

No. I.

*Letter from Lieut. Colonel GLEGG, Secretary to His Excellency Lord AYLMER, Administrator of the Government, to JAMES STUART, Esqr. His Majesty's Attorney General.*

CASTLE OF ST. LEWIS,  
Quebec, 23d December, 1830.

SIR,

I have received the Commands of His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, to acquaint you, that he has received a Petition from William Lampson, Esquire, in which it is stated, he is engaged in a Law suit respecting the Boundary of the Seigniorly of *Mille Vaches*, adjoining the territory of the King's Posts of which he is the Lessee, in which Law suit, as he states, the interests of the Crown are identified with his own.

His Lordship desires me to observe, that he would naturally have referred this Petition to you for your opinion, in regard to certain questions of Law, which it involves; but Mr. Lampson having stated, that you are retained as Counsel to the party opposed to him in this cause, His Lordship, before referring to you the Petition in question, requests to be informed, whether the assertion of Mr. Lampson, of your being retained by the opposite party is correct, and whether in your opinion, the interests of the Crown are identified with those of Mr. Lampson, as stated by him in his Petition.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

(Signed) J. B. GLEGG, Secy.

*Honble. James Stuart, Attorney-General.*

True Copy, J. STUART.

---

No. II.

*Letter from JAMES STUART, Esquire, His Majesty's Attorney General, to Lieut. Colonel GLEGG, Secretary, &c.*

Quebec, 24th December, 1831.

SIR,

I have been honored with the Commands of His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, signified in your letter of the 23d instant, in which His Lordship refers to a Petition from Mr. Lampson, wherein it is stated, that he is engaged in a law suit respecting the Boundary of the Seigniorly of *Mille Vaches*, in which law suit, as he states, the interests of the Crown are identified with his own, and wherein it is also stated, that I am retained as Counsel by the party opposed to him; whereupon His Lordship has been pleased to require me to report, for his information, whether the assertion of Mr. Lampson of my being retained by the opposite party is correct, and whether, in my opinion, the interests of the Crown are identified with those of Mr. Lampson, as stated by him in his Petition.

In obedience to His Lordship's Commands, I have the honour to state, that the duty of the office of Attorney General, which I have the honour of holding, necessarily, precludes me from taking any retainer to support the interests of individuals, in opposition to, or inconsistent with, those of the Crown; and I have not therefore, become, nor could be, retained by any party adverse to Mr. Lampson, to oppose, or question, interests in him, which are identified with those of the Crown.

The case to which Mr. Lampson, I presume, refers, and which it has been erroneously supposed by him furnishes ground for his assertion, is a possessory action, called in the French law an action "*de Réintégrande*" (being the *Interdictum unde vi* of the Roman law) recently brought by me for the Hudson's Bay Company against Mr. Lampson and his servants, for having with force and arms entered upon a piece of land which then was, and during a long period previously had been, in the peaceable possession of the Hudson's Bay Company, as Lessees of the Seigniorly of "*Mille Vaches*,"—for having expelled therefrom the servants of that Company,—for having commenced the erection of, and erected, a house, buildings, and fence thereon,—and for having since forcibly retained possession thereof, &c. This action turns exclusively on the alleged fact of possession in the Hudson's Bay Company, at the time of the trespass complained of, without reference to boundaries, or right of property. In this action, the boundaries between "*Mille Vaches*" and the adjoining waste lands of the Crown,