

their privileges, on the contrary, they have treated them as Catholics and have continued to give them work as heretofore.

7th. That far from having recourse to law and the tribunals of justice to gain their pretended rights the Indians rendered themselves guilty of acts against the law and of successive encroachments which have repeatedly occurred since about six years.

8th. That to ensure for themselves the support and sympathy of a religious authority hostile to the Seminary, they constructed against his wishes protestations and law suits, on the land belonging to the Seminary, a methodist chapel.

9th. That the Gentlemen of the Seminary to justify their rights have always had recourse to the Courts of justice, not with a view of exercising a religious persecution, although they have been so accused through certain public journals, but with the sole object of saving their just rights of property and to put an end to the depredations and encroachments of the Indians.

10th. That if when the last petitory action concerning the land on which they built the chapel, the Defendants did not file their pleas, the cause is owing to the neglect of their attorney and not from a lack of liberality on the part of Messrs. Prevost and Mathieu, the advocates of the Seminary, who on that occasion fulfilled towards their *confrère* all the obligations and courtesies observed in their profession.

11th. That the Gentlemen of the Seminary having been by judgment of a competent Court declared proprietors of the land which the Indians had unjustly taken, and having been put in possession of this land by the proper authority in virtue of the writ of possession also mentionned in said certificate, they had the right of enjoying the land at pleasure and to demolish the buildings constructed thereon.

12th. That the Defendants not having shown or made good any right before the Court or even a defense to the petitory action, have no claim to set up either for ameliorations or indemnities.