

His Holiness to ratify what he had done? This was a peculiar way of protesting, certainly. England was then, and continued until the Reformation, ecclesiastically subservient to the See of Rome. A very extraordinary judgment was delivered a few weeks ago by Judge Routhier, of the Province of Quebec, in an action for damages, brought by a parishioner, against the *Curé* of the Parish for defamation of character. Judge Routhier held that ecclesiastics enjoyed "immunities" in such cases which placed them beyond the reach of the civil authority. The judgment was but a reproduction of the pretensions of Becket and his clergy in the time of Henry II.

This judgment, redolent with the ecclesiastical absolutism of the middle ages, was reversed on appeal a few days since by a Court composed of Catholic Judges. Judge Mondelet dissented from the opinions of his brother Routhier, which he said "would make society go back and dip into the absolutism of a bygone age, which cannot be revived." "These principles," he further said, "or rather these pretensions, are moreover in contradiction to the jurisprudence of the country, and are no more, nor should be any longer, the subject of discussion." The Court of Appeal gave judgment against the *curé*, and pronounced against the existence of the ecclesiastical immunities contended for. Can it be maintained that this judgment on Appeal of these Catholic Judges, is a "vigorous protest" against the Church of Rome on behalf of an ancient faith and another Church? The general public do not, we fancy, look upon it in that light, but such must be the conclusion according to the Canons of construction adopted by the Rector of Rothesay.

From what we have said, how can it be truthfully affirmed that the British Church "never consulted the See of Rome, nor any foreign power in its rites, discipline, government, or consecration of Bishops and Archbishops?" What astounding truths these assertions are! The world has been studying history for the last one thousand years in vain. What we had considered unquestioned historical facts, have, by the dash of the Rector's pen, become myths, nay, perversions of history! We feel some little consolation, however, in the knowledge that Dr. Hook, a celebrated High Church divine, and the advocate *par excellence* of prelatical pretensions, does not entirely coincide with the views of the last quotation. He says, Peter and Paul "successively ordained Linus,

Cletus, and  
sion was  
and Cler  
Patrick,  
English  
ordinat  
churches

Dr. H  
England  
apparen  
some co  
governm  
side of t  
pull in  
point fo  
knowled  
greater  
shew tha  
The opin  
by Mr.  
and Dea  
Wickliff  
primitiv  
clergy w  
manner  
*Bishop*  
third ch  
chapter  
profound  
by Eras  
Fathers,  
can ther  
England  
Dr. H  
to affirm  
and sup  
Bishop,  
into bei  
not by d  
Church