important proposal for limiting the number of cases going to the Supreme Court of Canada, a proposal which we have rejected for reasons that should now be explained. We refer to the so-called "federal question" limitation. The proposal is that the Supreme Court of Canada should not have jurisdiction at all concerning cases which arise only under Provincial law, according to the list of Provincial legislative subjects in the British North America Act. The final court for such a case would then be the Court of Appeal of the Province in which the case arose. The Supreme Court of Canada would concern itself only with cases arising under Federal laws and statutes, according to the list of Federal powers in the British North America Act, and with the interpretation of the British North America Act itself. If such a limitation were feasible and desirable, it would considerably reduce caseload pressure on the Supreme Court of Canada. In our view, it is neither feasible nor desirable. This is a complex question. Nevertheless, our reasons for rejecting such a solution may be briefly explained at this point. (We give further information and references on the subject in Appendix D.)

It is alleged that the United States affords an example of successful limitation of the caseload of the Supreme Court of that country by the limitation of its jurisdiction to "federal questions" in the manner mentioned. The United States, unlike Canada, does have a complete dual system of courts that operate side by side, a complete system of State courts in each State, and a complete system of Federal courts culminating in the Supreme Court of the United States. It is further alleged that, for the most part, questions under State laws are tried