

going terms of the section, it is hereby declared that (notwithstanding anything in this Act) the exclusive legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say:

S-s. 27. The Criminal Law, except the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters.

Sec. 92. In each Province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say:

S-s. 14. The administration of justice in the Province, including the constitution, maintenance, and organization of Provincial courts, both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts.

Sec. 94. Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Parliament of Canada may make provision for the uniformity of all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and of the procedure of all or any of the courts in those three Provinces; and from and after the passing of any Act in that behalf the power of the Parliament of Canada to make laws in relation to any matter comprised in any such Act shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, be unrestricted; but any Act of the Parliament of Canada making provision for such uniformity shall not have effect in any Province unless and until it is adopted and enacted as law by the legislature thereof.

Sec. 101. The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance, and organization of a general Court of Appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

Sec. 94 has to be reconciled with sec. 101. I can see no reason why the latter is not subservient to the former, should the recent decision of *The Queen v. Levinger*, 22 O.R. 690, be good law. The decision in that case is the most recent one, and by it we are bound. Should this decision state the law correctly, as we are bound to assume that it does—deciding that the crime of forgery can be tried at the Court of General Sessions—what becomes of previously decided cases, not carried to the Court of Privy Coun-