoma, Johanna	Land of Canaan ditto	5 —	- ditto	8
Diamond, Sarah	Patientia ditto	15 —	John T. Osborn	17
Forrester, Thomas	Meadow Bank	15 —	- ditto	44
Luthers, A. E.	Ruimveld, residing on	15 —	- ditto	20
Miller, James & Co.	Foundry, Demerara	15 —	A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves.	21
Osborn, Anthony	Task gang	22 —	J. T. Osborn	21
Idem, qq. J. Akers	- ditto	22 —	- ditto	59
Eytels, J. P.	Stil en Eenzaam	25 February	Thomas Richardson	8
Spaman, J. P. qq. W. Bilstein	Itaka	26 —	- ditto	34
Marshall, Alexander	Parika	17 January	W. W. Kernan	24
Proctor, G. F.	Goedverwagting	11 —	- ditto	24
Idem, qq. M. C. H. Proctor	- ditto, domestics, &c.	11 —	- ditto	8
Reynard, J. M. qq. M. Mercurius.	St. Lawrence, place called	5 —	- ditto	8
Hartog, M. E.	Brickery, Onderneeming	5 —	S. C. Spieringshoek	26
Hohenkerk, J. W.	Klip, place called	13 —	- ditto	23
Perret, G. F. qq. E. Eckhart	- ditto	20 —	- ditto	8
Reoch, Andrew	Rust en Vried	13 —	- ditto	14
Widdess, John	Working gang	12 —	Thomas Frankland	7
Broodhagen, F. C.	Working gang and domestics	12 —	E. Bishop, jun.	19
Sessingh, H.	Maria's Lodge	15 —	- ditto	35
Gorman, P.	Belmont	20 —	Richard Watson	13
Jansen, J. P.	Guiana Grove	15 —	- ditto	7
Mackenzie, Alexander	Cottage	18 —	- ditto	13
Manville, M.	Sophia's Hope	15 —	- ditto	6
Elliot, William	Dumbarton Castle	9 —	J. M. Pherson	68
Primrose, William	Evergreen	8 —	- ditto	16
Wishart, Alexander	Aberdeen	14 —	A. W. Young	20
Wilson, James	Hackney	8 March	- ditto	17
Allicock, James	Wismar Wood-cutting establishment.	14 January	John D. Paterson	20
Brotherson, E. S.	Good Intent ditto	14 —	J. C. Peate	22
Bollers, William	Hyde Park	13 —	- ditto	10
Gallaway, Elizabeth	Semeria Wood Land	13 —	J. D. Paterson	21
Linkton, Benjamin	Wood-cutting gang	13 —	J. C. Peate	7
Stanton, George	Wensenhoope	13 —	- ditto	9
Van Hersel, W. H.	Stamhouder	7 —	- ditto	11
Hamilton, R. G.	Broek en Waterland	7 —	W. Fraser	13
Lerby, Elizabeth	Working gang	7 —	- ditto	10
Moffet, William	Mes Delices	7 —	- ditto	13
Jackson, W. J.	Task or working gang	12 —	James Douglas	51
Bronne, Thomas	Working gang	14 —	Thomas E. Blake	18
Bischof, C. W. P.	Strick en Heuvel	15 —	- ditto	5
Dougan, Marrott	Concordia	14 —	- ditto	7
Gertzen Pheleda	Nooit Ge dacht	14 —	- ditto	13
Labee Matilda	St. Eustatius	16 —	- ditto	9
Miller, James	Charlotte	16 —	- ditto	44
Rodie, Hugh	Wood-cutting establishment	23 —	A. W. Young	20

The TOTAL Number of Slaves in this List is One thousand one hundred and seven.

1,107

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.TABLE (A.)—*continued.*

No. V.—DEFAULTERS.

The Name of each Person who has omitted to make his Return.	The Name of the Estate, if any, to which the Slaves under the charge of such Person are attached.	The Number of such Slaves.	The District in which the Defaulter resides.	The Date of his last Return.

TABLE (B.)

EXHIBITING the various Complaints of Injuries inflicted upon, or suffered by SLAVES, which, during the half year to which the present Report refers, have reached the Protector and the several Deputy Protectors of the Colony of *Demerara*.

No. 1.

1.—THE Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*David*, aged eighteen years, male, residing in George Town, and at present working at his trade as a carpenter.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers, of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Formerly belonging to Angeletta King of this town, now dead, and latterly in the possession of E. Adcock, merchant, of this town; but now free. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 1, with Protector's Report, 1st November 1829.)

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 16th of September 1829. Claim made by said *David*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—Claiming remuneration for his services as a domestic while illegally detained in slavery, viz. from May 1820, when he was sold by the Board of Orphans, contrary to the last will of his said mistress, to June 1829, when he was set free. (*Vide* Protector's Report, as above.)

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—*Demerara*, 11th March 1830. The Protector having made several applications to the Board of Orphans on the subject of this claim, it has been admitted by the late President of that Board; but as an objection arose to paying the amount of said remuneration to the claimant in consequence of his being yet a minor, the Honourable the Court of Justice was petitioned to appoint a guardian over him (he being now emancipated from slavery), for the purpose of securing his interest herein, and receiving the amount of such remuneration. The Protector was informed that Mr. F. W. Thron, of this town, was appointed by the Court guardian over *David*. On the 26th April following, the Protector applied to said guardian, to know the amount of remuneration claimed by him on behalf of *David*, and if it had been paid.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—None.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—None.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—None.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—27th April 1830. The Protector received the following communication from the said guardian, Mr. Thron, in answer to his application to him of yesterday's date:

Sir,

I HAVE the honour to communicate to you that the Honourable Court of Civil Justice, after the negro boy *David* having obtained his legal manumission, and hereby, as a free person, came under its jurisdiction, has nominated me as guardian (he being yet a minor), as per appointment of the 11th March last, and that it is therefore now my duty to take care of him, and assist in obtaining the wages appropriated to his former services when considered a slave. I am already employed to ascertain by special inquiries what in right and justice I can claim for him, and to lay the result afterwards,

afterwards, when this object has been obtained, in a full account before the Honourable Court, by the established law, upper guardian, to whom I am responsible, and under whose protection the boy's property is now placed during his minority.

To Col. Young, Pro. of Slaves.

I am, &c.
(signed) *F. W. Thron.*

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves,
Table (B.)

No. 2.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Hannah*, aged about thirty years, female, of plantation Walton Hall, on behalf of her child Jane, also of that estate.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—The heirs of Benjamin Kingston, deceased, proprietors of said plantation, residing in England, and represented in this Colony by Mr. Griffith Parry, merchant of this town, and others.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—14th July 1829. Claim made by said *Hannah*, who appeared at this office with and on behalf of her said child Jane. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 19, transmitted with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That the said child Jane is the daughter of George Anderson, now deceased, and who was manager of the said plantation Walton Hall; that by the will of the deceased the sum of *f.* 600 was bequeathed to said child, for the purchase of her freedom, and two slaves, named *Amour* and *Mimba*, and the Orphan Chamber, being in the administration of the affairs of the deceased, that it be required to carry into effect the will, as far as regards the said child Jane. (*Vide* Protector's Report, as above.)

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(Continued from last Report dated 1st November 1829. *Vide* Complaint, No. 19.)—15th March 1830. Sufficient time having elapsed for the arrival of the permission of the proprietors of plantation Walton Hall to the sale of the said slave child Jane, the Protector again applied at the Orphan Chamber for the fulfilment of the will of the deceased George Anderson, so far as related to said child, and was informed that the Chamber were willing to purchase the said slave with the money bequeathed by the deceased, but that the attornies of the estate Walton Hall were as yet without an answer to their application to the proprietors in England for leave to sell; and that with regard to the claim to the two negroes bequeathed to her, it would form a subject for the consideration of the Board, previous to the final liquidation of the estate of the deceased; but that it appears the slave *Mimba* never came into the possession of the Board, and the slave *Amour* not until very lately.—April 30, 1830. No further steps having been taken by the Orphan Chamber up to this date for the arrangement of this claim, the President of the Court of Justice has been petitioned for assistance *pro Deo* to commence proceedings, to compel said Board to comply with the will of the deceased.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—None.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—30th April 1830. This case was this day placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to demand from the Orphan Chamber the bequests made in the will of the deceased George Anderson; and in failure of compliance thereto, to proceed against that body for said claims by order, *pro Deo*, before the next court.—24th June 1830. The Crown Advocate reports his being in communication with the Board of Orphans, in order to an amicable arrangement.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 3.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Frances*, aged 34 years, female, residing in George Town, a domestic.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Dr. Webster*, of this town, gaol surgeon.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—24th July 1829. Complaint preferred by *Frances*, at this office. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 23, with Protector's Report, of 1st Nov. 1829.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—To recover a debt due the said *Frances* by *N. J. M'Carty*, of this town, a coachmaker, the amount being *f.* 152. 7. 8. Holland's currency. (*Vide* Protector's Report, as above;) equal in sterling money to 10*l.* 17*s.* 8½*d.*

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.
Table (B.)

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(Continued from last Report, dated 1st November 1829. *Vide* Complaint, No. 23.)

Office of Protector of Slaves, 19th December 1829.

THE Protector of Slaves intimates to Mr. N. J. M'Carty, that if the amount due by him to the slave Frances is not paid by Wednesday the 23d December, he will be proceeded against in due course of law.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

17th March 1830. This claim was this day placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to institute a suit for its recovery, the Protector being unable to obtain payment of it by other means.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—17th March 1830. This claim, placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to sue for. (*Vide* Table (H.) page 197.)

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 4.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Susan Rogers* alias *Spooner*, aged about 35 years, female huckstress, residing in George Town.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Catherine Brown*, free coloured woman, of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 20th September 1829, complaint preferred at this office by said *Susan Rogers* alias *Spooner*. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 48, with Protector's Report, 1st November 1829.)

4.—The Substance of the Complaint?—For the recovery of a debt, amounting to *f.* 588, due to the slave *Quashy Spooner*, a carpenter by trade, and husband of said *Susan Rogers*, by *H. M. Tobie*, free-coloured man of this town, a carpenter, and transferred to her, *Susan*, by her said husband. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 48, with Protector's Report, as above.)—*f.* 588, equal to 42*l.* sterling.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(Continued from last Report, dated 1st November 1829. *Vide* Complaint, No. 48.)

19th December 1829.

THE Protector of Slaves intimates to Mr. H. M. Tobie, that if the amount due by him to the slave *Nelly Sue* or *Susan Rogers*, is not paid by Wednesday, the 23d December 1829, he will be proceeded against in due course of law.

(signed) *A. W. Young,*
Protector of Slaves.

17th March 1830. This claim has been placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to institute a suit for its recovery.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—30th April 1830. This claim was placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate on the 17th ultimo, to sue for; but no action has as yet been instituted, as this debtor is notoriously and desperately insolvent.—24th June 1830, as above.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 5.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Nelly Sue*, alias *Susan Rogers*, alias *Spooner*, aged about 35 years, female, residing in George Town, employed as a huckstress.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to Catherine Brown, free coloured woman of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 3d October 1829, complaint preferred at this office by said *Nelly Sue*. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 51, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—To compel said Catherine Brown, her mistress, to deposit in the Savings Bank for Slaves, for the use and benefit of complainant and her son Henry, the sum of 20 joes or *f.* 440 being amount of various sums paid by complainant to her said mistress in part of the purchase money of herself and said son, as per agreement between them dated 16th August 1826, transmitted with Protector's Report, 1st November 1829. (*Vide* Protector's Report as above.)

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(Continued from last Report, dated 1st November 1829. *Vide* Complaint, No. 51.) 2d November 1829. The Protector summoned Catherine Brown, and required her to deposit in the Savings Bank for Slaves the said sum of 20 joes.—3d March 1830. The Protector has repeatedly required Catherine Brown to deposit the aforesaid sum of 20 joes as above stated for the benefit of the complainant, but from her great embarrassments, as appears in evidence, she has been unable to comply with his requisitions up to this day.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—(Continued from last Report, dated 1st November 1829. *Vide* Complaint, No. 51.) March 3. Catherine Brown declares that she is willing to deposit the 20 joes in the Savings Bank for the benefit of complainant, but that she has not yet been able to procure the means of doing so; that she is deeply in debt and much distressed.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—11th November 1829. (Continued from last Report, dated 1st November 1829. *Vide* Complaint, No. 51.) It appears by an extract of the vendue sale of the boedel of the late C. Rogers, produced by Mr. Urquhart, to which boedel he was executor, that complainant with her son Henry, were purchased by Catherine Brown and paid for by Urquhart for her. It is also stated, that C. Brown has not yet been able to pay the amount of said purchase money to Urquhart, as appears by a copy of said sale; viz.

Miss C. Browne

To Vendue Office, Demerara, Dr.

June 28, 1826. To vendue the executors C. Rogers, deceased, at six, twelve and eighteen months credit with interest on the last instalment for the negroes Henry and Nelly Sue, *f.* 3,600

To the 1st instalment, due 28th Dec. 1826	- <i>f.</i> 1,200	
Church and poor money	- - -	72
		<u>1,272</u>

To the 2d instalment, due 28th June 1827	- - -	1,200
--	-------	-------

Ditto 3d - - ditto - - - 1827	- <i>f.</i> 1,200	
Eighteen months interest - - - - -		108
		<u>1,308</u>

3,780

July 12, 1827. By cash in payment of 1st instalment	- <i>f.</i> 1,272	
---	-------------------	--

Apr. 14, 1828. Ditto - ditto - - 2 - ditto - -		1,200
--	--	-------

Ditto - ditto - - 3 - ditto - -		1,308
		<u>3,780</u>

3,780

I do hereby certify, That the within amount has been fully paid for by Walter Urquhart, esq.

Demerara, 11th November 1829. (signed) *M. C. Ford*, for the Vendue Office.

Demerara, 11th November 1829. I hereby declare, That I sold the woman *Nelly Sue* and her child at public vendue as executor to C. Rogers, joint with B. Hopkinson, esq.; that I bought the said woman and child for C. Brown; that I was security for the payment, which more fully appears by the accompanying certificate, and that they were bought under no stipulation; and further, I consider them liable to me until fully paid.

(signed) *W. Urquhart*.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

I hereby certify, That Catherine Brown stood indebted to Mr. Urquhart in a sum of *f.* 15,673. 10. 14. on the 31st December 1828, of which said sum of *f.* 15,673. 10. 14. no part has yet been paid.

Demerara, 11th Nov. 1829.

(signed) *John Jackson,*
Book-keeper to Mr. Urquhart.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—5th March 1830. The sum of *f.* 440, equal to *£.* 31. 8. 6½. sterling, was this day deposited by W. Urquhart on account of C. Brown, for the benefit of her slaves Nelly Sue and her son Henry, in the Savings Bank for Slaves, and has been paid over by the Protector to the Colonial Receiver under the directions contained in the Act for establishing a Savings Bank for Slaves. (*Vide* Table (G.) page 189.)

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 6.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Thomas*, aged about 23 years, male, residing at Mahaica, a carpenter by trade.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*D. S. Van Gravesande*, deceased, owner, formerly residing at Mahaica, a planter.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 13th October 1829. Claim made by *Thomas* at this office.—(*Vide* Complaint No. 54, with Protector's Report, 1 November 1829.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—Claiming that the Board of Orphans, representing the estate of his late owner be compelled to manumit him; and that he has never been registered as a slave; but notwithstanding the Board have laid claim to him as a slave belonging to the said *S. Gravesande*, deceased.—(*Vide* Protector's Report, as above.)

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(Continued from last Report, dated 1st November 1827, Complaint No. 54.)—22d December 1829. The documents in this case, *viz.* statement of *Thomas* and the certificate of non-registry, by the Registrar, were this day placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to draw up petition to his honor the President of the Court of Justice for appointment of curator to manumit him.—5th January 1830. Petition presented to his honor the President, and referred to the Board of Orphans, for report on the 8th January 1830.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—4th May 1830. By final order on the petition, his honor the President appointed the Crown Advocate, curator *pro Deo*, for the purpose of effecting the manumission of *Thomas*.—11th May 1830. The intention to manumit said *Thomas*, advertised as usual, in order to the opposers, if any there be, stating their grounds of opposition on or before the 31st instant; and further, that in case of any such opposition, the same must be prosecuted according to law, within one month from the date of the intimation thereof to this office.—1st May 1830. No opposition having been made, the deed of manumission was prepared, and (24th June) duly executed, and is now ready for delivery to said *Thomas* whenever he calls for it.—26th June 1830. The deed of manumission was this day delivered to said *Thomas S. Gravesande*.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case which, could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 7.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Diana Spragg*, aged about 38 years, female, residing in George Town, and employed as a huckstress.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to *Johanna G. Bastiaanse*, of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 14th October 1829, the said *Diana Spragg* appeared at this office. (*Vide* Complaint No. 55, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—To recover payment of a debt due by *J. C. Scheffers*, free coloured man of this town, a carpenter by trade, amounting as *per good* to *f.* 76 equal in sterling money to *£.* 5. 8. 6½.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—17th March 1830. The Protector made several applications to said *Scheffers*, for payment of said debt since the 1st February last, the day upon which the time allowed him by

by complainant to procure the money expired; but no part of it being yet paid, it has been this day placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to sue for.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—30th April 1830. This claim has been settled by the said J. C. Scheffers, and the woman Diana Sprigg has received the money, say *f.* 76 or *£.* 5. 8. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ sterling, without suit being instituted.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

No. 8.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Jacoba, Julia, Dorothea, Una and Effa*, females, of plantations *La Penitentir* and *La Penitence*.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*M. Rush*, of plantations *La Penitence* and *Le Repentir*; manager.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 19th October 1829, complaint made at this office by said slaves *Jacoba, Julia, Dorothea, Una and Effa*. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 57, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—Illegal confinement of complainants in the stocks, &c. by inflicting more than one punishment on them for the same offence, between the afternoon of Saturday the 17th of October 1829, until one o'clock or thereabouts, in the morning of the 19th October following, the same being in contravention of the 14th clause of the Ordinance for the religious instruction of slaves, &c. and the Act further to amend the same. (*Vide* as above.)

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(Continued from last Report, dated 1st November 1829. *Vide* Complaint, No. 57.)—2d November 1829. In answer to an application from *Mr. Rush*, manager of plantations *La Penitence* and *Le Repentir*, of this date, the Protector replied, that he could not furnish *Mr. Rush* with copies of the statements and depositions upon which *Mr. Rush* had been fined, but that he would readily afford him a re-perusal of them at his office.—4th November 1829. *Mr. Rush* having again applied to the Protector, that having been refused copies of the documents above alluded to, he requested that the Protector would state in what manner, and in what particulars, he had transgressed the 14th clause of the Ordinance, &c. and 1st of the amended Act, as such an assertion was to him, *Rush*, incomprehensible. The Protector stated in reply, that *Mr. Rush* had had every means of knowing the grounds upon which he deemed it his duty to call upon him for the penalty, as expressed in his notice of the 27th ult. and that *Mr. Rush* had read all the evidence on both sides, in the Protector's office.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—9th November 1829. *M. Rush*, manager of plantations *La Penitence* and *Le Repentir*, not having yet paid the penalty ordered, the Protector this day placed the case in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to institute a prosecution against said manager without delay. (*Vide* Table (H.) page 195.)

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 9.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Frances*, aged about 45 years, female; residing in *George Town*; employed as a huckstress.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to *Antoine Sils*, residing in this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 23d October 1829. Complaint made at this office by said *Frances*. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 60, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That she had been punished by flogging or whipping, with a chaise or hunter's whip, on or about the 22d and 23d October 1829. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 60, with Protector's Report, as above.)

5.—The

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

- 5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(*Vide* Protector's Report, as above.)
- 6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—
- 7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—
- 8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—
- 9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—9th November 1829. Mr. Sils having refused to pay the penalty demanded, as directed by the 14th Clause of the Ordinance for the religious instruction of Slaves, &c. &c. for this illegal punishment, say, 1,400*f.*, 100*l.* sterling. The Protector, this day, placed the case in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to prosecute. (*Vide* Table (H.) page 196.)
- 10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 10.

- 1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Ben William*, aged about 28 years, male; residing in George Town; a blacksmith by trade.
- 2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Formerly belonging to Neil Livingston, deceased, a blacksmith, of this town, and now claimed by A. F. Harrower, of this town, a boat builder. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 61, Protector's Report, 1st November 1829.)
- 3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 30th October, 1829, claim made by said *Ben William* at this office.
- 4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That he was left his freedom by the last will of said Neil Livingston, deceased; that Mr. Harrower lays claim to him, and holds him in possession, alleging that he has a bill of sale for him from his late owner; that said bill of sale is incorrect. (*Vide* Protector's Report, as above.)
- 5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—(Continued from last Report, as above.)—3d November 1829. The Protector having examined the secretarial copy of the will of the deceased N. Livingston, dated 1st June 1826, produced by Mr. Alstrom, finds that complainant has been left his freedom, as also a box of tools belonging to the deceased at the time of his death, and that there is no mention made in said will, of any sale or transfer of complainant to said Harrower, by the deceased. It also appeared, that Mr. Reoch, of the Foundry, in this town, was left an executor to said will.—4th November. The Protector summoned said parties, Reoch, Urquhart and Harrower, to appear at this office.—18th December. On re-perusal of said will, the Protector observes, that a legacy of 14 joes had been left to a woman named Mary Glenn, by the deceased, after payment of his debts, and complying with the above in favour of Ben.
- 6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—2d November 1829. John Alstrom, of this town, states, that he was left executor by Neil Livingston, deceased, but that he resigned to Walter Urquhart, on his, Alstrom's, going to England; that Mr. Urquhart was appointed by the Court. Witness never heard of any claim Mr. Harrower had upon the deceased, except two joes for a Doctor Thompson, who was drowned, and therefore the money was never paid; that as far as he can recollect the agreement between Ben's master Livingston and Harrower was, that complainant was hired to the latter at the rate of 66*f.* per month; this agreement took place in the lifetime of the deceased. That Ben has been in possession of Harrower since 1824 or early in 1825. Witness further states, that after Livingston's death, he heard that Harrower had a bill of sale of complainant from the deceased, and that he, Harrower, had offered witness the purchase money of complainant, but in consequence of the deceased having left this man free by his will, copy of which witness has, and will produce, witness would not receive the money.
- 7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—Mr. Urquhart, of this town, appeared, and being questioned relative to this case, states, that Mr. Reoch having gone to Europe, he left him, Urquhart, his attorney, in this Colony, and that he acted for him as such; that he can give no information on the claim in question, further than that it had been before the Court, and that the man had been given over to Mr. Harrower in consequence of his claim to him being thought good. Mr. Reoch appeared and stated that he was left executor to the will of Livingston, deceased; that he did not conform to the will of the deceased by freeing Ben, there not being sufficient funds to do so after payment of the just debts of the deceased; that Ben had been sold to Mr. Harrower during the lifetime of the deceased, and previous to the will being made, and therefore he did not interfere. That he considered the sale to Harrower regular; that he was absent from the Colony himself, but that Mr. Urquhart acted for him as his attorney. Cannot exactly say, at this moment, whether the 14 joes, left to the woman mentioned in said will, has been paid to her or not. Admits that there is still some balance in favour of the estate remaining in the hands of Mr. Reid, the lawyer; that Mr. Reid was his Reoch's counsel and that it was by his advice Ben had been given over to Harrower, and the balance of his purchase money received.

8.—The

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—A. F. Harrower, of this town, boat-builder, states, that about eighteen months before the death of Livingston, he purchased the man Ben from him for the sum of 2,600*f.* and received a bill of sale of said slave at same time; that it was agreed that the said purchase money should remain in his hands until Livingston's intended departure for Europe in the spring following, and that until that time arrived witness was to pay wages for Ben to the deceased, at the rate of 66*f.* per month; that both the deceased and his slave were at this time in the employ of witness, but that in consequence of a subsequent misunderstanding between them the deceased left his employ, and took the slave away with him also, and that witness could never get hold of the slave until some time after the death of the deceased; that before their leaving witness's employ, however, several payments had been made to the deceased on account of the purchase money of the slave.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—19th December 1829. The Protector placed this claim in the hands of the Crown Advocate, to institute proceedings against the heir or heirs, representative or representatives of the estate of the said Neil Livingston, deceased, to carry into effect the testator's will, by procuring letters of manumission for the said Ben William, and obtaining certain tools also bequeathed to him. (*Vide* Table (H.) page 197.)

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

PART I.
DEMERARA.
Report from
Protector of Slaves.
Table (B.)

No. 11.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Sophia*, aged 22 years, female; residing on Plantation Bath and Kenderen Mahaicony, and employed thereon.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—The property of the estate of Robert Robertson, deceased, in the year 1819, and who was formerly a butcher of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—Complaint preferred on the 1st November 1829, by Adela Tinne, black woman, and reputed free, the mother of *Sophia*, and formerly belonging to P. F. Tinne, late Colonial Secretary, now residing in England.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That previous to P. F. Tinne leaving this Colony, he gave said Adela a free pass, stating that she was at liberty to go and get herself cured, she being diseased with sores; and further, that she should be free, and her issue after her, if she should ever have any; that subsequently, a Dr. Solomon Marsham offered to cure her for 10 joes; that he failed to do so, and therefore she did not pay him. He lived up the Demerara River at the time; that afterwards she got herself cured by another person, and had a child, said *Sophia*, for Bass Oxley. She then went to another part of the country, leaving said child with her mother Sophy M'Inroy, who died during her absence, and the said child, *Sophia*, was left with Doctor S. Marsham, who took upon himself to pawn or sell her to a Mr. Robertson, now deceased, without any authority or claim whatsoever; that said Dr. Marsham kept the free pass above mentioned, and that said *Sophia* is entitled to her freedom.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—The Protector, on inquiry, finds that said Dr. Solomon Marsham was a man of colour, residing up the Demerara River, and that he has been dead for many years; that Bass Oxley and Sophy M'Inroy are also dead; that the estate of Robertson is now represented by Dr. John Waddell of this town, and that P. F. Tinne, stated to be the former owner of said Adela, and to have given her the free pass, now lives in Liverpool in England, and that he is represented in this Colony by George Rainy, merchant.—2d November 1829. The Protector summoned Dr. John Waddell.—16th February 1830. The Protector having requested the Crown Advocate's opinion in this case, received the following:—

“The statement of Adela should, in my opinion, be referred to Mr. Tinne, now in Liverpool, to ascertain its correctness. Adela will also prove that *Sophia* is her child, either by the evidence of the midwife, or some other person. If Adela is an African, she can obtain her manumission for want of registry; if not an African, she is still the property of Mr. Tinne, as also her children, during his lifetime; and as *Sophia* has been registered, she will go to his heirs, but not the others, who will become entitled to freedom.

(signed)

“S. W. Gordon, Cⁿ Adv^r.”

17th February 1830. The Protector summoned Adela. 3d April, G. Rainy, attorney of P. F. Tinne, having been referred to, can give no information on this subject, but will write to Mr. Tinne about it.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—1st November 1829, Adela produced the following certificate in support of her statement:—

“20th October 1829. I do hereby certify, under tender of oath, That about 20 years ago the bearer, Allida Tinne, was in the hands of Dr. Solomon Marsham, who made
262. no

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

no cure of her, and I then offered to take her in hand, and completely made a cure of her.

Witness (signed) *G. Brown.*(signed) *Minerva* × *Laba.*
her
mark.

17 February 1830.

Adela appeared; says she is an African; that she has another daughter, aged about 13 years, besides Sophia; that the former lives with her unmolested in a state of reputed freedom, like herself, on Plantation Providence, the property of James Johnston, esq. where they are furnished with a house, food, &c. That the midwife, who was with her at Sophia's birth, is dead, but that she can and will bring proof of Sophia being her (Adela's) daughter, the woman and daughter in whose house Sophia's birth took place being yet alive here. The woman is named Jane M'Culloch; her daughter is named Eliza.

Jane M'Culloch, f. b. w. is now blind; knew Adela; she lived in her yard upwards of 20 years ago, and was delivered of a female child; does not know if the child was christened; Adela left witness's premises while this child was yet an infant; does not know what became of her since.

Eliza M'Culloch, f. c. w.; corroborates the evidence of her mother, Jane M'Culloch; cannot say if the girl here present is the daughter of Adela, born at witness's mother's. Adela went away from there while her child was yet an infant, and witness has never seen her since.

Sophia; is the daughter of Adela, but does not know any person who could identify her as such; has no children.

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—16th December 1829, Dr. John Waddell appeared; states, that he is executor of said Robert Robertson, deceased; that the girl Sophia works now upon his estate, Bath and Kenderen in Mahai-cony, on hire, with which the estate of the deceased is credited; that there is nothing in the will or papers of the deceased relative to her freedom; does not know how she came into the deceased's possession; can find no bill of sale of her, but it is not likely she could have come into his the deceased's possession without one; that she is named as a slave belonging to the estate of the deceased in the notarial inventory (produced) of his effects taken on the 24th December 1819; that she was registered by the deceased in 1817 as a slave belonging to him, and was then nine years of age, as appears by the certificate of registration of the slaves of the deceased, attested before the Registrar on the 9th August 1817 (produced); and that she has since continued to be registered regularly as belonging to the boedel of said Robertson.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—This case awaits an answer to a letter, written by Mr. Tinne's representative here to him in England.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 12.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Alfred*, male; residing in George Town; a carpenter by trade.

