

tional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada."

From these enactments it appears that the Parliament and the Government of Canada have jurisdiction in extradition matters, and that the Parliament of Canada, may create a special court to try extradition cases. That is what it did when it passed the Extradition Act (R.S.C., cap. 142) and appointed as extradition commissioners the judges of the Superior Courts and "such other persons as might be named by the Governor-in-Council."

The appellants argue that by "additional courts" are necessarily meant other courts of appeal or courts of the same nature as the Court of Appeal. That is an unreasonable distortion and restriction of the text. The act has in view courts of original jurisdiction and courts of appeal. It is in virtue of that section that the Exchequer Court was created, that jurisdiction has been given to certain courts in matters of contestation of federal elections, and that the Railway Commission was constituted.

The appellants call upon us to reconcile foregoing clauses with sections 91 and 92, which give the federal Government (91, sub. 27):

"The criminal law, except the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters."

And to the local Government (91, sub. 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."

There is no contradiction in the two clauses. The provincial courts do not exclude the federal courts with regard to the administration of federal laws. And if there were a contradiction, we should have to prefer section 101 on account of these words in it: "notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this act." The provincial jurisdiction of the provincial courts in criminal matters extends only to offenses committed within the province.