

section 34 of the "Interpretation Act," "the Court of King's Bench, and the Superior Court in the province of Quebec" unless the context otherwise requires." The Interpretation Act is a guide to the meaning of words and expressions used in all the varied kinds of statutes of the Dominion Parliament and, when it is a case of a statute dealing with criminal law or procedure, the expression "Superior Court" would by clause 26-a be held to mean the Court of King's Bench Crown side, but, when it is a case of statute dealing with such a matter as insolvency or insurance, the same expression would mean the Superior Court. But it appears to me clear that the expression cannot mean both of the two cases just cited for illustration and that the intention of the Interpretation Act is to indicate that one of the two named courts which has the appropriate kind of jurisdiction, but not both of them.

"In regard to awards under the Railway Act, when we consider that there are sections necessarily requiring the intervention of original civil jurisdiction, such as are those providing for deposits in court, judgments of ratification of title and writs of possession, I consider it proper to say that the context requires that the expression "court" means that the Superior Court in the province of Quebec that is to say "a Superior Court of the province or district," such as is referred to in clause 7 of section 2 of the Railway Act, and that the definition or indication given in the Interpretation Act does not apply.

"In this view, there is nothing in either the Railway Act or the Interpretation Act to support the contention that there can be an appeal from the Superior Court to this Court. The "Superior Court" referred to is therefore the Superior Court of Lower Canada and not the Court of King's Bench.

"I therefore do not consider that this court and the