

This will not be possible in Canada, and the application of English law to cases in the Canadian Courts will require care and discrimination."

*CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS—HOW FAR CAN
DELEGATES DELEGATE,*

The British constitution, with its array of a few foundation principles, and the absence of any process by which these principles can be varied, has always been thought to be free from the danger of undergoing alterations. Written constitutions can undergo alterations, because they always contain some provisions for the introduction of amendments.

To most persons the idea that the British constitution has changed will come as a surprise. It has been our boast in the past, is our boast still, and will so remain, many think, until there comes a revolution more disastrous than any we have yet experienced.

Is the British constitution undergoing alterations, or are those traditions handed down to us through ages, some of which have been crystallized into statutes, and upon which the fabric of the Imperial dominion has been constituted, undergoing a process of alteration? It seems to be so, and the same remark applies to the Canadian constitution, which is partly written and partly unwritten.

The sovereignty of Parliament as it was formerly understood meant in Great Britain, The King, the Lords Temporal and Spiritual, and Commons. In Canada, the King, the Senate and Commons. In both, all acting together constitute Parliament, and this Parliament has "the right to make or unmake any law whatever." In England an important and radical change has been introduced. Down to 1911 no Act of Parliament could be passed without the consent of both Houses. The House of Lords had the right and power to check any bill sent up to it by the House of Commons. The Lords may still discuss a money bill for a calendar month, but they cannot prevent its becoming an Act of Parliament at the end of that month. It is only in this case that the Parliament