

appeal to the Privy Council, as that was one of the inalienable rights of a British subject. The cost of the proposed court was also a serious objection, and the state of our finances was such that we could not indulge in expensive luxuries, whether it was a Supreme Court or a Georgian Bay Branch Railway.

HON. MR. BUREAU replied to some of the objections urged against the bill by his hon. friend from De Salaberry (Mr. Trudel.) At first he (Mr. Bureau) had been disposed to oppose the bill on account of its abolishing the appeal to England, but he had changed his opinion since he had more fully reflected upon the nature of the bill. The appeal to the Privy Council, on account of its great expense, was beyond the means of every one but the most wealthy, and he had known individuals to be ruined thereby. But an appeal to the proposed Supreme Court would be within the power and means of everyone. He was quite satisfied to trust the rights of his compatriots of the Province of Quebec to this Supreme Court, as he considered their rights would be quite safe in a court of which two of the judges would have to be taken from the Bench of that Province. On the whole, he would prefer to trust the rights of French Canadians to the proposed Supreme Court than to the Privy Council; at the same time that he gladly acknowledged that they had never yet had any reason to complain with the decisions rendered by that august tribunal.

HON. MR. SCOTT had been much gratified by the observations of his hon. friend from Kingston, who had approached this question in a spirit which might have been expected from a member of the late Government, which had formerly proposed a measure of this kind. He was, therefore, quite prepared for the frank and generous way in which that hon. gentleman proposed to deal with the bill. The weight of the discussion, so far, had been upon the least important section of the bill, that is to say, upon the sentimental clause—that in reference to the Privy Council. Now, he thought it would be admitted that the deprivation of a right that had only been exercised in Ontario once in six years,

could not be a very serious matter. It was certainly the best possible evidence that the people of Ontario were well suited with the way in which the laws were administered in that Province, and with the men who administered them. In the sister Province of Quebec he would have expected that the feeling would have been very strong indeed in favour of any Court of final appeal which would have prevented suitors from going across the waters to a bench of judges, who were in one sense strangers to their laws. He thought he was correct in saying that if the public sentiment of Lower Canada were consulted, it would very largely support any measure to do away with that appeal. In a very important case that occurred lately, where nine judges took part, eight of them took one view, the ninth dissenting, and the views of the dissenting judge were those upheld by the Privy Council at home. The hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Trudel) had thrown out a suggestion which had not occurred to him before—that was that we should ourselves constitute that high Court of Appeal, following the example of the House of Lords. He (Mr. Scott) was afraid that, considering what took place in another part of this building a short time ago, such a proposition would not meet with very warm favor in that quarter. In reference to the Maritime Provinces, he had just been informed that a case in appeal rarely went home from that quarter—only one in six or seven years. As had been remarked by the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Trudel), the Parliament of Great Britain had conceived the idea of abolishing the Privy Council, admitting that it was possible to establish a court that would receive higher consideration from the people of the Empire than the one at present existing. He believed it was conceded in the bill before the House that unless by special desire of the parties directly interested the appeal to the Privy Council would be denied. Cases might still go from the local courts to the Supreme Court or to the Privy Council, as the case might be, until the Local Legislatures had accepted the provisions of this bill. Suitors would still have a right to appeal to the Judi-