then existed, but he had this to say, and I quote from page 739 of the debates of 1875:

> True, the appeal to the privy council had often proved fatal to suitors who had succeeded in all their courts, and sometimes by the unanimous voice of all their judges in Lower Canada.
>
> True, some of the decisions of the privy council had been rendered contrary to the plainest principles of their civil law, but this evil had been and is, a necessary and inevitable one.

Why did he say that it was necessary and inevitable? He pointed out that the system of law in that province was vastly different in some respects from the laws of England which they were called upon to interpret. Mr. Langlois said, as reported on page 932, that there was a growing feeling in the province of Quebec in favour of abolishing appeals to the privy council and that one factor was the expense involved which militated against a poor litigant.

How true that is. That is one reason why we have so warmly supported the abolition of appeals to the privy council. Only people of wealth or corporations and provinces with great resources can carry through an appeal to the privy council. In other words, the poor litigant is denied recourse to the final court of appeal under the procedure we have had in our country for some generations. Then Mr. Laflamme is reported on page 935 as follows:

> As to the allegation that the court would be perfectly useless so far as the province of Quebec was concerned, its peculiar institutions were undoubtedly threatened with danger when cases were decided by a tribunal most of whom were ignorant of the laws of Lower Canada, and he would oppose the bill if he were not convinced that its passage would have the effect of abolishing appeals to the privy council.

I could go on to quote a number of statements along the same line. One interesting record in connection with that debate is that Mr. Irving moved on third reading for the abolition of appeals to the privy council. A vote was taken and his motion was carried by people who were close to confederation, not after consultation with the provinces, by 112 to 40. A vast majority of the members of the house who were close to confederation, who understood all the considerations behind the constitutional agreements that had been achieved, were in favour, not only of setting up a supreme court but of making it the final court and abolishing appeals to the privy council. Subsequently the decision was changed.

But nations move slowly. I could not quite follow the leader of the opposition this afternoon when he said that there was no reason for haste, that we should move more slowly. As the records of parliament show, this matter has been discussed for the last 75 years. I hope that we do not move as slowly in improving our social and economic conditions in the next 75 years as we have been in bringing a measure of this description before the House of Commons for decision in 1949.

We support this proposal. If a vote is taken on the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition, of course we shall vote against it. We believe the time has arrived when this measure should be adopted. The constitutional discussions foreshadowed in the speech from the throne must go on, but it seems to me that this is a matter separate from those discussions. This bill gives a court already set up the power to decide, to the ultimate end, cases arising in Canada.

Because we believe that this is the proper step, recognized by the law lords of the judicial committee of the privy council themselves as the right thing for Canada to do, we support it. Since I have been a member of parliament I have followed the British *Hansard*, on the several occasions when at Canada's request constitutional changes have been made, to see what happens in the British house. I find that they are moved and carried with a few perfunctory remarks.

When a Conservative member of the British house was visiting Canada a few years ago I asked him what the House of Commons in Great Britain would do in regard to any constitutional change that Canada might ask for and he said, "We would pass it without any question and largely without any discussion." Consequently I think the time has surely arrived when we should take unto ourselves the attributes of nationhood, and one of those attributes is that we should have our own judiciary interpret our own laws and our own constitution. That is why we should have our own Canadian court of last resort.

Because we are of this opinion we shall support the second reading of this bill.

Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the house because I think the subject before us has been discussed quite thoroughly, but I feel sure the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) would welcome a statement as to our position on this important measure. The government proposes by Bill No. 2 to abolish appeals to the judicial committee of the privy council. I notice that the bill provides that the judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada as it will be constituted shall be final and conclusive in civil, criminal and constitutional cases.

The whole question of privy council appeal has been under consideration and study more or less intensively for a good many