

the latter, accompanied by two captains of foot, went to meet him, and demanded by whose orders he had thus come into his majesty's territories and committed such acts of violence. The sieur de la Lacorne answered; it was by those of M. de la Jonquiere, who had also commanded him to take possession of Chippodi, John's river, Man-rem, Cooke, Pitcodiack, and of all that country, as far as the river, which was on the right hand of major Laurence, as belonging to his most christian majesty; or at least, that he was to keep and defend it as such, (*g*) till such time as the limits were settled by commissaries appointed for that purpose.

Though the sieur Laurence had under his command a detachment of regular troops, very little inferior to that commanded by the sieur Lacorne, he forebore committing any hostilities in obedience to the king's orders for that purpose. (*b*)

conference, it must be concluded, he did not come to attack. The sieur Cornwallis was there before him. What was he come there for? Whereas, till then at least, the country had been possessed by the French.

(*g*) That is the plain truth, to keep, and defend is not invading.

(*b*) Why did not these orders prevent his advancing so far? He acknowledges the sieur de Lacorne's detachment, to have been superior to his own; might not this detachment have been the cause of so much moderation? The marquis de la Jonquiere had then acted right, in sending troops to oppose the invasion.

The