

by which the King declares that he confirms the Papal bulls granted to that bishop "*vu qu'il ne s'y est trouvé aucune chose contraire aux privilèges, franchises et libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane.*" But this Edict does not say that the liberties of the Gallican Church ever did exist in Canada. The King, as protector of the Church in France, simply declares by these words that he had no intention of making or permitting innovations in the status of that Church. Such a declaration was the more necessary, because the edict was promulgated to confirm the appointment of a bishop, holding not from the Gallican Church, but immediately and directly from the See of Rome.

It is further contended that the name of "Catholic, Apostolic and Roman," given to the Church in the official papers of the colony, was a form generally adopted to distinguish it from the reformed churches. But what reason is there for supposing that any confusion could have been caused by the use of the term Gallican or Catholic Church? Was it not thus that the Church in France was universally and invariably designated; although the danger of confounding it with other religious bodies was much greater in the Mother Country than in Canada, where the number of the reformed was extremely small? No, the reason for so designating the Catholic Church in the colonial ordinances and statutes and in the articles of the capitulations and in the Treaty of Paris was a very different one; it was because she depended immediately on the Holy See. The Church of France was indeed a Catholic Church,* but her civil status was very different from the status of the same church in the other European countries, and especially in England and Scotland. In France the civil courts took cognizance of appeals in ecclesiastical matters and even in matters purely spiritual, while in England and in Scotland, before the Reformation, those appeals were carried directly to Rome, as they are to-day in Canada.

The court of the officiality, at first ignored by the Superior Council, is confidently asserted to have been at a later period recognized by that supreme tribunal. Whether there was or was not an officiality in the French colony is of no consequence, there being none in Canada to-day; for it is well-known that the *appel comme d'abus* existed in France, because the eccle-

* In most of the dioceses of France, the *Rituel de Paris*, not the *Rituel Romain*, was followed.