

such an allegation, having any regard for my character, I certainly should not be content to lie; especially having, as I am glad to say I have, abundant material for repelling it.

The indictment of mis-stating and misrepresenting facts which Mr. Scott lays against me, contains several counts, which I will take up in their order:

(1) That I have not quoted M. Dupin with sufficient fullness, so as to make his whole argument as clear as Mr. Scott thinks it should be made. This is the substance of a long paragraph in my opponent's letter. But here, let me remark, M. Dupin was the Seminary's lawyer, and employed by them to neutralize the effect of their failure in the Fleming appeal case, on the English government. In the greater part of Mr. Dupin's pleading, I, no more than the English law-officers, as expressed by them subsequently, have no concurrence. In some one or two things I agree with him fully, especially the one to which my quotation—only partially supplied by Mr. Scott—refers, viz., "That the Associates, as a society, was composed of many individuals, priests as well as laymen, for the conversion of the Indians of New France." And that the royal assent was given to the concession of their rights to the Seminary, "for the promotion and in consideration of the conversion of the Indians in New France, the whole was consecrated to this work; and even in case of excess or increase of revenue, such excess or increase was to be employed in like manner." Now, did not M. Dupin use these words? Is he wrongly quoted here? Mr. Scott will not say he is. What, if other objects are stated by M. Dupin, which serve to show that a settlement of French emigrants also was contemplated with the above, is not the fact plain for any one to see that the interests of the Indians was a leading consideration in the grants?

(2) The second count is a misleading statement concerning the articles of capitulation, by saying the 35th Art. "was first reserved for the King's consent and then subsequently disallowed." This statement, Mr. Scott says, "is simply the outcome of a fertile imagination," for the 35th Art., he avers, "was

ne
a
mi
wi
fo
be
or
ar
wi
Ri
of
th
th
Ju
in
gr
fo
m
w
Se
of
le
th
as
Se

A
de
na
C
ar
oc
G
ar
no
m