

Then as to the royal supremacy, which cannot exist if this statute is to become law, I will refer also to Mr. Todd, who says at page 313:—

“The source of the authority of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters and of its jurisdiction in the last resort ail over ecclesiastical causes is to be found in the doctrine of the royal supremacy. This doctrine is a fundamental principle of the British constitution. It was authoritatively asserted by Parliament at the era of the Reformation, and it is interwoven with the very essence of the monarchy itself.”

Further on he says :

“While by previous enactment ecclesiastical supremacy had been conferred upon the Crown, as a perpetual protest against the assumptions, by any foreign priest or potentate, of a right to exercise coercive power or pre-eminent jurisdiction, of British subjects.”

Now I think I have fairly shown that, at all events, the Statute law is against the introduction of the Pope into any matters in this country in the way this Statute provides. I will refer now to what I believe to be the objectionable clauses, and I will ask how it is possible for anyone not to admit, in the face of the Statute, that these clauses to which I refer certainly make this law an infringement of the law as it is defined by the Statute of Elizabeth. In reply to a letter of Mr. Mercier, Cardinal Simeoni says:

“I hasten to notify you that, having laid your request before the Holy Father at the audience yesterday, His Holiness was pleased to grant permission to sell the property which belonged to the Jesuit Fathers before they were suppressed, upon the express condition, however, that the sum to be received be deposited and left at the free disposal of the Holy See.”

Then, in another place, Cardinal Simeoni replies to Mr. Mercier:—

“The Pope allows the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' estates as a special deposit, to be disposed of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See.”

Is it to be said in this British country that we are to be told by a foreign potentate that he *allows* the Government of this country—a British Government—to “retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuit estates as a special deposit to be disposed

of hereafter with the sanction of the Holy See.”? Yet, allowing this Act is tantamount to saying that we allow the Pope to assume this important position. In another place, Cardinal Simeoni, replying to the question:

“Should authority be given to any one to claim from the Government of the Province of Quebec the property which belonged to the Jesuit Fathers before the suppression of the society, and to whom and how should it be given.”?

Says as follows:—

“Affirmatively in favor of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus and in accordance with the method prescribed in other places, that is to say, that the Fathers of the Society of Jesus treat in their own name with the civil government, in such a manner, however, as to leave full liberty to the Holy See to dispose of the property as it deems advisable, and, consequently, that they should be very careful that no condition or clause should be inserted in the official deed of the concession of such property which could in any manner affect the liberty of the Holy See.”

Then in another place Mr. Mercier appears to acknowledge all that the Pope through his Secretary demands. He says:

“That the amount of the compensation fixed shall remain in the possession of the Government of the Province as a special deposit until the Pope has ratified the said settlement and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount in this country.”

Now, the letters containing these sentences are a preamble to this Statute. They are referred to by a section of this Statute and are made part and parcel of the law of Quebec—a British Province—and that law is that nothing is to be done until the Pope has ratified the settlement and made known his wishes as to the distribution of the property. There is an admission on the part of Premier of a British Province that a foreign potentate—for such I claim he is—has the power to ratify British legislation. If he has the power to ratify it, he has the power to nullify it, and that is a power which no one, whether he be the head of a church or not, should possess. Then the Statute goes on, in order to give it a sort of meritorious effect, to talk about restitution. In the very front of the Statute, it speaks