2.—The names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belongs to James Laurie, of this town; a carpenter by trade.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—Complaint lodged at this office, on the 5th November 1829, by James Laurie.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That said slave Alfred has been employed on board the brig *Tamar*, now lying in this river, by Captain Mills, of said brig, for seven days, without the knowledge or consent of said Laurie, the said slave being therefore a run-away; that complainant, conceiving the same to be in contravention of the laws in force, desires that the penalty prescribed for such offence be enforced against Captain Mills.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—5th November 1829. On the question being put, Mr. Laurie states, that the only evidence he has in support of his complaint is that of a young man in his own employ who secured the slave Alfred, and to whom Captain Mills paid the amount of the seven days' hire of said slave, taking the young man's receipt for it, but which was unauthorized by him Laurie; that the young man received this money, ignorant of the impropriety of the act.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—Mr. Laurie, having admitted that the hire of his slave Alfred for the seven days he had been absent from him, had been received by

by a person in his own employ, the Protector considers the matter compromised, and does not think it requires interference on his part.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

No. 13.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Sam*, aged forty-eight years, male; residing in Pomeroun River; a wood-cutter.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Gerrit Timmirman*, curator to the estate of *H. Linau*, deceased, a wood-cutter, residing in Pomeroun.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 6th November 1829 the said slave *Sam* appeared at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—*Sam* claims his freedom, stating that his master *Mr. Linau*, late Postholder in Pomeroun, is dead; that he died about two years ago; that he formerly belonged to a bass (an overseer or superintendant) named *Michael*, by whom he was lent for two or three weeks to *Linau*, to go with him into the bush; that said *Michael* was at that time bass to a boat-builder, and died suddenly before he *Sam* returned with *Linau* from the bush; that said *Michael* had no other slave, and that he, complainant, was not left by him to any person, and therefore claims his freedom; that a free black man, named *Frank*, boat captain to *Mr. Gray*, and now in Pomeroun, knows all about him.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—7th November 1829. *Sam* being asked, declares that he has no further proof than that already stated to adduce in support of his claim. The Protector forwarded copy of *Sam's* statement to the Assistant Protector of the district in which the man *Frank* (the witness referred to by *Sam*) resides, desiring that his evidence might be taken upon it.—21st November 1829. The Protector having referred to the Office for the Registration of Slaves, finds that *Sam* has been duly registered in 1817, 1820, 1823, 1826 and 1829 by *G. Timmerman*, curator over the estate of *H. Linau*, deceased.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—21st November 1829. I certify, at the request of the Protector (having examined the free negro man named *Captain Frank*), long known to me as a respectable well-behaved man, on the subject of the complaint of the negro man *Sam*, who lays claim to his freedom, and had alleged to the Protector that the said *Frank* knew all about him the said *Sam*. *Frank*, in his examination, states, that he knew *Sam* since upwards of twenty years, and about that period he was employed in a schooner belonging to *Captain Limberg*, whose slave he considered *Sam* to be, and that since that period he has known him living with the late *Mr. Linau* until the time of his death, whose slave he also considered *Sam* to be; he however states further, that about seven years ago *Sam* came to him to beg to borrow or procure 10 joes, saying, that *Mr. Linau* told him if he would bring him, *Linau*, 10 joes, he would give him up his freedom to work for himself. It must be considered, however, that *Mr. Linau* was crazy some years before he died, and that *Mr. Timmerman* was appointed by the Court of Justice curator over his person and property. *Frank* declares solemnly that the above circumstances are all he knows respecting *Sam*.
(signed) *Charles Bean*, Assistant Protector of Slaves.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—7th November 1829. *G. Timmerman* having appeared, states, that he is curator to the estate of *H. Linau*, deceased, under the appointment of the honourable Court of Justice; that *Sam* was placed under his charge as a slave belonging to that estate; that he had transacted the affairs of the deceased for many years, and always knew *Sam* to be the lawful property of the deceased, and that he is so to this moment; that the deceased had owned him a great many years before his death; does not know how complainant came into the possession of the deceased; has never seen any bill of sale or other papers of him to the deceased; that about two years ago *Sam* said to him, that he did not belong to *Mr. Linau*, but being unable to bring any proof of this assertion being well founded, he, *Timmerman*, remonstrated with him on the absurdity of it, and recommended him to return to his duty. Complainant appeared satisfied and did so; that *Mr. Linau* was quite mad before he died, and destroyed all his papers, and it was reported that he had thrown his money into the river; that the deceased was in so deranged a state, that he was put into the Colonial Hospital in town, where he died; that bass *Michael*, the person mentioned by *Sam*, has been dead for about thirty years past.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—*Edward Bunbury*, of Plantation Devonshire Castle, knows the slave *Sam*, resides in the same district with him; has known him in the possession of *Mr. Linau* for several years. He is now under the charge of *Mr. Timmerman*, curator, appointed by the Court of Justice to the estate of *Linau*, who has been dead some years; he died in the Colony Hospital in this town, of mental derangement, and had been deranged for some time previous to his death.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

J. W. Linau, widow of the deceased, certifies that her late husband, Mr. Linau, was deranged for several years before his death; that in consequence she was under the necessity of separating from him; that after she left him, he being in possession of all the papers relative to his property, and in a great measure unprotected, he destroyed all his papers and documents; that the said negro Sam was given to her daughters, H. M. Linau and J. Linau (the latter since dead) by the late Mr. Gronendual, boat-builder, who resided in her husband's house; that they both told her that said negro belonged to her daughters; that on one occasion, shortly after Mr. Gronendual's death, a Mr. Peter Beck came to claim said negro, but Mr. Linau satisfied him that Sam belonged to her daughters aforesaid, and shewed him the papers to that effect.

Witness (signed) *E. Bunbury.*her
(signed) *J. W. × Linau.*
mark.

I do hereby certify, That since the year 1808, I knew the negro Sam to be in possession of Mr. Linau, formerly Postholder, and have always considered him to be his property.

(signed) *Alexander Wishart.*

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector does not consider it necessary to proceed further in this matter, there being no proof to support Sam's claim. Explained to him and dismissed.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 14.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Jacoba*, aged 30 years, female; residing in George Town, employed in light domestic work.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*A. Sils*, of George Town, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 9th November 1829, complaint lodged at this office by said *Jacoba*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That she and her child are sick, and that her master has no medical man to attend them.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—9th November 1829. The Protector summoned *Mr. Sils* to appear before him. *Jacoba* being questioned, admits that she had been seen repeatedly, as also her children, by *Doctor Bascom*, and got physic, and that she left her master's house on Saturday with her child without his knowledge; cannot say why she came away, does not like her master, and wishes to be sold to some one else.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—None necessary.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—5 November 1829. Appeared, *A. Sils*; states, *Jacoba* is an invalid with scrofula, her child has a cold, they are both of them attended by *Dr. Bascom*, her complaint therefore is false; she absented; with her child, on Saturday last the 7th instant, without any cause whatsoever, and I have not seen her or her child from that time until now; her other child was buried on Saturday; it was attended during its illness, as well as herself, by *Dr. Bascom*. I will get his certificate to support the above statement, if necessary.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—This complaint false and unfounded. The Protector cautioned complainant against absenting herself again in such a manner, and told her she must not prefer false complaints against her owner; that if she should in future have cause of complaint she must come direct to the office, and not stay loitering about town; and that the Protector could not oblige *Mr. Sils* to sell her contrary to his wish.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 15.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Nelson*, aged 25 years, male; residing in George Town, and employed as a cooper, on behalf of his mother *Rosey*, belonging to a woodcutter up the river.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to *J. Pemberton*, a free coloured man residing up the Demerary river, a woodcutter.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 9th November 1829. Information lodged at this office by said *Nelson*.

4.—The

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That informant's mother, a female slave named Rosey, belonging to said Pemberton, had been sent into the bush to pick wood, that she lost her way, and had been hollowing in the bush from six o'clock in the evening to six o'clock next morning. That a man named Trim, belonging also to Pemberton, asked his master if he did not hear some one bawling? Pemberton replied that he would not send any one into the bush to look for her, but took the shell and blew it; that they never heard any thing more of her; that it is now two months since Rosey went into the woods, and it was only last Thursday that his master sent in to look for her, but there was no trace of her found.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—Nelson being questioned by the Protector says, I never heard of the matter till yesterday, I live in town; my master's people told me of it yesterday when they came down the river.—9th November 1829. Immediate notice hereof given to his Honour the first Fiscal, in order to his taking such steps in the matter as he may consider necessary.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—10th November 1829. The Protector was informed, that this circumstance had been already reported to his Honour the Fiscal, who had inquired into the matter, and found that the owner Pemberton was blameless, having immediately at the time sent into the bush when the slave Rosey was missed; but there was no trace of her, and it was supposed that she had either absconded, or been destroyed by wild beasts. J. Pemberton reported her absence immediately to J. C. Peate, Deputy Fiscal of the district.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves:

Table (B.)

No 16.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Adam*, 28, male; residing in George Town, employed in the service of his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to the Colonial Government.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 17th November 1829. Complaint preferred in a written statement handed to the Protector by James Hackett, Civil Commissary.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—The statement of Adam represents, that one John Thomas, a coloured man of this town, a painter by trade, purchased from Adam a silver watch many months ago for the sum of 55 guilders; that said John Thomas has only paid complainant 24 guilders of this money, and that on his, Adam, calling for the balance, *f.*31., yesterday, said John Thomas refused payment and pursued complainant with a cutlass through the streets.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—19th November 1829. The Protector summoned said John Thomas to appear before him.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—19th November 1829. Appeared John Thomas; is a painter by trade; resides in George Town; did purchase the watch from the slave Adam about ten months ago; paid *f.*24. on account of it, but from sickness has been unable to pay the balance of *f.*31.; complainant promised to wait for this sum; being frequently importuned for said balance, offered to return the watch to complainant on his paying back the *f.*24., but complainant would not accept it; he had endeavoured to sell the watch to enable him to pay complainant, but could not find a purchaser; that on Friday the 14th instant complainant called again, when he, Thomas, was sick in bed, and stated that there was a person who wished to buy the watch, and desired that it might be given to him to show it; that he, Thomas, replied, "Let the person come to me if he wishes to buy it, and if he does I will pay you;" complainant said he had no time, and immediately started off with it, saying that having got the watch into his possession he would keep it, which he has done; seeing this, he got out of bed, took a cutlass in his hand, but certainly not with an intention of using it against complainant, and walked as far as the gate after him, but was unable to go any further; complainant now has not only the watch, but also the *f.*24. paid on account of it, and therefore can have no just grounds of complaint.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—Dismissed, there being no grounds for the Protector's further interference.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

No. 17.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment, of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Mary Ann*, aged 33 years, female; at present residing in George Town; jobbing about town.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to Griffith Parry, merchant of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 20th November 1829. Complaint preferred at this office by *Mary Ann*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That complainant was brought here in 1816 by a Mr. M'Koy from Barbadoes as a house-servant and washer, was sold by him two or three months after to a Mr. Nurse of this town, who sold her to her present owner, Parry, about four years ago; that Mr. Parry now wishes to sell her and her children to a Mr. Robert Gray, living in Pomeroun, and that Mr. Gray, as she understands, intends to put her in the field; that she is not used to field work, and does not wish to go so far in the country.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—20th November 1829. The Protector summoned Mr. Parry. * * * * On reference to the Office for the Registration of Slaves, the Protector finds that complainant was registered unconditionally in 1817, and that consequently she does not come under the regulations affecting slaves brought to the Colony from the Islands, which are subsequent to that period.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—Appeared G. Parry; is a merchant in this town; purchased complainant some years ago from Mr. Nurse, but knows nothing of her importation to this Colony; from her insolence and bad conduct and not paying her hire, she having been working out about town, he is about selling her and her two children to Mr. Gray, who resides in Pomeroun, and believes Mr. Gray intends to employ her as a washer; that he had been obliged to send one of her children, a boy, in the country some time ago from his being a great run-away, and in which he was encouraged by his mother, the said *Mary Ann*.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector explained to her that he could not interfere to prevent her sale in the country, and recommended her to conduct herself with more propriety in future so as to merit indulgence from her owner.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 18.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Boatswain*, aged about 65 years, male; residing in the Colony workhouse, George Town.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Robertson, manager of the workhouse in this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—On the 20th November 1829, complaint made at this office by said *Boatswain*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That he, complainant, has been 25 years in the workhouse; that the Governor released him about three years ago, and that Mr. Robertson, the manager of the workhouse, has the paper; that complainant therefore considers himself free, and upon that assumption left the workhouse some time ago, but was taken up some few days past by said Robertson, in the street; that he will not return to the workhouse, and thinks he has a right to go wherever he pleases.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—20th November 1829. The Protector summoned Mr. Robertson, and directed complainant to return with Mr. Robertson to the workhouse, and remain there until his case should be brought under the notice of his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, and which was immediately done by the Protector.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of Each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—20th November 1829. Appeared Robertson; is manager of the Colony workhouse in this town; states, that many years ago complainant was placed in the workhouse as a convict for life, under

under a sentence of the Court of Justice; that his former owner received 1,000*f.* from the Colony for him; that on the 28th July 1826, it appears by the Workhouse Book (produced) that the Governor granted him a free pardon; and that he was sent to the Fiscal to exhibit and give effect to the pardon; that the Fiscal told complainant that he was now belonging to the Colony, and that he was to remain in the workhouse as a domestic, to reduce the expense of that establishment; that about a year after his pardon, complainant made off, and has been absent ever since, until a few days ago, when he, Robertson, found him lying drunk in the street, and took him up.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to direct that complainant should be set at liberty.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.
 —
 DEMERARA.
 —
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 —
 Table (B.)

No. 19.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Hope*, 16 years of age, male; of plantation La Penitence.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to plantation La Penitence, M. Rush, manager.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—3d December 1829. Complaint made at this office by Captain George Warren, attorney of said plantation.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That said boy *Hope*, belonging to plantation La Penitence, had been absent a considerable time from said plantation, and that he came to him, Warren, yesterday morning, and gave himself up in consequence, he said, of having heard that the dienaars were looking for him; that on sending him to the estate, the boy declared to the manager, Mr. Rush, that he had been employed upwards of a month by a free black woman in this town, named Nanny Jane; that she induced him to stay with her by saying that he would be safe there; that he was employed in cooking for her and the white men named John Williams, Mortimer, Ferguson and Martines.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—The Protector finds, on inquiry, that said Nanny Jane is herself a slave.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—*Hope*, aged about 16 years, belonging to plantation La Penitence, is the same who ran away from that estate; corroborates the statement made by him to Mr. Rush, manager of the plantation; and says further, that the white man, Mortimer, told him not to tell Mr. Rush that he, Mortimer, was living at Nanny Jane's, as Rush would get him, Mortimer, put in jail. Mr. Rush, manager of plantation La Penitence, states, that said Mortimer had been an overseer under him for some time upon an estate which he, witness, formerly managed, and that he discharged him.

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector cannot interfere in this case, the party accused of harbouring the slave, *Hope*, being herself a slave.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 20.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Fanny*, aged 33 years, female; employed working about town on hire, and residing in town.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Sally Seward*, free coloured woman, residing in town, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—8th December 1829. Complaint made at this office by said *Fanny*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That about four weeks ago her said mistress took complainant up stairs, had her tied, both hands and feet, laid down on the floor, her clothes being pulled up, and flogged by the woman *Judy*, in the presence of complainant's daughter, with a horsewhip, because she, *Fanny*, could not find a boy named *Henry*, also belonging to her mistress, who had absconded, and in search of whom complainant had been sent; that she has come to complain with a view to prevent such punishment in future; and further, that complainant's daughter, *Charlotte*, had been kept for two weeks almost

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Table (B.)

constantly in the stocks, her mistress supposing that Charlotte had desired complainant not to bring the boy Henry home.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—8th December 1829. The Protector summoned the witnesses referred to by complainant, Charlotte, and Judy; and the Protector summoned Sally Seward.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Charlotte, a coloured girl, aged about 17 years, is the daughter of complainant; they both belong to Sally Seward. States, That Fanny was sent to look for the boy Henry, who had absconded; that she had been away some weeks, and returned without him; that her mistress, when complainant returned, put her in the stocks for two days, afterwards took Fanny up stairs in the afternoon, tied her hands and feet, laid her upon the floor, and caused the woman Judy to flog her with a horse-whip; that witness was present at the time; that complainant's clothes were not pulled up; declares that she, witness, was only three days and two nights in the stocks, and not two weeks, as stated by her mother Fanny; that her, witness's, confinement, was not for the reason given by Fanny.—Judy is aged about 37 years, belongs to Sally Seward. States, That the week before the last the boy Henry ran away. Her mistress desired complainant, who was working out on hire at the time, to go in search of him; that complainant, not having found him, was put in the stocks for two days and nights, and then taken out of the stocks about five o'clock p.m., tied and flogged with a horse-whip, by order of Sally Seward; that witness inflicted the punishment herself, gave complainant about five licks very slightly, they left no marks whatever.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—Appeared Sally Seward; resides in George Town; is the owner of complainant. Declares, That the woman Fanny is a very bad character; has repeatedly robbed her of money; took it out of her drawers. That she desired her to look after Henry, and that she, complainant, was some time, say several weeks, away; that she heard complainant had been idling at Mr. Mass's in the country, and consequently she put her in the stocks for two days and two nights; that she afterwards was punished with two or three stripes with the whip; that she, Sally Seward, is aware it is contrary to law, but complainant's conduct having been so repeatedly bad, caused her to inflict this slight punishment; that complainant has often instigated and encouraged her daughter Charlotte to steal. Did not tie complainant at all; when she gave her the licks, only gave her two or three very slightly, and that with her clothes on; that Charlotte was never in the stocks for a longer period at any time than two or three days; that she is a poor woman, and greatly dependent upon the hire of those slaves for her support.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—It appears that the chief object of this complaint is to prevent a repetition of similar punishment on complainant, who has allowed, as appears by her own statement, four weeks to elapse after the infliction of this punishment without making any complaint, although she resides only a few doors from the Protector's office; the punishment was very slight, but was nevertheless illegal and improper. The Protector therefore, considering all the circumstances of the case, does not think it expedient to institute a prosecution against Sally Seward, but most particularly cautions her against inflicting any such illegal punishment, however slight it might be, upon any of her slaves in future, under pain of being proceeded against as the law directs. Read and explained to complainant.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 21.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf, the Complaint was preferred?—*Peggy*, aged 44 years, female; residing in George Town, employed as huckstress.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to Sarah Adams, free coloured woman of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—6th December 1829. Complaint made at this office by said *Peggy*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That her said mistress, having no house-room for complainant, desired her to hire a house, and that she would pay the rent of it out of complainant's hire. Complainant did hire a room, at £4. 10. per month, for which said mistress paid the first month. Complainant was then desired to go into the country to sell goods, and pay half the rent herself; would not go, having no license to sell. Her mistress then said, if she would not go she should pay all the rent herself, and slapped her in the face, and put her that same night in the stocks in the jail, where complainant was kept so confined for a whole night and day, without getting any thing to eat or drink.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding —The Protector, on inquiry, (made on the 8th December 1829,) finds that no person

PART I.
DEMERARA.Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

person could be detained in the jail for a night and a day without being supplied with the usual allowance of food; and that complainant had been put in the stocks there for that period for refractory conduct and striking her mistress, as stated in the mistress's complaint, and that she received the proper allowance of food.—8th December 1829. Protector summoned Sarah Adams.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—Appeared Sarah Adams; lives in this town; is the owner of complainant; has no house of her own; is obliged to hire one, and there not being room in it for complainant, only requires her to pay three bits a day to enable her to provide herself with a room. Complainant is able to pay four bits a day; that out of the three bits a day defendant has to support herself and child. Some days ago she called at Peggy's house, desired her to take a few goods into the country to sell for her, but she would not go. Defendant then took out a government license for the purpose, and gave it to complainant's daughter to go out and sell. This displeased complainant; therefore she would not bring her hire on Saturday, but sent it on Tuesday following. She then sent to tell complainant that she could not afford to pay house-rent for her out of 18*f.* a month, unless it was regularly paid. Complainant returned for answer that she did not care, and that she should find a place for her. Defendant went in the evening to complainant, and asked her what she meant by sending so insolent a reply, upon which complainant struck her with some plantains she had in her hand, in the presence of one Hector Spooner. Defendant then went to the jail, got a dienaar, and had her taken up and confined there for a night and a day, then hired her to Mr. Breda, plantation Work en Rust, near town, from which she absconded on the 26th of last month, and has been absent until this day.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector reprov'd complainant for her ill behaviour, and dismissed the complaint as frivolous and unfounded.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 22.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*John, Bristo, Colon, Males*; residing on Hog Island, Essequibo, employed as wood-cutters.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*J. G. de Ryck*, owner, residing in Hog Island, Essequibo River, a wood-cutter.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—9th December 1829. Complaint preferred at this office by said slaves, *John, Bristo, Colon*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—Insufficiency of food, in support of which complainants produced a bunch and a half of plantains, which they state to be the allowance given them, each, for a week and a half; also, that they do not receive a sufficiency of fish, nor their clothing regularly; that they neither get blankets nor hats; that last year they only got one jacket each, the only one since the year 1823; that they neither have houses nor any thing to cook in; and that they are obliged to sleep about under their master's house.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—9th December 1829. The Protector, after taking down their complaint, sent complainants to the jail, to be fed, &c. until reference could be made to their owner, who resides in Hog Island, Essequibo, and which is a great distance from George Town. Wrote to Major Frankland, Assistant Protector of the District, to ascertain, by personal inspection, if the statement of complainants was true and well founded, and to take down the defence of their owner, *J. G. de Ryck*, and to forward the same to this office.—31st December 1829. The complainants having been sent for to the jail, on the arrival of *Mr. de Ryck*, at this office, and being afterwards questioned, admit that the plantains produced by them at this office, were not all they had received for their allowance; that they had eaten some on their way up to town; and that they were several days coming up in the boat, say about a week; that they left the boat tied at the river side in town here. Do not know what is become of it; suppose it to have been stolen. Came away from their owner's place without asking for leave or a pass.

6.—The names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—31st December 1829. Appeared *J. G. de Ryck*; owns complainants; has two other slaves; resides on Hog Island, Essequibo; received intimation of this complaint from the Assistant Protector of the District; declares the complaint to be altogether false; and states, that he had complainants with him only for four months, they having been previously hired out on plantation Endeavour; that he is supplied with plantains for his negroes regularly by plantation

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

Henrietta, and that they receive a bunch and a half each a week; that it can be proved by reference to the books of C. Benjamin, merchant in this town, that he supplies them regularly with fish; does not weigh the fish out to them, having only five slaves altogether; but they are allowed to take what they choose of it, that is to say, a reasonable quantity. That by referring to the books of Messrs. Kerston & Co. also in this town, it will be seen that complainants did receive their full allowance of clothing in December last, which clothing was taken up on account of J. P. Treseni, of this town, and to whom complainants had been hired for some time, and from whom defendant could not get payment of their hire, and was therefore obliged to take the said clothing in part payment of it; that as to their lodgings, they are as good as those of himself and family, as they occupy the lower story of the house in which he himself resides, and which forms comfortable quarters for them. That some time ago, they, coming to town with him in the boat, asked leave to bring up in it with them some wood for their friends in town, which he granted, but they overloaded the boat; and to prevent risk to himself and them, he ordered some of it to be thrown overboard; they got displeased at this, and have been dissatisfied ever since. They came away without his knowledge seven days before their appearance here (the 9th inst.) stealing for the purpose a boat, for which he has to pay five joes, and which it appears they have lost.

8.—The names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector considers the statement of complainants to be incorrect and unfounded, and dismisses it accordingly. Representing to them the impropriety of their conduct in leaving their owner's abode without asking for a pass, to come to complain, which could not, by the regulations in force, be refused them; they were also told, that in the event of their having cause to complain, they must, in future, apply to their master for one to the Assistant Protector of the District in which they reside, and not attempt to come away without one, unless it should be refused. Having, in this instance, without just cause, subjected their owner, not only to the loss of their labour for twenty-four days, but also to the loss of the boat, and the expenses of feeding, &c. in the jail, by their not complying with this necessary rule.

10.—Explanatory remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 23.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*William*, aged 14 years, male; lives on plantation La Belle Alliance, and employed working about the buildings of that estate, to which he belongs.

2.—The names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—F. G. Bayley, manager of plantation La Belle Alliance, belonging to the heirs of Edward Austin, deceased; Charles Bean, attorney of said estate, situate on the west coast Essequibo.

3.—The time when, and the person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—12th December 1829. Said slave William sent to this office with a note from C. Bean, attorney.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—1st. That an iron collar (with which he appeared at this office, and was obliged to be sent to a blacksmith's shop to have taken off,) had been fast rivetted about his neck by the manager's orders, on Monday of last week, 30th November, and was kept on since; had been working with it on. Shepperd, the blacksmith of the estate put it on; Complainant was carried to him for the purpose, by November, the driver, who said the manager ordered it to be done. 2dly. That he, Complainant, was flogged by said driver, before the collar was put on, twice, once by order of the manager, once without his orders; was also put in the stocks at night with the collar on; the punishment was for running away. He did run away for three days before the collar was put on; did so because he had been ordered to pot sugar, but over-slept himself, and was afraid of punishment. 3dly. That the driver, November, always carries the cat about the yard, and flogs any body he chuses, say Creoles; this is the fourth time he has had a collar on; never saw any of the men have a collar on.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—12th December. Complainant being questioned, says, several negroes saw the driver, November, flog him with the cat; Domingo was one, and Romeo another; that the first flogging was very severe; the latter was ordered by the manager, Mr. Bayley; that Simon's collar was taken off about a week ago, and Adam's about three weeks ago. Complainant was returned to Mr. Bean's house in town.—13th December. Protector proceeded to plantation La Belle Alliance, to investigate this complaint.—14th December. Protector arrived at plantation La Belle Alliance, and examined several witnesses.—21st December. Protector transmitted result of his investigation on this complaint, to the manager of La Belle Alliance, through the attorney of said plantation, who urged on behalf of said manager, with a view to the mitigation of that part of the fine relative to the driver carrying a cat, that "although it appeared such had been sanctioned by the manager, which is certainly "contrary to law, yet it was confined to the person in charge of the Creole gang, and not of
"adults,

“adults, which may not perhaps come within the true meaning of the 12th clause of the “Act.” The Protector, however, does not feel authorized to mitigate this part of the fine on such ground. For further information, *vide* Explanatory Remarks, page 154.—12th January 1830. The Protector, in reference to his decision of the 21st ult. on this complaint, called again upon the manager of plantation La Belle Alliance, for payment of the several fines therein stated.—7th May 1830. Amount of the fines, say 1,400*f.* or 100*l.* sterling, received and paid over by the Protector to the Colonial Receiver. *Vide* Receipt, page 154.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—November, Creole driver of plantation La Belle Alliance; took Complainant to the blacksmith’s shop, to have the collar put on, he being a great run-away; was not ordered to do so, but had at the request of Complainant stood security for him on former occasions, and had to pay 2*f.* to negroes of another estate for catching Complainant; gave him on these occasions a few licks with a cat; this last time put the collar on to prevent his getting away again. Complainant was not flogged twice in one day, but was put in the stocks on the night of Friday, the day he was flogged with two or three cuts; was in the stocks Saturday night also, and until Monday morning; had a collar on only once before, it was a small bit of iron hoop, which he broke off, and absconded; these punishments were not ordered by the manager. Has authority from the manager to punish the Creoles only without special orders. When working in the yard with the Creoles, generally carries a small cat.

Prudence and Josephus, Creoles of the estate; held William when the driver November, licked him; do not know how many stripes he got; about twelve or six.

Shepherd, the blacksmith of the estate, put the iron collar on William’s neck; was not told it was by the manager’s orders; he was brought for the purpose, by the driver November, who ordered the collar; the boy is a great run-away; never made any collar before; never saw a collar on any of the negroes’ necks before; never saw either of the boys Simon or Adam, with a collar on.

Anson works in the blacksmith’s shop with last witness, was desired by November, who brought William to the shop, to make an iron collar, got no further directions about it; could not make it; was assisted by Shepherd; was not told by whose order William was brought to the shop; never made a collar for Simon or Adam; never saw either of them with one on.

Domingo and Romeo, know nothing about the punishment of William; did not see him flogged, or have the collar on; the latter is William’s father, and says, he is always running away; witness works in the field, William in the buildings.

