The small group of Republicans in that Opposition developed a feverish activity, openly conspired with Beirao's enemics in the Cortes, and through a system of reckless obstruction rendered vain all efforts to legislate for the good of the country. It is commonly believed, however, that Beirao would have finally triumphed if the scandalous story of the Sugar Monopoly on the Island of Madeira had not come to light. An English company, as is known, had secured this monopoly through a Government protection suggesting startling stories of graft. The Premier promised to appoint an investigating commission to delve deep into the iniquitous corruption charged, but his encunes in the Cortes refused to vote for his inquiry, as they claimed that the Commission would use every means to whitewash Luciano de Castro, the leader of the Progressist and a personal friend of Beirao's, who was deeply mired in the scandal. This de Castro and many of his political friends were compromised in the other affair of the Credit Bank of Portugal.

This bank, known under the title 'Compañia General do Credito Portuguez,' was an official institution. Through a system of false balances and in defect of vigilant control, the Bank Directory allowed the payment of large dividends to stockholders, which were altogether at variance with the small profits accruing from its business. When, as was naturally to be expected, the knowledge of the real condition of things came to the public, a violent uprising against the responsible parties occurred. The scandal was the topic of bitter complaint in the Cortes and in all Portugal. The people clamored for information regarding the manner in which large sums entrusted to the bank officials had disappeared. Honest investigation speedily showed that millions had gone into the pockets of the Bank Directorate. It was proved, too, that this body for some time back had been made up of ex-Ministers and powerful politicians, who, being forced out of official place and thus deprived of political sources of easy inc

## LIQUIDATION SCANDALS IN FRANCE

Under the heading, 'Where is the Milliard?' the London Tablet of August 27 deals as follows with the latest report of the liquidators of the Church property in France:

The liquidation of the property of the dissolved religious congregations in France is still proceeding. How long and costly is the process is already known to our readers; and the Report of the operations for the year 1909 which has just been published in a Green Book signed by M. Barthou, Minister of Justice, and M. Cochery, Minister of Finance, contains little or nothing to encourage the hopes of those who were deceived with promises of a handsome nucleus for an old-age pensions fund as a result of the transaction. M. Waldeck-Rousseau gained votes and support for his Associations Law by pointing to the milliard of the congregations; M. Combes, his successor, dissolved the congregations wholesale, and the process of the liquidation of their property was entered upon with the promptitude that marks the itching palm. But instead of money being poured into the Treasury as the produce of this gigantic robbery by statute, the liquidators began to pile up debts in the shape of Treasury loans for legal expenses. Meanwhile, the liquidators and their agents were drawing large sums for their labors, whilst the milliard which M. Waldeck-Rousseau had dangled before the eyes of the electors at Toulouse was receding further and further into the dim distance. Grave misgivings were naturally aroused; awkward questions in the Chamber produced in 1906 a promise of an annual report on the transactions, but so unsatisfactory was the first instalment that early in 1908 M. Clemenceau was compelled to grant a Commission of Inquiry into the whole affair. A hideous series of revelations followed, and M. Briand insisted on quarterly accounts being rendered by the liquidators and immediate payments of the sums they received into the Treasury. As a result of the stricter supervision thus set on foot it was discovered that M. Duez, the liquidator of several important congr

The investigation into Duez's transactions is not yot concluded, but the Report just issued shows that he is not alone in his guilty practices. Thus, M. Vernhet, an ex-liquidator of the Congregation of Notre Dame and other is not alone in his guilty practices. Thus, M. Vernhet, an ex-liquidator of the Congregation of Notre Dame and other congregations, is found to have presented accounts in such serious disagreement with those of his successor that they are being made the subject of a searching inquiry. Another, M. Desrumeaux, who was entrusted with the winding up of the property of the Ursulines at Amiens is being prosecuted; a third, M. Duret, is charged with unnecessary delay in his work; whilst a fourth, M. Aurégan, has been sent before the Court of Correction on a charge of abuse of confidence. Such a result is in no way surprising, for these men were appointed mainly on account of their political guarantees. But the murder is now out, and Ministers have been compelled to admit the fact by taking the business out of the hands of these harpies and placing it in the charge of the Director-General of Estates. Long before this the old pretexts for the defence had been abandoned. There was no more talk now of the milliard of the congregations; M. Briand had even found it necessary to avow that M. Waldeck-Rousseau's estimate, backed though it was by a portentous volume of statistics collected for the purpose, was exaggerated and inexact. All mention of the nucleus for old-age pensions was dropped; and the expensiveness and protracted length of the liquidation process was laid at the door of the religious and of the heirs of the original benefactors who had the audacity to defend themselves in the courts of law.

If we now turn from the doings of the liquidators to the results of their operations was find that in saits of the

was laid at the door of the religious and of the heirs of the original benefactors who had the audacity to defend themselves in the courts of law.

If we now turn from the doings of the liquidators to the results of their operations we find that, in spite of the increasing strictness of Government supervision, the product is strikingly incommensurate with the magnitude of the transactions. During the year covered by this fourth Report, 406 cases were dealt with. The receipts from the disposal of the property involved and from other sources amounted to 20,880,672 francs. Against this has to be set an expenditure by or on behalf of the liquidators of no less than 15,992,484 francs. Thus there would appear to be a gross sum of nearly five million francs on the right side of the account, but against that, it seems, has to be set a matter of nearly three million francs by which the net product of these 406 transactions is reduced to 1,520,118 francs. If we add this sum to those of preceding years we shall find how very far we still are from the promised milliard. During the first years that the liquidators were at work until 1906, instead of there being a balance on the right side of the account there was actually a deficit of 572,347 francs. The year 1906 produced a profit of 520,003 francs; in 1907, 2,575,846 francs were netted; in 1908 a sum of 2,691,289 was obtained. Thus the year covered by the latest report shows a drop of over a million francs in the net profit, but here it must be remembered that the number of liquidators was less by about a hundred than that of 1908, when it was 505. People may well wonder how it is that the result of a winding up of property on so gigantic a scale has been so little profitable. But the answer is still the same—dishonest officials bent upon feathering their own nests, bloated fees to Radical and Socialist counsel and lawyers, and all sorts of curious payments to hangers-on. The Report sets down the fees of counsel at 211,386 francs, whilst a sum of a million and a half has

a sum of 24,296 tranes, which is simply set down to 'other charges'!

But these complicated accounts, with their mass of details, will delude nobody into thinking that the transactions of the year covered by the Report are beyond reproach. It is surely a matter of some significance that whilst giving debtor and creditor sides of the account, M. Barthou leaves it to the readers of the Report to make out for themselves the net profit to the Treasury on the year's work. Such studied silence would seem to show that the result was not one to which even the most optimistically-inclined Minister would care to give unnecessary advertisement. Besides the extravagant costs of the process, another reason for the small net profit on the liquidations has always been the low prices at which the property has been sold. The present report affords an example of this in the case of a hospital belonging to the Recolletines of Merville, which was knocked down to a bid of 7001 francs! There is another point of some interest attaching to this institution: the liquidator actually scrupled to carry out the legal process against it. It appears that the official regarded the place as excluded from sale by the provision of Article 18 of the Law of Association in favor of houses set apart for a purpose of public charity, and that he stood out against the order for its liquidation until the civil