

modified so far as might be necessary to give effect to these provisions."

The nature of the grievances was thus clearly before the Judicial Committee. If that tribunal had not been abundantly satisfied of their sufficiency to warrant Federal Intervention it is not conceivable that its judgment would have declared the appeal based upon them "well founded," and that the Court would have so clearly expressed its opinion of their nature and sufficiency, only refraining from specifically stating the precise steps to be taken to redress them. The answer to the first question submitted, determines the jurisdiction to hear the appeal:—the answer to the second question conclusively establishes the sufficiency of the grounds of appeal. To contend therefore that action should be deferred, "until it is clearly proven that substantial grievances exist," is to ignore one of the most important parts of the decision of the Judicial Committee. The Catholic minority, acquiescing in an investigation to determine whether their grievances are substantial in character, whether their nature and extent call imperatively for redress, if necessary by having recourse to the power, vested by the constitution in the Federal Parliament, would forego the position secured for them by the Judgment of the Privy Council, and would open again for contention and dispute, issues which they with justice claim are by that judgment finally concluded. And all for what purpose? That the majority may be convinced of the strength of the case for redress? If the solemn adjudication of Her Majesty's Privy Council does not carry conviction, is it reasonable to expect that the findings of a Dominion Commission would do so? No. That the

grievances are such as to call imperatively for redress, is as clearly established by the Privy Council as is their existence, and the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament to redress them. To propose a Commission to investigate this question for the purpose of determining the right of the minority to redress, is an insult to the intelligence of the Canadian Electorate.

Principal Grant himself appreciated the practical and substantial nature of one of these grievances as exemplified in the Sisters' School at Winnipeg. He writes in his third letter:—"It must surely strike all fair-minded men that it is a practical grievance that the poor parents, whose children are taught by the Sisters, because of conscience, and because they believe that their characters are better formed under their care, should have to pay, not only for them, but for the education of the children of their neighbors, and that the very building in which the Sisters do their excellent work should be taxed to maintain the imposing edifice hard by. What makes this practical grievance more galling, is that the Sisters' school was—prior to 1890—a legalized public institution, and that its founder considered it to be under the shelter of the constitution; that it was regularly rented by the board, and its teachers paid; that it was inspected and always open to the public, with a book kept in which all complaints could be registered; that no complaints were ever made or fault found with it, and that the visitor of the school was and is Father Cherrier, a member of the Council of the University of Manitoba, the chairman of its Board of Studies, and a man honored throughout the city for his character, his scholarship and the zeal with which he has labored for the