

is common sense to satisfy us that neither passengers nor freight will ever pass over this route, and the money might as well have been cast into the river. In conclusion, I have again to protest against the enormous expenditures contemplated by this Supply Bill, expenditures wholly unwarranted in the condition of our revenue, and which, I fear, must end in disaster.

Hon. Mr. GIRARD—Before closing the debate, I had intended to express my satisfaction at one item—\$550,000 for the construction of the Pembina Branch. I do not know that it is the intention of the Government to expend that amount, but I suppose that it will be spent, and that we will have the road. Any information that the hon. Secretary of State can give on that point, will be received with great pleasure by the Province of Manitoba.

The Bill was read the second and third time.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—Before the Bill is actually passed, I would like to ask the hon. Secretary of State if the return he promised me a few days ago, respecting freighting rails from Kingston to Fort Garry, has been brought down.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said it had been brought down in the shape of a memorandum.

The Bill was then passed.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS AMENDMENT BILL.

THE SENATE INSIST ON THEIR AMENDMENTS.

A Message was brought from the House of Commons by their Clerk, in the following words:—

“HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Thursday, 9th May, 1878.

“Resolved, That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors that this House disagrees to their amendments to, the Bill No. 68, intituled ‘An Act to amend the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 11, intituled ‘An Act to establish a Supreme Court and a Court of Exchequer for the Dominion of Canada,’ for the following reasons:—

“Because the first amendment, by inserting the word ‘highest,’ will in effect destroy this Sec-
Hon. Mr. McLelan.

tion which was intended to remove doubts as to the provisions of the law as it exists, respecting the right to appeal from the Court of final resort;

“Because the second amendment would deprive parties of a right of appeal to the Supreme Court in matters wherein an appeal lies to the Privy Council, and because there seems to be no reason why an appeal should be refused in matters relating to titles to land, annual rents, or such like matters or things where the rights in future might be bound.

“Ordered, That the Clerk do carry the said Message to the Senate.

“Attest,

ALFRED PATRICK,
Clerk of the Commons.”

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved seconded by Hon. Mr. Pelletier, that this House do not insist on their amendments to the said Bill, intituled ‘An Act to amend the Act 38th Victoria, Chapter 11, intituled ‘An Act to establish a Supreme Court and a Court of Exchequer for the Dominion of Canada.’ ”

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL—The amendment to which the Commons has dissented, is the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from DeSalaberry, who is not now in his place, and it was assented to in Committee, and by the House itself. It was for the purpose of maintaining the right of appeal as it now exists in Lower Canada. I do not suppose there is any occasion to dwell upon it, or that the House will depart from the decision which it arrived at on the previous occasion. It does not seem to me that the reasons given by the Commons are satisfactory; they simply say they desire to remove doubt by leaving that doubt out. No doubt existed at all, as I understand, upon the subject, and there was no appeal from Lower Canada except from the Court of final resort. The object of this amendment was to keep the Bill just as it is now, and as the people of Quebec are content that it shall continue to exist. There seems to be no reason for altering the law, except that the Commons desires to change it. I move in amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Armand, to leave out all the words after “That,” and insert “it be
“Resolved, That the said Bill be returned
“to the House of Commons with a Message informing that House that the Senate doth insist on their said amendments
“for the following reasons:—