

to the contrary. He is not beyond the jurisdiction of the court, and I assume, inasmuch as this caveat remained against the land, that there must have been some justification for the registrar in pursuing the course he did.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—Any purchaser could have invoked the power of the court to upset the caveat.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE—It seems to me the Torrens Land Act was a Federal Act originally, because I have a distinct remembrance of the discussions which took place over it, and the question was raised as to how it might be applied, and I think it contains a provision giving any Provincial Government the right to apply the Act to any portion of the country.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—In answer to what my hon. friend has stated, I will say this, that what is known as the Torrens Act was introduced by the Federal Government and was applicable to lands in the Northwest Territories when the Dominion Government administered the registry office, but that would not apply to Manitoba. There was a time, and in fact it continued until the present provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were erected, when the land registration laws were administered in the Northwest by the Federal Government.

The sub-section was adopted.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE SENATE DEBATES.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

Hon. Mr. FARRELL moved concurrence in the fourth and fifth reports of the Senate Committee on Debates and Reporting.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE—I was trying to get a copy of the report to look over, but could not get one, and therefore know absolutely nothing of its contents. It seems to me we ought to have some means of knowing what we are called upon to endorse. I therefore move that this report be taken into consideration at the next sitting.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Before the amendment is put, I should like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that it is most important, if we want to do anything this session, that this report be now adopted, but, of course, not before

the hon. gentleman has seen it. I understand that the Clerk of the House has sent for the report in order to put it in the hands of the hon. gentleman from Grey. They are two very short reports which the chairman or any member of the committee can explain in a few words. To adopt the plan recommended by the committee there needs to be joint action of the House of Commons and the Senate on this report.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE: Would it carry out the purposes of this report to delay it until the next sitting of the House, which I presume will be this evening or to-morrow?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: This evening.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Let it stand until to-night.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—But that will give very little time.

The SPEAKER—The motion is on the amendment of Hon. Mr. Sproule asking that the consideration of this report be deferred until the next sitting.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—Perhaps if the chairman of the Debates Committee will explain what the report is, there will be no reason for waiting.

Hon. Mr. SPROULE—I find that the report reads as follows:

1. That a reporting branch be formed as part of the permanent official staff of the Senate, to report the debates of the Senate and evidence taken before committees of the same.
2. That Mr. Albert Horton, at present editor of the debates of the House of Commons, be transferred, with the consent of the House of Commons and under the provisions of the Civil Service Amendment Act, to the position of editor of Debates of the Senate, and that he have the direction and management of all matters connected with the organization and management of the Senate reporting branch.

The other report reads as follows:

Your committee recommend that in view of his 40 years' faithful services as reporter and editor of the Senate Debates, Mr. George C. Holland be paid an annual gratuity of \$1,000, such payments to commence from the 1st of January, 1917.

I take it from this paragraph that Mr. Holland does not come under the superannuation section of the Civil Service Act. I want to say, with regard to this, that I have no objections. As far as my knowledge enables me to say, we could not select a better person than Mr. Horton for this work. He has certainly done most creditable work in the House of Commons, and I have no doubt he will do equally creditable