

of the estates belonging to the Propaganda was advertised for the 8th day of August, 1874. The 6th of August in the same year, the Propaganda, by a bailiff's act, summoned before the Court the Committee nominated for the settlement of the clergy's estate, in order to be excluded from the conversion and to annul the sale. Notwithstanding this summons the sale took place; and the Propaganda, not urging her opposition, the complaint was withdrawn from the roll.

Since then, and till to-day, ninety-four estates belonging to the Propaganda have been sold, and this without any new opposition. This shows that since the year 1874, or about one year after the promulgation of the law of 1873, till the year 1880, the sale had progressed with the most perfect accord between the Committee, settler, and the Propaganda's congregation,—contrary to your words that “for ten years the Government had acted as if this law did not concern the Propaganda.” It was only in the year 1880 that the Propaganda revived the old opposition which superseded the sale, and for which lately the Supreme Court had given its sentence.

How does it happen that an operation, which, during six years was acknowledged a regular one, at least by the silence with which it was accepted in all its consequences, and which already had been accomplished for more than half of the immovable capital,—how does it happen I say, that to-day the same operation is examined and debated with so much hatred and bitterness, and it is treated as a spoliation?

I will not try to answer this question, contenting myself with having proved beyond doubt that at your assertion