

his reputation for dealing fairly and wisely with the questions coming before this House. He (Mr. Letellier de St. Just) hoped the Senate would vote down the motion for throwing over the bill.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE regretted that he was obliged to oppose this measure. He did so, not from motives of mere party opposition to the Government, but because he conscientiously believed the measure was a wrong one, and would be prejudicial to the interests of the people of the Provinces of this Dominion. He had opposed the idea of such a Supreme Court from the very first, and when, while he was a member of the Lower House, and the late Government, composed of his political friends, proposed to establish a similar Court, he had told his late lamented political chief, Sir George E. Cartier, that he could not support him in this measure. He opposed it, not only because he believed it unconstitutional, but because he considered it an act of treachery towards the people of the different Provinces, and because he felt then, as he felt now, that it would be a gross injustice towards the ratepayers of the country. Our expenses were already very great, and a general feeling of uneasiness pervaded the community regarding our enormous and increasing public debt, and in face of these facts was it wise to burden the tax-payers with an additional \$100,000 a year—for he fully believed the whole expense of the Court would amount to that—for an establishment which the people did not want and had never asked for? Scarcely twelve months have elapsed since the Minister of Finance stated in the Commons that he regretted to say that the Government had felt it their duty to impose new taxes on the people of the country to the amount of \$3,000,000, and when he was asked Why? His answer was that it was necessitated by the legislation of the late Government, which could not be carried out without that increased taxation. Now, if the Hon. Minister spoke what he thought true, how could his Government come and ask for the adoption of such legislation involving such an expense? An hon. gentleman had stated that this bill, if passed, would be a great boon to the

poor, as the appeal to the Privy Council in England would be abolished. He (Mr. Bellerose) would say that it would be, as a rule, a great boon to the rich, but a great charge to the poor. Hon. gentlemen knew full well that as a rule the poor had no occasion to seek for such a tribunal, while the rich often require it. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture had stated the hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia (Mr. Dickey) ought to have proposed some amendments instead of moving the rejection of the entire bill; but it was well known that every kind of amendment had been proposed in the Commons, and how had the Government received them? Why, they had accepted a few unimportant changes and refused all the rest. What would be the use of proposing amendments when the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were not in a position to accept any amendment whatever? Where were the Commons today? They had nearly all gone home, and there scarcely remained a quorum to transact business. So that the Government could not accept any amendments except those forced upon them by the majority of this House. And that was the reason why the Government, with such indecent haste, were endeavouring to force this measure through the house at any cost, and just as it stood. The hon. gentleman then proceeded at considerable length to discuss the constitutional aspect of the question, declaring that under the terms of the Union Act, this Legislature had no right to establish the court as proposed. The compact which we had entered into was a Federal one, which left to the several Provinces the sole administration of all their local affairs. The 13th and 14th sub-sections of the 92nd clause of the British North America Act gave to the Provinces exclusive right to legislate upon matters relating to civil rights and the administration of justice, but the proposed Supreme Court would interfere with those rights and wrest from the Local Legislature some of the privileges they now enjoyed. After having adverted to the purport of the 101st clause of the Union Act, and shewn that this clause could not be constructed so as to be understood to give