

Another point which arises with regard to the powers of Parliament is, whether,—in view of the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures over the administration of justice on the province, and over the constitution of both civil and criminal courts,—Parliament can impose new duties upon, and give new powers to, such Courts as to non-provincial matters. The answer is that it can do so: *Valin v. Langlois* (p. 27); and, indeed, there seems no doubt that it can, in matters within its sphere, impose duties upon any Canadians, whether officials or private citizens.

As to provincial powers one thing is clear, and that is that the provincial legislatures possess no powers of legislation except those expressly given to them by section 92 of the Federation Act; *Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons* (p. 29); and that in this respect, and all others, so far as that Act is concerned, the provinces all stand on the same level, and are in the same position: *Liquidators of the Maritime Bank v. Receiver-General of New Brunswick* (p. 31). But within these limits, the powers of the provinces, cannot be denied merely because they may be abused, or because they may, by their exercise, limit the range which would otherwise be open to the Dominion parliament: *Bank of Toronto v. Lambe* (p. 32); and the provincial legislatures themselves have a residuary power of legislation in relation to 'all matters of a merely local or private nature in the province' under No. 16 of section 92: *Liquor Prohibition Appeal 1895* (p. 78).

Moreover subjects of legislation which in one aspect and for one purpose fall within section 92 of the Federation Act, and, therefore, are within provincial powers, may in another aspect, and for another purpose, fall within section 91, and so some under Dominion jurisdiction: *Hodge v. The Queen* (p. 35). And, again, an Act may be in part *ultra vires*, and yet the rest of it may remain unaffected and valid, if the two