

COURTS OF APPEAL.

of the Privy Council, which, being a decision of a Court of last resort," should be taken to govern. Again: when upon the highly important question, as to whether Colonial Legislative Assemblies had inherent power to punish by imprisonment for a contempt committed outside the House, the Privy Council at first, in 1836, affirmed the doctrine that there was such a power: *Beaumont v. Barrett*, 1 Moo., P. C. C. 59. But when, in 1842, another appeal came up, presenting the same matter for adjudication, the same Court delivering judgment through the same Judge, Parke, B., disaffirmed the existence of any such constitutional power as a legal incident in Colonial Houses of Assembly: *Kielly v. Carson*, 4 Moo., P. C. C. 63. This later opinion was adhered to when, for a third and last time, in 1858, the same question arose in *Fenton v. Hamilton*, 11 Moo., P. C. C. 347.

With this fluctuation of decision contrast the judicial position of the House of Lords as set forth in the language of Lord Campbell: "By the constitution of the United Kingdom, the House of Lords is the Court of appeal in the last resort, and its decisions are authoritative and conclusive declarations of the existing state of the law, and are binding upon itself when sitting judicially, as much as upon all inferior tribunals." *The Attorney General v. The Dean and Canons of Windsor*, 8 Ho. of L. C. 391. See also the language of Lord Eldon in *Fletcher v. Lord Sondes*, 1 Bligh, N. R. 144, 249, on the same point, and per James, V. C., in *Topham v. Portland*, 38 L. J. N. S., Ch. 513.

The *Solicitors' Journal* maintains that there are six points which are essential to the existence of a satisfactory Supreme Court of Appeal: It should be (1) single; (2) Imperial; (3) constant; (4) of weight corresponding to its authority; (5) reasonable rapid in action; and (6) not prohibitory in point of expense. Without commenting upon all these points, we may say, as to the first, there is no doubt it is extremely desirable to do away with the distinctions which we have shown to exist between the decisions of the two present Courts of ultimate appeal. The law as laid down by the one highest Court should be of validity for all purposes, in all Courts, and at all times, till changed by statute. In no other way can certainty in the law be reached. By the second requisite is meant that the mem-

bers of the Court should be drawn not only from the English, but from the Scotch, Irish, and Colonial bench. In other words, that it should be in truth a representative court, where at least one of the judiciary body should be practically acquainted with each of the different systems of law which obtain over the wide-spread dominions of England. Only in this way, it seems to us, can the fourth requisite be secured; so that, in learning and judicial experience, colonists may regard this tribunal as superior, not only in name, but in fact, to their own Provincial Courts. When Mr. Knapp first began, some thirty years ago, to report the decisions of the Privy Council, Sir John Leach, in his usual imperious style, refused to lend an ear to the new reports, at the same time acutely remarking that decisions regarding systems of jurisprudence of which the Court knew little or nothing, could never acquire authority; and that it was a useless exposure of inevitable and incurable judicial incapacity to publish their judgments. These strictures are to a considerable extent well founded. The surest way to obviate them and others of a like kind, is to constitute the appellate court in manner as indicated; thereby its moral weight shall be decisively greater than the Colonial and other Courts whose decisions it reviews. Apart from this great advantage, there is another which we need hardly elaborate. That is, the very strong bond of union which would be thus formed between the mother country and her colonies. It would be, we conceive, constitutionally impossible, as well as highly undesirable to do away with the right of appeal from the colonies to the Privy Council. Practically but few appeals go there from this Province, so strong, and, in many respects, so well constituted is our own Provincial Court of Appeal. According to statistics laid before the Dominion Parliament, there were, between the years 1869 and 1872, but two appeals from Ontario to the Privy Council. From the other Provinces the figures stood thus: Nova Scotia, one; New Brunswick, two; Quebec, twenty-one. Yet though we of this Province are seldom before the Privy Council, we should not relish being deprived of the right to go there. While our confidence is great in the present constitution of the Judicial Committee, yet a reformation such as has been mooted, and the infusion of a Colonial element into the