

Their Lordships consider that the powers intended to be conferred by the Act in question, when properly understood, are to make regulations in the nature of police or municipal regulations of a merely local character for the good government of taverns, &c., licensed for the sale of liquors by retail, and such as are calculated to preserve, in the municipality, peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct. As such they cannot be said to interfere with the general regulation of trade and commerce which belongs to the Dominion Parliament, and do not conflict with the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, which does not appear to have as yet been locally adopted.

The subjects of legislation in the Ontario Act of 1877, secs. 4 and 5, seem to come within the heads Nos. 8, 15, and 16 of Sec. 92 of British North America Statute, 1867.

Their Lordships are, therefore, of opinion that, in relation to secs. 4 and 5 of the Act in question, the Legislature of Ontario acted within the powers conferred on it by the Imperial Act of 1867, and that in this respect there is no conflict with the powers of the Dominion Parliament.

Assuming that the Local Legislature had power to legislate to the full extent of the resolutions passed by the License Commissioners, and to have enforced the observance of their enactments by penalties and imprisonment with or without hard labor, it was further contended that the Imperial Parliament had conferred no authority on the Local Legislature to delegate those powers to the License Commissioners or any other persons. In other words, that the power conferred by the Imperial Parliament on the Local Legislature should be exercised in full by that body, and by that body alone. The maxim *delegatus non potest delegare* was relied on.

It appears to their Lordships, however, that the objection thus raised by the appellants is founded on an entire misconception of the true character and position of the Provincial Legislatures. They are in no sense delegates of or acting under any mandate from the Imperial Parliament. When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a Legislature for Ontario, and that its Legislative Assembly should

have exclusive authority to make laws for the Province and for Provincial purposes in relation to the matters enumerated in Sec. 92, it conferred powers not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial Parliament, but authority as plenary and as ample within the limits prescribed by Sec. 92 as the Imperial Parliament in the plenitude of its power possessed and could bestow. Within these limits of subjects and area the Local Legislature is supreme, and has the same authority as the Imperial Parliament, or the Parliament of the Dominion, would have had under like circumstances to confide to a municipal institution or body of its own creation authority to make by-laws or resolutions as to subjects specified in the enactment, and with the object of carrying the enactment into operation and effect.

It is obvious that such an authority is ancillary to legislation, and without it an attempt to provide for varying details and machinery to carry them out might become oppressive, or absolutely fail. The very full and very elaborate judgment of the Court of Appeal contains abundance of precedents for this legislation entrusting a limited discretionary authority to others, and has many illustrations of its necessity and convenience. It was argued at the bar that a Legislature committing important regulations to agents or delegates effaces itself. That is not so. It retains its powers intact, and can, whenever it pleases, destroy the agency it has created and set up another, or take the matter directly into its own hands. How far it shall seek the aid of subordinate agencies, and how long it shall continue them, are matters for each Legislature, and not for courts of law, to decide.

Their Lordships do not think it necessary to pursue this subject further, save to add that, if by-laws or Resolutions are warranted, power to enforce them seems necessary and equally lawful. Their Lordships have now disposed of the real questions in the cause.

Many other objections were raised on the part of the appellant as to the mode in which the License Commissioners exercised the authority conferred on them, some of which do not appear to have been raised in the Court below, and others were disposed of in the course of the argument, their Lordships being clearly of opinion that the resolutions were merely in the nature of municipal or