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—F. G. Bayley, manager of plantation La Belle Alliance, examined. Did not direct the driver November to take William to have the collar put on his neck; might have seen William after the collar had been put on, but did not notice it; would have done so if he had been aware of it; the Creoles have sometimes a bit of puncheon iron hoop round their necks, as a distinguishing mark, which perhaps was the reason he, Bayley, did not notice it. William was put in the stocks by his, Bayley’s, orders. It was the only punishment he ordered him; he was in the stocks only for three or four days; he, William, had not been longer at home; was in the stocks at night only, except the Sunday, otherwise William would certainly have run away. The driver November has only authority to give the Creoles a touch or two, without his, the manager’s, orders. Personally inspects the Creole gang four, five or six times a day; they are always in the yard. States further, the boy William is a most notorious run-away, and has been so for a long time past, in consequence of which I had disgraced him by cutting off part of his hair, putting distinguishing marks about his neck, flogging him and locking him up at night, all of which I found of no avail, as he still persisted in running away: I therefore put him solely under the charge of the driver November, and threatened to punish him if he allowed him in future to escape. It has now been about six months since I put him under the charge of November, during which time he has run away ten or a dozen times, but I never punished him, but still threatened to punish November for allowing him to escape. In regard to the collar round his neck, it was certainly contrary to my order or knowledge. I might have seen him with it, but did not notice of what nature it was, being in the habit of seeing several of the Creole children with distinguishing marks about their necks for running away. I desired November to put him in the stocks at night, and not lose sight of him in the day. He was not punished latterly by my order in any way, but by confinement at night.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Mr. Austin, head overseer on plantation La Belle Alliance, examined, states, the driver November commonly carries a cat about with him, not always; said driver has only authority to punish the Creoles of his own accord. That William sometimes works about the buildings, and pots sugar, but seldom he could ever be got out to do any thing hardly; did not see him with the iron collar on; did not see him after he was flogged lately; never saw Simon or Adam with a collar on.—Adam, examined; says he never had a collar on; that Simon run away on the same day that William did, (8th December 1829,) and is still absent; that Simon never had a collar on.—Mr. Evans, overseer on plantation La Belle Alliance, examined; never saw William with an iron collar on; did not know he had been flogged; saw November the driver sometimes carry a cat; does not know that November has authority to punish with it, without getting permission first to do so; from his services as an overseer, always thought they (the drivers) should have such permission first from the manager, and supposed they had; that

William

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

PART I.
 —
 DEMERARA.
 —
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 —
 Table (B.)

William does pot sugar sometimes, about four o'clock, sometimes sooner or later; it is general among Creoles of the male kind, about the age of William (fourteen years); they, the Creoles, take it by spells through the week.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—21st December 1829. The Protector having duly considered the foregoing complaint, with all the evidence and statements adduced on both sides, is of opinion that F. G. Bayley, manager of plantation La Belle Alliance, has incurred the following penalties, under "The Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves, and for the improvement of their Condition," in force; viz.

- 1st. A fine of *f.* 200, for placing round the neck, or allowing to be placed round the neck of Complainant, an iron collar instead of a tin one, the same being in contravention of the 14th clause of said Ordinance, and 1st of the amended Act.
- 2d. A fine of *f.* 600, for allowing the driver November to carry a cat, while superintending the Creoles working about the yard, in contravention of the 12th clause of said Ordinance.
- 3d. A fine of *f.* 600, for inflicting, or allowing to be inflicted on Complainant, more than one punishment for the same offence, the same being in contravention of the 1st article of the amended Act.

And the Protector accordingly calls upon F. G. Bayley, manager of plantation La Belle Alliance, for payment of said penalties, amounting to *f.* 1,400, or 100 *l.* sterling, in default of which he will be proceeded against in due course of law.

7th May 1830.—Received from A. W. Young, esq. Protector of Slaves, the sum of one thousand four hundred guilders, being for a penalty incurred by F. G. Bayley, esq. manager of plantation La Belle Alliance. 100 *l.* sterling.

(signed) *M. J. Retemeyer,*
 Colonial Receiver.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—The manager of plantation La Belle Alliance has alleged that he was ignorant of many of the acts of the driver November, and which appeared by the preceding examinations to have been the case, but the Protector considers that this cannot in any case be admitted as an excuse. The manager of an estate will at all times be answerable for the infliction of punishment on the negroes under his charge: and as regards the discipline of plantation La Belle Alliance, the manager having entrusted the driver with an authority to inflict punishment, and allowed him the means of instant correction, he becomes the more especially liable to responsibility, for the improper use of a power which the Protector believes the manager has been singular in delegating to any person on the estate. The punishments of the boy William, considered as following each other in rapid succession, were unnecessarily severe, and more than one punishment was inflicted for the same offence.

No. 24.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Ellen*, female, residing in George Town, employed as a domestic, on behalf of her daughter *Harriett*, residing on plantation *Ruimveldt* with Mr. Cramer.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Stephen Cramer*, or plantation *Ruimveldt*, planter.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—17th December 1829. Complaint lodged at this office by said *Ellen*, on behalf of her said daughter *Harriett*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That *Harriett* was left a legacy of *f.* 800 by the will of the late *P. C. Ouckama*, deceased, to be applied to the purchase of her freedom; that *Stephen Cramer, Esq.* is executor to said will, and has received the said legacy; that said executor purchased *Harriett* at Vendue, in June 1825, for *f.* 1,000, and has since kept her in his employ without making any allowance for hire to her, whereby she has not been able to repay him the balance due on said *f.* 1,000, and that in consideration of *Harriett's* long services to *Cramer*, Complainant considers her entitled to her freedom, without further payment to him, *Cramer*.

4.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive proceeding?—17th December 1829. The Protector summoned *Mr. Cramer* to appear before him.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—27th December 1829. Appeared *Stephen Cramer*; produced the following account; and states, that he is most anxious to get rid of the woman *Harriett*, and will apply for her manumission as soon as she pays him the balance of said account; that it is true she has been about his house with her husband, who belongs to plantation *Ruimveldt*, but was never, in any way, employed or kept under any restraint from her working for her own benefit by him, *Cramer*.

The Coloured Woman Harriett

To Stephen Cramer, D^r

Jan. 15th, 1826.	For payment made Vendue Office, for first Instalment of Amount of Purchase-money of your ownself f. 1,000, and for your own benefit, as soon as you shall redeem the amount thereof - - - f. 333. 7.	
	2 per cent. Church and Poor Money on f. 1,000 - - - - - 20.	
	6 months' Interest thereon, after the conditions of sale - - - - - 10.	
		363. 7.
July 15,	— Payment of second Instalment - - - - - f. 333. 6.	
	1 year's Interest thereon, after conditions of sale - - - - - 20.	
		353. 6.
July 15th, 1827.	Payment of third and last Instalment, due this day f. 333. 7.	
	18 months' Interest thereon - - - - - 30.	
		363. 7.
		1,080.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Table (B.)

C^a C^r

May 7th, 1825. By this day received the amount of a Legacy bequeathed you by P. C. Ouckama's Will - - - - - f. 800.

Balance due me - f. 280.

Without charging any Interest for late Payment.
 (signed) S. Cramer.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—Mr. Cramer's account appears to be equitable. The Protector informed Complainant that as soon as her daughter Harriett shall have paid Mr. Cramer the said sum of 280 guilders, her manumission shall be effected.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No 25.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Mary Anne Sealey*, aged 28 years, female; residing in this town, employed as a domestic, and huckstress of cakes.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Catherine Garraway*, of this town, free coloured woman.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—23d December 1829, *Mary Anne Sealey*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—1st. Being kept constantly and unlawfully at work on the Sabbath-day, going to market, and preparing fruit for making pastry, &c.—2dly. Being employed in such a way as tends to destroy her constitution, and has already injured her health, baking cakes and pastry, and selling them about town, and being obliged, as soon as the cakes and pastry are baked, to wash and dress herself to go out with them; is subject to the rose in her legs, and has an enlargement of the glands of her groin in consequence.—3dly. Not being allowed a sufficiency of clothing.—4thly. Not receiving her weekly allowance of six bitts for food, regularly.—5thly. Being obliged to remain at home, to perform the domestic work of the family, every other Sunday, thereby having only one Sunday in two to herself; whereas her fellow-servants are allowed three Sundays in four.—6thly. Having been confined in gaol for quarrelling with her fellow-servants.—7thly. Stopping her weekly allowance, to pay gaol expenses; and, 8thly, Having been chastised with a horsewhip on Monday morning, either in the month of July or August past.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—24th December. Protector summoned *Catherine Garraway* to appear, and desired complainant to name such witness as she may have to bring forward in support of her complaint; Complainant however declined doing so for the present.—30th December. *Catherine Garraway* informed the Protector, through the Assistant Protector in *Wakenaam*, that she was then on that Island, sick; that she would attend at his office as soon as her health permitted.—31st December. Protector summoned *Dr. Alleyne*, who attends the family of *Catherine Garraway* to appear.—14th January 1830. Protector summoned Complainant, *Mary Anne Sealey*, and required her to name her witnesses if she had any, which she did; and the said witnesses were accordingly summoned.—24th January. *Mr. Tonge* (from whom various communications have been received, relative to the complaint of *M. A. Sealey* and the other slaves of *C. Garraway*, and who avows himself to be the adviser of said *M. A. Sealey*, and with whom it appears she cohabits) was summoned to give evidence, touching this complaint and other information given by him relative to the slaves of said

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

said C. Garraway; but he replied, that being under civil arrest he could not attend without a protecting warrant, for the purpose, being obtained by the Protector for him.—25th January. Protector forwarded to Mr. Tonge written interrogatories relative to this complaint, and a statement made by him, purporting to be an information against Catherine Garraway for unlawfully punishing, by whipping or flogging, the said Mary Ann Sealey and Spanish Marianne and Paulinda, her slaves.—To these interrogatories, however, Mr. Tonge has failed to give satisfactory answers.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Peggy Stewart, free coloured girl, examined; knows nothing of any ill-treatment of Complainant by her mistress; never heard of any; lived with C. Garraway's mother; never heard Mary Anne Sealey speak of her being ill treated.—David, a black boy, aged about 17 years, lived as servant with Mr. Tonge; knows Mary Anne Sealey; she lived with Mr. Tonge; knows of no ill treatment she received from her mistress; never heard her speak or complain of any such treatment; lived five months with Mr. Tonge last year; left Mr. Tonge's service seven months ago.—The woman Grace, named as witness by M. A. Sealey, is not to be found.—Spanish Marianne, Paulinda and Edward, fellow-servants of M. A. Sealey, and named by her as witnesses in support of her complaint, having been examined by the Assistant Protector of the Island of Wakenaam, they declared that her complaint was false and unfounded; that neither of them had seen her beaten, or in any way ill treated, and that such could not have happened without their knowledge; and further, that the conduct of said M. A. Sealey has frequently been very bad, and several times outrageous, but more particularly so when Miss King, the daughter of the gentleman with whom C. Garraway lives, was on her death-bed; she, M. A. Sealey, having entered the chamber in a furious rage, and struck last-named witness several blows with a stick.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—25th January. Appeared C. Garraway; is the owner of M. A. Sealey, lives with David King, esq. as house-keeper; declares that she never on any occasion beat or ill-used Complainant; that her general conduct is bad, and more particular so since she has been living with Mr. Tonge, now for two years; that there was not more required of her of a Sunday than of any of her domestics; that Complainant went every evening at five o'clock to Mr. Tonge's, and returned to her every morning at seven o'clock; that she defendant never interfered in this matter; that Complainant never did nor had occasion to complain of being hard worked, never said her complaint was occasioned by hard work; that she was always a violent woman, and sometimes very insolent; that she bought her in 1826, and has since learned that she was sold for misconduct; that she would have sold her before now, but she begged her not; would have sold her to Mr. Tonge himself, but when the contract was prepared he could neither pay nor give security for the purchase money; that he has since been trying to get her from her by every means; that Complainant is now in the country, not as a punishment but to keep her away from Mr. Tonge; and that she had herself admitted to Mr. Ross, manager of the estate upon which she lives now, that Mr. Tonge had put her up to this complaint in order to frighten her, defendant, and thereby get possession of complainant upon his own terms. That she will even now sell her willingly to any person wishing to purchase her, and will leave it to any two people appointed by both parties to fix her value.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Ann Hammond, f. c. w., certified to have lived with C. Garraway, and that her treatment to her servants was always that of a kind and indulgent mistress.

W. Urquhart and J. Jackson certify, that they reside immediately opposite the residence of C. Garraway; that no whip of any kind had ever been borrowed from any person at their house, to their knowledge or belief by said C. Garraway, as stated by Complainant; never witnessed or heard of any punishment by her, and consider that she has always acted with great mildness towards her slaves, and that they have always known her as a woman of exemplary good conduct.

J. H. Alleyne, M. D. appeared 31st December 1829; states, that he has attended Complainant as a medical man, that her mistress has always paid her every attention, and has been very kind and humane to her, and that her ailment cannot in any way be attributed to bad treatment or the way in which she is employed.—16th January 1830. Paulinda examined, belongs to Catherine Garraway; is employed in the house as a domestic; is aged about 18 years, has never been flogged or whipped by her mistress; has no complaint of any kind to make either against her master Mr. King, or against his housekeeper Miss C. Garraway. Spanish Marianne examined; belongs to Miss C. Garraway; is a domestic; works in the house; is aged 28 years; has never been flogged or whipped; has nothing to say against her mistress or master.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—27th January 1830. It appears clearly that this complaint has been made at the instigation and under the tutorage of the party with whom the woman Marianne Sealey cohabits, with a view to alarm her owner by threats, and thereby to induce her to give up her right to her services, in order that Complainant may employ herself wholly according to the wishes of said party. The complaint is dismissed as unfounded. The information of W. C. Tonge, as to the whipping or flogging of Spanish Marianne and Paulinda, fellow servants of Complainant, is also unfounded, as appears by their own evidence.

10.—Explanatory Remarks, upon the case which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads?—20th February 1830. The Protector received the following letter from Mary A. Sealey, and sent it to the Assistant Protector of Wakenaam, to be attested by her in his presence.

PART I.
—
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

Sir,

Wakenaam Island, Caledonia, 11th February 1830.

I TAKE the liberty to acquaint you that Mr. W. C. Tonge lodged a complaint to the Deputy Protector of Slaves on this Island, against Mr. John Ross, manager of this estate; he declared upon oath that Mr. Ross punished me and kept me in a state of duress. I appeared before the Deputy Protector aforesaid this day, and I declared to him, and I now do the same to you, that Mr. Ross did not punish me in the slightest degree, nor have I been punished at all by any other person whatever since I came from town to this island; I must therefore request of you, in your official capacity as Protector of Slaves, not to receive or pay any attention whatever to any communication he the said W. C. Tonge may make to you regarding me. I am sorry for the trouble I have already given you in complaining of my mistress Miss Catherine Garraway; were it not on account of Mr. W. C. Tonge, who persuaded me to it, I would not have troubled you at all in the business.

Witness,

W. Lyle,
A. M'Intosh.

her

Marianne × Sealey,
mark.

I Marianne Sealey attest that the above is true and correct, and written to the Protector of Slaves by my own free will and request, and that the signature to it was a cross made by my own hand, being unable to write.

her

Marianne × Sealey,
mark.

Done before me, this day the 24th February 1830,
the above letter being first read to her.

S. C. Spierenshock,
Assistant Protector of Slaves.

No. 26.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Margo*, aged about 55 years, female; residing on plantation Unity, Mahaica; employed in the care of poultry.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Dr. George Sanders, of plantation Unity, in Mahaica, M. D.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—28th December 1829. Complaint made by said *Margo* at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That Complainant has to mind stock (poultry) a-back of the plantation; and in case of any being stolen or lost, that she has to pay for them; that she does not get plantains, and only about half a bits worth of fish a day; that she does not wish to stay a-back minding the stock.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—28th December. The Protector sent Complainant to the gaol, to be fed, &c. and wrote to her owner, requiring his reply to the complaint.—4th January, 1830. Received Dr. Sanders's reply, and sent for Complainant to the gaol, and, on her master's statement being read to her, she admitted that she had never heretofore paid for any of the stock that had been stolen or lost; acknowledges also that she gets yams or potatoes, but would rather have plantains.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—4th January 1830. George Sanders, M. D. owner of Complainant, and residing at Mahaica state. I ordered Complainant to remain at one of the watch huts a fortnight ago, to mind a few fowls, and from that time I have not seen her; the task I assigned her may not be pleasing, but slaves cannot be permitted to do as they please. The woman is not in good health, and the chief object in giving her charge of the hut was with a view to her own benefit. I generally feed my negroes on ground provisions, viz. yams, cassava, potatoes, &c. as I think my land better adapted for their cultivation than plantains.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—4th January 1830. Complainant was directed to return to her owner, it not appearing that she had any reasonable ground of complaint.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

PART I.

No. 27.

DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Table (B.)

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Harry*, aged about 16 years, male; of plantation La Penitence.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*J. H. Albony*, proprietor, and *M. Rush*, manager of said estate.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—28th December. *M. Rush*, manager, and *G. Warren*, attorney of plantation La Penitence.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That said slave boy being an absentee from said plantation La Penitence, had been harboured and employed by *J. H. H. Holmes*, esq., of this town, advocate, without the knowledge or consent of the said manager or attorney for a period of about three weeks.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—The Protector summoned *Mr. Holmes* on the 28th December 1829.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—*Harry*, belonging to plantation La Penitence, is the same who had absented from said plantation and hired himself to *Mr. Holmes*, was walking about in the streets in *Lacy's Town*; about three weeks ago, met a coloured man, named *Waldron*, and asked him for a pass. *Waldron* wrote with a pencil on a bit of paper, and gave it to witness, who afterwards went to *Mr. Holmes's* house, and offered himself to work, producing this pass. That *Mr. Holmes* gave him back this pass, and desired him to go and bring one to work out; upon which witness found *Waldron* again in the street, and asked him for another pass, as the first was not good. *Waldron* then went in to a grog shop, and wrote another pass with a pen, and gave it to witness, with which he returned to *Mr. Holmes*, and on producing which he was employed, and had been with *Mr. Holmes* about three weeks.

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—*J. H. H. Holmes*, of this town, advocate, states, that the slave *Harry* had been employed by him, but he was not aware that he was a runaway; that when said slave came to him first, he said he belonged to *Mr. Waldron*, and produced a pass in that name; that as this pass was only what is called a night and day pass, he, *Holmes*, sent the slave back to his master for a working pass; the negro returned with such a pass (here produced), upon which he, *Holmes*, not suspecting any fraud, hired him; that the slave was with him three weeks before he discovered (by the boy being seized as a runaway in his yard) that *Waldron* was not his owner, and that a fraud had been committed by either *Waldron* or by some other person, who signed such name; that on finding that the boy was a runaway from plantation La Penitence, he, *Holmes*, wrote a note to *Mr. Rush*, manager of that estate, explaining the case.

PASS produced by the Slave *Harry* to *Mr. Holmes* :

Pass the bearer *Harry* for to work out at *f. 36* per month unmolested.

George Town, 1 December 1829.

L. J. Waldron.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—It does not appear to the Protector that there is any just ground to proceed against *Mr. Holmes*, for unlawfully hiring the slave of plantation La Penitence; but the Protector considers it of moment, that the matter should be laid before his Honour the First Fiscal, by the attorney of the estate, to proceed against the person who gave the slave of La Penitence an unauthorized pass.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 28.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Charles*, aged 24 years, male; residing in George Town; a joiner by trade.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Thomas Campbell* of this town, a joiner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—30th December 1829. Complaint preferred at this office by *Harriette Schloy*, free black woman, on behalf of said *Charles*, her son.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That said *Charles* is the son of the late *Charles Barton Baynes*, deceased, a free black man, and formerly of this town, a carpenter; that the said *C. B. Baynes* died in the year 1824, and directed by his last will, that her son *Charles* should be manumitted; that this has not yet been done, and her said son is still in the possession of *Mr. Thomas Campbell* of this town as a slave.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—30th December 1829. The Protector having examined the copy of the will of
 the

PART I.
 —
 DEMERARA.
 —
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 —
 Table (B.)

the deceased produced by Complainant, finds that her statement as to her son being purchased and freed at the expense of the deceased's estate is correct; and that the property of the deceased was left by him to his wife Rosetta Baynes, now in this town, and to be administered by her; also that the Honourable Charles Simpson and Frederick Cort, esq. were left executors with said widow to the will of the deceased; that the property of the deceased, and which is now possessed by his said widow, consists of a family of five slaves and a small house and a lot of land in this town, and that the purchase of the said Charles for freedom was, however, to be effected at the convenience of said widow.—30th December 1829. The Protector requested the attendance of the executor of the deceased (Fr. Cort, esq.) the other executor having left the Colony.—6th January 1830. The Protector summoned the widow Rosetta Baynes and Mr. Campbell, the present owner of the boy Charles.—11th May 1830. The intention to manumit the said Charles was advertised in the usual manner, and the Protector assented to the separation of the boy Kenneth belonging to said R. Baynes from his mother Amba, also her property; said boy being aged as per registry, 14 years, and being this day transferred to T. Campbell in part of the ransom of said Charles from slavery, with his own and his mother Amba's consent. *Vide* Table (E.), p. 187.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—6th January 1830. Thomas Campbell of this town having appeared; says he is the owner of the boy Charles; is willing to arrange with Mrs. Baynes for the sale of said boy for freedom at a fair value.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—1st January 1830. Frederick Cort, of this town, was left as an executor to the will of the deceased, but never interfered with the administration of the estate, as the widow herself was fully authorized by the will to act for herself, and has done so without the interference of any person; believes, however, that the widow is unable to purchase the boy Charles from slavery, having only the family of slaves left her by the deceased to support her; that for want of means she has not been able to complete the house mentioned in the will, the frame of which was put up during the life-time of her husband; that he has directed her, Rosetta Baynes, to call at this office to reply for herself.—6th January 1830. Rosetta Baynes, appeared; is the widow of the deceased, C. B. Baynes; has inherited the small property he died possessed of, and which is mentioned in his will; has administered the same without the interference of any person; is willing to comply with the will of the deceased as regards the purchase of the boy Charles from slavery, but cannot well afford to do so; will, however, endeavour to arrange with Mr. Campbell, his present owner, about his purchase for freedom.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—11th May 1830. Rosetta Baynes and Thomas Campbell having appeared at this office, the latter declares to have sold to the former the said slave Charles, and to have been fully paid for him; and on the application of said Rosetta Baynes, said slave was this day advertised for manumission by the Protector. No opposition having been entered, the deed of manumission of Charles has been duly executed by said Rosetta Baynes; recorded in the Colonial Secretary's Office and delivered to him, this 8th of June 1830.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads?—

No. 29.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Uriah*, aged about 35 years, male; residing on plantation Nouvelle Flandres, and employed as a carpenter.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Profession?—James Laurie, residing on Plantation Nouvelle Flandres, a carpenter by trade.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—23d January 1830, said James Laurie complained at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That the said slave *Uriah*, his property, had absconded from him since Whitsuntide last, and had been harboured and employed by one Jack Shipley, a free black man, residing up the Demerara River, working at a punt belonging to said Shipley; that said slave is now in the gaol, having been taken up by the *dienaars* a few days ago, and that he has made a declaration to the above effect to Complainant.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—23d January 1830. The Protector summoned the witness named by Complainant in support of his complaint; also the slave *Uriah* from the gaol, and forwarded intimation of this complaint to Jack Shipley, requiring him to show cause, within ten days from date, why the penalty prescribed by the 10th clause of the "Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves" should not be enforced against him.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—23d January 1830. James Green, a white man, a cooper by trade, examined; saw a negro man named *Uriah* working at a punt up the Demerara River, belonging to Jack Shipley, in the month of October last, when he, witness, left the employ of Shipley; *Uriah* had been there several weeks before; witness knew that said negro belonged to Mr. James Laurie; knows no more about the matter.

Uriah

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

Uriah, belonging to James Laurie, examined; absented from his master the day after Whitsuntide; did so because he does not like to live in the country; prefers town; saw Jack Shipley after he had been in town a few days, and asked leave to stay at his house, which was granted; Shipley told him he had a wood-cutting place up the river, whither Uriah might go with him, and return by the punt whenever he pleased, and that if he assisted him (Shipley), he would pay him at the same rate he paid the other people. Witness subsequently asked a free coloured man, named Brotherson, who was working up the river with Shipley, what the rate of hire was, and was told it was a dollar a day; worked with Shipley until a few weeks before Christmas; Shipley then told him to come down to his house in town, as he suspected he would be informed upon for harbouring witness; witness did so; Shipley afterwards desired him to leave his house, as people were coming to catch witness, and threatened, if he did not go away, he (Shipley) would himself tie him, and send him to gaol; worked with Shipley altogether about six months, and all he received as payment for his work was five bits; was taken up a few days ago by the dienaars in town.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—16th February 1830, appeared Jack Shipley; is a wood-cutter up the Demerara River; received the Protector's intimation of the complaint against him from Mr. Brotherson on the 12th inst. Declares that the slave Uriah had not been employed or harboured by him in any way whatsoever, as will be proved by the witnesses and certificates here produced. That the slave Uriah had been seen up the Demerara River, and passed himself as a free man, and stating that he was sickly, and therefore was up there for the benefit of his health; that he never did any manner of work in the employ of defendant; that several persons residing in the defendant's neighbourhood up the river can prove these facts.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—F. Brotherson, free coloured man; lives with Jack Shipley up the Demerara River; he (witness) worked with Shipley at the punt for some time; the man Uriah came there sometimes, and looked on; he neither did, nor was he ever asked to do any thing, nor did he remain with Shipley at any time; there was never any inducement held out to him to do so; Uriah stated that he was a free man, and was up the river for the benefit of his health; witness always believed him to be so.

L. Sampson, free coloured man; resides on the same place that Shipley does; did not assist Shipley in building the punt, but corroborates the evidence of last witness in every other particular, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

A. Cuming certifies, under tender of oath, that being in the habit of visiting frequently the house of Shipley, he never, to the best of his knowledge, saw the man Uriah there.

H. L. Snider certifies, under tender of oath, having been at Shipley's at the same time with James Green, and that he saw no other persons there except themselves, Shipley and his family.

John Hackett certifies having been for some time working with Shipley, during which time Shipley had no other assistants than witness, his two sons, and Green the cooper, and that witness did not see any negro (slave) whatsoever with Shipley.

9.—The result of the Proceedings, if terminated?—It does not appear to the Protector that there is sufficient ground to support a prosecution against Jack Shipley for harbouring the slave Uriah. The complaint is therefore dismissed.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 30.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Alfred*, aged about 13 years, male; residing in George Town, and employed as a domestic.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Fanny Beete, free coloured woman of this town, owner, and now in Surinam, and at present under the charge of Mary Appleton, free coloured woman of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—25th January 1830. Said Alfred complained at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That he has a sore on his foot, and that the same is not properly attended to; and that he does not get a sufficiency of food.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—26th January 1830. The Protector summoned Mary Appleton.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—26th January 1830. Mary Appleton, examined. Is the person who has the charge of Alfred; he belongs to her sister Fanny Beete, who is at present in Surinam; Complainant has a sore on his foot from allowing chicoes to get into it; this sore is dressed regularly every day when Complainant is not absent; he is a great runaway, and steals; cannot keep a fowl in her yard for him. Complainant had been sent to plantation Caledonia under the charge of

Mr. John

Mr. John Ross, manager of that estate, with a view to break him of his vicious habits, but he there stole ten dollars from one of the overseers, for which, and other misconduct, he was sent back to her; can get no good of him; when not runaway he receives his meals regularly, and in sufficient quantities every day, the same as her other domestics.

8.—The names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Esther, black girl, and domestic of Mary Appleton, sees Alfred get a sufficient quantity of food every day, when he remains at home; and has his foot dressed; he runs away very often, and steals fowls, or any thing he can get about the yard.

John Ross, manager of plantation Caledonia, knows the boy Alfred; he lived with him on plantation Caledonia for twelve months; he is a most notorious thief; robbed one of the overseers on the estate of ten dollars; is the worst boy of his age witness ever met with; in fact, so bad, that witness could not keep him any longer on the estate, and sent him back to his mistress.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The complaint is unfounded. The Protector reprimanded Complainant, and advised him to better behaviour in future.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.
—
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.
—
Table (B.)

