

to which he did go, and that distance is "within five hundred yards thereof."

Now Judge Stuart is not the man to look at plans affecting the rights of parties, as a little girl gazes at Punch and Judy in a puppet show. He doubtless stretched the legs of a divider over the plans of which you speak; he thus found that 500 yards extended to low water mark, a distance of 200 yards from the mouth of the river. If Lambly's evidence in reference to the distance, was correct, he never had even entered the river Beauport, but, as he said that he had entered it, we will suppose the judge to have made an allowance of half the distance. This is certainly doing a great deal for Lambly. Lambly then, who admits that he had "*never* been as high up as the mill," may be supposed to have entered the river (as he says, in a boat) as far as a spot situated some 250 yards below the mill. Now, between that spot and the mill, there is, as you know, a sharp angle or turn in the river, making it quite impossible that Lambly could have ever seen the "locality" as you call it. The edifice which you have thus erected upon the evidence of Lambly, is demolished by reference to the plans.

But, incapable of yielding, you will require more demonstration. Lambly says from that point (at 500 yards) "he could see the mill and both sides of the river." "Now let us look at the plans;" Lambly never could have seen both sides of the river at the locality, nor indeed either side, at 500 yards or even at 250 yards. What would you think of a tailor who should undertake to furnish you with a nether garment without taking your measure? Had you in your judicial capacity in a suit involving thousands, measured the spot as you would expect a poor tailor to do you in a suit of no kind of importance, you would have ascertained that no confidence could be reposed in the evidence of Lambly; I make this remark without impeaching his character, and solely because he had reached an age before which "Swift had become a driveller and a show."

Permit me to submit another view of the subject.

In your contrast between a skiff of the very smallest size, and a schooner, you intend to exhibit on the one hand exiguity, on the other, bulk. You define, it is true, only the skiff, but you expect the imagination to do the rest. This is your