

583, 584,
58b, and

following, shewed no disposition to make any arrangement by which the Appellant might be relieved. At length finding that Mr. Burns preferred giving the Proprietors a deduction of £600 from the amount of their debts, under condition that they should pay the balance, and take all risks on themselves, to the course pointed out by the Titles, and that he had absolutely concluded an agreement with them to that effect; the Appellant had no alternative left to him but instituting an Action against Mr. Fraser, or giving up the money he had laid out for that Gentleman, and of further paying the £60 for which he had granted an unconditional Note. As to an application which he made to the widow and Heirs to refund his money and to cancel his Note, it is obvious that it was not attended with success. The Action was brought in June, 1801, for the *Lods et Ventes* on one of the wharves, and in this Action the Attorney General intervened, claiming the *Lods et Ventes* as accruing within the Censive of the Crown; the widow and Heirs La Croix were called into the cause, and after hearing the parties on the evidence, the widow and Heirs were declared to hold *en fief* as Seigneurs of Villeray, and the Court rendered a Judgment against Mr. Fraser for £500 sterling, being the sum due by him on one of the wharves. These Judgments, and particularly the arduous Letter written to the Appellant, by Mr. Paul La Croix, (the Respondent's Brother and Agent) induced the Appellant to hope that on his bringing another Action for the *Lods et Ventes* due on the other wharf, Mr. Fraser would have seen the propriety of entering into an amicable settlement with the Appellant; but in this expectation he was deceived, for Mr. Fraser having dispossessed himself of all his funds in this Country, he was quite indifferent to the issue of the suits in Canada. The Action was brought against him for arrears on the other wharf, and in this also the Appellant obtained a Judgment for the *Lods et Ventes*, in which Judgment the Widow and Heirs were again recognised to be *Seigneurs Primitifs* of the fief Villeray. After having been involved into so much expense, and finding that Mr. Fraser's property was without the Jurisdiction of the Courts of this Province, the Appellant had no means left to recover his money than to transmit copies of these Judgments to an Agent in London, with instructions to bring an Action of Debt in the Court of King's Bench, at Westminster. So soon as this latter proceeding took place, Mr. Fraser wrote to his Agent here, that he had no prospect of getting rid of the suit in England, but by instituting an Appeal from the Judgment in the first Action, to His Majesty in Council; and from the latter to this Honorable Court; and his wishes in this respect were immediately complied with. During the pendency of these Actions, the wharf, for the *Lods et Ventes* on which the first Action was brought, was sold by *Decrété forcé* at the suit of one Jacobs against Mr. Brehaut, and it became necessary for the Appellant and the Widow and Heirs La Croix to file Oppositions to preserve their respective rights. The Crown, by the Attorney General, filed a Cross-Opposition, and for a second time called in question the rights of the Widow and Heirs to hold us *Seigneurs Primitifs* of the wharf; and this new contestation was promoted and encouraged by an Act, passed on the 8th April 1801, which permitted Commissioners to accept of compositions for arrears of *Lods et Ventes* due by *Censitaires* of the Crown: for the Proprietors of these wharves hoped, what they ultimately realized, to obtain an acquittance for a title, provided they could succeed in proving that this property was in the Censive of the Crown. Thus stimulated, the claims of the Widow and Heirs came to be opposed with a degree of animation hitherto unknown; written evidence was produced which threw a new light on the titles to these wharves; and the Widow and Heirs, intimidated with the proceedings had by their Attorney, Paul La Croix, withdrew their Opposition and renounced their claim and the Appellant's Cause. The assistance of the Widow and Heirs being thus withdrawn from the Appellant, the Judgment of the 20th June, 1809, followed, as a matter of course, in which the wharf was declared finally to be within the Censive of His Majesty and the Crown, allocated for £150, (the sum for which Mr. Brehaut had been permitted to compound with the Commissioners) instead of a much larger amount.

These are the facts of this Case, which are almost entirely proved by the written and parol testimony in the Cause. And after such a full disclosure it is difficult to conceive on what grounds of fact or of law the Court at Montreal could have rendered the Judgment of the 19th October, 1815, now complained of. If the minds of the Judges were struck with the fact of the multiplicity of suits to which this Assignment gave rise, they might have seen that these arose *entirely* by the fault of the Widow and Heirs of La Croix, in claiming that as their property which did not belong to them, and have been *exclusively* the misfortune of the Appellant. One circumstance is striking—it was with no small share of reluctance the Appellant resorted to a Court of Law. He waited five years before he brought his Action, and only followed up by the advice of the La Croix's that success which attended the commencement of the suit. Nor ought it to be forgotten that in the first instance he purchased only those arrears which were due by Mr. Fraser on the 21st October, 1738, and not those which had become due on the 30th September, 1796, eight years afterwards. At that period it was no debt *litigieux*, and so thought Mr. Fraser, for in the Actions brought against him no such defence was set up. It was left for Mr. Hubert La Croix, the Respondent, first to injure the Appellant by taking a sum of money under a false representation, and then to attempt to turn the odium from himself by holding him out as the purchaser of litigated rights, a "Mover of pleas and suits."

It will be distinctly seen from the evidence of Messrs. Brehaut, Panet, and Voyer, that the Widow and Heirs, long before the year 1796 held themselves out as *Seigneurs Primitifs* of the Fief Villeray. Indeed the titles of the wharves in 1772, and 1783, place this beyond a question: and the transport itself shews that at the time of the purchase of these arrears of *Lods et Ventes*, the Widow obstinately persisted in this assumed character. Where, it may be asked, is there any thing in the transaction to indicate that the Widow La Croix sold, or that the Appellant bought this debt as *douteux et incertain*?