from the very highest Courts in the Province. The appellant who chose the Court of Review was bound by the decision of that Court. If the decision were in his favor, the other party had the right to appeal. This, he thought, was a very wise provision for checking and restraining litigation. This measure would go further and give the appellant the choice of another court. As this legislation was opposed by the representatives of Quebec Province, he would support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. PENNY said it might be in the interest of lawyers to have as many courts as possible, but it might not be in the interest of their clients. In the Province of Quebec there were four courts—first, the Superior Court, then the Court of Review, then the Court of Appeals, and last of all the Supreme Court of the Dominion.

The Committee divided on the amendment which was adopted.

Contents, 16.

Non-contents, 15.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL moved to further amend the clause by leaving out the words from "Majesty" to "provided."

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER hoped the hon. Senator would not insist upon this amendment, as it would be depriving us of a right we already possess.

Hon. Mr. TRUDEL said the question was practically this—for instance, a man had an annual rent of ten dollars; it was due by a party who was wealthy, and who wished to avoid paying the rent, yet under this Bill as it stood, the case might be carried to the Supreme Court, and the landlord might be obliged to travel five or six hundred miles from his residence, and spend hundreds and hundreds of dollars trying to collect that trifling amount of rent. It would lead practically to his abandoning his rights. In the Province of Quebec, parties had been denied the right of appeal from the Court of Review to the Court of Queen's Bench, on account of the cost which it entailed, and, for the same reason, he hoped this amendment would be adopted.

*Hon. Mr. Miller.*

The Committee divided on the amendment, which was adopted,

Contents, 16.

Non-Contents, 15.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE moved in amendment, "That all the words after "'be' in the main motion be left out, "and the clause be 'amended' by "inserting in page 2, line 14, after 'by-"laws,' the words, 'for the passing of "which, the vote of the freeholders or the "ratepayers is required.'"

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said there might be many by-laws besides those of the character mentioned in the amendment, which it would be desirable should be appealed, such as the opening of streets, etc. He did not think, in cases of that kind, individuals should be deprived of the right of appeal to the Supreme Court. It often happened that municipalities got into the possession of rings, who controlled them against the public interest.

Hon Mr. CAMPBELL concurred in the opinion of the hon. Secretary of State. The by-laws which required to be sanctioned by the rate-payers were very few. It was only where it was intended to incur some obligation. This amendment proposed something entirely new, and it would be difficult to say how far it would go; though some of the by-laws of municipalities were unimportant, others which did not require the votes of the rate-payers were exceedingly important, and parties should have the right to appeal against them.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE said he would have no objection to change the motion so as to make it less restrictive, but he would like to see the municipalities protected.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT wished to know if the hon. gentleman could mention any case of a grievance that had arisen under the existing law.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE said he did not; but under the existing law, any by-law passed by a council might be tried in Court, and a wealthy man—he knew of one in his own county who was not will-