

place myself right in relation to my own Province. It might be inferred that, in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet), and opposing the amendment of the hon. member from West Durham, I should be voting to support the local rights of the Province of Quebec; while voting the other way, not only with reference to my own Province, but all the other Provinces of the Dominion, it is well that I should put that matter right. I intend to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for West Durham; and I shall do it on this principle: I cannot say that I have any faith in the results of the working of this Bill; but the Government of the country, having taken upon themselves the responsibility, not of drafting this Bill, but of fathering it and placing it before this House, and this House having spent a great deal of time in endeavoring to make it as workable as possible, I have arrived at the conclusion, whether correctly or not, from some objections which have been raised during the passage of the Bill through Committee, that there is a very strong desire in this House to make the Bill as unworkable as possible. I am not one who has much faith in the working of the Bill; but I intend to do nothing, by my vote or voice, to impair the efficiency and workable character of this Bill. The Government having assumed the responsibility of placing it before the House, and of making it, as I trust they will, the law of the land, I think it would be very unfair to introduce such a clause as that moved by the hon. member for West Durham, the effect of which would be, if I rightly understand the law, to give co-ordinate powers to the Provinces and the Dominion, which might lead to the defeat of the harmonious working of this Bill, and to immense litigation throughout the different Provinces. Taking that view of the case, I felt it necessary, as a New Brunswick representative voting against a resolution which gives powers to the Local Legislatures on this question, to make these explanations, which I hope will be satisfactory to this House and to my constituency.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not wish to delay the House, but I think the remarks of the hon. member for Cardwell ought to be alluded to. I think he will require rather more time than was at his disposal this afternoon to leave the impression on the House, even on his own side, that there was any attempt on the part of the hon. member for West Durham to mislead the House. Was any insinuation cast out by the hon. member for Cardwell last night, when the hon. member for Simcoe, reading an extract from a newspaper, closed with a sentence which was not in the paper at all, and for which he was brought to task by the hon. member for Middlesex? There was no censure then, no imputation, no insinuations thrown out by hon. gentlemen opposite; and yet the hon. gentleman thinks it not beneath him to attempt to cast doubt on the good faith of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition in the House. On this side of the House we have unbounded confidence in the hon. gentleman, and I believe that, in the country, the people have unbounded confidence in his honesty and integrity; and I beg leave to say, I believe there is not one hon. member in this House—and I would hardly except the hon. member for Cardwell—who has not the same confidence.

Mr. OUIMET. I really find myself in a very awkward position. Indeed, I am very grateful for the compliment that was paid my motion, and the principles involved in it, by the hon. member for West Durham. I hold this Parliament has no power to restrict, or take away from any Province any privilege or jurisdiction it may enjoy under the British North America Act. But if we have no power to take away anything from a Province, have we the power to give it anything? If this Act were in force, I would be the first to vote against any motion preventing to carry it into effect; but if it has been repealed by the Crooks Act,

Mr. MITCHELL.

have we the power to revive it, to say that a law Ontario has repealed should be re-enacted?

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask my hon. friend whether, upon the theory of this Bill, the Local Legislature can have the power to repeal—whether their repeal would be valid?

Mr. OUIMET. No; the point is this: As I understand it, in my humble opinion, anything that belongs to the municipal institutions belongs to the Local Legislature to legislate upon; and, of course, in this way the Legislature of Ontario had the right to deprive the municipalities of a power given them. If my vote could give the municipalities that right I would give it to them; but the Legislature of Ontario, led by the friends of the hon. member for West Durham, have taken upon themselves to take that away from the people of Ontario—that is the power to give or to control the giving of licenses in that Province. What their reason was, I do not know, but I suppose they had good reason for so doing. Now we are asked to give back to the people of Ontario that power which was taken from them by their own Legislature. Why? Because, they say, it was taken from them wrongly. But we in this House cannot say that. The Legislature of Ontario have passed upon it, and we have no power to go over any legislation they have thought proper to make. I say we have no more power to revise any law which is no longer in force—that would be an infringement on their rights—than we have to legislate to take anything from them.

Mr. LISTER. I will detain the House only a few minutes in order to set my hon. friend who has just spoken right. This Act is based on the assumption that the Local Legislature has no right whatever to restrict or control the sale of liquor within the Province, and there can be no doubt that the Act to which the hon. member for West Durham referred was in force in Ontario at the time of Confederation. This Bill now before the House is based on the assumption that a Local Legislature has no right to interfere with the Acts in force in 1867 relating to the sale of liquor. Such being the case, this Act existing in 1867, to which my hon. friend referred, could not be repealed, and the Act repealing it was nugatory and void, if the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite is correct. The repealing of it, on their contention, was an act of usurpation on the part of the Ontario Legislature. The hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec have been assisted by hon. members on this side in maintaining which we contend to be Provincial rights, which existed previous to Confederation, and we have a right to expect from them to set aside all party considerations, and stand with us on this question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." It was that unfortunate speech the hon. gentleman made at Yorkville, under such remarkable circumstances, last June, that caused this legislation to be introduced. We would never have been asked to legislate on this subject if he had not made that unfortunate speech; and he comes into this House with this Bill, not in the cause of temperance at all, but simply to do battle with Mr. Mowat. The way this Bill has been brought up shows it has been bungled; and while we are willing to protect the rights of Ontario, you are taking away from every Province in this Dominion rights which they heretofore enjoyed. You are invading those rights, and I believe when you come before the people they will bring you severely to account for this.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I deny that the hon. gentleman is justified in attributing to the hon. First Minister that he was actuated by such motives; and I contend he would be fully justified, in any case, in taking away from Mr. Mowat and his corrupt Administration the charge of the liquor traffic in Ontario. It is well known in Ontario, and throughout the Dominion, that