> wealthy litigant may at present go as a right to the House of Lords, and that means involving the successful litigant in an enormous amount of expense which may really, in the end, although the decision remains the same, deprive him largely of the fruits of victory. It is as well that that right should be supervised. The right to apply to a committee of the House of Lords, in the opinion of the Bar Council, fully safeguards the interests of the litigant in every way."

Lord Atkin:

> "The great importance of this reform is this, that a rich corporation - or perhaps I might say a strong government department - will not for the future be able in any way to terrorize the person with whom they may have a dispute by a threat that the case will certainly be taken to the House of Lords. I think it is a great advantage that a case will not now come to your Lordships' House unless there are substantial grounds for so taking it either in the opinion of the Court of Appeal or of your Lordships' House."

Lord Hanworth:

> "There are some cases which I have in mind, over the past few years, in respect to which certainly an appeal ought not to have been brought, but an appeal was brought for purposes, I may say, other than that of trying to put a wrong decision right. Sometimes a delay is involved in going to your Lordships' House, a delay which may be worth paying for even though the appeal is unsuccessful."

We presume that there has been a small but significant number of cases in Canada, appeals as of right to the Supreme Court of Canada under present rules, which would be examples of these abuses. The plenary consent jurisdiction that we recommend for civil cases in the Supreme Court of Canada would put controls in place that would prevent such abuses.

The Supreme Court of Canada should remain the general and final court of appeal for Canada on all subjects. The Court should not be limited to so-called federal questions.

(5) We come now to the discussion of a different and