delegates, Judge Black, Father Ritchot and Mr. Scott, it was not that they were to impose restrictions upon the people of the future who were going to occupy that country, It was merely that the people who did occupy that Selkirk settlement at that time amounting to twelve thousand people should be protected in whatever rights they possessed, or desired to possess, after they had become a part of the Dominion of Canada. Now, if you look at it in the right spirit you will realize that this is the fact. This fact is more impressed upon us in consequence of the small territory that was first of all included in the province of Manitoba. The first territory that was carved out for the purpose of being included in the province of Manitoba was the territory comprising Winnipeg as a centre and a radius of 60 miles around Winnipeg. That was the first territory to which those rights were to extend. Since then, the province of Manitoba has been enlarged until it has a boundary extending east to Ontario and west to the 29th range, which is a very different province to-day from what the province of Manitoba was when those delegates came down to confer with the government of Canada in 1871. Now, if in 1871 the Selkirk settlement were accorded certain rights which were to be lasting to them as individuals, are the people who are included in the portion of the province of Manitoba in which I reside to be brought under the legislation known as the Manitoba Act in its constitutional restrictions? Now, that is the position we have to decide upon. What is the ruling of the Privy Council? The ruling is that the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba under the legislation of 1870, which constituted the Manitoba Act—not under the British North American Act—and under the legislation passed by the legislature at its first sitting after the passage of that Act have the right of appeal to Parliament. I wish you to realize that there are no rights beyond the right of appeal. All through the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—all through the argument before the Judicial Committee—it was made perfectly clear that the right of appeal to the Governor in Council constituted the right of that minority, and, when it went before Parliament, their rights ceased. Parliament is a constitutional body with perfect right to say. "We will adopt one policy to-day and we will adopt another policy to-morrow." The constitutional liberty of the people of Canada under the British constitution is such that they have perfect constitutional liberty to change, day by day, any policy that they consider in the public interests of the country. Have we not gradually changed our policy in regard to the veto power after twenty-five years experience of its working in the direction of granting fuller liberty to the provinces not inconsistent with the national interests of Canada. Had not the government the power to veto the Provincial Act of 1890? Now that the veto power of Parliament is called into play, is the government now going to recommend Parliament to exercise the veto power which they themselves did not consider it wise or politic to exercise? I will just show you, from the reading of the argument before the Judicial Committee of the Council, what was in the minds of the Lords of the Council themselves—what was in the minds of those who were appealing on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority, in order to show that they expected Parliament only to exercise its constitutional power as a matter of policy, and not as a statutory obligation—

Lord WATSON—The Governor might be of opinion to-day or this year that it was not desirable, in the interests of the community, that certain previous privileges given by Parliament should be repealed; but ten years hence, he might be of a different opinion. If there were legislation of a prohibitive kind included in this remedial legislation, there would be an Act of Parliament in the way of his exercising his discretion on the subject.

I can see all through the argument that was made before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that the Lords of the Council themselves were somewhat puzzled between the anomaly of having a constitution which was a constitution of liberty and having a restrictive influence such as is imposed by the British North America Act and the Manitoba Act. They saw, themselves, that it was anomalous to a certain extent, but as a judicial tribunal they merely had to give their judgment as it was presented to them in the wording of the legislation on which they were called upon to pronounce themselves. I will read you also what Mr. Ewart, who was the counsel for the appellants, said in his remarks before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.