

meeting of the Council, called by the King, with reference to Canadian affairs. (The proof of the fact here asserted will be found in the Archives of Government at London, where it will be easy to verify it.) A short time after this, on the 29th of April 1764, the cession took place, and demonstrated that the dependence of the Seminary of Montreal had ceased to exist, according to the wish of the Government. The promise thus made by the King, and the cession, form together an agreement by which the Sulpicians renounce their right of selling, and the King binds himself to allow the Seminary of Montreal to enjoy the property. And now that the Sulpicians have fulfilled their engagements, can it be wished that the King should not perform his?—We entertain other ideas with regard to His Majesty's gracious promises.

It may perhaps be asked whether the Seminary of Montreal was so far a portion of the corporation of the Sulpicians, as to be regarded as co-proprietor of the property of that body.

There can be no doubt that it was. The Letters Patent of 1677 permit the corporation of the Sulpicians to establish a Seminary at Montreal. (Loix du pays, 80.) Now it is evident that it could establish nothing but a community of its own body. The Letters Patent set forth that in consequence of the good which the Ecclesiastics of the Seminary at Paris had done at Montreal, that the King is willing that they should erect a community and Seminary at the latter place, and it is clear that the intention was that those who had commenced the good work should continue it for ever, in an establishment permanently attached to the place.

It was
who v
In cor
of 169
of the
Semin
real b
they c
other
asked
of the
of the
of the
ment

W

tic In
Mont
of St
ed, t
it by
the S
were
they
son
der
whic
one
out
The
of S