

purity of every human life. That must be, surely, the ideal that we must set before us.

While the unbelieving person may not realize this dignity of life, the Church should be the last one to fail to do so. When, therefore, a Christian marries one against whom there is no bar except that of religion, and the Marriage has been consummated, it seems to me that it is a horrible degradation of human life for the Church to separate those two persons, and permit the Christian partner to marry another. However unwise the marriage may be, this separation can never be justified because of the sanctity of human life, and of the human body. Let the Church discipline the person, if she will, who disobeys her advice, but it is a horrible degradation of our human life to *separate them*, and permit either to marry again. Once the state of matrimony has been in force.

We have seen then that the essential of marriage is mutual consent, given before witnesses. It is desirable from the Church standpoint that the witness before whom it is given should be the priest of the Church, that the Church's benediction may be given, yet this is not essential, because the ministers of the sacrament are the contracting parties. The marriage would be equally valid if the authorized witness were another than the priest. The State authorises certain persons to act for it before whom such consent may be given. The State must therefore protect the civil rights of all who give "their troth either to other" before any authorized witness. We must not allow the real point at issue in the present controversy to be lost sight of in the mass of irrelevant matter. The *Ne temere* Decree is only an *incident*, it is not the *issue* before us. It has served to draw attention to the claims which are being made, but it really ought not to matter to us whether it is in force or not, for no foreigner, either civil or ecclesiastical, has jurisdiction in **this** Realm. Nothing that the Bishop of Rome says, therefore, either individually or through the Sacred Congregation of the Council can affect our laws. What makes it a question with us in this Province is, that those who adhere to the Papacy believe the decree to be binding on them as a law of their Church. And an ambiguous clause in our Civil Code, it is claimed, makes the law of any Church a part of the law of this Province.

The first point at issue is the *supremacy of the Civil* over the *Ecclesiastical* authorities in the matter of *marriage*. When a marriage is contracted, and there is no legal impediment recognized by the State, then the State must protect such marriage and safeguard those married in their whole Civil Status. No other power than the State can set aside such a marriage. The State must recognize the marriage solemnized by all whom it authorizes to officiate. No annulment of marriage should be permitted because of the religious