"The true check for the abuse of powers, as distinguished from an unlawful exercise of them, is the power of the central government to disallow laws open to the former reproach."

The language used by statesmen speaking in an official capacity is in full accord with these judicial dicta.

In the Report, dated June 8, 1868, which Sir John Macdonald submitted with reference to the course to be pursued with respect to the disallowance of Provincial legislation, he specifies the following classes of cases as being proper for the consideration of the Minister of Justice:

(1) Those which are altogether illegal or unconstitutional.

(2) Those which are illegal or unconstitutional in part.

(3) Those which, in cases of concurrent jurisdiction, clash with the legislation of the general parliament.

(4) These which affect the interest of the Dominion generally.

The meaning of the word "illegal" in the first two of these paragraphs is not entirely clear. But, having regard to the position taken by the statesman who used it in the report next mentioned, it may reasonably be inferred that he intended it to cover statutes which interfered with private rights. Under any other construction, in fact, the two descriptive expressions would be virtually synonymous.

In the report in which the same Minister recommended the disallowance of the Rivers and Streams Bill, passed in 1881 by the Ontario Legislature, the following language was used:

"I think the power of the local legislatures to take away the rights of one man and vest them in another, as is done by this Act, is exceedingly doubtful; but, assuming that such right does in strictness exist, I think it devolves upon this Government to see that such power is not exercised in flagrant violation of private rights and natural justice, especially when, as in this case, in addition to interfering with private rights in the way alluded to, the Act overrides