

of this subject and dictate to the learned Judges of the Supreme Court what they should do on what is really an insignificant matter of practice. There is another way I wish the difficulty could be obviated, and it is adopted by the leading practitioners having business in that Court, namely, when printing books for the Court of Appeal of Ontario they strike off a double number; instead of fifty they print 100 in all important cases in which there is a reasonable probability that they will go to the Supreme Court, the simple result being that they have to pay for the paper and press work for the extra fifty copies, and when the cases go to the Supreme Court a title page, the reasons of appeal and the requisite additional matter is added. While no hon. member will object to this resolution being adopted, I venture to doubt whether it is either expedient, or our duty, to waste the time of the House in discussing it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When this motion was up the other day, I mentioned that the hon. the Minister of Justice had called the attention of the Judges of the Supreme Court to the subject. I hold in my hand a memorandum from the Chief Justice and the Judges on the matter, in which they state that the Court has had frequently to call attention to the unnecessary amount of printing matter not required by the rules, and has been compelled in several cases to direct the Registrar to refuse to allow such printing to be taxed as costs, I will not detain the House by reading this memorandum, but will hand it to my hon. friend for perusal.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad that the hon. leader of this House and the hon. Minister of Justice in the other House, consider that the matter is not so unworthy the attention of Parliament as to be set aside. I always have been of opinion that it is unfortunate we should have to notice these questions, and agree with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), that it is quite within the competence of the Supreme Court to remedy this grievance; but I stated that several years ago the attention of the Court was called to it, and it was brought up in Parliament two years ago, as well as three or four years ago. If, therefore, nothing has been done after a lapse of four years, and in the meantime money is being expended uselessly, I do not think it is too early now to bring this subject again before the House and spend ten minutes of time in saving an expenditure of several thousand dollars to the suitors of this country.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (Halton). I agree very much in the opinion of my hon. friend behind me, that it is not the business of this House to concern itself about the internal management of any particular high court in the procedure which may take place before it. If any abuses occur there is a means of applying the remedy without the necessity of discussing them in this House, where very few of us can have any considerable amount of knowledge respecting the details involved. I have made enquiries, as well as my hon. friend opposite, regarding the printing of material for the Supreme Court, because I had also observed the very ponderous volumes printed in that Court in connection with the case shortly to be argued and decided there; but I ascertained that the rules of the Court were not in fault at all. If any fault existed, it belonged to the solicitors in the case, because it was for them to say what matter they wished to be printed and used there. There is no rule of that Court requiring that anything but the case should be printed at all. Exhibits may be brought in manuscript, and there is no rule, at all events, against the use of printed cases from the Courts below. It is necessary that the judgments of those Courts should be before the Supreme Court, which has to reverse or confirm those judgments, as it is necessary it should be in possession of the reasons for and against the appeal; but it is not the fault of the rules of the Court if it results from our

own statute that the Supreme Court must have before it the cases from which appeal is taken. The whole matter is in the hands of the counsel engaged, and the question is whether it is any particular grievance with which Parliament should interfere that the parties in litigation should make more expense than is necessary. There is another view from our standpoint that may be well considered. It is not desirable that all the cases which arise in the inferior courts should be appealed, and I think it is no great disadvantage that there should be some obstacles in the way of such appeals; and if parties will carry these cases to the court of last resort, I do not think the general public will be much concerned should they have to incur considerable costs in securing their object.

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. BLAKE, in moving for a statement of the number of persons in each electoral district counted in the Census, &c., though absent from the place at which they were counted, said: On a former occasion, during last Session, I indicated my opinion that it was extremely important that the arrangements for taking the Census should be such that there would be some statement of the persons who were counted, although absent from the place where they were counted. It was known that very considerable difficulty existed in ensuring any measurable degree of accuracy in the application of the *de jure* system to such a statement. So much difficulty exists in informing the minds, guiding the judgment, and ensuring accuracy of understanding when matters of discretion and opinion are involved, that that was granted. I believe from what I have been able to learn from information communicated to me in various parts of the country, that all sorts of opinions have prevailed in the minds of enumerators as to the mode in which they should count the population. In some cases they have counted every person who belonged to a house, even although that person had been a very long time resident in foreign parts, unless the head of the household would say he was quite sure the person was not coming back. In other instances, men who have been absent eight, ten, or twenty years, have, as I have been informed by persons in the locality who were familiar with the circumstances, been counted. It is not unnatural that such results should occur, because it is impossible, with such a vast army of enumerators to be instructed, that mistakes and misinterpretations of directions should not take place. But a corrective element would have been, and I hope has been, introduced, if the Census has been taken on the principle that each enumerator noted in a separate column every person who was counted although absent; because with that protection we could understand in any particular locality when there was an abnormal counting of the persons not present; and well understood laws of average, as applied to the ordinary circumstances of the country, would point to the cases in which it was likely there was a misinterpretation of instructions, thus affording ground for further enquiry and the correction of errors of this description. I hope, therefore, that steps have been taken of this kind, and that the hon. gentleman will be able to bring down that for which I ask—a statement of the number of persons in each electoral district counted in the Census, though absent from the place at which they are counted.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I do not remember the circumstance the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) has spoken of in alluding to this matter last year. When the schedules were laid on the Table, all were produced, and the hon. gentleman did not propose any amendment. It is true, it was most unpopular, and that no unnecessary questions were given—no more were put than were thought necessary for the country. With that principle in view, I cut down the