No. 31.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Tom*, aged about twenty-five years, male, of Plantation Ogle, situate on the east coast of Demerara.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—C. & W. Shand, and A. Simpson, owners; James Deuchar, manager of said plantation.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—26th January 1830; said Tom complained at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That he was flogged this morning, because three hogsheads of sugar had not been made yesterday; that this punishment was unjust, because he had not a sufficiency of coals, and the wood also was green; that they are not allowed more than one cask of coals, and the casks are too small; that he is fireman to the engine; that he tries to do his work, but often gets punished; that they commence working at ten o'clock at night, first cock-crow; that they work at the mill by spells, that is to say, one party works at it for two days, and are then relieved by another; that it was his turn to go in the field to-day, if he had not been flogged.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—26th January 1830; the Protector sent intimation of this complaint to the manager of plantation Ogle, and required his attendance. The complainant being asked, states that he has no witnesses to call in support of his complaint. He was sent to the jail, *ad interim*.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—27th January 1830. Appeared James Deuchar; is manager of plantation Ogle; states, that in consequence of the neglect of, and idleness of complainant and two others, they only made one and a-half hogsheads of sugar instead of three, on Monday last; that three hogsheads a day, is the usual quantity, and can be easily finished by four o'clock, P. M. That complainant had been very idle for five days previously, and had been repeatedly warned, but he not only paid no attention to these warnings, but was very insolent when spoken to; that therefore the manager found himself under the necessity of punishing complainant; he gave him eighteen lashes, the others received only three lashes, not being so culpable as complainant. That his complaint as to insufficiency of coals and bad wood, is unfounded; his statement as to the time of turning out to work, is so also; as the mill gang, which is the first out, of plantation Ogle, never do, nor are they required to turn out before daylight in the morning; they then commence making fire; they never do, nor are they required to work at night; they work by task, and can easily, and generally do, finish that task by four o'clock in the afternoon.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—I, John Perrett, overseer on plantation Ogle, do hereby certify under tender of oath, that the slaves Tom, Cadett and Bertrand, of this estate, were punished by order of the manager, on the morning of the 26th instant, for neglecting their duty; Bertrand and Cadett, for not making fire to the coppers, and Tom for not making fire to the engine, and also for not doing the regular quantity of work for days previous to that; and that he was allowed a sufficient quantity of coals and wood, and that the wood was of a proper quality; and that he was never ordered by the manager to the mill before daylight, and that I have seen the regular task finished often by four o'clock, P. M.

27th January 1830.

(signed) *John Perrett.*

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—It does not appear that complainant was punished unjustly, he, with the two others who were punished at the same time, having neglected

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

neglected their duty; his complaint as to night work, is also incorrect. He was therefore admonished, and desired to return to his duty.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 32.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Carel*, aged about 28 years, male, residing in George-Town, and employed as a rough carpenter.

2. The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—J. P. Spaman, of this town, a blacksmith, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—9th February 1830. Complaint made at this Office by said *Carel*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That the complainant was purchased at the vendue of the estate of P. C. Ouckama, deceased, by J. P. Spaman, for freedom, and that his sale is so entered in the vendue books; that he has now been some years with Mr. Spaman, but he is not yet willing to free him; and further, that Mr. Spaman has never given him any clothes.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—9th February 1830. The protector summoned Mr. Spaman. On reference to the Vendue Office, the Protector finds that complainant was sold by Stephen Cramer, executor of P. C. Ouckama, deceased, on the 16th July 1825, to Thomas Forrester, and not to Spaman, as stated in his complaint, and that he was purchased without any condition or engagement on the part of the purchaser as to his freedom. Complainant being questioned, admits that the clothes now on him, consisting of a hat, shirt, trowsers and jacket, were given him by his owner, and that he left his master's on Saturday evening, the 6th instant.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—J. P. Spaman examined: lives in this town; is a blacksmith and farrier; is the owner of *Carel*; purchased him, in August 1827, from John Milne of this town, a carpenter, but not under any stipulation as to freedom, as per bill of sale, (here produced and examined by the Protector;) believes Milne purchased complainant from Mr. Forrester; has supplied complainant with clothes regularly since he has had him; gave him the clothes he, complainant, now has on, and from which it can easily be judged that his complaint on that score is unfounded; that complainant is an idle drunken fellow; that he absented from him since Saturday last, without any cause whatsoever.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector explained to complainant that it did not appear by the vendue books, that he was purchased under any condition as to freedom, and that there was therefore no ground upon which such a claim could be supported; the complaint as to clothing is also incorrect, as appears by complainant's own admission; he was therefore admonished, and directed to return to his duty.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 33.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Harry*, aged about 45 years, male, of plantation Grove, east coast Demerara, and employed as a carpenter on that estate.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode; their Callings or Professions?—John Chapman, senior, proprietor, and Henry Chapman, manager.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—11th February 1830. Said slave *Harry* complained at this Office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That the manager intended to put him in the stocks the night before last, and flog him the next morning; the reason of this was that complainant, and another man named Monday, had been ordered to put up a stock house forty feet long by twelve feet wide, which they were expected to finish in the one day; that he was obliged to make his escape on the night before last from the plantation, to avoid this punishment; that he is sometimes confined in the stocks every night for a month.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—11th February 1830. The Protector forwarded intimation of this complaint to the manager of plantation Grove, and required his attendance in reply thereto. The complainant being sent to jail to be fed, &c. *ad interim*.

6.—The

6.—The names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—None. Complainant having said that he had none to call.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused party or parties?—16th February 1830. Appeared Henry Chapman is manager of plantation Grove or Grove and Orange Nassau. Directed complainant, and the other carpenter of the estate, named Monday, to put up a stock-house, thirty feet long by twelve feet wide. Did not confine them to any particular time to have it completed, but desired them to make haste. That complainant is always late in going to his work; and that his conduct has been such as to set a bad example to the rest of the gang; that from his repeated irregularities he threatened to punish him, and shortly afterwards complainant absented himself; that he has never been in the stocks at all; and that it is a considerable time since he has been punished in any way.

8.—The names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

I hereby certify, That on the forenoon of the 8th instant, I heard Mr. Chapman order the men, Harry and Monday, to go and erect a stock-house in front of plantation Grove, and to carry all their tools with them; that the man Harry had been very frequently reprimanded, and found fault with for laziness, and turning out late to his work; that as to being confined for a month together in the stocks during the nights, it is an unfounded falsehood; that the last time, to the best of my recollection, he was punished, was on the 13th November 1829, and that was corporal punishment, and not confinement in the stocks; since which day he has never been locked up.

(signed) *Richard Sutcliffe*, Overseer.

We hereby certify, That we heard the man Monday say, that Mr. H. Chapman, manager of plantation Grove, did not threaten the man Harry with punishment, for not putting up a house with him, the said Monday, in one day; but for turning out late to his work, it being half-past two o'clock, P. M. when said Harry came to work, who alledged, that the cause of his being so late was, that he went for his augur; and that the said house was thirty feet long by twelve feet wide, and not forty feet long by twelve feet wide, as alleged by Harry.

(signed) *R. S. Turton*.
R. S. Turton, junior.

Plantation Grove, 13th February 1830.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector considers this complaint frivolous and unfounded. The complainant was reprovved for his irregularities and falsehood as to his confinement in stocks every night for a month; and directed to return to his duty.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 34.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Judy*, aged about 34 years, female, residing in George Town, and employed as a huckstress.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Duke*, free black man, of this town, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—18th February 1830. Complaint made by said *Judy* at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That *Mrs. Francina Lawrence*, free coloured woman, of this town, owes complainant the sum of 7*l.* 4*s.* 3½*d.* sterling, or 101*f.* Demerara currency, for goods sold to her, and that complainant cannot get payment of the same.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—18th February 1830. The Protector summoned the said *Francina Lawrence*. 19th April 1830. The Protector again demanded payment of this debt, but said *Lawrence* being confined to his bed, further time was allowed him. 18th June 1830. The Protector again demanded payment, under pain of immediately instituting a suit against *Lawrence* for recovery of the debt.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—18th February 1830. *John Lawrence*, free coloured man, of this town, a carpenter by trade. Acknowledges the demand of the slave *Judy* to be just, and states that it had been incurred by his wife before he married her; that he would have paid it before, but had not the means of doing so. Is very sickly and poor, but will endeavour to pay the debt out of the first money he earns.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—Good security has been given to the Protector of Slaves for the payment of this demand, at the rate of one joe per month, until fully paid. In pursuance of which a joe, 1*l.* 11*s.* 5½*d.* sterling, has been received and paid over to the slave Judy, who expressed herself satisfied with this arrangement.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 35.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Thomas*, male, residing at Mahaica, and employed as a domestic; and *Minkey*, an elderly female, residing at same place, and also a domestic.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Thomas M'Creath*, owner, residing at Mahaica, a medical doctor.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—20th February 1830. Complaint preferred by *D. S. Van S'Gravesande*, of Mahaica, in a letter to the Protector.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That a slave, named *Thomas*, residing with him, *S'Gravesande*, had beaten and abused the slaves *Thomas* and *Minkey*, belonging to *Dr. M'Creath*, of Mahaica; that said *Thomas*, of *S'Gravesande*, is the same for whom the Protector has made application for letters of manumission, through the Board of Orphans, as representing the estate of his late owner; and representing to the Protector, that if he, the said *Thomas S'Gravesande*, is set free at his present age, "about 23 years," he will become a great blackguard.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—20th February 1830. the Protector read the Complaint of *Dr. M'Creath*, addressed to *Mr. S'Gravesande*, against said *Thomas*, and which was enclosed in *Mr. S'Gravesande's* letter to the Protector; and transmitted his opinion (*vide* "Result") on the matter to *Mr. S'Gravesande*.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness.

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—It does not appear to the Protector that this case is of a very serious nature; it seems to be merely a quarrel between the slaves, which the owners might have settled themselves; but, however, it is a matter more properly cognizable by the Fiscal than by the Protector. The complaint is therefore dismissed.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads?

No. 36.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Emma*, aged 16 years, female, residing in this town, and employed as a domestic.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Susannah Greaves alias Goodfellow*, free coloured woman of this town, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—19th February 1830. Complaint preferred by said *Susannah Greaves*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That her said slave, *Emma*, has repeatedly absented herself from the service of complainant; that recently she has been absent for three weeks, and was, on or about the 16th instant, taken out of the premises of *Miss Kitty Kernan*, free coloured woman of this town, by the police officers; that said *Kitty Kernan* has buoyed up a vain idea in the mind of said slave that she was free, which appears to be the sole cause of her disobedience, and absence from complainant's service; that such conduct is in opposition to the laws now in force for the protection of property, and the well-being of slaves.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—19th February 1830. The Protector read the bill of sale of said *Emma* to *Susannah Greaves* by *R. G. Butts*; produced by her in proof of said slave being her lawful property; and summoned *Kitty Kernan*.—25th February 1830. On reference to the sexton, the Protector finds that the remains of *Mrs. Van Marchywk* were interred in the George Town burial-ground on the 5th January 1820. The Protector obtained copy of the will of deceased, and having learnt that there was a son of deceased residing on a wood-cutting establishment in *Essequebo*, summoned him; also summoned the executor (*S. Van Wyk*) to said will.—31st March 1830. His Honour the President of the Court of Justice was petitioned to appoint the

the Crown Advocate, curator over the person of said Emma, for the purpose of obtaining for her regular letters of manumission.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—H. S. Van Wyk, practitioner at law, resides in George Town; is the executor to the will of Mrs. Van Marckwyk, deceased; sold the girl Emma to Mr. Butts; had no order from the Court of Justice to do so. The estate of the deceased is indebted as per account current, produced.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—Kitty Kernan, free coloured woman of this town, states (by desire of the negro girl Emma) that Mrs. Warneeke, or Van Marckwyk, who died some time ago, appointed, as her executor, or one of them, to her will, Mr. S. Van Wyk; that by her said will she requested that the said girl Emma should be manumitted, which, however, has not yet been done; that said Emma was the property of the deceased, and says, she, Emma, was sold by Van Wyk to Mr. Butts, and that she is now in the possession of Susanna Greaves, alias Goodfellow, free coloured woman.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Extracted from the copy of the will of the late Anna Catharina Prokter, formerly widow Warneeke, and remarried to M. Van Marckwyk, dated Demerara, 3d December 1819, and recorded 5th January 1820, viz. "5thly, I declare it to be my will, that the negro girl Emma, my property, shall on no account be sold after my demise; but that she shall remain for my son J. J. Warneeke, desiring, however, that he shall not be allowed to sell her, and that she shall immediately after *his death* be made completely free. Should it however happen, that my estate was to devolve to my nieces, named Catharina, Prokter, then and in that case I desire that aforesaid girl Emma shall not be surrendered to them, but be directly and completely manumitted at the expense of my estate."—29th March 1830. John Jacob Warneeke is the son of Mrs. A. C. Warneeke, who was remarried to Van Marckwyk, and is since dead; witness resides in Essequebo; states, that after his arrival in this Colony from Holland he was much in want of money, and in the year 1821 he represented this to the executor, Mr. Van Wyk, and pressed him to apply to the Court of Justice for leave to sell the girl Emma; that Mr. Van Wyk would not comply with his request; that he Van Wyk has, however, since sold the girl, but never applied for the sanction of the Court to do so, and that witness has never received any money for her.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—29th March 1830. The complaint of Susannah Greaves against Kitty Kernan, for harbouring the slave Emma, is dismissed; it appearing to the Protector that said girl Emma is entitled to her freedom, having been illegally sold by the executor of Mrs. Van Marckwyk, H. Schaade Van Wyk.—2d April 1830. The prayer of the petition of 31st ultimo in favour of Emma being granted by his honour the President, the intention to manumit her was advertised in the usual manner on the 24th of April 1830, and from that date to the 15th May allowed for the opposers, if any there should be, to state their opposition to her manumission.—7th and 14th May 1830. Opposition entered by the representatives and their attorney-at-law, of Robert Goodfellow, who purchased said Emma from Butts for Susannah Greaves, alias Goodfellow, aforementioned.—And said notices of opposition, and the documents and statements in this case, given to the Crown Advocate to defend the cause of Emma before the Court.—*Vide* Table (H.) page 189.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 37.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Sprightly*, aged 40 years, male; of plantation, Philadelphia, and employed thereon as a carpenter.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—William Odwin, proprietor, and residing on said plantation.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—22d February 1830, *Sprightly* complained at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That he, Complainant, was flogged on Wednesday morning the 17th instant, and was sent to work afterwards. The cause of his being flogged was, that he, with the whole of the estate's gang, carried the plantains, which had been given them for their allowance on Tuesday morning, and put them at their owner's door; the plantains being bad. That his master would not give them time to speak, but desired them to go away, and said that Complainant was the second who threw down the plantains. That the slaves on this estate never get blankets, tobacco or pipes.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—On questions being put to Complainant, he states, that he left the estate on Thursday morning, (18th instant), hid himself in the cane piece, and remained there until (21st) yesterday, when he came across the river. Had not been in any house. Slept last night in an outhouse in town here; there was no person there beside himself. Did not ask for a pass to go to Assistant Protector of the district (W. W. Kernan), or to come here to lodge his

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Table (B.)

his complaint; was never told to do so, and cannot tell lies.—22d February 1830. Mr. Odwin being in town, was summoned by the Protector.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—22d February 1830. William Odwin examined. Is the owner of Complainant, and of plantation Philadelphia; does not grow a sufficiency of plantains for the consumption of the estate, but is well supplied with them from plantation Poederoeyen. It will now and then happen that the plantains are not of the very best description; but this cannot always be avoided. Those issued to his slaves are generally very good; in the instance now complained of, they were of rather an inferior quality, but by no means so bad as to give just reason for the unruly conduct of Complainant and some of the other slaves of the estate. Complainant and another man were the cause, by their example and advice, of the whole of the gang being dissatisfied. They all assembled before his, Odwin's, door, threw down the plantains, and caused such a noise and uproar as greatly alarmed a family which had been staying with him, Odwin. Complainant was on this, as he generally is upon all occasions, very insolent. It is a little more than the usual time, two years, since they (the slaves) got their blankets, but they will receive a fresh supply in June next. That as an indulgence tobacco and pipes are given to his slaves; but it has been stopped latterly from some, on account of carelessness, and on many occasions nearly causing serious injury. Complainant is employed as a carpenter, and as such has less hardship than many of the others. He received eighteen lashes for his insubordination and insolence on the 17th instant.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector explained to Complainant that he was punished for behaving in a disorderly manner, and thereby, as a principal man (being a tradesman) on the estate, setting a bad example to his fellow slaves; that therefore the Protector could not consider his punishment as wholly undeserved; that if he had any complaints to make to his master as to his allowances or otherwise, the same should have been made in a quiet and peaceable manner; that he should never leave the estate without first asking for a pass, after which he should then go to the Assistant Protector of the District, and from whose decision, if he thought proper, he might appeal to the Protector; that with respect to the plantains, although there were not a sufficiency grown on plantation Philadelphia, yet his master was at the expense of purchasing them from another estate, and that they were seldom otherwise than good; that his blankets would be given him in June next; that with respect to the tobacco and pipes, it was an indulgence to be merited by attention to his duty and good conduct; and that he should, by industry and attention to the cultivation of his own provision grounds, endeavour to supply himself with the means of procuring any further quantities of articles of the latter description he may wish for, and that he must not be unreasonably dissatisfied. The Protector directed Mr. Odwin to be regular in supplying his negroes with their blankets.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 38.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slaves by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Ceres, Grace, Venus, Helen, Charlotte, Angel, Bella, Cornelia, Bess and Silvia, and Prudence, Kitty, Christina, Betsy, Celinda, Sophia and Sue*; females of plantation Enmore; field people.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slaves, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Thomas and Henry Porter, merchants of Liverpool, proprietors, and G. C. Bell, manager of said plantation.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—22d & 23d February 1830. Complaints preferred at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That the quantum of work required of Complainants daily is too much, and that they are unable to perform it. And further, Prudence, Christina, Celinda and Sophia complain of being compelled to turn out to work too early in the morning; say at four o'clock, A. M.

Prudence and Sophia also complain, that when they or their children are sick, they do not get what they require.

Sue complains also of not getting a sufficiency of clothing.

Kitty complains also, that she was put in the stocks on Saturday night.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—23d February 1830. The Complainants were sent back to plantation Enmore, they being informed that the Protector would go to that estate the following morning to investigate all their complaints.—24th February. The Protector proceeded to plantation Enmore, a distance of sixteen miles from town, and examined the witnesses hereinafter mentioned. On inquiry (as to the quantum of work of the description complained of by the women of plantation Enmore, performed by women under similar circumstances, having young children,) on an adjacent plantation called The John and Cove, the Protector finds the following to be the daily task required of each woman; viz. Effective women weed and mould sixty beds of three roods of young canes; when in addition they have to strip them,

forty

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

forty beds. Pregnant women, and mothers with infants at the breast, do two-thirds of the above work; their children, as on plantation Enmore, are placed in trash houses near them, with an old woman or two to nurse them while the mothers are at work, and to call them when the children want the breast; and that this task is performed on plantation John without complaint, and that the slaves are generally out of the fields there between four and five o'clock, P. M. and sometimes some of them as early as three o'clock, P. M.

6.—The names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Driver Bartlett, and sick nurse Horatio, witnesses called by Complainants Prudence, Christina, Celinda and Sophia, as to their being obliged to turn out to work at four o'clock in the morning.

Bartlett corroborates that part of his evidence in support of the defence, which relates to this point.

Horatio, slave and sick-nurse of plantation Enmore, knows that Complainants have the means given them of making pap for their children, and that they are allowed plenty of time, before going to the field, to prepare it for their children. That the women of the second gang do not go to the field for an hour after those of the first gang, their children being younger. The first bell rings at six o'clock, the women do not go to the field for an hour after that. Both of the above witnesses, as also the manager and the attorney, deny that the Complainant Kitty had been at all in the stocks on Saturday night, though she was one of those who merited that punishment.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—24th February 1830. G. C. Bell, manager of plantation Enmore, states, that the task allotted is thirty-two beds for an able woman; the beds are three roods each. The soil is dry and light on this estate, as is the case on the east coast generally. Complainants formerly did forty beds each. The second gang women are given twenty beds each; they are as able bodied as the first gang, but their children are younger. That these tasks can easily be performed and are performed by the rest of the women gang, without complaint. That Complainants, who belong partly to the first gang and partly to the second gang, never do finish their tasks; and seven of them, who were confined in the stocks, did not perform more than one half of it. That generally they have been very insubordinate, and seem to be determined not to do their work. That when he (Bell) first came on the estate, (1st January 1830), these very women behaved much better, but that within the last two weeks particularly, they have taken to be dissatisfied. That as the work is new to them, the estate having been changed from cotton to sugar in April last, he at first indulged them, but found it was of no use, and they became worse every day. The nature of the work is weeding young canes, thirty-two beds, three roods each of one cane row for the first gang, consisting of women whose children are weaned. The second gang, consisting of women whose children are not weaned, have twenty-eight beds of the same description and nature of work.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—D. M'Arthur resides on plantation Enmore, is the attorney of said estate, corroborates the statement of G. C. Bell, manager.

M. Williams is overseer on plantation Enmore; states, that sometimes the women do not turn out until eight o'clock, A. M.; they have from eleven to one o'clock for meal. They are never kept later than six o'clock in the field. Complainants never finish their tasks; corroborates the statement of the manager, as to the description and quantum of work required.

Bartlett, slave and driver of the women gang, of plantation Enmore, corroborates the statement of the manager, as to quantum and description of the work required; and states, that the bell rings at seven o'clock, A. M. for the women to turn out to work; they seldom leave the buildings before eight o'clock; by the time they reach the field it is near nine o'clock; the field is about a mile distant from the buildings. They, Complainants, are all young strong women, and could, if they chose, easily finish their tasks before six o'clock, P. M. They have, when they first commenced this work, done forty beds of the same description; since the new manager, Bell, came, there is not one of them will do their work; they sometimes do only fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen beds each of a Saturday; only a few of them, Complainants, will finish sixteen beds, but never more.

A. M'Aulay, medical doctor, is the medical attendant of plantation Enmore; attended Prudence and Sophia with their children, when last sick; found his prescriptions fully attended to; they were supplied with every thing they required; has attended this estate since the year 1828, and has always, during that time, known every care and attention paid to the sick of this estate.

Estate's Journal examined, and shows, that one hat, one blanket, one petticoat, one wrapper, three yards Osnaburg handkerchiefs, two needles, two skeins of thread, &c., had been given to the Complainant Sue.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—24th February 1830. The Protector having investigated the preceding complaints, and examined the nature and extent of the work required to be performed by Complainants, is of opinion that the said complaints are unfounded, and that the quantum of work required daily of each of these women, is not more than a fair and moderate task. The Complainants were therefore admonished, and recommended to follow the example of their fellow slaves, who, it appeared, performed the same quantity of work every day without murmuring.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.

No. 39.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Jane*, aged, per registry, eleven years, female; residing in George Town, and employed as a domestic.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Elizabeth Neil*, free coloured woman of this town, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—24th February 1830, complaint preferred by *W. C. Tonge*, of this town, on behalf of said *Jane*, (in a letter to the Protector, dated 23d instant.)

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That yesterday morning, (22d instant,) a female slave, apparently considerably above the age of ten years, was severely punished with a whip by *Miss Neil*, who lives in the next house to that occupied by Complainant. That said slave is afflicted with elephantiasis, and has been, often within the last twelve months, punished with greater barbarity than in the present instance.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—25th February 1830. The Protector summoned *A. M. Levy* and *Mr. Hammill*, Assistant Government Secretary, the witnesses named by *W. C. Tonge*.—27th February 1830. Also the girl *Jane* and her mistress, and on reference to the office of the Registrar of Slaves, the Protector finds that said *Jane* is registered as being 11 years of age. The Protector caused the girl *Jane* to be carefully examined by two female domestics in his house; and they both declare, that there is not the slightest scratch or mark of beating or whipping upon any part of her body. The witnesses in support of the defence were also summoned.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—27th February 1830. *A. M. Levy*, a broker of this town. Was at *Mr. Tonge's* on business on Monday morning last; heard a cry, and beating with a horse-whip in the adjoining house. Was desired by *Mr. Tonge* to look out of the window; did so, and saw a girl running out almost naked, and a coloured woman following her and beating her with a whip. *Mr. Tonge* observed, that this was what occurred day and night, the beating was most cruel—shocking. Witness knows nothing of the parties; could not identify the woman who was beating; but could the slave, from her having swelled legs; she was a mulatto girl, and was, from her appearance, about 20 years of age; from the report of the whip, supposes it was a horse-whip. Supposes, from the report of the heavy lashes, that the girl would be marked. Is certain she was a mulatto girl with swelled legs.—1st March. *Mr. Levy* having again appeared, and also the girl *Jane*, he says he cannot swear that she was the same he saw beaten, only that this one has the swelled legs, and is a mulatto, which so far answers the description; but he cannot say if she is the same. He looked out of the window at *Mr. Tonge's* desire, but did not take particular notice of this matter, as he, witness, had his business to attend to.—*T. C. Hammill*, Assistant Government Secretary, was at *Mr. Tonge's* house about a month ago; it was in the evening, before dark; heard a noise of whipping in the next house; went to see what was the matter; found it was a boy who was being punished by his mother; was informed, that the boy was punishing for bad conduct; did not interfere any further, and left the house immediately. The coloured woman in the house was very violent to witness, and asked what he wanted into her house. Witness was told by *Mr. Tonge*, that this woman was cruel to her slaves.

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—*Jane Neil*, free coloured woman, is the owner of the girl *Jane*; has no other mulatto girl or woman, a slave, in her house; *Jane* is registered in her (*Jane N.'s*) mother's name, but belongs to defendant; her mother and sister live in the same house with herself; her mother's name is *Elizabeth Neil*, her sister's name is *Catherine Neil*. Defendant on Monday last took up a small whip of platted twine, with which the children were playing, and gave *Jane* a few stripes with it for misbehaviour; the girl is very seldom punished, having swelled legs, say the rose. She has been attended by two doctors at different times for this disease, but they declared it to be incurable, and could do no more for it. Defendant's mother and also others tried to cure it, but could not reduce the swelling; the girl does very little; is merely employed about the house, doing any little trifling work. Whenever defendant has had occasion to punish her, it has been done generally with a bit of leather strap, which defendant used to the children in her school, which she kept; never gave *Jane* more than three or four licks on any occasion; she has never been tied, laid down or stripped, or regularly whipped by defendant or any other person. Is ready to make oath to the correctness of what she has now stated, and that no severer punishment than that already mentioned, has ever been inflicted by defendant or any other person on any occasion on the slave *Jane*. Defendant also states, that this complaint has been made by *Mr. Tonge* wholly through spite, on account of some observations made some time ago by defendant, relative to a quarrel between two black women slaves, one of whom, named *Mary Anne Sealy*, cohabits with *Mr. Tonge*.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—*Jane*, belongs to *Miss Jane Neil*; has been unptised by the *Rev. Mr. Lugar*, Rector of *St. George's Parish*; knows there is a God Almighty, and that she must always tell the truth; was desired, on Monday morning last, by her mistress, to bring a cloth and rub the table, but omitted to do so; her mistress took up

up the little whip from one of the children, and gave her three licks with it; it was a small bit of rope fastened to a little stick; is sure she only got three licks; they did not burn much; they were given over her back; her clothes were not taken up; is not often licked; does not recollect when she was whipped before this time; is the only coloured girl, a slave, in the house.

Elizabeth Neil, is the mother of the defendant, Jane Neil; was sitting at a window in the house when defendant gave the girl Jane two or three licks with the little whip over the clothes; Jane bawled and made much noise, but witness is sure she was not hurt; witness has scarcely ever punished Jane; pities her on account of her legs; has some time ago, say about four months back, given her two or three licks with a little whip of the same description as that used by her daughter on this occasion. Witness neither has herself inflicted, nor has she known of any punishment being inflicted in her house on any slave whatever, except that now mentioned upon Jane, and another upon a black boy, by his own mother, named Peggy, her slaves, for remaining absent the whole of the day when sent out to buy plantains, for the last four months.

Catherine Neil corroborates the statement of Jane Neil and of last witness.

