was completely erroneous. As for the motives, which might have influenced the Propaganda to supersede and withdraw the first opposition we may find them afterward.

I proceed now with the eloquent speech of M. Chase Casgrain.

After an introduction, which is a short compendium of the history of the sacred rights of property, M. Chase-Casgrain attacks the wretched offspring of the Roman juris-consults, and charges them with having changed the laws respecting property. If it pleases us," he ironically pursues, " to take away from you your lands, your houses, your palaces, we will do it; and we will give you certificates for rent which we will pay at our pleasure."

Thus, then, dear professor, with those words you try to insinuate that the Italian government does not respect the rights of property. This ironical invective could have been witty if it had been just and true, unhappily it is neither true nor just, and, *ergo*, ridiculous.

The Italian Government does not rob, the Italian Government does not touch the Propaganda's properties.

The immovable were converted before the sentence of the Court, and they will still continue to be converted after; and here I must more particularly call the attention of my readers to the falsity of the statement that the Italian Government has seized the Propaganda properties.

I will explain myself more clearly with an example.

Let us suppose that one amongst my readers should receive in legacy, a house which the law forbid him to possess, and that in accordance with this law the Government