

The conflicting powers of the Dominion and our Provinces has been lifted out of the region of local politics and dealt with, rightly or wrongly, upon the basis of pure law and constitutional right and justice. No Canadian can over-estimate the value of the elimination from the settlement of these puzzling questions of the heat and turmoil and bitterness of political struggles. It may well be that in cases which do not involve any large amount of money, an appeal to England should be denied. But that should be only if it might be oppressive to one or other of the litigants. In cases which are important, either because of the amount at stake or because the questions are of grave importance, this reason does not exist.

To speak of an appeal as carrying a cause to the foot of the throne, is to use a metaphor which may become a cause of offence to some. It is not necessary to reinforce sentiment by representing the King as redressing wrongs through his Privy Council. He does not do so in any sense other than that of providing, from that body, a tribunal unexceptional in point of ability and learning, to which his subjects may resort.

One thought still remains. Discussions which have for their object the exact definition of Canada's new status inevitably seek to carve out a definite and separate entity. No other position lends itself to completeness or finality. Anything else is more or less indefinite and hazy. And yet our greatest progress and freedom have been achieved in something other than a precisely expressed and well defined political status.

Is there not a danger that these discussions will give greater hardness of outline to our nationhood and familiarize us too much with the idea of separation?

—VIATOR.