

and this extinguish-
ought it desirable
ous sale of these
ly no subversion
of Her Church.
of Her Majesty's
he Province. It
that compensation
egislature regard-
which had become
with which Her
Province.

at it is a disloyal
ereign's Suprem-
of the title of a
acquires from the
iations, however,
y state that the
moral obligations

ments of British
Government, do
e public domain,
ny way conflict-
and Supremacy
le that the Pope
make any distri-
ould seem to be
way derogatory
remacy. It was
Government and
tively irrelevant
and Supremacy,
compensation to
necessary for the
e, to guard, was,
ns which it was
onger, and those
vince, doubtless
hed by dealing
s interested, had
the claims and
of the compen-

being here dis-
tute than to its

validity. Indeed it is difficult to understand the objection now under consideration as being an objection in any way affecting the validity of the Act.

When the very extensive powers which the British North America Act confers, (some of which have already been enumerated), are considered, it will be seen that whatever objections some may have to the Act, even on the second ground on which its invalidity is claimed, that ground would hardly be available for an attack on the Act as being *ultra vires*.

It may not be unimportant, in considering how extensive the rights and powers of Provincial Legislatures are, to refer to some of the authorities, which have pronounced on the powers conferred on the Colonies by the British North America Act and other similar enactments. For example, in the case of *Harris vs Davies* (10 App. Cases 279) it was held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, under a statute not very dissimilar from the British North America Act that :

"The Legislature of New South Wales, has power to repeal the Statute of James I, and had impliedly done so by 11 Vic., No. 13, which, according to its true construction, placed an action for slander for words spoken upon the same footing, as regards costs and other matters, as an action for written slander." The Statute of James I, had made provision as to the amount of costs which the litigant could recover when he only obtained a verdict for a certain amount for slander; the Act applied to the colony, the Legislature passed an Act changing that provision. The judgment of their Lordships was delivered by Sir Barnes Peacock, who said: "Their Lordships are of opinion that there are no sufficient grounds for reversing the judgment of the court below. Their Lordships are of opinion that the Colonial Legislature had the power to repeal the Statute of James I, if they saw fit, and they are also of opinion that, looking at the first section of 11 Vic., No. 13, it was the intention of the Legislature to place an action for words spoken upon the same footing, as regards costs and other matters, as an action for written slander."

Another important decision was *Hodge vs. the Queen* (9 App. Cases 117) which is thus referred to in the case of *Powell vs. Apollo Candle Company (Limited)* (10 App. Cases 282), also an important decision as to the powers of a Colonial Legislature.

"Two cases have come before this Board in which the powers of Colonial Legislatures have been a good deal con-