

ing your purchase did not turn out as profitable as you expected, when you declare under oath that you purchased the shares for the purpose of selling them at a high figure? I defy you to bring forth a single fact which can justify your attacks against this Company or any of its officers. If you have any quarrels to settle with those who sold you the stock, you are not justifiable in calling the officers of the Company to account for them—the more so when you exchanged for those shares mortgaged property, and obtained for them a high figure.

In reply to your remarks on the judgment rendered, I have not in my letter said anything reflecting in any way on the Court; simply, that I hoped the judgment would be reversed. This remark is quite natural, since the case is in appeal.

As to the Senators, I did not say the half of what I wanted to. These gentlemen did not scruple to accuse us of fraud, and that simple on the strength of Mr. Lighthall's assertions. And some of these gentlemen—I refer to the Honourable Messrs. Vidal, Campbell and Bottsford were compelled to amend their report in the open Senate, and acknowledge, peremptorily, the falseness of their accusation, and admit that they had no grounds for the rashness of their remarks. But this admission they made only on the representations of the Hon. Messrs. Bellerose, Trudel and Miller, and we sincerely thank the latter for the manliness they displayed on this occasion.

Why, Mr. Editor, do these Honourable Senators espouse the cause of Mr. Lighthall? Surely not on constitutional grounds. The Bill was a private one, which had been fully heard, discussed and commented upon in the House of Commons, and passed by it after having gone through all its readings.

I cannot account for it otherwise than by the remark made by Mr. Lighthall, before leaving for Ottawa, that he knew of a certain Senator, a friend of his, in Montreal, who