the same Province there should be, in Courts having the same jurisdiction, two different rules of decision, and two substantially different modes of proceeding before juries; and that one side should have the arbitrary privilege, by selecting a particular Court, of choosing which rule and procedure shall be adopted, and the other side, without the chance of a hearing, and without appeal, be bound arbitrarily to submit to such selection.

The only other point on which I shall make any remarks, though it involves no principle, and is personal to the profession, is still one I feel of sufficient importance to be worthy of further consideration.—It is as to sections 87 and 88, by which a serious, and I think an unnecessary burthen is cast on the Barristers and Attorneys of the Provinces, by the condition on which they are to be permitted to practice in this Court, viz. by admission in general term, which is at Ottawa, and "upon paying such fees" as the said Court shall fix and determine, and upon signing a roll to be kept in the custody of the Registrar of said Court, who by section 77 is required to reside and keep his Office at the City of Ottawa.

The Act entitles Barristers and Attorneys to admission as of right; and it seems hard that to avail themselves of this right, they should all be required to make a journey to Ottawa, simply to pay fees and sign a roll; whereas a simple declaration in the Act that Barristers and Attorneys of the Superior Courts of the Provinces, so long as they shall properly conduct themselves as such, shall be Barristers and Attorneys of said Court, would seem to accomplish everything. If so, by simple operation of law, the journey, the roll, and the fees, are rendered alike unnecessary, and the profession exempt from what otherwise, I am sure, would be looked upon as a substantial grievance.

I feel I should be open to reproach if, after taking so many exceptions, I did not attempt to offer some scheme presenting fewer objections.

Without going into minute details, I will take the liberty of suggesting what I conceive would, in its practical working, be found to be an easily accessible, and, at the same time, simple, cheap, expeditious, and efficient appellate jurisdiction.

A Court of Appeal for Canada—pure and simple, without original jurisdiction—to be simply a Court of *dernier ressort*, to correct the errors of inferior tribunals.

In the high appellate Courts in England—the House of Lords—the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—the Lords' Justices—the Exchequer Chamber—we find no union of appellate and original jurisdiction.

The Court of Appeal to be composed of the Chief Justice and Senior Judge (or one of the Judges) of the Queen's Bench of Ontario,	2
The Chief Justice and Senior Judge (or one of the Judges) of the Common Pleas of Ontario,	2
The Chancellor of Ontario,	1
The Chief Justice and Senior Judge (or one of the Judges) of the Queen's Bench of Quebec,	2
The Chief Justice and Senior Judge (or one of the Judges) of the Superior Court of Quebec,	2
The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and Judge in Equity in Nova Scotia,	2
The Chief Justice and Senior Judge (or one of the Judges) of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick,	2
	13