Robert Clarke, was at Miss Neil's house about a month ago in the evening, when Mr. Hammill came in there; the slave Peggy was licking her son; she gave him about two dozen with a small horsewhip; the boy was very obstinate.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector having attentively considered the whole of the evidence brought forward in this case, is decidedly of opinion, That there has not been any act of cruelty or even of severity exercised by Miss Neil, or any one of that family, towards their slaves. The complaint is therefore dismissed. But as it appears that the slave Jane is rather above the age, say ten years, prescribed by the "Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slavery" for the application of corporal punishment of any kind to females, the Protector deems it necessary to caution Jane Neil and the others against using such a mode of punishment, even in the slightest degree, again towards the said slave Jane. The slave Peggy being summoned, the Protector desired her to observe in future, in punishing her son for any misbehaviour he may be guilty of, that such punishment must be inflicted by her with temperance and moderation.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 40.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Primo*, aged 50 years, male, residing in George Town, and employed as a boat-builder.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Belonging to the estate of Yearwood, deceased, late of this town, a boat-builder.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—28th February 1830. *Primo* complained at this office.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That complainant had been promised his freedom by his former owner, a Mr. Johnson, a boat-builder of Mahaica, who died about 35 years ago. That after his said master's death he remained in the possession of a Mr. M'Kennis (also since dead), but whose wife is still alive in this town, for many years, and was then sold to Mr. Yearwood; and thus he continued, as complainant thinks, improperly deprived of his freedom to this day.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—28th February 1830. The Protector summoned J. D. Claxton of this town, the representative of the estate of Yearwood, deceased; also Mrs. M'Kinnis. On reference to the Orphan Chamber for any information that could be afforded in this matter, the Protector was informed:—That there was no record in that office so far back, say about 35 years ago. The Protector also referred to the Colonial Secretary's office, and finds that there is no record of any will by the said Johnson in that office.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—J. D. Claxton. Is the representative of the estate of the late Mr. Yearwood, deceased; states, that complainant had been purchased many years ago, by the deceased, from one Mr. M'Kennis, of Mahaica, as per bill of sale (produced.) That Mrs. M'Kinnis is now living in this town, and will probably be able to explain how complainant came into the possession of her late husband. That during the time his Honour, the First Fiscal, acted as protector of Slaves, complainant set up this same claim, and his Honour, after due investigation, finding it unfounded, dismissed it accordingly.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Mrs. M'Kinnis being unable to attend at the Protector's office to give her evidence from infirmity, the Protector went to her residence, and having shewn her the bill of sale of complainant by her late husband to Yearwood, and examined her touching this claim; she declares, under tender of an oath, That the said

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

bill of sale, and transfer of complainant by her late husband, is perfectly correct; that her husband became possessed of complainant in consequence of the death of her daughter, Mary Isabella Brown, to whom the complainant had been given by a deed of gift, duly executed in the presence of witnesses by Mr. Johnson, a considerable time before his death; that said Johnson died in witness's house at Mahaica; that he died intestate; that on the Christmas-day before his death, which took place on the 1st January following, he, the said Johnson, being then ill in witness's house, called witness, and said that he made her a present of all his property, then consisting of seven slaves; he also called up the said slaves and told them so; that shortly after his death, however, the Orphan Chamber took possession of these slaves, and the whole of his effects, in consequence of his having made no will; that the Orphan Chamber also claimed the boy Primo (the complainant) but were obliged to relinquish their claim to him immediately, in consequence of the deed of gift already mentioned, in favour of her said daughter.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—It appears clearly to the Protector, that there is no ground to support a claim to freedom in this case. The same was explained to complainant and dismissed.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 41.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Princess*, aged about 34 years, female, residing in George Town, and employed as a domestic.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Mrs. Sarah Ann Gibson of this town, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—4th March 1830. Complaint preferred at this office by said *Princess*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That complainant's owner, Mrs. Gibson, had entered into an agreement with the late Benjamin Slade, with whom complainant lived as housekeeper, to sell her to said Slade, for the purpose of being manumitted; that said Slade paid Mrs. Gibson part of the purchase money during his life-time, and directed by his will that the balance should be paid by his executors from his estate, and that complainant should be completely manumitted. That on application made by complainant to said executors, they have stated that they cannot comply with the deceased's will in her favour, as his estate is insolvent.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—4th March 1830. The Protector obtained copy of the will of Benjamin Slade, deceased, of which the following is an extract:

“ Demerara, 27th September 1829.

“ And I do hereby further declare, That having entered into an agreement with my neighbour, Mrs. Sarah Ann Gibson, for the purchase of the col. woman *Princess* for the sum of three thousand guilders, Demerara currency, and having paid her at various times certain sums in liquidation thereof, as per account in my ledger, it is hereby my will and desire, that my hereinafter-named executors do pay whatever balance may be due on the said purchase money to the said Mrs. Sarah Ann Gibson, her heirs or executors; and it is further my desire, in consequence of the uniform good conduct and faithful services to me, that my executors do manumit the said woman *Princess*, in the event of my not having done so previous to my demise, and that whatever property I may be possessed of at the time of my demise, not mentioned in the inventory aforesaid, shall be for and enjoyed by her as her own.”

And summoned Mr. Clifford, one of the executors. Also Mrs. Gibson, owner of complainant.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Sarah Ann Gibson; is the owner of complainant; made, about two years ago, a verbal agreement with Mr. Benjamin Slade to sell the said girl *Princess* to him for 3,000 *f.*; he told witness he would manumit her, *Princess*. Previous to the death of Mr. Slade, which took place in October 1829, he paid witness as follows: 1 vat for about 10 or 12 joes value; gutters, about 5 joes; cash, 7 joes and 1 dollar; cash paid to Mrs. Maggee, about 7 joes; 1,000 feet lumber, about 5½ joes; 2,000 shingles; 84 lbs. nails; muslin, linen, groceries, 6 or 7 joes; amounting in the whole to 1,200 *f.* more or less. Witness bought at the vendue of the estate of Slade, held by his executors, a piece of land for 1,000 *f.* and furniture for about 3 joes, 66 *f.* There is now a balance unpaid, on account of the purchase money of the woman, after deducting the above, of about 800 *f.* Witness is willing to give up that balance, provided the executors of Slade pay the vendue office for the piece of land and furniture, and provided the girl *Princess* gets free. *Princess* has five children begotten before Slade lived with her, which are now in witness's possession, all slaves belonging to witness.

7.—The

PART I.
DEMERARA.Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—Samuel B. Clifford, merchant of this town, is one of the executors to the will of the deceased Benjamin Slade; states, that except the will of the deceased, there is nothing to be found among his papers relative to the purchase of the complainant. That by the deceased's books it does appear that Mrs. Gibson is indebted to him for lumber and other articles in the sum of 1,177*f.* 11 *st.* 8 *p^{ts}*; corroborates the statement of Mrs. Gibson, as to the purchase by her of the piece of land, &c. at the vendue sale of the deceased's effects; but states that it is quite impossible for the executors to accede to the proposal of Mrs. Gibson as to the appropriation of the value of the above piece of land, &c. for the benefit of the slave, as the estate of Slade is insolvent. The Act of Deliberation in the estate of the deceased has not yet expired. When it does, the state of the deceased's affairs will be laid before the Court of Justice.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceedings, if terminated?—28th May 1830. This case was referred to the Crown Advocate for opinion and report, and if necessary to take such legal measures in favour of said slave as her case may require.—24th June 1830. This case is yet under consideration of the Crown Advocate.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—

No. 42.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*John*, aged thirty-two years, male, residing at Mahaica, employed as a cattle-minder.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*R. S. Turton*, owner, residing on the place called *Rebecca's Rust*, cattle farm, Mahaica.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—5th March 1830. Complaint preferred at this office, by said *John*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That on Wednesday the 3d instant, complainant was tied to a tree in the savannah, and flogged with a cat for two hours, because two of the cows got fighting, and were killed. That this punishment was unjust, complainant having used every exertion to separate them, as can be proved by the slaves *Smart*, *Active* and *Cornelius*, of plantation *Dantzic*, and *Sambo*, of plantation *Broom Hall*, who assisted complainant; that complainant did not neglect the cattle, being in the habit of taking care of them for the last six years; that the punishment, complainant is sure, far exceeded twenty-five lashes, as the driver *Billy* was obliged to rest four times while inflicting it. Complainant does not know how many lashes he received, but more than twenty-five were inflicted.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—5th March 1830. The Protector forwarded a copy of this complaint to the Assistant Protector (*W. Fraser*) of the district of Mahaica, with instructions to investigate the matter; and sent complainant to be detained in jail, *ad interim*.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—*Cornelius*, slave of plantation *Dantzic*, a cattle farm, adjoining *Mr. Turton's*; was called early on Tuesday morning, 2d March, by the slave *John*, complainant, to assist in separating two of *Mr. Turton's* cows that had been fighting in the savannah, and were lying on the ground. The red cow was dead, the black one nearly so. After separating them, they gave the black one some water, which it drank; tried to raise it up, but it could not stand; the dead cow was much swollen, and had worms in its ears and wounds; thinks the cows must have lain there since Monday night; was assisted in separating the cows by *Active* and *Sambo*, also complainant; the man *Smart*, was not there at all.—*Active*, a slave of plantation *Dantzic*; was called on Tuesday morning, by the slave *Sambo*, of plantation *Broom Hall*, to assist in separating two of *Mr. Turton's* cows that had been fighting, and then lying in the savannah; on getting to the place, found the red cow dead, and much swollen, with worms in the wounds and ears; cannot say how long she might have lain there before they were discovered; the man *Smart* was not there; thinks if *John* had attended to his work and seen the black cow in time, it would not have died.—*Sambo*, slave of plantation *Broom Hall*, adjacent to *Mr. Turton's* cattle farm, *Rebecca's Rust*; on Tuesday, the 2d March, found two of *Mr. Turton's* cows lying on the ground in the savannah, one was quite dead, the other had her horn fastened in its neck, and was also apparently in a dying state; ran to call *John*, who was absent at the time, to inform him of what witness had seen; found *John*, who went and called two negroes of plantation *Dantzic*, viz. *Cornelius* and *Active*, they then separated the cows, this was early in the morning, does not know how long the cow had been dead before witness saw it, they must have been there for a long time, or the other cow would not have died; the dead one was much swollen and had worms; the man *Smart* was not present.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—*Robert Turton*, joint owner of the cattle farm *Rebecca's Rust*, at Mahaica; states, That the driver *Billy* reported to him on Tuesday night, that two of the cows in the savannah were dead or dying; that complainant had come home that night to tell of the occurrence; that complainant being in the habit of absenting himself frequently from the cattle in the savannah

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

during the day, and otherwise neglecting them by not giving them water, he, Turton, suspected that there was some neglect on his part in this instance also, as such an occurrence could not easily take place if John had attended to his duty, he accordingly ordered John to be locked up that night, and the next morning went to the savannah with him, accompanied by his brother Richard Turton, and the driver Billy, John's father, where he found that the cows were dead, and had been so for some time, one of them must have been so for some days; he also found, on enquiry of the neighbouring cattle-minders, that John had not attended properly to the cattle, and that he had been skulking about the adjacent watch-houses, instead of attending to the care of the cattle, the only duty assigned him. He therefore directed the driver Billy to give him twenty-five lashes with the cat, which was accordingly done in presence of Richard Turton; there was not one more than twenty-five stripes inflicted.

8.—The names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Billy, slave and driver of the cattle farm Rebecca's Rust; is the father of complainant; gave complainant twenty-five stripes with a cat-o'-nine-tails, on Wednesday the 3rd March, by order of Mr. Robert Turton; did not give him one more; the punishment was not very severely inflicted; complainant deserved the punishment, having been absent from, and neglected the cattle, and thereby caused the loss of two of them; witness did not rest while licking complainant; the punishment was over in less than ten minutes from the time it commenced; it was inflicted in the presence of Richard Turton; and corroborates the statement of Robert Turton, as to complainant's neglects in former instances.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—11th March 1830. The Protector dismissed this complaint, it appearing that complainant had neglected his duty, and it being proved by the driver, that the extent of punishment allowed by law had not been exceeded. The complainant was directed to return to his duty.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 43.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Monday*, aged about 48 years, male, of Plantation Dooren's Vreede, in Essequibo, and employed as fireman to the engine.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—William Crichton, owner, John Hood, manager, residing on said plantation, (now called "Newtyle.")

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—12th March 1830. Complaint preferred at this office by said *Monday*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That said manager frequently finds fault with complainant about the engine fire; that the engine is out of repair, and therefore does not work well; that complainant always makes fire properly under it, and consequently is unjustly blamed; that complainant does not like this duty, and was purchased by Mr. Crichton to be a boat captain; that on Saturday week last (27th February), the manager having found fault with complainant about the engine fire, gave complainant over to the driver, directing him to be put for the future in the field to weed the plantain-walk, and threatening that if complainant did not finish his task, the same as the other negroes, he should be punished; that complainant not being used to such work, and through fear of punishment, absented himself that same day.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—12th March 1830. The Protector summoned Mr. Crichton, who, complainant states, is at present in town.—On questioning complainant, he admits, that he had been employed as fireman to the engine for many years back, and that the work was not new to him; also, that he had not been punished by the manager, previous to his absenting himself; that he did not ask the manager for a pass to go to complain, and had heard the slaves of the plantation told, long ago, that it was necessary to do so; that after being in the bush at Troolie Island (on which plantation Doorens Vreede or Newtyle is situated) for a week, he got some Indians to take him in their canoe to Mr. Baggot's the Second Fiscal, who not being at home, complainant went to Mr. Bishop's, the Assistant Protector, on the west coast of Essequibo; he got to Mr. Bishop's the day before yesterday, and was sent by him here.—Says further, that this is the first time he has ever absented from his master or complained, and hopes if he, complainant, has done wrong, that the Protector will beg his master not to punish him this time.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—Substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—William Crichton, is the proprietor of plantation Newtyle, formerly called Doorens Vreede; states, the engine on that estate is in very good order, and complainant can have no excuse on that score. He was not unjustly blamed by the manager, for he had recently been often guilty of inattention and neglect of duty as fireman, which duty he understands well, and is perfectly well able to perform with ease, having been employed at it for seven years past. He has often been found fault with for his neglect and idleness, and warned; he has also been repeatedly

repeatedly found fault with and cautioned for keeping hogs loose about the estate, contrary to his (Crichton's) express orders; and he, as well as all the slaves on the estate, have been given clearly to understand, that if they felt themselves aggrieved, in the slightest degree, by the manager or any one else, they had only to apply for a pass to the Assistant Protector of the District, or to this office, to lodge their complaints, and it should immediately be given them, and also conveyance.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The complaint is frivolous, and is accordingly dismissed. It appearing that Complainant is fully sensible of the impropriety of his conduct, in having left the estate without first asking for a pass, which he was perfectly aware was necessary, and occasioning such a considerable loss of labour to his owner, (say twelve days,) the Protector requested Mr. Crichton, that the manager might be instructed not to inflict any punishment on Complainant in this instance; and this request being complied with, the Protector cautioned Complainant against absenting himself in a similar manner, and upon such frivolous pretexts in future; and recommended him to be more careful and diligent in the performance of his duty, and in obeying the legal orders of his owner and manager.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.
—
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

—
Table (B.)

No. 44.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Betty Dash*, aged 35 years, female; residing in George Town, and employed as a huckstress.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—*Dorothy Thomas*, free coloured woman, of this town.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—15th March 1830. Complaint preferred at this office by *Betty Dash*.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That Complainant had been sent out by her said mistress to collect different sums of money due for goods sold by Complainant; that, being unable to get payment promptly, Complainant remained away seven weeks, and was in consequence advertized by her said mistress as a runaway, and was taken up and put in the gaol. Her mistress then released her, and put her in the stocks in her own house, and kept her so confined for eleven days and nights, intending to send her into the country to work as a field negro, until she (her mistress) could procure a purchaser for Complainant and her children. That Complainant does not wish to go in the country.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—15th March 1830. The Protector summoned *Mrs. D. Thomas* and the witnesses hereinafter mentioned.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—*Nelly*, slave of *D. Thomas*; knows Complainant, she is a fellow slave of witness; witness put Complainant in the stocks, by order of her mistress, some weeks ago; Complainant was kept in the stocks about seven days; she then broke the stocks and went away; it is about two weeks since she broke out of the stocks and absented herself.

Molly Ann, slave of *D. Thomas*; saw Complainant in the stocks at her mistress's house, does not know how many days or nights she was kept confined; witness works out and does not stay in the yard; Complainant and her mistress sometimes disputed, but witness never saw complainant ill-used.

Nancy or *Nanny*, slave of *D. Thomas*; has a room next to the stocks room; does not know how long Complainant was kept in the stocks; does not remain at home, but thinks Complainant might have been in the stocks about a week, day and night; has never known Complainant to be ill-used by her mistress.

Frankey, slave of *D. Thomas*; does not know how many days and nights *Betty Dash* was kept in the stocks; works out; never saw Complainant ill-used.

Princess, slave of *D. Thomas*; thinks Complainant was kept in the stocks for a week, night and day; never witnessed her mistress ill-treating her.

Marie, slave of *D. Thomas*; says Complainant was kept in the stocks by her mistress for a week, night and day, one foot only, when her mistress, during that time, wished to change the foot Complainant would not allow it; never saw Complainant ill-treated; she owed a good deal of money for goods given her to sell; she asked leave to go and collect it, which was granted; she never paid any thing, and remained absent until taken up and put in gaol by the police; she absented before Christmas; has runaway often.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties —15th March 1830. *Dorothy Thomas*; is the owner of Complainant and her three children; states, that she employed Complainant as huckstress of dry goods, &c.; that since the year 1823,

Complainant

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

Complainant has trusted out and made away with goods to the amount of *f.* 803. as acknowledged by Complainant herself on reckoning with her some months ago; and a further sum of *f.* 256. 15 *st.* For the former sum, she accounted by saying it was due to her by several persons whose names she mentioned; the latter sum she also said was due to her, but could not mention the names of those by whom it was so. Up to this present day she has not paid one guilder of the above sums, although she has, no doubt, recovered part, if not the whole of them.—On the 17th July 1829, Complainant requested that a few goods might be given her to sell while she would go to collect the aforementioned sums; defendant was induced to grant this, allowing her to sell the present goods, but instead of taking three or four weeks, Complainant was absent four months without being seen or heard from; and as she had no pass for such a length of time, defendant advertized her as a runaway. Complainant came home on the 2d November 1829, further deficient in the goods last given her *f.* 148, and without having any money to pay, and saying that this sum also was owing to her; she then absented herself, and being away for several weeks, was advertized as a runaway a second time, and a reward for her apprehension offered. She was accordingly apprehended, brought home, and was then sent to the Colony gaol; but the expenses there being rather high, was released and put in the stocks in defendant's house for a few days, until a purchaser could be got for her; she was however released, with the intention of sending her in the country, when she broke out in a furious rage, and abused and threatened her, defendant, in the most violent and shameful manner, and refusing positively to go into the country, and tried her utmost to cause defendant to strike her, but which defendant avoided, and put her, Complainant, into the stocks again, intending to have her punished by his honour the Fiscal, for her abusive and insolent language; but Complainant broke out of the stocks and again ran away, carrying her three children with her; this occurred two weeks ago, and defendant has not seen her since until this day. That, independent of the losses already stated, the loss of Complainant's labour, during her absence and gaol fees, defendant had to pay *f.* 66, for apprehending Complainant.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness? —

9.—The result of the proceeding, if terminated?—19th March 1830. The Protector having duly considered the preceding complaint, with the evidence adduced in support of it, and the statement of Mrs. D. Thomas, is of opinion, that Complainant has clearly proved that she had been confined in the stocks for a longer period than is allowed by the laws in force; and that, although it does appear that Complainant's conduct has been very reprehensible, in absenting and making away with her owner's goods, and also using improper language and threats to her owner, yet this cannot be admitted as an excuse for the owner to inflict any punishment exceeding what the established law directs. The Protector therefore deems it his duty to call upon Mrs. D. Thomas for payment, within three days from this date, of the sum of *f.* 200, or 14 *l.* 5 *s.* 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* sterling, being a penalty incurred by her, for having acted in contravention of the 1st article of the Slave Act, dated 1st August 1829, by keeping her said slave Betty Dash confined in the stocks, during the days and nights for one week or thereabout.—20th March 1830. D. Thomas appeared at this office and paid the above penalty.

Demerara, 20th March 1830.—Received of A. W. Young, esq. Protector of Slaves, the sum of Two hundred guilders, for a fine incurred by Mrs. Thomas.

For the Colonial Receiver,

(signed) A. M. Fogelmark.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 45.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Christopher Sealy*, aged about about 37 years, at present residing in George Town, and employed as a domestic. A tailor by trade.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Captain George Warren, owner, and T. Carter, deceased, late manager of Plantation Farm and Taymouth Manor, situate in Mahaicony, and belonging to Captain Warren.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—23d March 1830. Complaint preferred at this office by said C. Sealy.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That said T. Carter, deceased, owed Complainant, at the time of his death, the sum of *f.* 49, equal to 3 *l.* 10 *s.* sterling, for making eight pairs of trowsers and six vests, as per account produced. That Complainant had applied to J. R. Dempster, the executor of the deceased, for payment of this account, but said executor has refused to pay it.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—23d March 1830. Complainant having sworn to the correctness of his account,
the

the Protector summoned Mr. Dempster, the executor of the said Carter, deceased.—6th April. The said account was exhibited to Mr. Dempster, and payment demanded by the Protector.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—6th April 1830. Appeared J. R. Dempster, of this town, marshal, and having read the account of the slave, Christopher Sealy, states, That he is the executor to the estate of the deceased; that he cannot at present pay the demand, because the act of deliberation taken out by him as executor to the boedel, and which must continue in force for twelve months from the date of it, has not yet expired, and will not expire for many months to come, Mr. Carter having died only in August last; that while this act continues in force he, Dempster, cannot pay any of the debts of the deceased without becoming liable, in his own person, for all and every claim that may be made against deceased; that he does not yet know whether the boedel will prove solvent or not, and therefore it is at present a question whether this claim, as well as others which have been made, can hereafter be paid; that he will, however, take a copy of this account, and will include it with the other demands against the boedel; that it appears there is money due by Captain Warren, as salary of the deceased, who was manager of his, Warren's, estate, the farm, and Taymouth Manor, in Mahaicony, and which he, Dempster, is now endeavouring to recover.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The Protector gave Mr. Dempster the account of Complainant accordingly, explaining to the latter that his interest would not be neglected; that on the settlement of the deceased's affairs, if circumstances admitted, his account would be paid, and that whatever the result of the boedel might be, his claim would share the same fate as the other claims against the estate.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

No. 46.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and Mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Bacchus*, aged twenty-eight years, male, at present on plantation Annandale, West Coast of Essequibo.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—Alexander Martin, proprietor of a task gang, present owner of Complainant, and employed on the West Coast of Essequibo.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—1st April 1830. Complaint lodged at this office by said Slave.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That Complainant has been lately sold by Mr. Mackae, attorney of plantation Annandale, to which estate Complainant belonged, without his wife Lydia; that he was not lawfully married to Lydia, but has cohabited with her for some years, and has two children by her.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—1st April 1830. The Protector summoned Mr. Mackae. Protector directed the man Jonas to be brought to this office.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—1st April 1830. Alexander Mackae. Is the attorney of plantation Annandale. Lydia, the woman mentioned by Complainant, is not his wife; his complaint is therefore incorrect. She is the wife of another man, named Jonas, belonging now to plantation Annandale. Complainant was driver of that estate, and took her away or cohabited with her unlawfully, which caused a great deal of commotion upon the estate between these two men; they were always quarrelling. Lydia has one child said to be for Complainant, and three for Jonas. She has made no complaint about Bacchus being sold: he has been sold to prevent further disputes about this matter.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—Jonas, slave of plantation Annandale, lived in the same house with Lydia for many years; she was his wife; has had three children by her. Bacchus was driver on plantation Annandale, and took Lydia away from witness by force. Often disputed with him about Lydia. Bacchus had the woman Mary Ann to wife, when he took Lydia; he then left Mary Ann, and she has since lived with a cooper named Jem, a slave on the estate.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—It is proved that the woman Lydia is not the wife of Complainant, and that he unlawfully cohabited with her. The complaint is therefore dismissed; it being explained to Complainant that, for the reasons above mentioned, the Protector could not prevent his sale separately from said woman; and that to enjoy the privileges conferred by the law in this respect upon husbands and wives, it is necessary

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

necessary that they should preserve their fidelity in marriage or reputed marriage to each other.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 47.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave, by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Fatima*, aged 27 years, female; of plantation La Penitence, a field negress.

2.—The names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or, Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—J. H. Albony, proprietor, and Matthew Rush, manager.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—13th April 1830. Complaint preferred by said slave.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That she is overworked, having been obliged to carry megass from the mill for three successive days; that the quantity of megass which falls to her share is too much; that the first day she did not finish carrying it until a little before gun-fire (eight o'clock, P.M.); the second day, after eight o'clock, and the third day, not until nine o'clock at night; that she was confined in a room, say locked up, for the three nights, for this; and that she was sick while at this work, but did not complain to the manager or overseer, thinking, if she had done so, she would have been locked up.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—13th April 1830. The Protector desired Complainant to return to the estate, which is but a short distance from town, and proceeded himself to the estate, to investigate her complaint. The Protector proceeded to the sick house, and Doctor Smith, the medical attendant of the estate, being present, the Protector caused the woman *Fatima* to be examined by him.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—13th April 1830. *Mathew Rush*; is manager of plantation La Penitence, states, that Complainant was locked up for two nights, Thursday and Friday last, for laziness and not finishing her task, carrying the megass from the mill; that she persisted in her laziness on the following Saturday also, the last day of her spell at that work, and would have been locked up that night too, but she absented herself. On the latter day she refused altogether to do the work. She was taken up in town by the dienaars, and confined on Monday afternoon; that she never complained of being sick; that there were five other women beside herself put to carry away the megass of three hogsheads of sugar; which task they could have performed with ease, and have done early in the afternoon if they chose; the women who had this duty before Complainant and her party do so without murmur, and that, furthermore, the weather being bad during Complainant's spell at this work, there were only two hogsheads of sugar made per day, which consequently reduced the quantity of megass to be taken away by Complainant and others with her, one-third; so that the work was much lighter than it otherwise would have been.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—*A. Loyden*, is head overseer on plantation La Penitence, corroborates the statement of the manager, *M. Rush*, and states further, that Complainant never finishes her task on any spell; that she has persevered in this conduct for some time past, and that she has not lately complained of being sick; had she done so she would have been seen by the medical attendant of the estate, who attends here daily, as is the invariable rule upon this estate. *Nelson*, slave of plantation La Penitence and engineer, puts the mill about generally at about three o'clock A.M.; three boxes of liquor are made by six o'clock A.M.; has orders to stop the mill then, to allow the megass to be taken away; this can be done in half an hour. That the gang Complainant belongs to never have more megass than the other women gang to carry away. That *Fatima's* gang has always had the same quantity of work as the others, and have formerly done it; but that since the complaint to the Protector (19th October last), neither Complainant, nor the five women who then complained, viz. *Jacoba*, *Julia*, *Una*, *Dorotha* and *Effa*, and who now constitute the gang she is in, will do their work. Doctor *E. M. L. Smith* is the medical attendant of this estate, which he has attended for some time, has been here every day, did not hear of Complainant being sick, either from herself or any one else. When any of the people of this estate complain of being sick, they are always brought to the sick-house to be examined by witness. Having now examined *Fatima*, declares that there is nothing the matter with her; knows her to be a lazy and bad subject, and to be unworthy of belief.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—This Complaint is unfounded; *Fatima* was desired to return to her duty.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

No. 48.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Cato*, aged 23 years, male; of plantation Vreedestine, on the west bank of Demerara River.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—The heirs of the late John Jones, proprietors, and Adam Jellicoe, manager.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—19th April 1830. Complaint preferred at this office by said slave.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That when Complainant had finished his day's work on Tuesday last, 13th instant, the manager, on a complaint of the overseer, Mallelieu, ordered him to be confined for the night, and said he would flog him the next morning. The cause of this intended punishment was, that Complainant objected to the way in which the overseer had directed the worm to be hoisted out of the still-house, and proposed to said overseer a better way of effecting this duty; that, on hearing the order for his confinement and flogging next morning, he started off, considering the punishment ordered unjust.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—19th April 1830. The Protector summoned Mr. Jellicoe, desiring him to adduce proof that there was just cause for the punishment he had ordered to be inflicted on Complainant. The estate Vreedestine not being very far from town, Complainant was asked why he had not come here sooner to lodge his complaint, it appearing that he had been absent from the estate six days, when he could easily have reached this office in one day. He replied that he had remained all about on the dams; got plantains from the watchmen of plantations Boode's Rust, and slept two nights in the logie of plantation Vreed en Hoop, and had fever for these two nights, and that nobody saw him while in said logie. He was sent to gaol, to be fed, &c. until Mr. Jellicoe appears.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the Substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—21st April 1830. Adam Jellicoe, is manager of plantation Vreedestine. Ordered Complainant to be locked up only, on the evening of Tuesday the 13th instant; but did not say he was to be flogged the next day. Gave this order in consequence of the overseer, Mr. Mallelieu, having represented that Complainant had that day behaved in a very insolent manner to him and the plumber employed at the still, in presence of the other negroes; thereby setting a bad example, and showing a want of respect to, and treating the orders, relative to the work going on, of the overseer with contempt. Upon giving the above order, Complainant started off from the man who was ordered to take him to be locked up, and has not been seen until now by any one belonging to the estate. That the negroes have all been told, if they wished to go to the Assistant Protector of the District, or to this office to complain, they must first apply for a pass, and that it would not be refused them. That, by setting this mode of proceeding at defiance, Complainant has occasioned a loss of his labour to the estate, which would otherwise not have occurred, as he would then have had to go at once, either to the Assistant Protector, or to come here, with his complaint, and the business would have been settled immediately.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

I do hereby declare, under tender of oath, That the negro *Cato*, belonging to this estate, was, on the 13th instant, excessively insolent both to myself, as head overseer, and Mr. Parker, a plumber engaged on the estate at the time: That in consequence of my representation of such conduct to the manager, he was ordered to be locked up that night: That in taking him to the room, he made his escape from the negro in whose charge he was placed, and has not since been heard of.

(signed)

George Mallelieu.

Plantation Vreedestine, April 21st, 1830.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—The complaint is frivolous, and is dismissed accordingly. The Complainant was reprimanded for his insolence to the overseer, and remaining so long absent from the estate before preferring his complaint; also for not attending to the orders of the manager to apply for a pass, before quitting the estate, to lodge his complaint; and was ordered to return to his duty.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

No. 49.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (B.)

