

capacity for undertaking difficult pieces of work. In one of these his name is even given in the Iroquois form.

What is there to be said as to Mesplet's character and disposition? Shall we accept Laterrière's estimate as conclusive and draw no other deductions? This estimate seems hardly fair. We must remember that it was formed under most unfavourable circumstances. Mesplet was in close confinement under which, being used to work, he chafed. Then there was Jautard's evil influence which, with enforced idleness and drink, would in many cases debase the sweetest disposition. That he did reform after his liberation is proved by the fact that he broke away from Jautard's influence and was received into the bosom of the church. That he was untruthful and ungrateful, or, to put it mildly, made promises he was unable to fulfil, is amply proved by his action in regard to his promise to abstain from all controversial subjects in his *Gazette Littéraire*, in his neglect to meet his bonds when due, and in his treatment of his friend Berger. The debt due the latter was altogether ignored, notwithstanding his many acts of kindness. In this Mesplet was most ungrateful. Another indication of his untruthfulness is the immoderate language used in his appeal to Congress, and this too, after settling down as a British subject, in which he claims that the ill-treatment at the hands of the Loyalists, whom he calls "Canaille," because of his sympathy with the cause of the united "did him honour." But Laterrière's assertion is not true; that he was actuated by "an evil genius, which, but for the softening influence of his wife, would have led him to commit many wrong things unworthy of an honest man."

From Cramahé's letter to Haldimand,¹ which states "when our printer has a cup too much, which is not seldom," coupled with Laterrière's account of the drinking bout every afternoon, we are forced to the conclusion that Mesplet's besetting sin was drunkenness and to this should be attributed his utter financial failure; nevertheless, he must have had some good qualities to secure the patronage he did and some attractiveness of manner to obtain loans and other financial help through all his business career.

While he had a fair education and was a most intelligent workman we may conclude with Laterrière that he lacked refinement and culture. The whole tone of his memorial to Congress, one of the few examples of his own composition we possess, bears this out.² The use of the expression "ces animeaux"—*these beasts*—stamps him as of a rather low nature—*grossière*—as the French would express it.

¹ See appendix C No. 10.

² See appendix D No. 33.