104), which provides that no suit for wages under £50 shall be brought by any seaman in any Court of Vice-Admiralty unless in certain cases mentioned, had been repealed, pro tanto, by s. 56 of the Dominion Seamen's Act, 1873 (36-37 Vict., c. 104, D.), which placed the limit at $200 in the case of any seaman belonging to any ship registered in the Province of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia, and this, although s. 109 of the Imperial Act enacts that that part of the Act which includes s. 189 shall apply to all ships in any part of Her Majesty's dominions abroad (*i*).

If any weight is to be attached to the recognition of Imperial Legislation by Canadian Legislation as being in force here, then the same importance must be attached to the formal recognition by the Imperial authorities of Canada's right to repeal Imperial Legislation, as in the case of the Dominion Seamen's Act, 1873, repealing an Imperial Act relating to Canada. The two cases differ in this respect, that it was expressly agreed that Canadian Legislation should be passed without it having any bearing whatever on the question of the right of Canada to legislate exclusively on the subject involved, whereas in the other case no such agreement took place.

Dicey (*j*) remarks that "Acts passed by the Victorian Parliament would not be valid which repealed, or invalidated, several provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts meant to apply to the colonies." The case of "The Royal," supra, furnishes a complete reply to that contention, so far as the same should be urged as regards Canada. *Riel* v. *The Queen* (*k*), decided by the Privy Council in 1885, is likewise pertinent. There had been three Imperial Statutes for the regulation of the trial of offences in Rupert's Land, since known as the North-West Territories of Canada. The Statutes of Canada made other provisions inconsistent with these statutes, and the conviction of the prisoner had taken place under the Statutes of Canada. The Lords of the Judicial Committee declined to admit an appeal, entertaining no doubt as to the correctness of the conviction. In the same year the same body again decided (*l*) that the Legislature of New

(*i*) (1883) 9 Q.L.R. 148, 151.

(*j*) Law of the Constitution, 3rd ed., p. 102.

(*k*) (1885) 4 Cart. 1

(*l*) *Harris* v. *Davies* (1885) 10 A.C. 270.