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Dublin*, aged 30 years, male; of plantation Vreedestine.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—The heirs of the late John Jones, deceased, proprietors; Adam Jellicoe, manager of said plantation.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—23d April 1830, complaint preferred at this office by said slave.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That he, *Dublin*, complained to the Assistant Protector of the District in which he resides, three weeks ago, that Mr. Jellicoe had obliged Complainant to go with him in a boat on Sunday, to the Sand Hills, up the Demerara River, and that Mr. Jellicoe would not pay him for his work on that day; that the Assistant Protector gave him a letter, upon delivering which to the manager, the latter paid Complainant six bits, 2 s. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. sterling; that since this, Complainant has been confined in the stocks every night, although he finished his work every day; and that this confinement was for having made the above complaint to Mr. Blake, the Assistant Protector.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—2d April 1830. The Protector made reference to Thomas Blake, esq., on the subject of the complaint preferred to him by *Dublin*, as to the refusal of the manager, Jellicoe, to remunerate him for his services on the Sunday, and directed the Assistant Protector to investigate the complaint as to his confinement subsequently in the stocks.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

27th April 1830. IN the case of *Dublin*, belonging to plantation Vreedestine, the complaint is correct, and the manager, Mr. Jellicoe, has acknowledged it to be so, but says, that he laboured under a mistake, supposing he had my sanction for the confinement, which I positively deny. *Dublin* broke out of confinement (where he had been for some crime) and came to me with a complaint, that he had been worked on Sunday, and not paid; Mr. Jellicoe then paid him, but conceiving that he had received assistance in effecting his escape, he requested that I would endeavour to make *Dublin* tell how he got out. I desired him to put *Dublin* into the stocks a few nights, until he explained how he effected his escape. This explanation was given the first night of his confinement, to the driver, Harry, who had charge of him; but the explanation not being satisfactory to the manager, the confinement was continued, supposing, as I have stated above, that he had my sanction for so doing.

(signed) *Thomas E. Blake,*
Assis' Prot' of Slaves.

26th April 1830.

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—27th April 1830. The memorial of Adam Jellicoe, manager of plantation Vreedestine, sheweth, That your Memorialist noticing the complaint made to you by the slave *Dublin*, together with the letter from the Deputy Fiscal of this District, begs to call your attention to the following facts: To the first cause of said negro's confinement in the dark room, which was for disobedience of orders on the estate's duty, which confinement was only for one night, when the said slave became more refractory and ungovernable, by breaking out, and, in addition, absconding from the property, and proceeded to the Deputy Fiscal to lodge his complaint, which was carefully attended to on the part of Major Blake; and your Memorialist considered it his duty to lay such conduct before the Assistant Protector; the said slave was ordered to be placed in confinement at night in the bed stocks, until such time as he confessed how or by what means he effected his escape; and this is admitted in the letter of this date from the Assistant Protector himself to you. It is true, no limited time was specified; but your Memorialist positively states, Complainant never satisfactorily did explain how he effected his escape, which is a convincing proof of his obstinacy. Therefore your Memorialist humbly requests you will take into consideration that he was acting wholly under the influence of the orders previously obtained from Major Blake, as Assistant Protector, and by no means in disobedience of the laws in force in this Colony, &c. That if Memorialists has exceeded the punishment allowed by law, it was more through ignorance than intention, and craves, therefore, if any fine attaches, that it might be remitted, &c.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—29th April 1830. The complaint of the slave *Dublin*, of plantation Vreedestine, against Adam Jellicoe, manager of that estate, being fully established, the Protector, after giving the matter due consideration, considers it imperative on him to demand, as he does hereby demand of said manager, a fine of *f.* 200. equal to 14 *l.* 5 s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. sterling, in failure of payment whereof, on or before the

5th of May next ensuing, the said Adam Jellicoe will be proceeded against in due course of law. The said manager having acted in contravention of the first Article of the amended Slave Act, dated 1st August 1829, by causing said slave Dublin to be confined in stocks at nights for a longer period of time than is allowed by the aforesaid Act. 4th May 1830, the above fine was paid at this office, by the manager of plantation Vreedestine.

Received, from A. W. Young, esq. Protector of Slaves, two hundred guilders, for a fine incurred by Mr. Jellicoe, manager of plantation Vreedestine.

(signed) *M. J. Retemeyer,*
Colonial Receiver.

f. 200. Demerara currency.
14*l.* 5*s.* 8½*d.* sterling.

PART I.
—
DEMERARA.
—
Report from
Protector of Slaves.
—
Table (B.)

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads?—29th April 1830. Remark forwarded by the Protector, through the Assistant Protector of the District, together with his decision on the preceding complaint, to the manager of plantation Vreedestine; viz. The manager's letter, addressed to this office on the 27th instant, sets forth, that he has acted through ignorance, in having exceeded the time the law authorizes for detention in the stocks, and that he was under the impression that he was acting in obedience to the orders of the Assistant Protector, who desired the manager to keep the Complainant in stocks for a few nights, until he declared through whose assistance he had effected his escape; but the manager, who is bound equally with the Assistant Protector to make himself acquainted with the law, so peculiarly attaching to both of them, must have been aware that the Assistant Protector could never have meant, nor had he the power to authorize a manager to exceed the law, and more particularly one that had so recently been especially brought under the notice of persons in charge of slaves. (By a circular letter of the Protector's, dated 25th September 1829).—It is evident that not only in this instance, but on previous occasions also, ground of complaint has been afforded to Dublin.

No. 50.

1.—The Name, Age, Sex, Residence, and mode of Employment of the Slave by whom, or on whose behalf the Complaint was preferred?—*Jenny Manda*, aged 35 years, female; residing in George Town, and employed as a domestic.

2.—The Names of the Owner or Owners, and Manager or Managers of the Slave, their Places of Abode, their Callings or Professions?—H. Fleishman, of this town, owner.

3.—The time when, and the Person through whom, the Complaint was first preferred to, or first reached the Protector?—27th April 1830, complaint preferred by said slave.

4.—The substance of the Complaint?—That Miss Mersey Fleishman, a coloured woman and housekeeper to Mr. Fleishman, beat and ill-used Complainant about a week ago, and that she wishes to be sold to some other person.

5.—The Proceedings taken upon the Complaint, with the date of each successive Proceeding?—27th April 1830. Complainant being questioned, says, that several of the neighbours saw Miss Fleishman beat her, but refuses to name those persons; will point them out if any one is sent with her for the purpose; left her owner's the day she was beaten; has since stayed in Boarda's Walk; did not come here sooner, being sick; has not been in any house; had two guilders, with which she purchased food for herself and child (about three years old) while they were absent; has no marks of the beating about her body; was struck by Miss Fleishman with her hand.—The Protector sent the office messenger, Fraskini, to summon said Mersey Fleishman, and sent Complainant with him, to point out the persons who, she stated, saw her beaten.—Complainant being again questioned by the Protector, on her return with the messenger, says, that nobody saw her beaten, because her mistress dragged her under the house.

6.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Complaint, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—

7.—The substance of the Defence made by the accused Party or Parties?—Mersey Fleishman, free coloured woman, lives with Mr. Fleishman; has the management of his domestics and household; denies having struck Complainant. Defendant was in her kitchen on the 16th instant, when Complainant came in there and began to chide her child for taking her handkerchief, and made a good deal of noise; defendant desired her to go away and keep quiet, upon which Complainant began to abuse her, and make use of shameful language, and putting her arms a kimbo, commenced pushing defendant with her elbows. Defendant then sent off to call Mr. Fleishman, who was out at the time, upon which Complainant attempted to make off, and defendant laid hold of her by the arm to prevent her going; but Complainant being much stronger than her, and there being no one in the place

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.
Table (B.)

to assist in securing her, she dragged defendant out on the bridge on the street, and attempted to throw her into the trench, upon which defendant was obliged to let her go, and she instantly made off, and has not been seen until now. That defendant never even attempted to strike her, knowing that it would be illegal to do so; and that all the time she was dragging defendant out to the street, she, Complainant, was bawling out and making a great uproar, so as to induce the neighbours to suppose that defendant was beating her. That when she made off she carried the child, now here present, and with whom she had been quarrelling about the handkerchief, with her.

8.—The Names of the Witnesses, if any, examined in support of the Defence, and the substance of the Evidence of each Witness?—G. F. Fraskin, messenger in the Protector's Office, having gone with Complainant, and inquired of the people she pointed out if they had seen her beaten by said Mersey Fleishman, on the 16th inst. or thereabouts; states, that said people, namely, two coloured women, residing in the house opposite Mr. Fleishman's, declared to him that they had not seen Miss Fleishman strike or beat Complainant; but that, on the contrary, they saw Complainant drag her said mistress, who was trying to keep Complainant back, out on the bridge before the house, and there attempt to throw her mistress into the drain.

H. Fleishman is the owner of Complainant, declares that she has been absent with her child since the 16th instant; that she is a most violent and bad character; has often encouraged her other daughter to steal, and has, on a former occasion, when they resided on plantation Ruimveldt, actually beaten and torn the clothes off her mistress; that, therefore, he will either sell her and her children, or send them into the country as soon as possible.

9.—The result of the Proceeding, if terminated?—This complaint is false, and is dismissed; Complainant being reprimanded for her falsehoods, insolence, and absenting from her owner.

10.—Explanatory Remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.

APPENDIX TO TABLE (B.)

PART I.
DEMERARA.Report from
Protector of Slaves.Appendix to
Table (B.)*Complaints of Injuries.*

REPORT of the Protector of Slaves of the Colony of *Demerara* and *Essequibo*, made to His Excellency Sir *Benjamin D'Urban*, Lieutenant Governor of the said Colony; from 1st November 1829 to 30th April 1830.

In pursuance of the Ordinance for the "Religious Instruction of Slaves," &c. &c. dated 7th day of September 1825.

Note.—Under the late Slave Ordinance it was not imperative on the Assistant Protectors of districts to report to the Protector all the complaints made to them, but only such cases as required the interference of the Protector, and which are herein contained.

No. 1.

1. THE name, age, sex, residence and mode of employment of the slave by whom or on whose behalf the complaint was preferred?—*Maria*, female, residing on plantation called *Belfield*, and employed thereon.

2. The names of the owner or owners, and manager or managers of the slave, their places of abode, their callings or professions?—*William Easton*, of said plantation, owner, a carpenter by trade.

3. The time when, and the person through whom the complaint was first preferred to or first reached the Protector?—27th December 1829. Complaint preferred by Assistant Protector *E. Bishop*, of the west coast of *Essequibo*, on behalf of said slave.

4. The substance of the complaint?—That complainant had been severely beaten on the 21st instant by *Miss Kitty Easton*, free coloured woman, and housekeeper of said *William Easton*. That she has been punished sometimes with blows in the field by said *Kitty Easton*; that this is in consequence of complainant having a mulatto child, which *Kitty Easton* supposes to be the child of *Mr. Easton*, and is therefore jealous of complainant.

5. The proceedings taken upon the complaint, with the date of each successive proceeding?—21st Dec. 1829. The Assistant Protector summoned *Kitty Easton*, and the witnesses, *Kitty Ann*, *Harriet* and *Elizabeth*, named by complainant; who produced the following note addressed to the Assistant Protector: "The bearer, *Maria*, has some quarrel with my housekeeper, and requires a pass to complain. You will please to settle the matter between them. (signed) *William Easton*."

29th December. This complaint was, by the advice of the Crown Advocate, referred to his honour the First Fiscal, it appearing that complainant was neither the property of, nor was she legally under the control of said *Kitty Easton*; the case therefore coming under the 12th article of the "Regulations for the Treatment of Servants and Slaves," and being consequently more properly cognizable by the Fiscal than by the Protector.

9th January 1830. A question having arisen as to whom it specially belongs to entertain this case and proceed against said *Kitty Easton*, the Protector referred to the Assistant Protector to know whether the complainant was considered as a *domestic* or as a *field negress*.

19th January 1830. The Assistant Protector reported that "the complainant was the property of *Wm. Easton*, and employed in *field labour* of a small coffee and plantain plantation, the residence of *Wm. Easton*."

The case, with this explanation of the Assistant Protector, was again, by the advice of the Crown Advocate, referred to his honour the First Fiscal, it appearing that it does not come within the provisions of the "Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves," and that a prosecution by the Protector in virtue of such Ordinance cannot be supported.

6. The names of the witnesses if any examined in support of the complaint; and the substance of the evidence of each witness?—The Assistant Protector did not find it necessary to examine the witnesses named by complainant, *Kitty Easton* having acknowledged the complaint to be correct.

7. The substance of the defence made by the accused party or parties?—*Kitty Easton* acknowledged that she had beaten complainant; that it was true that a jealousy existed between her and complainant; intended to have well bruised complainant's mouth with the shingle, but was prevented by complainant's hands and arms.

8. Names of the witnesses (if any) examined in support of the defence, and the substance of the evidence of each witness?—

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Appendix to
 Table (B.)

9. The result of the proceedings, if terminated?—In reply to reference made by the Protector, his honour the Fiscal stated: “I have consulted with Mr. Gordon, your legal adviser, upon the case of the slave Maria referred by you to me; and as we are both of opinion, that under all circumstances it is not a case for the consideration of the court, I have caused information to be transmitted to the owner through the deputy Fiscal, which we think will be sufficient to protect the slave against the recurrence of the act complained of. I have, &c. (signed) Charles Herbert, First Fiscal, R. O.—To A. W. Young, Esq. Protector of Slaves.”

No. 2.

1. THE name, age, sex, residence and mode of employment of the slave by whom or on whose behalf the complaint was preferred?—*Batavier, Philip and Cornette*, males, residing and employed as field people on plantation Sparta, west coast of Essequibo.

2. The names of the owner or owners, and manager or managers of the slaves, their places of abode, their callings or professions?—Donald Campbell, proprietor, and Archibald M'Lennan, manager of said plantation.

3. The time when, and the person through whom the complaint was first preferred to or first reached the protector?—30th January 1830. Complaint preferred by Assistant Protector E. Bishop, on behalf of said slaves.

4. The substance of the complaint?—That they, complainants, are hard worked, severely punished, and not properly fed; that when they have applied to Captain M'Pherson, the Assistant Protector of their own district, he has not afforded them the necessary protection.

5. The proceedings taken upon the complaint, with the date of each successive proceeding?—25th January 1830. Assistant Protector Bishop referred complainants to Captain M'Pherson, giving them a note to him as their proper Assistant Protector.

30th January. Complainants having returned on the 27th instant to Captain Bishop from Captain M'Pherson, with the above note *unopened*, the former referred the matter to the Protector, stating also that the manager had threatened complainants with punishment.

30th January. The Protector wrote Captain M'Pherson, informing him of the foregoing, and directing him to investigate most particularly the foregoing complaints “of said slaves being hard worked, severely punished, and not properly fed;” also to ascertain if they had been punished for going to Captain Bishop to complain, and to report if he, Captain M'Pherson, had, when applied to in former instances, refused the slaves necessary protection. The Protector also remarked, that it appeared to him that Captain Bishop had acted very properly in sending the slaves to the Assistant Protector of their own district for redress of their grievances, and had duly observed that propriety and courtesy so necessary on all occasions of the kind.

7. The substance of the defence made by the accused party or parties?—“Plantation Sparta, 8th February 1830. Sir, I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 30th ultimo, relative to three of this estate's negroes having gone up to Captain Bishop to complain of having been hard worked, severely punished, and not properly fed; also, their having stated to the above Assistant Protector, that when they applied to me for redress, their complaints were not attended to, and that they were sent away. In obedience to your desire, I came up here to investigate the cause of their complaints; and having accordingly called up the three negroes alluded to, namely, *Batavier, Philip and Cornette*, and inquired of them as to the above statement, they certainly repeated nearly the same story; that the work was too much, and when not finished they were locked up; and that they only got, between the hours of eleven and one o'clock, five plantains and fish, and if they could not obtain plantains, then rice and fish were given. They acknowledged to have received every Sunday a bunch of plantains, and a couple of pounds of fish. I here thought it expedient to call in the adjoining proprietor J. J. Gilgeons, of plantation Windsor Castle, to go aback with me to examine the kind of work they were employed at. He accompanied me. I took both *Batavier* and the driver John with me, at same time desiring the manager's attendance. I then went to the very spot where they had been working; the nature of the work being clearing away some bush which had been some time previously cut down, and digging small two-foot drains. I here asked of *Batavier* and the driver John, how much of this work was required to be done daily. They both said that 10 roods or 120 feet was required of each man per day: the exact nature of the work being the removal of the pegass or vegetable substances and roots out of the site or spot where the drain was to fall; the depth of the mould varying from three to six inches; when this was accomplished, 15 roods were then required of each, of a shovel and a half in depth. Mr. Gilgeons, who saw the nature and extent of the work, and had similar work to do himself, declared that the work in question was by no means too much, and that his own people performed even more. It must be here observed, that most of the others (negroes of this estate) finished the same task with ease, without saying a word of its being too much; therefore the manager, M'Lennan, was obliged to lock complainants up, who did not finish their task, in the dark house of an evening: it was on one of these occasions that complainants went up to Captain Bishop to complain. I particularly directed my attention to the amount of rations given out. It appears Mr. Campbell, the proprietor, obtains supplies from Demerara; viz. plantains, rice and fish; of the former a bunch is regularly delivered out of a Sunday, or the instant the boat arrives from town, which may not be perhaps until the day thereafter; also two lbs.

of

of salt fish, to each slave. Exclusive of this, there are a couple of women cooking for them out of the provisions Mr. Campbell has in store, of which they do receive about five or six plantains and some salt fish each, or if plantains are not at hand, then they cook or prepare for them rice and fish daily, and when they come home at sun-down they then prepare their own plantains; of a day the men receive each a couple of glasses of rum, and occasionally tobacco. Of the precise number of bunches of plantains given out, the estate's journal shows, as also other provisions. The negroes (complainants) were punished by Mr. Campbell's desire, for having, as he conceived, run away, and remaining absent altogether four days, and by no means for having gone up to Captain Bishop to complain. Mr. M'Lennan, the manager, had given the most positive orders, long before, telling the whole gang, that in the event of any of them wishing to complain, they had only to come to him for a pass to the Assistant Protector of slaves for the district, and there lodge their complaint. I found it here requisite to ask Batavier and Philip if they did not know I was the Assistant Protector of this district? they acknowledged that they did. I then asked why they did not apply *at once* to me? on which they were silent, but admitted that they proceeded directly on to Captain Bishop, without asking for a pass.—(signed) *J. M'Pherson*, Assistant Protector of Slaves."

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Appendix to
 Table (B.)

9. The result of the proceedings, if terminated?—The Assistant Protector, Captain M'Pherson, having, in conjunction with another planter of the district, personally inspected the nature and extent of the work complained of, and found that the same was not too much, nor more than other slaves are called upon to perform, not only upon this estate, but also upon other estates in the neighbourhood; and the complaint as to insufficiency of food appearing also to be equally groundless and unsupported; and the complainants having, without asking for a pass, which they well knew was requisite, absented themselves for four days from the estate, and thereby caused a considerable loss of labour and time, for which alone they deserved to be punished; and having gone a considerable distance, about 20 miles, to an Assistant Protector of another district, instead of the one in their own vicinity, who from his proximity to them could more effectually investigate and redress their complaints: the Protector considers that complainants have evinced a dissatisfied disposition and a wish to avoid the performance of that work which is performed by others, and which it is not unreasonable to exact from them; and that the pretexts upon which they have thus absented themselves are frivolous and idle. The complaint is therefore dismissed; the Assistant Protector, M'Pherson, being requested to take an early opportunity of explaining to complainants, and to the gang of plantation Sparta generally, that although every attention will be paid to and redress afforded to complaints when well founded, yet if slaves prefer complaints which turn out to be incorrect, and presume to set discipline and respect to the manager at defiance, they must expect to meet that punishment which such conduct will necessarily bring upon them.

10. Explanatory remarks upon the case, which could not properly be comprised under any of the preceding heads.—Remark subjoined by Assistant Protector M'Pherson to his report of the preceding investigation: "The general appearance of the negroes on this estate (Sparta) unquestionably bespeaks good condition. They have been hitherto indulged with the free use of an excellent plantain walk; so that it need not excite astonishment if they murmur a little, now that, instead of having a great abundance of their own, their master has to purchase, which arises solely from the increase of the disease in this useful description of food.—(signed) *J. M'Pherson*, Assistant Protector of Slaves."

No. 3.

1. THE name, age, sex, residence and mode of employment of the slave by whom or on whose behalf the complaint was preferred?—*Jacob*, male, residing on the west coast of Essequibo, and employed as a carpenter.

2. The name of the owner or owners, and manager or managers of the slave, their places of abode, and their callings or professions?—*Colin Young* and *James Prouse*, owners, residing on said coast; carpenters by trade.

3. The time when, and the person through whom the complaint was first preferred to or first reached the Protector?—24th March 1830. Complaint preferred at this office through Assistant Protector Bishop, on behalf of said slave.

4. The substance of the complaint?—That said *J. Prouse* (Mr. Young's partner) had promised him, *Jacob*, a pass yesterday, 22d instant, to go to the Assistant Protector to lodge a complaint; that after waiting a considerable time for said pass, and finding still no attention paid to his request, complainant started off to the Assistant Protector; that on his return to Mr. Prouse (the Assistant Protector having sent him back with a note, desiring a pass to be immediately given him to lodge his complaint), Mr. Prouse had complainant immediately seized and dragged to plantation Huis T. Deiren, before the Second Fiscal Bagot, who directed complainant to be again sent to Mr. Bishop, the Assistant Protector; that on complainant's return home, he again demanded the pass to Mr. Bishop, and Mr. Prouse promised one for the morning, but accompanied this promise with much violence, and threatened to have complainant again before the Fiscal and severely punished, which caused

PART I.
DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Appendix to
 Table (B.)

caused complainant to apprehend the worst consequences for the night, and to apply again at once to the Assistant Protector.

5. The proceedings taken upon the complaint, with the date of each successive proceeding?—Essequibo, March 23d, 1830. Complainant having called at this office, was sent back to his owner by the Assistant Protector for a pass to lodge his complaint, the distance not being more than a mile.

24th March. The Assistant Protector wrote Mr. Prouse, desiring an explanation why the slave Jacob had been carried to the Fiscal, instead of receiving a pass to the Assistant Protector, as required by the latter's note of yesterday, and proceeded to investigate the original cause of complaint.

7. The substance of the defence made by the accused party or parties?—James Prouse, carpenter, states, "The only explanation I can give for taking the negro Jacob to the fiscal is, for having absented himself from his work without my permission. He had certainly applied for a pass where I was working; and having no pen or ink on the spot, I went over to my house to give it him, and which I told him would be given; but he thought proper to go away without it, which I consider to be disobedience of orders and insubordination, which too frequently occurs with the gang under my direction. I did threaten him with the Fiscal, and shall still do so."

9. The result of the proceedings, if terminated?—The Assistant Protector having investigated the original cause of complaint by Jacob, finds it is for being flogged; and by Jacob's own statement, that that punishment was just, as it was for neglecting his duty. The Assistant Protector, therefore, repeats in presence of Mr. Prouse his sense of the slave having merited this punishment; but as to Mr. Prouse's conduct in bringing the complainant (who had been absent only about one hour, and had fully accounted for that absence by the Assistant Protector's note,) before the Fiscal under plea of desertion, and in unnecessarily intimidating and threatening complainant when he did apply for a pass to come to complain, the Assistant Protector cannot but express his sense of the impropriety of such proceeding, and considers that Mr. Prouse's conduct has been in fact such as fully to warrant the reception of complaints from his and Mr. Young's negroes without any pass in future.

24th March 1830. Protector's Office, George Town. The Assistant Protector having investigated and discharged the complaint, the Protector's interference is not called for.

No. 4.

1. THE name, age, sex, residence and mode of employment of the slave by whom and on whose behalf the complaint was preferred?—*Louis*, male, of plantation Windsor Castle.

2. The names of the owner or owners, and manager or managers of the slave, their places of abode, their callings or professions?—*J. J. Gilgeons*, proprietor, and *John Archer*, manager of said plantation.

3. The time when, and person through whom the complaint was first preferred to or first reached the Protector?—26th March 1830. Complaint preferred to this office by Assistant Protector *E. Bishop*, on behalf of said slave.

4. The substance of the complaint?—That about two weeks ago, while working at the truck at the mill, the overseer, *Kelsh*, found fault with complainant, and immediately ordered the engineer, *Fortune*, to flog him. That complainant had gone to the negro houses, and when *Fortune* came for him, he, *Fortune*, flogged him all the way coming from the negro houses to the mill, where he received the flogging ordered by the overseer. That about two hours after this, the said engineer again gave complainant some licks with the Creole driver's cat, after which complainant was going away with the intention of proceeding to the Assistant Protector to lodge his complaint, but being missed, said engineer, *Fortune*, made search and found complainant in the negro yard. The manager then ordered him to be confined in the stocks that night, and the next morning caused him to be flogged with 24 stripes. That complainant, not knowing that Captain *M'Pherson* was the Assistant Protector of his district, went that night to Mr. *Bishop's* with his complaint, but Mr. *Bishop* being in town, complainant stayed there three days, and on Captain *Bishop's* return home received a pass to go with his complaint to Captain *M'Pherson*. That on delivering this pass to Captain *M'Pherson*, he read it, but said nothing to complainant, and detained him there for a week.

5. The proceedings taken upon the complaint, with the date of each successive proceeding?—27th March 1830. The Protector referred this complaint to *Charles Bean*, esq., also one of the Assistant Protectors in the district, with instructions to investigate the same and report.

29th March. The Assistant Protector having investigated the complaint, returned the same, with the evidence adduced on both sides, to the Protector.

6. The names of the witnesses, if any, examined in support of the complaint, and the substance of the evidence of each witness?—*George*, slave of plantation Windsor Castle. Was, together with complainant, in charge of the trucks at the mill on the day the transactions complained of took place. They left their charge and went to the negro houses; when the overseer, *Kelsh*, came in the mean time, and observing their absence sent the engineer, *Fortune*, to bring them back, and gave each 10 or 12 stripes with the cats. *Fortune* then

then desired Louis to carry canes, and the man John to take his place at the truck, which order the man Louis refused to obey, and on Fortune making towards him, Louis ran off and Fortune after him, brought him back, and gave him six lashes with the cat.

John, slave of plantation Windsor Castle. Corroborates the evidence of last witness, only stating that he did not count the number of lashes inflicted.

Fortune, engineer, and slave of plantation Windsor Castle. Flogged complainant on the day alluded to; did so by order of the overseer, Kelsh; gave him about ten lashes with the Creole driver's cat, for going away and leaving his truck; tied him up for the purpose.

7. The substance of the defence made by the accused party or parties?—John E. Archer, manager of plantation Windsor Castle. Saw the engineer, Fortune, in the negro yard on the afternoon of the 10th instant, defendant being then on his way to the field; called to Fortune to know what he was doing there while the engine was at work; Fortune replied he was in search of Louis, who had absented himself and was hiding at the top of the negro houses; then ordered Fortune to call the carpenters to his assistance in taking Louis, and to put him in the stocks, which was done, and the following morning, the 11th March, gave him 24 stripes and sent him to his work; the same night complainant absented and went up to Captain Bishop. Knows nothing of what took place the preceding day between Louis and Fortune. The overseer, Kelsh, did report to defendant that he had on the 10th ordered complainant a few stripes for absenting from the truck; does not know if he was regularly flogged, but on the 11th, when brought out to receive the 24 stripes, had no marks whatsoever of punishment previous. Neither the overseers, drivers nor engineer-man are allowed to punish any slave without defendant's knowledge and orders. Had been on the 20th inst. before Captain M'Pherson, who was then investigating this complaint; complainant there behaved in a very insolent and disrespectful manner to defendant.

8. The names of the witnesses, if any, examined in support of the defence, and the substance of the evidence of each witness?—David Kelsh, head overseer on plantation Windsor Castle, declares, that on the morning of the 10th March the man Louis, belonging to said estate, was employed working the trucks which convey the megass from the engine to the logie: That passing by the truck-way, he observed the one which Louis had been working during the morning loaded with megass in a most dangerous situation, without any person in charge of it. The truck was six yards from the gangway, towards the engine, where the Creoles and mill-gang were working, fairly and openly exposed to the unmanned truck; had it slipped or wheeled back, inevitably some of the Creoles would have been killed: That witness is fully of opinion that would have been the result, from a similar circumstance having occurred on the 26th February, by one of the trucks nearly killing a boy, in presence of J. J. Gilgeons, esq. and witness, in the same manner: That seeing the loaded truck in this dangerous situation, witness called Fortune, the engineer, and showed it to him, who said it was Louis's fault, but could not tell where Louis was gone, and at the same time complained to witness that Louis had been very insolent to him during the morning, and had neglected his work: That witness then told Fortune to go in search of Louis, and bring him back to his work; he went to the negro houses, and found Louis in his house; Fortune complained a second time of his being insolent and abusive, and Louis made answer, that it was a falsehood, and that Fortune was a liar. Fortune had two or three pieces of twine tied to a little rod, belonging to the Creole driver, with which he drives the Creoles about the buildings, and witness told Fortune to give Louis a few stripes on the shoulders; he gave him about 10, in presence of witness, with said rod and twine; Mr. Devonhill was also present. This was done merely to satisfy Fortune's feelings, he appearing much hurt at Louis's bad conduct towards him. This did not cut or leave the smallest mark of violence upon the person of Louis. Witness then told Fortune to let Louis go to his work, and they both walked towards the engine, but of what took place between them afterwards witness knows nothing, until about an hour afterwards, when Fortune came and told witness that Louis grossly refused to do his work, to carry canes to the engine, and attempted to beat Fortune. Louis then a second time left his work and concealed himself in the negro yard, until again caught by Fortune, and the manager hearing the circumstances, ordered him to be confined and flogged him the next morning.

