

cause of the Supreme Court; but let them not forget the hostile votes cast against the institution of that Court; let them not forget that several of them introduced motions, and made speeches against its creation; and yet it was not sought at the time to fill a gap, which assuredly did not exist in the minds of those hon. members. Why, then, is it asked to-day which is the tribunal that is to take the place of the one we are asked to abolish? As the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Vallée) has said, Mr. Speaker, we have already the tribunal that we require; we have the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England. In that Court, the contending parties have to pay the costs of suits, and the people are not required to spend their money, an advantage greatly appreciated by them. If I look at the question from a pecuniary point of view, it is the people themselves who pay most of the expenses; it is the people who pay the Judges' salaries; it is the people who pay the working expenses of that Court, and those expenses amount to at least about \$60,000 a year. And, as has been remarked by the hon. member for Portneuf, that Court has cost since its creation more than \$300,000 without our deriving any advantage therefrom. Last year, and this year, there have been nothing but complaints about it, and next year it will be the same. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Macdougall) tell us that there was one advantage in taking a case to Her Majesty's Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that was that of being able to plead in a language which one appears to ignore or which one cannot understand in the Supreme Court. Better justice is thus rendered to litigants before the Privy Council. There are men in the Privy Council who are statesmen, who understand languages perfectly; men before whom we can plea in our own language in the interest of our clients, and who are certain to understand us. Such is not the case in the Supreme Court. There are a thousand reasons for the abolition of the Supreme Court, and I do not see any that can justify the actual state of things. The hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Public Works have expressed their regret and my not consenting to the proposal of suspending the second reading of that Bill. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, of the agreement entered into. I could not consent to a delay in the reading of that Bill, when it was agreed, and such was the agreement, that it should fall through of itself, unless some member rose and asked the House to be allowed to foster it. I was thus naturally obliged to take it under my protection, in order to prevent its falling through. Having done so, I had resolved, as I said this afternoon, to suspend its reading, when an amendment supervened asking that the debate be adjourned. We were nevertheless still willing to suspend the reading of the Bill, on condition that the hon. member for Maskinongé should withdraw his motion for the adjournment of the debate; the hon. member consented, but there was a member who refused his consent, and you are aware that when an amendment is put to the vote, it can only be withdrawn with the unanimous consent of the House. Consequently, the blame thrown on me, for refusing to accept the proposal of the hon. Ministers of Justice and of Public Works, is not founded on fact, as the reasons I have given point conclusively to the contrary. Under these circumstances, and considering that the Government has noways introduced a measure in conformity with the promises made by it last year, I think it is my duty to vote against the six months' hoist proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell.

Amendment (Mr. Mills), six months' hoist, agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Baker,	Hay,	O'Connor,
Barnard,	Hesson,	Ogden,
Mr. LANDRY.		

Beauchesne,	Holton,	Quimet,
Béchar, Hooper,	Houde,	Paterson (Brant),
Benoit,	Hurteau,	Pickard,
Blake,	Jackson,	Platt,
Boulton,	Kilvert,	Pope (Compton),
Bowell,	King,	Pouppore,
Brown,	Kranz,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bunting,	Langevin,	Rogers,
Burpee (St. John),	Lantier,	Ross (Middlesex),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Laurier,	Royal,
Cartwright,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Ryan (Montreal),
Casey,	McDonald (Pictou),	Schultz,
Casgrain,	McDonald (Vict., N.S.),	Scriven,
Charlton,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Shaw,
Cimon,	Macmillan,	Skinner,
Coursol,	McCarthy,	Smith,
Dawson,	McConville,	Stephenson,
DeCosmos,	McCuig,	Sutherland,
Drew,	McInnes,	Tassé,
Elliott,	McLennan,	Trow,
Eitzsimmons,	Malouin,	Tupper,
Fleming,	Manson,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Gault,	Masson,	Weldon,
Geoffrion,	Mills,	Waeber,
Gillies,	Mousseau,	Wiser,
Girouard (Kent),	Muttart,	Wright,
Gunn,		Yeo.—88.
Guthrie,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bannerman,	Hackett,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Hilliard,	Perrault,
Bourassa,	Landry,	Pinsonneault,
Bourbeau,	LaRue,	Rinfret,
Bunster,	McQuade,	Ross (Dundas),
Coughlin,	McKory,	Rouleau,
Coupal,	Massue,	Routhier,
Cuthbert,	Merner,	Rykert,
Desaulniers,	Méhot,	Strange,
Dumont,	Mongenais,	Tellier,
Fortin,	Montplaisir,	Vallée,
Gigault,	Olivier,	Vanasse,
Grandbois,	Orton,	Wallace (York).—39.

COURT OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. McCARTHY, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 12) for constituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, said: It is, perhaps, necessary that I should add something to what I said when I had the honor of introducing this measure to the notice of this House. It is difficult, perhaps, to approach this subject—not because there is not a great deal to be said about it, but because the subject is of so wide a character, and embraces so many considerations, that it is almost impossible to limit oneself to any particular point, and because it is almost impossible to embrace the whole subject within the limit of an ordinary address. I do not propose to inflict upon the House a speech of any great length on the subject, because I think the main feature—the principle of the Bill, that is the establishment of some tribunal for the determination of railway matters and matters concerning the difficulties which arise between railway companies and individuals—is sufficiently well known and sufficiently appreciated as to render it unnecessary that I should take up the time of the House at any great length. But it is, perhaps, proper that I should make a few observations in asking the House to make a change of this kind. It has been said more than once during this afternoon's debate—if it is not improper to refer to the fact—that we have in this country a great many courts, more, in the estimation of some hon. gentlemen, than are essential to the wants of the people; but many courts as we have, I think I can safely say that we have no Court that has the requisite and proper machinery to deal with the difficulties that arise in connection with railway companies; and though, as I shall show in a moment or two, the law requires railway companies to do many things which they do not do, I think I am safe in saying that we have no adequate means of enforcing the