

“As to the first amendment:—

“That it is unwise to allow an appeal, save from the highest Court of final resort in each Province, and the word ‘highest’ was inserted by the Senate’s first amendment, to prevent doubt on that point, and maintain the right of appeal as it now exists.”

“As to the second amendment:—

“That the words struck out apply to cases involving the title to, or questions relating to the laws of immovables in the Province of Quebec, laws derived from France which are not familiar to the majority of the members of the Supreme Court, nor is the French language, and that an appeal to Her Majesty’s Privy Council from the Courts of their own Province, affords in both respects a satisfactory tribunal to the people of Lower Canada; and that it is unwise to deprive them of the right they now enjoy in this respect.”

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I feel myself in a very embarrassing position just now, inasmuch as there is evidently a misconception with respect to the facts of the case. From the language of the Act, one would naturally conclude that there was an appeal from the Court of Review, and we must assume that the House of Commons would scarcely commit itself to that expression of opinion unless, in the judgment of the gentlemen who participated in the debate they felt they were justified in coming to that conclusion. In reference to the other point, I think it is fairly open to discussion whether it may not be in the interests of the people of Lower Canada that an appeal, even under the laws that are peculiar to Quebec, should not come to the Supreme Court rather than to the Privy Council. The Province of Quebec has been more interested in appeals than any other Province in the Dominion, as they have sent a larger number of cases across the Atlantic than all the rest of the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—And they want to continue to send them there.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Only one-half the cases have been sent there since the Supreme Court has been established. Having established the Supreme Court here, it does seem reasonable that it should be the Court of final resort.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried on the following division:—

Hon. Mr. Campbell

CONTENTS :

The Hon. Messrs.

Armand,	Flint,
Bellerose,	Girard,
Campbell,	McLelan (Londonderry)
Carrall,	Macpherson,
Chapais,	Miller,
Dickson,	Sked,
Dumouchel,	Wilmot.—14

NON-CONTENTS :

The Hon. Messrs.

Baillargeon,	Penny,
Chaffers,	Power,
Christie (Speaker)	Reesor,
Hope,	Scott,
Leo'ard,	Simpson.—11.
Pelletier,	

The question being put on the main motion, as amended, the same was also resolved in the affirmative, and it was

Ordered, That the last mentioned resolution be communicated to the House of Commons by the Clerk of this House.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT.

SENATE AMENDMENT AGREED TO.

A Message was brought from the House of Commons by their Clerk in the following words:—

“HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 9th May, 1878.

“Resolved, That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honors that this House doth not insist on its disagreement to the first amendment made by the Senate to the Bill (No. 14) intituled: ‘An Act further securing the Independence of Parliament,’ and that it now agrees to the said first amendment.”

“Ordered, That the Clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

“Attest.

“ALFRED PATRICK,

“Clerk of the Commons.”

TRANSPORTATION OF RAILS.

ENQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON asked if the Government had awarded the contract for the transport this season of rails to Winnipeg.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said he was not aware that they had. He thought the tender of \$18 from Kingston to Winni-