J. M'Pherson, esq., Assistant Protector of Slaves of the district. Received complainant with a pass from Assistant Protector Bishop. Heard his story, but could not well make it out. Sent immediately for the proprietor, Mr. Gilgeons, and detained complainant with him in the mean time. On Saturday morning, 20th March, Mr. Archer appeared before witness, and upon complainant being called and asked if he had asked for a pass to come to complain, he replied, No; that the manager was a queer man. He also behaved in a very disrespectful manner during the whole of the investigation to the manager. Mr. Gilgeons had not yet appeared at that time, nor was the investigation of the complaint closed, and as it was to be referred to the Protector, witness did not interfere any further.

Surgeon William Mitchell. Certifies to have been present with Captain M'Pherson, Deputy Protector, and Mr. Archer, manager of plantation Windsor Castle, during the investigation of the complaint of Louis, and that the said Louis was during that time exceedingly insolent to Mr. Archer.

9. The result of the proceedings, if terminated?—1st April 1830. The Protector having attentively considered the preceding complaint, with the evidence in support of it, and also the defence of Mr. Archer, with the evidence he has adduced in its support, is of opinion, that no ground of complaint exists in this case *against the complainant Louis* on the score of delay in the investigation, as that delay appears to have been on the part of the defendant: That any punishment which takes place on an estate must be accounted for by the manager, whether

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Appendix to
 Table (B.)

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.Appendix to
Table (B.)

whether ordered by him or not, for he alone can be looked upon as the person acting for and on behalf of the proprietor: That the overseer, Kelsh, caused to be inflicted corporal punishment on complainant without waiting for the expiration of the time which ought to elapse previous to the infliction of such punishment: That the manager has made himself obnoxious to the law in permitting an instrument of punishment to be carried by a driver about the buildings, either as a badge of authority or as a stimulus to labour; and to this permission of the manager is to be attributed in a great measure the illegal act of the overseer, Kelsh, or at least it afforded (what the law intended to exclude) the ready means of satisfying, by instantaneous punishment, either the anger which the overseer felt on account of the misconduct of Louis in leaving the truck in a dangerous situation, or the wounded feelings of the engineer, Fortune: That a short time after this punishment by order of the overseer, the engineer inflicted six lashes with the cat; and that these punishments, though said to be slight, (having been inflicted with the Creole driver's cat, two or three pieces of twine tied to a little rod,) are nevertheless illegal, and are calculated to prove in the highest degree so mischievous to the good order of an estate, by exasperating the tempers of the negroes, that even if they were not contrary to the law, true policy would forbid them: and, finally, that the corporal punishment ordered by the manager was preceded by confinement in the stocks, contrary to the first article of the amended Slave Law of the 1st of August 1829, an excess of punishment against which further warning was given in the Protector's circular letter of September last; and that Louis has just cause to complain of undue severity being exercised towards him.

The Protector accordingly hereby demands from J. E. Archer, manager of plantation Windsor Castle, immediate payment of the sum of *f.600*, = *42 l. 17 s. 1 ½ d.* sterling, as a fine incurred by him, under pain of being proceeded against forthwith as the law directs.

24th April 1830. The above fine was paid at this office this day, being *42 l. 17 s. 1 ½ d.* sterling, or *f.600*.

Demerara, 24th April 1830. Received from A. W. Young, esq. Protector of Slaves, the sum of 600 guilders for a fine incurred by Mr. Archer, manager of plantation Windsor Castle.—For the Colonial Receiver. (signed) *A. M. Fogelmark*.

24th July 1830.

A. M. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

Table (C.)

TABLE (C).

Exhibiting the Number of Cases in which Slaves have been employed to labour on Sunday in works of Necessity, and the Conditions upon which such Labour has been performed.

TABLE (D).

MARRIAGES.

Number of Applications for Marriage Licenses made to the Protector.	Number of Cases in which the Consent of the Owners or Managers was given.	Number of Cases in which the Consent of the Managers was withholden or refused.	Number of Summonses for the Attendance of Managers to show Cause against the Marriages of Slaves.	Number of Cases in which the Protector's Licenses were refused.	Number of Licenses actually granted.	Number of Slaves actually married under such Licenses.
Protector, A. W. Young, none.	1	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 couple.
Assistant Protector, Thierens, none.	2	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	2 ditto.
Ditto, Koert, none.	1	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	1 ditto.
	4	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	4 couples.

TABLE (E).

SEPARATIONS OF SLAVES.

The Number of Certificates given by the Protector, under this head, are three; viz.

1. To the slave girl Nancy, aged, as per registry in July last, 15 years, being separated from her mother, Charlotte, the property of J. M. M'Gusty, of this town, and being sold to another person. Dated 31st November 1829.

2. To the slave boy Primus, belonging to plantation Vrees-en-Hoop, being left with his father, a slave on said plantation, and being separated from his mother Judy, hitherto belonging to said plantation, but who (in conformity with the will of her late father, Primo Jonas, free black man, deceased, and an order of the court of justice, bearing date 11th March 1830, granted to the curator to the estate of the deceased), has been replaced on said estate by a slave named Simon, the property of the deceased, for the purpose of devoting her services to two others of her children, who have been redeemed from slavery by the deceased during his lifetime. Dated 26th March 1830.

3. To the slave boy Kenneth, aged, as per registry, 14 years, being separated from his mother, Amba, the property of Rosetta Baynes, free black woman of this town, and transferred to Thomas Campbell, of this town, joiner, for the redemption of the boy Charles from slavery. Dated 11th May 1830.—(Vide Table (B) Complaint No. 28.

The Grounds upon which the Protector gave his Consent to the Separations mentioned above are,

1. The girl Nancy wished to be sold to another person, and her mother, Charlotte, consented thereto; also it appears, by the certificate of registry produced, that said Nancy was 15 years of age in July last.

2. The woman Judy declared her wish to be exchanged from plantation Vrees-en-Hoop, without her said child Primus, who remains with his father, also a slave of that estate; and she also declares herself satisfied to devote her services to the support of her two children aforesaid; moreover, she has been separated for some years from the father of Primus, and has stayed in town, where she has lived, and still lives, with another man.

3. The slaves Amba and Kenneth both consented to be separated, in presence of the Protector. The latter is aged, as per registry, 14 years, and is transferred to Thomas Campbell, for the redemption of the boy Charles from slavery.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (E.)

TABLE (G.)

PROPERTY.

5th March 1830.
 THE sum of *f.* 440. = *31 l. 8 s. 6 ½ d.* sterling, has been this day deposited in the "Savings Bank for Slaves" by a female slave named Nelly Sue, alias Susan Rogers or Spooner, a huxtreess in this town.

(*Vide* Table (B).)

PART I.
 DEMERARA.

Report from
 Protector of Slaves.

Table (G.)

TABLE (H.)

ACTIONS, PROSECUTIONS AND PENALTIES.

No. 1.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of Criminal and Civil Justice.

Table (H.)

2. When it was commenced?—Twenty-fourth May 1828.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, prosecutor, against Johannes Saurman, manager of plantation Zeelugt, defendant.—(*Vide* No. 1, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To recover five fines of *f.* 900, equal to *64 l. 5 s. 8 ½ d.* sterling each; or in case of non-payment, that the defendant be confined in the colony jail for a period not exceeding three calendar months for each. And to recover three fines of *f.* 1,000, equal to *71 l. 8 s. 6 ½ d.* sterling each, or such other sum as the court may award, and for the costs, being penalties incurred by the defendant under the 13th Article of the "Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves."

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—Eighteenth June 1828, called in court; when defendant asked copies of the documents filed by the plaintiff, and day to answer thereto, at the Roll Court. 28th July 1828, defendant filed exception and contrary conclusion. 12th August, the plaintiff rejected the exception, persisted for replication; proceedings were closed and term taken to produce vouchers and hear witnesses; about which time the court went into recess. 15th December 1828, hearing witnesses. 16th December, the like. 12th January 1829, the like. 27th January 1829, the like. 9th March 1829, the like. 28th March 1829, the like. 17th May, the like. 16th June, the like; when the plaintiff closed his case under reserve of ampliation. 9th October 1829, defendant requests that witnesses be re-summoned for cross-examination. 21st September 1829, defendant withdrew his cross-examination. 2d December 1829, defendant filed inventory. 11th Jan. 1830, defendant's witnesses recalled. 8th February 1830, received copies of defendant's vouchers. 10th March 1830, plaintiff filed ampliation of inventory, and parties closed proceedings for hearing on the 20th May 1830. 21st May 1830, parties were heard before the court.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—22d May 1830, sentence was this day pronounced, by which the court condemned the defendant, with rejection of his conclusion of exception and answer, to pay five fines of *f.* 900 each; and in case of non-payment, to be imprisoned in the colony jail for the space of 14 days for each of such penalties. The court rejecting the further claim and demand, with further condemnation of the defendant in the costs of these proceedings. 28th June 1830, the defendant, Johannes Saurman, has surrendered himself to the confinement in lieu of paying the fines, and has paid the costs of these proceedings.

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—

8. The total amount of costs and expenses incurred in the action or proceeding.

Secretary's office - - - -	<i>f.</i> 585	=	£. 41 15 8 ½	sterling.
Marshal's office - - - -	209	=	14 18 6 ¾	
Taxing officer - - - -	9	=	- 12 10 ½	
Crown advocate's fees - - - -	462	=	33 - -	
Total - - - - <i>f.</i> 1,265		=	£. 90 7 1 ¾	sterling.

25th June 1830, the above costs were paid this day by the said Johannes Saurman.

No. 2.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of criminal and civil justice.

2. When it was commenced?—28th February 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, prosecutor, against Philida Gertzen, free black woman, defendant. (*Vide* No. 2, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (H.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To recover a fine of *f.* 600 = 42*l.* 17*s.* 1½*d.* sterling, or in case of non-payment thereof, imprisonment not exceeding one calendar month, or such penalty or fine as the court shall deem meet; and for the costs of these proceedings. Being for a violation of the 10th clause of the “Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves.”

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—This suit called in court 13th April 1829, when plaintiff filed his documents of which defendant requested copies, and it was then, in the usual way, transferred to the Roll Court. On the 7th May 1829, defendant filed his conclusion of exception and answer, *in scriptis*. On 5th June 1829, plaintiff rejected the exception proposed, and persisted by his claim and demand. Parties closed and took term to file further documents, and to cite witnesses. The 30th June 1829, four witnesses heard in behalf of the plaintiff. 14th July 1829, plaintiff closed his examination in chief, and filed his documents. 28th July 1829, defendant requested the reproduction of the witnesses for cross-examination. 5th October 1829, the witnesses are reproduced by plaintiff, and cross-examined by defendant. 13th January 1830, plaintiff served an intimation to proceed, the suit having stood over to afford him the opportunity to complete his evidence, several of the witnesses living a great distance from town. 27th January 1830, defendant requested reproduction of the witness L. Breda. 22d February 1830, this witness again cross-examined by defendant. 10th March 1830, this witness was again required by defendant. 22d March 1830, this witness was again examined by defendant. 19th April 1830, the like. 17th May 1830, defendant examined his own witnesses. 16th June 1830, defendant filed his inventory.

6. If brought to a close the result of the action or prosecution?—

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—24th June 1830. This case is in full process, and is expected to be decided at the ensuing sessions in October next.

No. 3.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of Criminal and Civil Justice.

2. When it was commenced?—19th March 1829; petition for appointment of a curator, *pro deo* presented to the President of said court.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by the Crown advocate as curator *pro deo*, for the slaves Hendrick, Cornelius and Betsey, legatees in the will of Hermanus Moll, deceased, plaintiffs, against the heirs or representatives of said deceased, defendants. (*Vide* No. 11, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To obtain the sum of 900 guilders, equal to 64*l.* 5*s.* 8½*d.* sterling, being the legacy bequeathed by the late Hermanus Moll to the above-mentioned slaves.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—19th March 1829; petition presented to the president of the court of justice to appoint a curator *pro deo*. This was referred to the party to report, and by final order of the 4th May 1829, the president has appointed the Crown advocate curator *pro deo* for the purpose of instituting such action against the representatives of the estate, or the heirs of Hermanus Moll, deceased, and carry on such proceedings as are provided by law to obtain what is due, and in consequence thereof all the papers have been given over to the Crown advocate. 24th June 1830; the Crown advocate reports the necessary proceedings to have been instituted. (*Vide* Paragraph, No. 7.)

6. If brought to a close the result of the action or prosecution?—

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—This case is in full progress on the roll, and is expected to be decided in October next.

No. 4.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Not yet brought before the court.

2. When it was commenced?—1st July 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to commence proceedings.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—To be brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, against Alexander Simpson, a cooper. (*Vide* No. 3, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To recover a fine of *f.* 220 equal to 15*l.* 14*s.* 3½*d.* sterling, imposed by the Protector, or in case of non-payment thereof to be proceeded against and suffer such fine or punishment as the court may deem meet, for improperly punishing his male slave James.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—1st July 1829. This case was placed in the hands of the Crown advocate, as stated at Paragraph, No. 2, to institute proceedings against said Simpson. But he, Simpson, having entreated to be allowed some time to procure the fine imposed by the Protector; and from his being totally insolvent, several

several writs of apprehension being out against him, and to avoid expenses of proceedings, the prosecution was deferred. 24th June 1830: he has since absconded from the colony, and has left no property whatsoever.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—The party accused, A. Simpson, has absconded from the colony.

PART I.
DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (H.)

No. 5.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Not yet brought before the court.

2. When it was commenced?—11th September 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—To be brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, against James Pyne, a carpenter. (*Vide* No. 6, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To recover the sum of *f.* 40. 10*st.* = 2*l.* 17*s.* 10½*d.* sterling, due by said Pyne to the slave Charles Hind, belonging to T. Rooth.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—11th September 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—24th June 1830. No suit has as yet been instituted, in consequence of this debtor being insolvent; and nothing can be done in it at present.

No. 6.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Not yet brought before the court.

2. When it was commenced?—11th September 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—To be brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, against Damon Brotherson, free black man. (*Vide* No. 7, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To recover the sum of *f.* 59. = 4*l.* 4*s.* 3½*d.* sterling, due by said Damon Brotherson to the slave Harriett M'Intosh, belonging to Rosaline M'Leod, free coloured woman.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—11th September 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—24th June 1830. No suit has as yet been instituted, as after repeated inquiries this debtor cannot be found, therefore nothing can be done in this case at present. It does not appear that this man is possessed of any property, or that he even had a fixed place of abode in this colony.

No. 7.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of criminal and civil justice.

2. When it was commenced?—26th September 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, against F. W. de Rochemont, *nom. uxor.* and guardian over the minor children of M. L. S. de Witt, deceased, defendant. (*Vide* No. 4, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For manumission of the mulatto slave Cootje, female, sold by the late M. L. S. de Witt, a guardian to her minor children, in or about the month of July 1827, to John Ripley of this town, merchant, for the benefit of the said mulatto slave Cootje.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—12th October 1829; called in court, when the plaintiff filed his documents, and the defendant concluded to an absolution of the instance and rejection of the plaintiff's claim and demand. Parties closed and took term to file further documents, and to cite witnesses, and it was then in the usual manner transferred to the roll court. On the 30th November 1829, two witnesses heard in behalf of the plaintiff. The 15th December 1829, plaintiff filed his inventory. 28th December 1829, defendant requested the reproduction of the witness Milborn for cross-examination. The 12th January 1830, the witness Milborn was examined by the defendant, who also reserved his right to cite John Ripley as a witness if need be. The 27th January 1830, the defendant requested to produce John Ripley for cross-examination. 22d February, witness John Ripley examined by the defendant. 10th March, the defendant required this witness

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (H.)

again for further cross-examination. 22d March, witness Ripley again examined by the defendant. 19th April, the witness is again examined by the defendant. 17th May, roll court; the defendant examined his witnesses. 16th June, the defendant filed his inventory. The following roll court, 28th June 1830, parties closed proceedings for pleadings, &c.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—This case is in full process, and is expected to be decided at the ensuing session in October.

No. 8.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Commissary court.

2. When it was commenced?—26th September 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, for and in behalf of the slave Charles Hind, plaintiff, against John Knights, free black man, defendant. (*Vide* No. 5, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the recovery of the sum of *f.* 47. 15 *st.* = 3 *l.* 8 *s.* 2 ½ *d.* sterling, due by the said John Knights to said slave.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—This suit was called in court on the 8th October 1829; but the defendant not appearing, first default was obtained against him, with admission to issue a second citation. Second citation served on the 24th October 1829. On the 5th November 1829 the suit was again called, and defendant being again absent.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—5th November 1829, sentence was obtained against him, on account of his contumacy, to pay the said sum of *f.* 47. 15 *st.* with the costs of the suit. 24th June 1830, no further proceedings have been carried on, the defendant having no known property at present.

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?

8. The total amount of costs and expenses incurred in the action or proceeding?—

Marshal's office	- - -	<i>f.</i> 30	=	£. 2	2	10 ½	sterling.
Secretary's office	- - -	59	=	4	4	3 ½	—
Taxing officer	- - -	3	=	-	4	3 ½	—
Crown advocate	- - -	110	=	7	17	1 ½	—
Total	- - -	<u><i>f.</i> 202</u>	=	<u>£. 14</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6 ¾</u>	<u>sterling.</u>

No. 9.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Not brought before court.

2. When it was commenced?—26th September 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, against Ann F. Campbell, free coloured woman. (*Vide* No. 8, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the recovery of *f.* 60. 10 *st.* = 4 *l.* 6 *s.* 5 ½ *d.* sterling, due by said Ann F. Campbell to the slave Mary, female.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—26th September 1829, placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit; and the said Ann F. Campbell requested time, which being allowed.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—Said Ann F. Campbell paid (on the 25th January 1830) the amount of said claim, say *f.* 60. 10 *st.* to said slave without suit being instituted.

No. 10.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Not brought into court.

2. When it was commenced?—26th September 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, against T. Letty Stewart, free black woman. (*Vide* No. 9, with Protector's report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the recovery of *f.* 55. = 3 *l.* 18 *s.* 6 ¾ *d.* sterling, due by said T. Letty Stewart to the slave Bob Harrower.

5. The

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—26th September 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit. Said T. Letty Stewart requested time, which being allowed.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—She paid (on the 27th January 1830) the amount of said claim, being *f.* 55. to said slave, without suit being instituted.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Report from
 Protector of Slaves.
 Table (H.)

No. 11.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Before his honour Charles Wray, president of the court of criminal and civil justice.

2. When it was commenced?—3d October 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—By A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, acting herein by S. W. Gordon, Crown advocate, for and on behalf of the slaves, Kitty and her two children. Against Joseph Hubbard. (*Vide* No. 10, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To prevent the sale of said slave, (she being advertised for sale at Vendue), and to obtain her manumission with her said children, on payment by her of the balance of her purchase-money to said Hubbard; he having agreed to receive from her the sum of *f.* 1,500 = 107 *l.* 2 *s.* 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* sterling, as the purchase of her freedom, and of which sum she has paid the greater part; there being due to said Hubbard, on the 29th May 1826, only *f.* 822; since which she states to have paid him various other sums for the same account, though not to the full amount of the said purchase-money; and she having lived in a state of reputed freedom from the time of the said agreement between her and the said Hubbard in the year 1824.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—3d October 1829; petition presented to his honour the President, representing the case of said Kitty, as stated in the preceding paragraph, and praying that a curator might be appointed to act for and take such legal steps for protecting her rights, as may be deemed necessary, whether by interdict to her sale or otherwise, with the provision *venia agendi*.

5th October 1829, his honour the president was pleased to appoint the Crown advocate curator, for the purposes prayed in the petition.

7th October 1829, proceedings in interdict to prevent sale were commenced by the Crown advocate, in conformity with said petition and president's order.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—24th November 1829, this case terminated favourably to the plaintiff in interdict, with condemnation of the defendant in the costs.

24th April 1830, the intention to manumit said Kitty and her children was advertised by the Protector in the usual manner.

24th June 1830, deeds of manumission were this day executed in the presence of the Protector, by S. W. Gordon, Crown advocate and curator, in favour of said Kitty, or Kitty Hubbard and her two children, Maria and Charles; and (25th June 1830) have been duly recorded.

28th June 1830, the deeds of manumission of said Kitty Hubbard and her two children, Maria and Charles, were delivered to her this day.

All in pursuance of the above.

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?

8. The total amount of costs and expenses incurred in the action or proceeding?

	<i>f.</i>	<i>£.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	
President's office - - - -	23	=	1	12	10 $\frac{1}{2}$ sterling.
Marshal's office - - - -	52	=	3	14	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ -
Secretary's office - - - -	137	=	9	15	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ -
Crown advocate's fees - - -	330	=	23	11	5 $\frac{1}{2}$ -
Total - - -	<i>f.</i> 542	=	£. 38	14	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ sterling.

No. 12.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Not brought into court.

2. When it was commenced?—30th October 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—By A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, acting herein by S. W. Gordon, Crown advocate, for and on behalf of the girl Eleanor Blair. Against J. R. M'Burnie. (*Vide* No. 12, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To compel said M'Burnie to execute a deed of manumission in favour of said Eleanor Blair, as required by the laws in force in this colony; said Eleanor Blair having been duly advertised for freedom by the Protector, at the request of said M'Burnie. No opposition was made to the manumission. The deed has been prepared, and requires only the signature of M'Burnie.

5. The

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (H.)

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—30th October 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate, to take the necessary steps to compel M'Burnie to execute letters of manumission, in due form, for said Eleanor Blair.

24th June 1830. This case has lain over in consequence of M'Burnie's absence from the colony; but a petition is now prepared, and will be immediately presented to his honour the president of the court of justice, praying that the Crown advocate might be appointed curator, for the purpose of signing the deed of manumission.

And as no difficulty or objection can arise in this matter, said deed will shortly be completed.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time the decision may be expected?—A deed of manumission has been executed by M'Burnie in favour of said Eleanor Blair, in London, but she not being there present at the time, and being in this colony, it became necessary, on M'Burnie's arrival here, to have the said deed executed anew, in presence of the Protector, in order to give it due effect. M'Burnie accordingly made the necessary application to the Protector for that purpose, and the manumission was advertised without any opposition having been made to its being carried into effect. M'Burnie did not appear to sign the deed at the time prescribed by the Protector's advertisement for that purpose, and was subsequently summoned to do so by the Protector; he, however, omitted to comply with the Protector's summons, and shortly afterwards left this colony for Berbice, but was expected to return here in a short time. The measure specified in paragraph No. 5 has been adopted, as the most speedy way of bringing this matter to an end. And the deed of manumission will be finally executed and completed so soon as the order is made on the petition aforesaid, which may be expected to be done in a few days.

No. 13.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Not yet brought into court.

2. When it was commenced?—30th October 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, on behalf of the slave Cato, belonging to John Paul of this town, against John William. (*Vide* No. 13, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the recovery of $f. 15 = 1 l. 1 s. 5 d.$ sterling, due by said John Williams to said slave.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—30th October 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate to put in suit.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—24th June 1830. This case has not been put in suit in consequence of said John Williams being a pauper. It remains in the hands of the Crown advocate.

No. 14.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?

2. When it was commenced?—31st October 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, on behalf of the slave Sampson M'Alpine, against B. G. M'Alpine or his representative in this colony. (*Vide* No. 14, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829.)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To obtain the manumission of said slave, on the ground that his said owner, M'Alpine, had, when in this colony, promised it to him on payment by the slave of $f. 1,500 = 107 l. 2 s. 10 \frac{1}{2} d.$ sterling.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—31st October 1829; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate, to investigate whether he has any ground to support a claim for manumission.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—30th November 1829. No part of the purchase money, stated by the slave Sampson M'Alpine to have been stipulated for, between himself and said M'Alpine, as the condition of obtaining his freedom, has ever been paid, as is acknowledged by the slave himself, either to M'Alpine or his attorneys. The said stipulation or agreement is stated to have been a verbal one, and the slave can bring forward no proof of such agreement having ever taken place. He has been sold by the attorney of M'Alpine to another person. There is therefore no ground to support a claim for freedom in any shape, and the case is dismissed without further proceeding.

No. 15.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?

2. When it was commenced?—31st October 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, on behalf of the slave Harry, son of Hester Alström, and now the property of H. O. Seward, of this town, merchant, but formerly belonging to the minor Duncan M'Bean,

son

son of Betty Game, free black woman of this town. (*Vide* No: 15, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829).

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To obtain the manumission of said slave Harry, on the ground that he was taken possession of unjustly by said Betty Game, and through such means became the property of her said son, the minor D. M'Bean, and was sold afterwards by the curator to the latter, to his present owner Seward.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—31st October 1830; placed in the hands of the Crown advocate, to investigate whether there is any ground to support a claim for freedom in this case. The Crown advocate reported, that there was no ground to support this claim; and that this same slave had been sold by order of Court of Justice, dated 12th May 1828, by William Lachlan M'Intosh, as curator *de bonis*, for the minor Duncan M'Bean, for the purpose of appropriating the purchase money for the benefit of said minor; which clearly shows that the Court considered this man, Harry, not to be entitled to freedom.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—After due investigation of this case, it was found that the slave Harry had no claim whatever to freedom, and the case was dismissed. A petition was then presented to the President of the Court of Justice by said Hester Alstrom, free black woman, mother of said Harry, on the same subject; which, after examination, was also dismissed by his honour.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

(Table H.)

No. 16.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of criminal and civil justice.

2. When it was commenced?—30th November 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, prosecutor, against Matthew Rush, manager of plantation La Penitence and Le Repentir, accused. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 57, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829; and Table (B).)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the recovery of five fines, each not greater than *f.* 600 = *42 l.* 17 *s.* 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* sterling, and not less than *f.* 200 = *14 l.* 5 *s.* 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* sterling, incurred by said Rush for a contravention of the 14th clause of the "Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves," passed on the 7th September 1825, and published on 20th October following; and the Act further to amend the same, passed and published on the 1st August 1829.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—16th December 1829, this suit was called in court, when the plaintiff filed his documents, of which defendant requested copies, and day to answer; and it was then in the usual manner transferred to the Roll Court. On the 12th January 1830, defendant filed conclusion of exception and answer. 27th January 1830: Parties closed, and took term to file further documents and to cite witnesses. 10th March 1830: Seven witnesses heard in behalf of the plaintiff. 23d March 1830: Another witness heard in behalf of the plaintiff. 5th April 1830: Plaintiff filed his documents by inventory. 20th April 1830: Defendant requested production of the witness R. Thornton, for cross-examination. The defendant is to cross-examine said witness at the Roll Court, of the 17th May 1830. 17th May 1830: The witness R. Thornton did not appear although duly summoned, in consequence of which the plaintiff took default against him, with leave to summon him again for the next Roll Court of the 14th of June, at the expense of said witness. 16th June 1830: Roll Court, the cross-examination of said witness taken on the 8th previous, was filed by defendant.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—This case is in full process, and is expected to be decided at the ensuing session in October.

No. 17.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of criminal and civil justice.

2. When it was commenced?—November 1829.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, prosecutor, against A. Sills, accused. (*Vide* No. 60, Complaints, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829; and Table (B).)

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the recovery of a fine of *f.* 1,400 = 100 *l.* sterling; for a violation of the 14th clause of the "Ordinance for the Religious Instruction of Slaves."

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—16th December 1829, this suit was called in court, when the plaintiff filed his documents, of which the defendant requested copies, and it was then in the usual manner transferred to the roll court. At the roll court of 12th January 1830, the defendant remained absent, and the plaintiff requested and obtained default against him, technically called "Verstek of Answer, Salvo Purge." At the next roll court, on the 27th January 1830, the defendant appeared, and after having cleared the said default, concluded to an absolution of the instance, and to a rejection of the plaintiff's

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

Table (H.)

plaintiff's claim and demand. Parties closed by persisted, and took term to file further documents and to cite witnesses. Plaintiff summoned five witnesses in support of the action. 10th March 1830, these witnesses appeared, but only three were examined, the commissary of the court refusing to admit two slaves to take oath, they not being sufficiently instructed in the principles of religion to understand the nature of an oath. 24th March 1830, the plaintiff filed his documents by inventory. 5th April 1830, defendant filed his document by inventory. 20th April 1830, parties finally closed, and requested the commissary to report the matter to the court for hearing and decision. This suit was then again transferred to the court. 29th April 1830, this cause was heard before the court, and,

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—By sentence of the court the plaintiff's claim and demand was adjudged, with condemnation of the defendant in the costs.

