

and indivisible, and it should be observed that in all the Colonial Acts or other instruments relating to appeals from the Colonies, words have invariably been introduced reserving the undoubted right of Her Majesty, her Heirs and Successors, to admit appeals from all judgments whatsoever of the Colonial Courts. The Canada "Supreme and Exchequer Court Act" is the first exception to the rule.

This subject has more than once been the subject of judicial decisions by the Privy Council itself (see the cases of "*Cuvillier v. Aylwin*," 2 Knapp, p. 72; "*Macfarlane v. Leclaire*," 15, Moore's P. C. C., p. 181; and "*in re Louis Marois*," 15, Moore's P. C. C., p. 189); when the effect of the Lower Canada Act, 34 George III, Cap. 6, was under discussion. The result of these arguments and decisions seems to be that the jurisdiction by way of appeal from all Colonial Courts is a prerogative of the Crown which cannot be taken away except by the express words of an Act of the Legislature to which the Crown has given its assent; but Lord Chelmsford intimated, in delivering judgment in this last mentioned case, that their Lordships desire not to be precluded from a further consideration of the serious and important question which it involves.

If, however, it be important for the Crown to retain the uncontrolled power of admitting and deciding the Colonial Appeals for the sake of justice, public order and Sovereignty, it is much more important to the suitors in Colonial Courts to have access to this supreme jurisdiction; for Courts of Justice exist not for the interest of the Judge but of the suitor. This Act would deprive suitors in Canada of a right and a remedy, which they have not been slow to use. Here many considerations arise. The Dominion of Canada has recently been erected on a federal basis, including several provinces. Questions of great nicety must arise under such a constitution between the federal and provincial legislatures and judicatures. These are precisely questions upon which the decision of a Court of Final Appeal, not included within the Confederation, would be most impartial and valuable. Again, in Canada strong divisions of race, religion, and party are known to exist. The policy and the duty of the British Government, and especially of the Last Court of Appeal, has been to secure absolute impartiality to the rights or claims of the minority of the population. Laws passed by a strong political majority, and administered by Judges and Courts appointed by the representatives of the same majority, are less likely to ensure an entire respect for the rights of all classes than the decisions of a perfectly impartial and independent tribunal. Accordingly, a very strong opposition manifested itself in Parliament against this Bill, and a protest was signed by no less than seventeen members of the Legislature.

It may be said that the Canadians are the best judges of their own wants, and are entitled to place the administration of justice to themselves in whatever hands they please. But here it must be remarked that the allegation of extreme expense and delay in the prosecution of appeals to England is unfounded. The delay rests entirely with the parties or their agents: any appeal may now be heard within six months; the expense