

of certain general regulations between the Bishop of Quebec and his Chapter, confirmed by His Most Christian Majesty on the 11th February, 1692, "*du consentement du sieur Evêque de Québec et du sieur Abbé de Brisacier, supérieur du Séminaire des Missions Étrangères, faisant tant pour le dit Séminaire que pour le dit Chapitre de Québec, au sujet de plusieurs contestations, etc.,*" make the following remark: "Sur les articles à être réglés entre l'Evêque et le Chapitre de Québec, il y a peu de choses à remarquer, si ce n'est que *l'on oblige l'Evêque de se conformer aux usages des Eglises de France.*" Do the learned legists desire it to be understood by this, that the Canadian Church was held to conform to the privileges and liberties of the Gallican Church? We suppose so, for those privileges and liberties formed part of the usages of the French Church. Now, the regulation here alluded to, cited at length from the Edicts and Ordinances, p. 267, and not merely as analysed in the *Histoire Générale*, is in these terms: "Le grand vicaire, l'official et le promoteur de Monsieur l'Evêque se conformeront *pour les places et les rangs dans l'Eglise Cathédrale et partout ailleurs aux usages de l'Eglise de France.*" The regulation, then, far from proving that the whole ecclesiastical law of France passed into the Colony, shows the contrary, inasmuch as the intervention of the King was necessary in order to introduce into the Province the usages of the French Church respecting the place and precedence of certain dignitaries in the Church.

Finally, the authors of the *Histoire Générale du Droit Canadien* have in their last number completely proved the fact that there was no *officialité contentieuse* in Canada. On page 249 the learned gentlemen say that the officiality *connaît du mariage quant à sa validité ou invalidité.*" At page 242 they say: "Le 26 Janvier, 1711, dans une procédure pour *faire casser* le mariage fait en contravention des dispositions du Concile de Trente, Montoléon, le marié, refusa de répondre, prétextant que le Conseil Supérieur n'avait aucune juridiction et demandant à être renvoyé à l'officialité de cette ville. **LE CONSEIL SUPERIEUR REJETE LE DÉCLINATOIRE.**"

beg to assure Mr. Lareau that we had no intention of ignoring his due share of merit in the composition of that work. The name of Mr. Lareau is not, however, of sufficient weight to take away the presumption that his colleague, as President of the *Institut Canadien*, is naturally biassed in favour of the doctrines of that institution.