of unlimited expense in connection with this court, and he urged the House to reject the bill. No one had yet suffered from the want of this court, though he was not prepared to say that the time might not come when such a court would be a necessity. He trusted, therefore, that the House would pause before they gave their assent to this bill. He thought it would do no harm to let it stand till another year, when the people might know what the bill was, and be prepared to express their opinion upon it. He therefore moved, seconded by HON. MR. FLINT, that the bill be not now read a third time, but that the third reading be postponed for three months.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said this House could not complain that sufficient time had not been given for the consideration of this measure. It had been discussed for six weeks in the Commons and in the press. Every one knew with what care it had been scrutinized by both parties in the other House, and finally accepted by them without divisions, and now it is pretended that the bill should be thrown out because sufficient time had not been given for its consideration. He thought it would look far better for its opponents to endeavour to amend it than thus to try to throw it overboard altogether. The objections urged by the hon. gentleman were not sufficient to justify this House in rejecting the bill. If this country was not able to find among its own men those qualified to be the judges in the last resort on cases affecting our civil rights, we would have reason to despair of our country. One objection made by his hon. friend was that all the judges were required to reside at Ottawa. There were many reasons why they should reside in this city. Since the court was established, more particularly for the purpose of settling the doubtful cases of jurisdiction between the Local and Federal Governments, and questions of privilege, it was manifestly desirable that they should at all times be near the seat of Government. The hon. gentleman had complained about the item of $3,000 for a library. Was that sum too much for an institution that would be an honour to our country? The sum was not too large for a library that they ought to have ready to their hands. He (Mr. Letellier De St. Just) ventured to doubt the sincerity of those who pretended to oppose this bill on the ground of economy. The hon. gentleman had opposed the abolition of appeal to the Privy Council solely on the ground of feeling—he had given no other reason. They in Lower Canada did not complain that their cases had to be submitted to the Privy Council, though, on account of the peculiar character of the laws in that Province, cases carried to the Privy Council were subjected to difficulties which the hon. gentlemen opposite could not understand. So that when cases were sent home from Quebec they were likely to be decided not according to the old French laws prevailing in Canada, but according to the Code Napoleon, with which their Lordships of the Privy Council seemed to be much better acquainted. It had been contended that the time for the establishment of this court had not arrived. He claimed that it had, and that the framers of our Constitution foresaw its immediate necessity and provided for its creation. When the first Parliament met after Confederation one of the first questions put to the Government was in relation to the early establishment of a Supreme Court. Seven years had now passed, and a great many cases had arisen which showed the necessity of a court such as now proposed, which would greatly contribute to the smooth working of our Act of Confederation. When this bill was in the House of Commons there was no division upon it, and the amendments adopted by the Government were carried by three to one. This was a proof that the people, through their representatives, had declared that the time had arrived for the establishment of this court. The arguments of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dickey) had no weight and were not founded on fact. He ought to have shown wherein the bill was defective, and endeavored to convince the Senate of the necessity of amendments, instead of trying to throw the bill out altogether. Instead of proposing to amend the defects of the bill, he had taken a course which would not add to