The vote was then taken on hon. Mr. Dickey's amendment, which was lost by 27 to 31, as follows:—

CONTENTS—The Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Alexander, Allan, Armand, Bellerose, Benson, Bourinot, Campbell, Chapais, Cornwall, Dever, Dickey, Dumouchel, Ferrier, Flint, Guevremont, Hamilton, (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Howlan, Kaulbach, Macfarlane, Macpherson, Read, Ryan, Shaw, Trudel, Vidal—27.

Non-CONTENTS—The Honorable Messieurs Archibald, Baillargeon, Botsford, Brown, Bureau, Carrall, Chaffers, Chinic, Christie, Cormier, Fabre, Glasier, Haythorne, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McClelan, McMaster, Macdonald, Miller, Montgomery, Muirhead, Pâquet, Penny, Price, Scott, Seymour, Simpson, Skead, Sutherland, Wark, Wilmot --31.

HON. MR. ALLAN moved, seconded by HON. MR. CAMPBELL, that the forty-seventh clause be struck out.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL was in favor of the principle of the bill, but was opposed to abolishing the appeal to England. He had just voted against the amendment since the Government had expressed a willingness to meet the views of the House by expunging the clause. He apprehended that the striking out of this clause would not invalidate the working of the Act, and commended the Government for consenting to leave the question to the sentiment of the House.

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST did not consider the retention of this clause as absolutely necessary to the working of the bill. He knew, however, that there were great objections to it in his own Province.

HON. MR. WILMOT said if this clause was struck out the bill would be worth

nothing, and he should vote against it, The Supreme Court would then be only a circum ocution office, and make only one more degree of jurisdiction. It would mean more expense to the litigants. What would be the use of saddling this country with \$75,000 a year if this appeal to England was still allowed? It would be better to remain as we were. He trusted that the majority of this House would not so mutilate this bill.

Hon. MR. ALLAN voted against the bill because this clause was in it. But the bill having been carried, he considered it is duty at all events to eliminate this most objectionable feature of it. He understood the hon. Secretary of State to say that he did not attach importance, from this point of view, to what he had called the sentimental clause.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the fairest way would be to take the sense of the House without any more discussion.

HON. MR. MILLER wished to know if the Government were united on this point?

HON. MR. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said they were not united, but they agreed to leave it to the House to pronounce whether they wished it to be struck out or not. For himself he was in fayour of retaining it.

HON. MR. SCOTT regarded the bill Three or as one of great importance. four years had been taken in its elaboration. Gentlemen high in the legal profession and distinguished statesmen belonging to both the political parties had combined to make this bill With something worthy of Canada. the view of making it acceptable he had stated he was willing it should be ' struck out if the House desired. He was content to abide the decision of public opinion, feeling satisfied that if the clause were struck out now the public would ultimately demand the abolition of the appeal to England. At present if this House was hostile to the appeal being abolished, he was prepared to yield. He did so in the hope of lessening the opposition of hon. gentlemer.

Hon. MR. BROWN thought this clause was more one of sentiment than of practical importance. Still we were bound to give great consideration to matters of feeling and sentiment. It