the idea that there is some important limiting effect from the so-called "federal question" restriction in the United States on the caseload of the Supreme Court of that country is largely an illusion.

There is a second and deeper reason why a "federal question" limitation is not feasible, let alone desirable. In real life at the level of everyday affairs, Federal and Provincial laws in Canada are interpenetrating in numerous ways. Federal tax liability for John Jones may turn not just on a section of the federal Income Tax Act, but also on a point of property law under the Civil Code of Quebec. The validity of a promissory note may turn not only on the Federal Bills of Exchange Act, but also on the contract law of Ontario. Federal bankruptcy law is inextricably intertwined with Provincial property and contract laws. The constitutional validity of a Provincial statute cannot be determined unless and until that statute has been authoritatively construed for its true meaning. And so one could go on. Moreover, there are issues of private and public international law that cannot be confined to a single province. The basic common law is common to nine provinces, and much uniform Provincial statute legislation has been enacted. The same points of course can be made about the United States, where Federal and State laws also interpenetrate in a multitude of ways. As indicated, the Americans have recognized this.

The Special Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Constitution of Canada has recommended that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Canada be limited to