

character, I certainly having, as I am calling it.

representing facts and accounts, which

th sufficient fullness as Mr. Scott instances of a long time, let me remark, employed by them Fleming appeal later part of Mr. law-officers, as concurrence. In y, especially the supplied by Mr. society, was common laymen, for the and that the royal rights to the Seminary of the conversion is consecrated to ease of revenue, in like manner."

Is he wrongly What, if other to show that a mulated with the hat the interests ne grants?

ment concerning Art. "was first subsequently dissimply the outcome avers, "was

neither reserved" nor "disallowed," but was "granted." Here a number of questions, pointing to an opposite conclusion, might be put. I will select a few of such. How was it, I ask, with the idea that the article was granted, that we have the following in the preamble of the Act of 1840: "And it had been contended that all and every of the said fiefs and seignories became, by the conquest of this province by the British arms, vested, and still remains vested, in the Crown?" How was it, if the 35th Art. was granted, that in 1819, the Duke of Richmond, and in 1834, Lord Aylmer, as Governors-General of Canada, made a demand on the St. Sulpicians to surrender their properties to the government? If Mr. Scott wishes further information on these points, let him apply to the Hon. Ex-Judge Badgley, the reputed author of the memorial from the inhabitants of Montreal to the Home Government, against granting the Charter and Titles to the Seminary, which are found in the Act of 1840. He may obtain from the Ex-Judge much valuable information on this whole matter. It is true it would be greatly damaging to the cause of his clients, the Seminary, and would look in strange contrast to Mr. Badgley's opinion lately given the government. Yet, perhaps, Mr. Badgley would explain why he said the thing was black then, and that it is white now. There are strange things to be met with as we journey along; and the conduct of Mr. Badgley and Mr. Scott, in this Seminary affair, is among such.

But I am not done with asking questions here. If the 35th Art. was granted, as Mr. Scott assures us it was, and with such, a declaration was made of the absolute ownership of the Seminary in their estates, how was it that the law-officers of the Crown, viz., Sir C. Robinson, Ad.-Gen., Sir V. Gibbs, Att.-Gen., and Mr. Plumer, Sol.-Gen., in 1811, when, on one of those occasions of fierce controversy between the Seminary and the Government on the subject, the case was referred to them for an opinion, they declared, "That the Sulpicians in Canada had not a valid title to the lands transferred to them by the Community of Paris?" And was it not in this view of the question