24th June 1830 : This sentence has been put in force by proceedings in execution, and levy has been made on the property of the defendant.

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?

8. The total amount of costs and expenses incurred in the action or proceeding?—

Marshal's office	-	-	-	f. 108	- st.	=	£. 7	14	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	sterling.
Secretary's office	-	-	-	322	10	=	23	-	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
Taxing officer	-	-	-	6	-	=	-	8	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
Crown advocate	-	-	-	462	-	=	33	-	-	—
Total	-	-	-	f. 898	10 st.	=	£. 64	3	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	sterling.

28th June 1830. Costs of proceedings in execution of sentence.

Marshal's office	-	-	-	f. 83	- st.	=	£. 5	18	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	sterling.
Secretary's office	-	-	-	66	-	=	4	14	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
President's office	-	-	-	12	15	=	-	18	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
Crown advocate's fees	-	-	-	138	-	=	9	17	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
Total	-	-	-	f. 299	15 st.	=	£. 21	8	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	sterling.
Total Costs to date	-	-	-	f. 1,198	5 st.	=	£. 85	11	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	sterling.

No. 18.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of criminal and civil justice.

2. When it was commenced?—January 1830.

3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, opposer, against A. Sills, defendant.

4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To prevent the passing of a transport advertised, of real property, by the said A. Sills, until security be given by him for the payment of such sum of money as the court should award in the then pending prosecution instituted against him by the Protector of Slaves, for the recovery of a fine of f. 1,400 for having punished a female slave, Frances, in violation of the 14th clause of the "Ordinance," &c.

5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—25th February 1830, this suit was called in court, when the plaintiff filed his documents, of which the defendant requested sight, and day to answer.

At the court of 29th April 1830, parties closed, and agreed to let this opposition share the fate of the action for the recovery of the fine of f. 1,400.

6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—By sentence of the court of the 30th April 1830, this opposition was declared to be just, legal and well founded; with condemnation of the defendant in the costs.

7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?

8. The total amount of costs and expenses incurred in the action or proceeding?—

Marshal's office	-	-	-	f. 69	-	=	£. 4	18	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	sterling.
Secretary's office	-	-	-	98	10	=	7	-	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
Taxing	-	-	-	3	-	=	-	4	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
Crown advocate	-	-	-	132	-	=	9	8	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	—
Total	-	-	-	f. 302	10	=	£. 21	12	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	sterling.

No. 19.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of criminal and civil justice.
2. When it was commenced?—25th February 1830.
3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by S. Cramer and M. Najpels, representatives of V. A. Heyleger, proprietor of Plantation Farm and Vreeden Rust, situate on the river Demerary, opposers, against John Barton, curator of the slave Catherine Heyleger and her son, defendant, and A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, co-defendant.
4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the purpose of preventing the execution of the act of manumission of said slave Catherine Heyleger, and her son James. The intention to carry which manumissions into effect was advertised by the Protector, at the request of said John Barton, curator, on the 22d December 1829, and was opposed by said parties on the 4th January 1830.
5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—25th February 1830, the Protector appeared in court, and observing that the original defendant, John Barton, as curator aforesaid, had taken upon himself the defence in this case, declared to make himself no party in these proceedings at this period of the case.
6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?
7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—24th June 1830, this case is in progress, and is expected to terminate during the next session of the court of this month.

No. 20.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—The commissary court.
2. When it was commenced?—27th March 1830.
3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, against N. J. M'Carty, defendant. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 23, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829, and Table (B.))
4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the recovery of a sum of *f.* 152. 7. 8. p^{ts} = 10*l.* 17*s.* 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* sterling, due by said M'Carty to the female slave Frances, belonging to Dr. Webster.
5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—27th March 1830, the necessary documents lodged in the marshal's office for service of citation.
6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—24th June 1830, the said woman Frances is now manumitted, and the above claim has been withdrawn by her from this office.
7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—24th June 1830. In consequence of the said N. J. M'Carty being placed in the colonial hospital as insane, and not being possessed of any property whatsoever, no further proceedings have taken place in this matter.

No. 21.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of criminal and civil justice.
2. When it was commenced?—24th June 1830.
3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, for and in behalf of the slave Ben William, legatee in the will of Neil Livingstone, deceased, dated 1st June 1826, against the heir or heirs, or representative or representatives of the estate of N. Livingstone, deceased, or his or their representative. (*Vide* Complaint, No. 61, with Protector's Report, dated 1st November 1829, and Table (B.))
4. The object of the action or prosecution?—For the purpose of carrying into effect the will of the testator, by procuring letters of manumission in due form for the said slave Ben William, and of obtaining certain tools bequeathed for his use.
5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—24th June 1830. The necessary documents are lodged in the marshal's office for service of citation before the court at its next session.
6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?
7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay; the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—24th June 1830. The cause of delay in proceeding with this suit has been, not having been able to obtain the necessary proofs to maintain the claim. The present owner or possessor of the said Ben William having shown a bill of sale, dated 20th December 1824, by which said Neil Livingstone, it would appear, had sold this same slave, to whom he subsequently bequeathed freedom, in his will, dated 1st June 1826. The present proceeding has been instituted against the executors as that most likely to be effective.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Report from
Protector of Slaves.

1. IN what court, or before what magistrate, the action or prosecution was commenced?—Court of Criminal and Civil Justice.
2. When it was commenced?—23d June 1830.
3. By or against whom the action or prosecution was brought?—Brought by Robert Goodfellow against S. W. Gordon, Crown Advocate and Curator for obtaining manumission, defendant, and A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, co-defendant. (*Vide* Table B.)
4. The object of the action or prosecution?—To oppose the manumission of the slave Emma.
5. The date and nature of each successive proceeding?—23d June 1830. The Crown Advocate took sight of the documents filed by the plaintiff, and day thereafter to proceed. The Protector of Slaves, as co-defendant, has joined in the defence of this suit, for and in behalf of said slave Emma.
6. If brought to a close, the result of the action or prosecution?—
7. If not brought to a close, the cause of the delay, the present state of the process, and at what time a decision may be expected?—This case is in full process, and a decision may be expected at the session of the court of this month, June.

TABLE (I.)

ACTIONS AND PROSECUTIONS DEPENDING.

1. THE number of actions or prosecutions depending and undecided?—Eleven.
2. The names of the parties plaintiffs and defendants, and of the parties prosecuting and accused, in each action or prosecution so in arrear?—
 - No. 1. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, prosecutor, v. Philida Gertzen, accused.
 - No. 2. S. W. Gordon, Crown Advocate and Curator, plaintiff, v. the heirs or representatives of Hermanus Moll, deceased, defendants.
 - No. 3. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, v. James Pyne, defendant.
 - No. 4. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, v. Damon Brotherson, defendant.
 - No. 5. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, v. F. W. De Rochemont, nom. ux. and guardian over the minor children of M. L. S. De Witt, defendant.
 - No. 6. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, v. John Knights, defendant.
 - No. 7. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, v. John William, defendant.
 - No. 8. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, prosecutor, v. Matthew Rush, accused.
 - No. 9. S. Cramer and M. Nypels, representatives of V. A. Heyleger, proprietor of Plantation Farm and Vreed en Rust, opposers, v. John Barton, Curator of the slave Catherine Heyleger and her son, defendant, and A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, co-defendant.
 - No. 10. A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, plaintiff, v. the heir or heirs, or executor or executors of the estate of Neil Livingston, deceased, or his or their representatives, defendants.
 - No. 11. Robert Goodfellow, opposer, v. S. W. Gordon, Crown Advocate and Curator for obtaining manumission, defendant, and A. W. Young, Protector of Slaves, co-defendant.
3. The cause of the delay in each case?—
 - No. 1. There is no other delay in this case than that which is caused by the forms of law. The examination of witnesses is by written interrogatories filed at every 14 days Roll Court, and so is the cross-examination by defendant, and examination of defendant's witnesses, and their cross-examination, by plaintiff. The non-appearance of a witness, therefore, under this system is oftentimes cause of great delay. There was a vacation of the courts during the months of August and September.
 - No. 2. The Protector is unable to assign any other than the general cause given above.
 - No. 3. This case has lain over, in consequence of the insolvency of the debtor, James Pyne.
 - No. 4. Has lain over, as this debtor, Damon Brotherson, free black man, cannot be found. It does not appear that he was possessed of any property, or had even a fixed place of abode in this colony.
 - No. 5. The cause of delay in this case is the same as that assigned at No. 1.
 - No. 6. This case has been brought to sentence (*vide* Table H. page 192, paragraph No. 6), but unfortunately the defendant has no property wherewith to satisfy it. The expenses (*see* Table H. page 192, paragraph No. 8.) have already more than quadrupled the original debt, and further proceedings under the defendant's present circumstances would only increase them, and entail on the colony an expense without benefit to the plaintiff.
 - No. 7. The prosecution of this suit has been deferred in consequence of this debtor being a pauper.
 - No. 8. The only delay in this case is that occasioned by the forms of law given at No. 1.
 - No. 9. The same as No. 8.
 - No. 10. The cause of delay in this case is given at paragraph No. 7, page 197, Table H. The case is now in full progress.
 - No. 11. At the session of the court of June, the plaintiff and opposer requested stay, in order that an accountant might prepare a statement of the boedel of Mrs. Van Marckwyk, deceased, for the information of the court, which request was granted.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

THE cases contained in the present Report were necessarily conducted according to the old law, but the advantage of the law regarding slaves, as it now exists, are very great, for the protracted forms of the ordinary process, previous to its promulgation, have been superseded by a mode of prosecution ensuring greater expedition in arriving at a conclusion with less expense to all parties, whilst the merits of the case may be satisfactorily ascertained by means of evidence elicited, not on written interrogatories, but by *vivá voce* examination in open court.

These advantages are provided for in that portion of the present law which emanated from the Colonial Legislature, on the Protector's proposition contained in his letter of the 3d March last, addressed to his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor.

The deficiencies of the present law cannot be ascertained on so short an experience of its effects.

The inconvenience of it to the slaves consists in their being prohibited from labour on their own account on the Sunday, and being thus deprived of their, perhaps, sole opportunity of acquiring property.

The moral condition of the slave is to be improved by a religious observance of the Sabbath; at present the Protector is not aware that this effect has been accelerated by the prohibition of labour during the whole of the Sunday.

Demerara.
Sworn before me, this 24th July 1830.

A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

B. D'Urban, Lieut. Governor.

Office of Protector of Slaves, 15th May 1830.

NOTICE.—In obedience to the orders contained in the 4th clause of his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor's Proclamation, bearing the date the 29th of April 1830, I hereby fix

One bit ($4\frac{1}{7}d.$ sterling) per hour, for potting sugar;
One bit - (ditto) - per hour, for turning and drying coffee or cotton;
Picking a basket of coffee, weighing 70lbs. gross, three bits ($1s. 0\frac{2}{7}d.$ sterling);
Picking a basket of cotton, weighing 30lbs. gross, three bits ($1s. 0\frac{1}{7}d.$ sterling);

to be the lowest rate of wages for labour on Sunday in the above works.

(signed) A. W. Young,
Protector of Slaves.

The above is a copy of the Advertisement inserted in the Gazette of the Colony.

A. W. Young, P. S.

N^o 7.CIRCULAR DESPATCH from Secretary Sir *George Murray* to the
Governors of the Crown Colonies.

PART I.

DEMEBARA.

Correspondence.

SIR,

Downing-street, 7th October 1830.

IT is desirable that the Protectors Reports for all the Crown Colonies should be susceptible of accurate comparison with each other, and for this purpose it is necessary that they should embrace the same half-yearly periods. In future therefore the Protector for the Colony under your government will commence his Report for the first half-year of each year on the 1st of January, and that for the succeeding half-year on the 1st of July. A separate Report must be made for any broken period which may occur in adopting this arrangement instead of the present. You will have the goodness to issue such directions or regulations as may be necessary to carry this Instruction into effect, and the requisite blank books will accompany this Despatch.

I have, &c.

The Officer administering the Government,
&c. &c. &c.

(signed) *G. Murray.*N^o 8.DESPATCH from Viscount *Goderich* to Sir *B. D'Urban*, K. C. B.
&c. &c. &c.

SIR,

Downing-street, 18th February 1831.

I HAVE had the honour to receive your Despatch of the 26th of July last, covering the Report of the Protector of Slaves for the six months ending the 30th April 1830.

It appears by the Table (A.) in which is comprised an Abstract of all punishments inflicted by the domestic authority of the owner, that the Total number of such Punishments has equalled about one-seventh of the whole number of Slaves comprised in this return. While I acknowledge with satisfaction the diminution which has recently taken place in the number of such punishments, I cannot but notice the very great difference in the proportion which they bear to the number of Slaves on various estates. On the estates Eendragt, Lusignan and New Tyle, the proportion is respectively 292 punishments in 464 Slaves, 188 in 439 and 57 in 95. I cannot, of course, from the mere statement that such has been the number of punishments inflicted, judge whether it proceeds from an undue severity on the part of the manager, or from an unfortunate spirit of insubordination in the Slaves; but I cannot forbear the expression of my regret that it should have been considered necessary to inflict punishments amounting in some instances to more than one-half of the whole number of Slaves on the estate. I have noticed with great satisfaction, the small number of punishments which have taken place on estate Golden Fleece, which is under the management of Mr. Bishop, viz. 2 in 444, and also the circumstance, that in fifty-two gangs, comprising a total of 1,107 Slaves, none whatever have been required.

Among the Crimes punished by the domestic authority of the owner I observe, that there have been, one attempt to poison, two rapes, and one attempt to ravish, and ten stabbings, or attempts to stab. My predecessor has already called your attention to this subject in his Despatch of the 2d September 1829, in which he observes, that "it is obvious that crimes of this nature should be punished by the Court of Justice, not by the domestic authority of the Owner;" and he desired the Protector to report what steps he had taken in the cases mentioned in that Despatch. The Protector has stated in answer, that the constitution of his office does not allow him to interfere for the purpose of procuring a greater severity in the punishment of the crimes of Slaves, than the owner may be disposed to inflict by his domestic authority. In this opinion I concur, but I cannot at the same time forget, that the permanent interests of the Slave population, no less than the claims of public justice require, that crimes of so grave a nature should not be visited

visited merely by an informal and domestic punishment. You will, therefore, with the advice of your Council, take such measures as your local knowledge may suggest for discountenancing this practice, and for bringing before the established Tribunals of the Colony any Slave who may hereafter be guilty of crimes of this serious description.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Correspondence.

The result of the claim of Susan Rogers for a debt of £.42 sterling, is stated to be, that it was placed in the hands of the Crown Advocate to sue for; but no action had then been instituted because the debtor was notoriously and desperately insolvent. The Protector must understand, that the acquiescence of the slave is an indispensable condition to the relinquishment of an action on grounds of this nature.

p. 138.

The complaint of Fanny, belonging to Sally Seward, was, that she had been tied both hands and feet, laid down and flogged with a horsewhip, by order of her mistress, for not having found and brought back a boy who had run away, and in search of whom she had been sent. This complaint was corroborated by two witnesses, from whose evidence, and the admission of the accused, it further appeared, that the Complainant had been put in the stocks for two days and two nights before the flogging, and that both these punishments were for the same offence, which was another violation of the law. The owner did not deny that she had caused the woman to be flogged, and only alleged that the punishment had been slight, and that the slave had not been tied; in which latter circumstance she was contradicted by the woman whom she had employed to inflict the punishment; yet the only result of the case is, that the Protector, not thinking it expedient to institute a prosecution, cautions the owner not to repeat the offence. I am at a loss to discover by what authority the Protector thought himself empowered to decline instituting this prosecution; and the reasons which he has alleged for so doing, appear to me to be far from satisfactory. He says that the chief object of the complaint was to prevent a repetition of similar punishment on the Complainant, who stated that to be her object when she preferred the complaint. Even supposing this to have been the only desire of the Complainant, the duty of the Protector was not only, or mainly, to satisfy the Complainant; but also to vindicate the law, and show that it could not be broken by any one with impunity. The allegation that the flogging was slight, rests merely upon the evidence of the woman who ordered the flogging, and the other who inflicted it; you will, therefore, direct the Protector to re-consider this case, with a view to the prosecution of the defendant, should such a measure be still in his power; and you will caution him against assuming in future an authority to remit the exaction of fines which have been incurred by a contravention of the provisions of the Slave Ordinance.

p. 149.

The Complaints of John, Bristo, and Colon, appear to have been dismissed on the mere counter-allegation of their owner, Mr. De Ryk, without requiring any of the documentary or other evidence which he tendered, to be produced. I take this opportunity of observing, that in no case can the unsupported contradiction of the defendant be taken as a satisfactory disproof of the charge preferred.

p. 151.

The Protector dismisses the complaint preferred by the slave Ellen, in behalf of her daughter Harriet, and informs her, that as soon as her daughter shall have paid to Mr. Cramer the sum of *f.* 280, which is stated to be due to him, that gentleman will apply for her manumission. I cannot agree in the view taken of this case by Colonel Young. A sum of *f.* 800 had been bequeathed to the slave Harriet, towards the purchase of her freedom, by Mr. Ouckama, who died in 1825. It is clear that this sum is insufficient for the purpose, ought to have been placed at interest in the Savings Bank until it should have amounted to the sum required. But I find that instead of adopting this course, Mr. Cramer, the executor to Mr. Ouckama, purchased the slave Harriett, for the sum of *f.* 1000, having himself received the legacy of *f.* 800 due to her, and has not yet applied for her manumission on account of the surplus of *f.* 200 still unrepaid to him; to which is to be added the taxes on her price due to the Vendue Office and the Poor's Fund, amounting to 80*f.* and making in all a sum of *f.* 280. The prayer of the Petitioner is, that her daughter may be liberated, and her services to Mr. Cramer considered as a liquidation of this sum. Without entering into the question how far Mr. Cramer may have availed himself of the services of the slave Harriet, I cannot allow that, having some years since received the legacy of

p. 154.

PART I.

DEMERARA.

Correspondence.

of *f.* 800 belonging to the slave, he should still forbear to apply for her manumission on the ground of the surplus of her purchase money due to him; you will therefore direct the Protector to apprise him, that unless he shall consent to forego the claim which he considers himself to have upon the Slave Harriet, he will be called upon to refund to her the legacy bequeathed her by the late Mr. Ouckama, with the interest thereupon accruing up to the present time. If the sum which shall thus come into the hands of the slave shall appear to be sufficient to purchase her freedom, under the compulsory Manumission Clause, the Protector will cause an appraisal of her to be forthwith made, and the money to be so applied; but if it should appear to be insufficient he will cause it to be deposited in the Savings Bank, there to bear interest until it shall amount to the sum necessary to procure her manumission.

p. 158. By the complaint of the boy Charles, it appears, that although by the will of his master, who died in 1824, he was directed to be purchased from slavery, yet he was still unredeemed in the year 1829; and it was not until an application was made to the Protector, that steps were taken for ensuring his manumission. I shall have occasion, in the course of this Despatch, to advert frequently to the inattention to the provisions of wills which seems to prevail in Demerara; and I shall suggest such a Plan as appears to me calculated to meet the deficiency in the existing law.

pp. 158, 159,
&c. I have remarked, in one or two instances, that complaints have been preferred to the Protector, against free persons for harbouring runaway Slaves. I am unable to discover upon what grounds such complaints are considered as within the province of the Protector of Slaves; nor am I aware that the order by which his office is established, gives him any authority to punish the offence of harbouring runaway Slaves.

p. 161. With respect to the complaint of the Slave Tom, of having been flogged unjustly, which is dismissed on the mere contradiction of it by the parties accused, I must repeat the remark which I made at the commencement of this Despatch, that such evidence alone cannot be considered as a refutation of the charge.

p. 164. The case of the Slave Emma affords a strong exemplification of the carelessness to which I have already adverted, in the execution of wills. This Slave states, that she was left by her owner, Mrs. Warnecke, who died in 1820, to her son during his life-time, but he was on no account to sell her. The will is produced, and fully corroborates the statement of the Slave. Mr. Warnecke, however, being in want of money, and his mother's executor having refused to apply to the Court of Justice for permission for this sale, sold the Slave without permission in the year 1821. An action is in progress for declaring the Slave free by the act of sale contrary to the provisions of the will. Even should this action result in favour of the freedom of the Slave, I cannot but view with serious disapprobation the conduct, in this instance, of Mr. Warnecke. Had that gentleman died, there is no ground to conclude that the Slave would have thereby acquired the freedom to which she would have been entitled, since she had passed into the possession of a third owner, who does not appear to have been aware of the facts of the case. Nor can I approve the conduct of Mr. Van Wyk, the executor, since, though aware of the injustice which had been committed, he took no steps whatever to remedy it.

p. 165. The Slave, Sprightly, complains that he was flogged for throwing his plantains down at the door of Mr. Odwin (manager of the estate to which he belongs,) they being of bad quality, and for complaining that the gang had not received the usual supply of blankets. Mr. Odwin admitted that the plantains were of an inferior quality, and that the supply of blankets was in arrear; but alleged that they would be issued in the ensuing June (this complaint was made in February); but he asserts that the Slave was punished, not for rejecting the plantains, but for insubordination and insolence. Supposing, therefore, that the flogging was merited by some serious act of insubordination on the part of the Slave, still Mr. Odwin cannot be acquitted of blame, when his own admission of the badness of the food of his Slaves, and the neglect in supplying them with blankets, is considered. If the laws of Demerara have not denounced a penalty against such neglect, the consequent entire dependence of the Slave on the humanity of his master ought to have held out to Mr. Odwin a strong motive for exactitude.

Mr. Tonge

Mr. Tonge prefers a complaint on behalf of the slave Jane, belonging to Miss Neil, to the effect that, "on the 22d February 1830, a female slave, apparently, much above the age of 10, was severely punished by flogging, in the house of Miss Neil, which is next to his."—His statement is corroborated by Mr. Levy, who asserts, that "he was at Mr. Tonge's on business, and heard a cry and beating with a horse-whip in the adjoining house; was desired by Mr. Tonge to look out of the window, did so, and saw a girl running out almost naked, and a coloured woman following, and beating her with a whip. - - - Witness knows nothing of the parties; could not identify the woman who was beating, but could the Slave, from her having swelled legs; she was a mulatto girl, and was from her appearance about 20 years of age: from the report of the whip supposes it was a horse-whip; supposes from the report of the heavy lashes that the girl would be marked; is certain she was a mulatto girl, with swelled legs."—On the appearance of Jane, Mr. Levy was unable to identify her further than by her being a mulatto, and having swelled legs. On the other hand, it appears that there is no other mulatto girl belonging to Miss Neill; that the Protector's servants, who examined Jane, were unable to discover any traces of the severe beating said to have been inflicted; that the girl herself states, that she only received three lashes over her clothes, with a child's whip: that the sister and mother of the defendant depose to the same, and that it is stated that the complaint has been brought forward through spite, on account of some comments made by the defendant upon Mr. Tonge's conduct in the case of M. A. Sealy. Whatever credit may attach to the assertions of Mr. Tonge, I cannot but observe that the evidence of Mr. Levy is of importance, because he is the only person who seems uninterested in the event, except as an acquaintance of Mr. Tonge.—The Protector dismisses the case, with a caution to Jane Neil and the others against using such a punishment again, even in the slightest degree, towards the slave Jane. If, however, entire credit be due to the assertion of the Neils, some motive must be presumed for the false testimony of Levy. Yet I have been unable to discover the trace of any such. The testimony on either side appears to have been inconclusive; and I must regret that the Protector did not attempt to obtain some impartial evidence, and that he did not at all events exact the fine which appears to have been incurred even upon the case as it stood.

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Correspondence.

p. 168.

The Assistant Protector of the West Coast of Essequibo, transmits the complaint of the slave Maria, the property of Mr. Easton, against Kitty, a free coloured woman, his housekeeper, for beating her severely in a fit of jealousy. The assault is admitted by Kitty Easton, who says that she "intended to have well bruised complainant's mouth with the shingle, but was prevented by complainant's hands and arms."—The proceedings taken upon the complaint are stated as follows:—

Appendix,
 p. 181.

"29 December.—This complaint was, by the advice of the Crown Advocate, referred to his Honor the First Fiscal. It appearing that complainant was neither the property of, nor was she legally under the control of said Kitty Easton; the case therefore coming under the 12th Article of the Regulations for the treatment of Servants and Slaves, and being consequently more properly cognizable by the Fiscal than by the Protector."

By a subsequent correspondence between the Protector and Assistant Protector, it appears that the Slave is employed in field-labour on a coffee and plantain plantation, the residence of W. Easton; and the case with this explanation is finally referred to the Fiscal; "it appearing that it does not come within the provisions of the Ordinance for the religious instruction of Slaves, and that a prosecution by the Protector in virtue of such Ordinance, cannot be supported." The result of the proceedings is an answer from the Fiscal, to the following effect: "I have consulted with Mr. Gordon your legal adviser, upon the case of the Slave Maria, referred by you to me, and as we are both of opinion that under the circumstances, it is not a case for the consideration of the court, I have caused information to be transmitted to the owner, through the Deputy Fiscal, which we think will be sufficient to protect the Slave against the recurrence of the Act complained of." Mr. Herbert has not explained upon what grounds he thinks this "not a case for the consideration of the Court;" if however it be from any doubt of a Slave's competency, under the existing laws, to maintain an action

PART I.
 DEMERARA.
 Correspondence.

action of assault against a person not his owner, you will lose no time in calling upon him to propose such a remedy for this state of the law, as his experience may suggest. I cannot but view with distrust, a state of things in which the Slave has no other protection than what the general feeling of the community, or the influence of his master, may afford him; since it is obvious that cases may arise, (of which the present is one) in which, although the Slave might experience unjust and cruel treatment, the master would feel little inclination to interfere.

In a former part of my Despatch I have informed you, that I should suggest a provision to meet the existing deficiency in the law, in regard to the fulfilment of bequests in favour of Slaves. In the Slave Ordinance enacted in the Island of Mauritius in the year 1829, I find a clause inserted apparently with a view to the occurrence of cases similar to what I have already noticed in this Despatch. By that clause it is provided, under a penalty, that every person who in the capacity either of attorney or executor or administrator of a will, should come to the knowledge of any provision in favour of a Slave, should be bound to inform the Protector of it within fourteen days. You will suggest to the Court of Policy, the propriety of enacting a provision of this nature, to put a stop to the disregard which now prevails on the subject, and which tends considerably to neutralize the benevolent intentions of testators.

Table (C.) in which ought to be stated "the Number of Cases in which Slaves have been employed to labour on Sunday in works of necessity, and the conditions upon which such labour has been performed," is not filled up, nor is any explanation given of the reasons of the omission.

p. 186. I regret to observe by Table (D.) that in the large Slave population of Demerara no more than four Marriages have been celebrated during the period comprised in this Report.

p. 188. By Table (F.) it appears, that the number of Manumissions effected with the consent of the owners, during the half year, was 112; the decrease since the preceding half year being nine. The average price paid for manumissions by purchase was £. 72 sterling. The Tables of compulsory manumissions are not filled up; but I conclude this arises from the short period during which the compulsory manumission clause had been in force at the time of closing this return.

p. 189. Among the actions comprised in Table (H.) in which the Protector has been engaged on behalf of Slaves, I observe, that proceedings for recovery of a Fine of £. 15. 14s. 3d. sterling imposed for improperly punishing his Slave, are not instituted against A. Simpson, because he has absconded; no reason, however, is stated for not seizing the Slave in satisfaction of the penalty.

p. 199. In his "General Observations" on the new Slave Ordinance, Colonel Young remarks, that "the inconvenience of it to the Slaves consists, in their being prohibited from labour on their own account on Sunday, and being thus deprived of their, perhaps, sole opportunity of acquiring property." I am not aware to what clause in the Order in Council the Protector alludes in this remark; it has been thought necessary to guard in the most positive manner against any abuse of authority by the Owner in regard to labour on Sunday; but I do not find in any part of the order a provision which would bear the interpretation put upon it by Colonel Young.

As the principle for fixing the Rate of Wages for labour on Sunday, was so fully explained in Sir G. Murray's Despatch of the 2d November 1829, I conclude that Colonel Young has followed the rule there laid down in his present scale. This, however, is a subject to which I would beg your own peculiar supervision, since it is evident, that whatever benefits may result from the comments of the Secretary of State can have reference only to a future arrangement, but are incapable of correcting a mistake at its origin. Your local knowledge, also, will give you an advantage in this matter, which can be enjoyed only by persons actually on the spot.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Goderich.*

PROTECTORS OF SLAVES REPORTS.

COPIES OF REPORTS

FROM THE

PROTECTORS OF SLAVES

IN THE

COLONIES of *Demerara, Berbice, Trinidad,*
St. Lucia, the Cape of Good Hope and
Mauritius.

PART I.—DEMERARA.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
10 March 1831.
