

trifling in the extreme—the road was improved at the public expense, and it was the occupants of the houses, who constructed the same at their own cost. Had the Inspector General, (Mr. Primrose,) of the Domaine, and the Surveyor General, been deputed as they were, *in a similar case of John Reynar*, a Lessee of Your Memorialists, in the year 1834, who set up a claim precisely such as Laporte's, to have ascertained what outlay had been made by Mr. Laporte, a report more unfavourable to that person's allegations would have been made, than was, in Mr. Reynar's, whose claim was entirely set aside by the then Governor in Chief and Executive Council of Lower Canada, *and Your Memorialists maintained in their rights.*

That the Crown having been by surprise led to promise a lease to Laporte on certain conditions, ~~cannot~~ in justice be considered as binding when the vested rights of a party, such as those of Your Memorialists were affected thereby. It has been matter of continued occurrence that Reports of Council similarly obtained have been set aside by the Government.

3rd.—The Messrs. Fraser, when they purchased from Your Memorialists, had, as they still have the strongest ground to believe, that their title was good, and the decision in Appeal has shown, that, *that belief to a very great extent was not unfounded, a large portion of the property being declared to belong to Your Memorialists*, and it would be hard indeed to visit Your Memorialists with an act of undue severity, for doing that which was not illegal, and to the competency of the doing of which, no objection in fairness can be raised.

4th.—The recommendation that Jean Baptiste Laporte should be permitted to purchase all the ground belonging to the Crown *without reference to the boundary*, but that to avoid all further intervention of the Crown in the matter of litigation, the pro-