

would appear to be a vested right in every human being namely, if he wants to say anything, to let him say it. The objection that it would induce perjury does not require serious refutation, for the immediate corollary to such a proposition would invalidate fully half the evidence now given in Court.

I have just shown this to a gentleman whose judgment every one respects, and handed him the documents alluded to for him to examine. He says I have quoted them perfectly accurately—the \$238 paid Mr. McGibbon, he points out, carries interest by the deed, and he says that, notwithstanding my natural desire to avoid further allusion to my own particular case than would explain the great principle I am contending for, I might legitimately have pointed out the inevitable position Mr. McGibbon's own statements land him in, from which no human logic can extricate him. If I had been unsuccessful, my untaxed costs, consisting of travelling on eight occasions to St. Hyacinthe, and fees to Lawyers other than those on the record, would have been swelled by my taxed costs of about \$150, and Morgan's costs also of probably as much; but all this he says he would have shared. As however through my suit he received his claim in full at the same hour that I received my own, with all expenses he himself even pretends he was ever put to, indeed a simple sum in addition would indicate a trifle more, he considers that this releases him from sharing in the costs of the suit!

ALFRED RIMMER.