

Was not that retrospective legislation? One would naturally think that it was legislation of a retrospective and most objectional and vicious character. Here was a property that belonged to a municipality subsequently leased to a private individual. The lessee claims the timber on lands that never belonged to him—the municipality protests and the Legislature passes a Bill providing that the timber upon this property was included, and intended to be always included, in the licenses so granted. Section 2 provided that

“The licensee shall be deemed to have, and to have had, all rights in the trees, timber, lumber thereon, or cut thereon, as if the same were cut on any patented land of the Crown.”

Now here was an Act that was retrospective in its character, that interfered with private rights, that directly took the property from one person and vested it in another without compensation, that overrode the judgment of the Court and rights of the municipality. The corporation of the county of Frontenac petitioned against this Act, and the Act passed in review before the hon. the First Minister with all its objectionable features. Did the hon. the First Minister disallow the Bill? Not at all. He said: “It is clearly within the competence of the Local Legislature, and the undersigned recommends that it be left to its operation.” When the Streams’ Bill came before the hon. gentleman he did not take that ground; it was admitted that it was within the competence of the Local Legislature, but though it was within the competence of the Local Legislature it was a violation, according to the Government’s opinion of private rights, as now expounded by them, it was retrospective legislation, it was vicious legislation, and therefore, at the instance of political supporters they at once disallowed the Bill. One rule is laid down where a Bill is objected to by a political opponents. Another where a Bill is objected to by a political friend. Sir, if I could only trespass on the patience of the House I could mention a score of cases where the hon. gentleman has acted on principles entirely different to that in which he acted in disallowing the Streams’ Bill. The hon. gentleman in disallowing this Bill has not a foot to stand on—he has transgressed all rules and all precedents, his own precedents, his own record for fifteen years, constantly springs up against him. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look at the Blue-Books they will find he has in this matter, as in others, transgressed the rules laid down by himself. Let me refer for a moment to another case—the Goodhue Will Case. Goodhue made his will leaving to his children a life estate, in his property, with a reversionary interest, to his grandchildren. The children