

To the Honorable the Speaker and Honorable Members of the  
House of Commons of Canada :

The Petition of Thomas W. Chesley, of Granville, in the County of  
Annapolis, Nova Scotia, Barrister-at-Law, respectfully sheweth  
to your Honorable House as follows :

1. That a judgment of two thousand dollars, and costs to the amount of six hundred dollars, in favor of the Government was several years ago entered against your Honors' petitioner, on a fraudulent Bond to the Government, the penalty of which the late lamented Sir John Thompson, knowing the facts, did on two several occasions, as Minister of Justice, declare to your petitioner that he would never be called upon to pay, but which said judgment is up to this time a ruinous encumbrance on petitioner's real estate.
2. That up to the lamented decease of Sir John his pledge was inviolably kept, and petitioner was never asked to pay a dollar.
3. That since the decease of Sir John, petitioner made a formal application to His Excellency-in-Council to be formally released from liability, and his real estate released from the encumbrance of said judgment.
4. That petitioner's application has been refused, on the sole ground of the report of the present Honorable Minister of Justice, "that no Parliamentary authority exists to authorise the granting of petitioner's application," wherefore petitioner is driven to the course of petitioning your Honorable House, in the interest of common justice toward petitioner, for relief by such action of your Parliament as may seem mete to effect the relief for which petitioner prays.
5. The singular train of facts and circumstances which have resulted in the threatened financial ruin of your Honors' petitioner at the advanced of eighty-one years and his wife at the age of seventy-seven years, and a recently issued execution by a Government solicitor for the sum of three thousand and five hundred dollars or thereabouts, in the hands of the sheriff, pending the action of your Honorable House, are briefly as follows, and to which petitioner craves the kind consideration of your Honors' Parliament :—
  1. That on or about the 21st day of January, 1881, your petitioner was solicited by H. D. Van Blarcom, then Savings Bank Officer at Annapolis, and also Post-master, to consent to be a surety on his bond to the Government to the extent of five hundred dollars only, which petitioner consented to do, on the mistaken and erroneous belief that Van Blarcom's Savings Bank accounts and the records of his office had been regularly inspected as the law required, and the administration of his office correct, and no defalcations existing; *and which aforesaid account of \$5000 I offered the*
  2. That Van Blarcom thereupon produced a blank form of bond with a blank form of affidavit annexed to it, and solicited petitioner to simply place his signature to each, which he did, but affixed no seal to the bond, knowing that both papers were legally void, until he affixed his seal to the bond or authorised it to be done, and sworn to the truth of the affidavit of justification after the blanks were filled in.
  3. That within the space of a few minutes thereafter, and the blanks not written in and no seals affixed nor Van Blarcom's or Delap's signatures on the paper, I simply acknowledged my signature before Samuel Hall a post clerk as a witness, saying: "Mr. Hall that is my signature," and at once took passage on the train for my home 18 miles away.
  4. That your Honors' petition never saw either of the said papers afterwards, until about three months thereafter, Van Blarcom having absconded a defaulter for about thirteen thousand dollars as Mr. Anderson of the head office informed me when the bond in a completed state was shown me with the signatures of Laurence Delap and Van Blarcom to it, and a seal opposite each signature including my own, with the affidavit I had signed in blank properly filled out, including the jurat, and the signature of A. W. Corbitt a magistrate affixed to the jurat, falsely certifying petitioner had sworn to it before him, which deceptive act of Corbitt enabled Van Blarcom to prevent petitioner detecting his fraud in filling out the blank form of bond with a penalty of \$2,000.00.
  5. That on being called upon to pay the fraudulent penalty, petitioner denied liability, was sued for it, defended the action, recovered judgment on the trial, and likewise on the argument of the appeal taken out by the Government solicitor to the Supreme Court of this Province sitting *in banco*, when he again recovered judgment.

*Secretary of the Government to pay and to defalcation by at my hand of my refusal  
and I have been compelled to wear the coat of my father with the extent of my own  
besides that my wife must have been to let her hand of my and amounting at \$4000  
not time to about \$3500.00*