

not one of their Lordships who sat on the argument, as I verily believe, had the least knowledge of my personal character either professionally or personally, and by a reference to their Lordships published judgment touching the case I have the cruel mortification to learn that my uncontradicted testimony on the trial was totally discredited by their Lordships, and as a consequence the appeal was sustained, the judgments of both courts in my favor in my native province reversed, and a final judgment pronounced against me for \$2,000 00 and costs. Whereas, if my uncontradicted testimony at the trial had been regarded by their Lordships as absolutely verity, it now appears that the appeal would have been dismissed on both questions in relation to the absence of seals and the forged jurat to the alleged affidavit annexed to the alleged bond. I am, as to the unfavorable result of the argument in my absence, driven to the conclusion that the circumstances connected with the facts I had stated in my evidence at the trial, could not have been pressed or mentioned by my counsel at the argument, as I observe on reading over the published judgments of one or more of their Lordships. His Lordship Justice Strong says in his judgment:—"I proceed entirely on the weight of testimony * * * the mere denial and statements of the defendant, the party interested, and without the least circumstance confirming it * * *." And His Lordship Justice Gwynne says:—"Van Blarcom followed him (meaning myself) immediately to the train" (viz. after I had placed my signature to the blank form of a bond) "I can entertain no doubt that Van Blarcom had in the meantime filled in the blanks in the instrument and made it perfect." * * * His Lordship Justice Patterson says:—"The Statute required the bond to be proved * * * and also required every surety to make an affidavit of justification in the form given * * * a Deed executed