

for instance the province of British Columbia or Saskatchewan, you would hardly think it was the correct thing that there should be an appeal from the decision of the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court of British Columbia or to the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan. I do not think any hon. gentleman can quote a precedent for an appeal from a higher court to a lower court, even though it is an appeal from a single judge of a higher court to a lower court sitting in banc. I have the honour to move that the committee rise. We shall get along very well without this Bill for another year.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—I must second the motion. I think this is a very extraordinary Bill for some of the reasons which I pointed out the other day, and because some of the explanations which we have asked for have not been given to us. I asked this morning whether the result would be that two or three different jurisprudences might not arise under the operation of this Bill. We will have separate jurisprudence established by the provincial courts of nine different provinces. Before I give my sanction to a Bill of this kind, I want to know which of these jurisdictions is going to establish the jurisprudence for the Exchequer Court, a federal court. I have pleasure in seconding the motion that the committee rise.

The motion that the committee rise was carried on a division; yeas, 12; nays, 9; names not recorded.

#### DEBATES AND REPORTING OF SENATE.

##### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

On the order of the day being called:

Consideration of the third report of the Committee on Debates and reporting of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—I beg leave to move concurrence in this report. I might say that we grant an extra allowance to Messrs. Holland Bros., making \$6,500, which is about \$200 over the contract price. The contract is a very old one and things have grown expensive since then. There is a provision for a payment of Mr. Cinq-Mars for his services as translator. This is practically the same as last year.

Hon. Mr. POWER.

It also recommends that notice be served on Messrs. Holland of cancellation of the contract as arranged yesterday.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—When was that report presented to this House?

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—At the last sitting. And a motion was made to allow it to come up at this sitting.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I suppose there is no objection to it.

The motion was agreed to.

#### RAILWAY SUBSIDIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved the second reading of Bill (No. 174) An Act to correct a clerical error in Chapter 63 of the Statutes of 1908, respecting railway subsidies. He said:—I may explain in one word what has occurred. If my hon. friends opposite will look at the Statutes for 1908 they will find at the bottom of item 2 that a grant is made to the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company towards the construction and completion of a railway across Burrard Inlet. By accident, the essential part of it \$200,000 was left out in the printing of the Statutes, but it is found in the summary of the House of Commons and this merely corrects the omission that has been accidentally made in the Statute.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Can my right hon. friend say whether this amendment appears in the Subsidy Bill as brought down to the House of Commons, or did the error occur there also?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—No, it was corrected in the House of Commons, I am informed, but was accidentally omitted in the Statute which I presume governed. The hon. gentleman will see, if he glances at this—

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Yes, I have looked at it, but the only question in my mind is as to the original authority for the \$200,000.