

report which does not assert that the said Act is beyond the competence of the Local Legislature but expresses an opinion adverse to the propriety of certain provisions of the Act.

That the said Act was within the exclusive competence of the Local Legislature, and was not of such a nature as to render its provisions subject to the judgment of or disallowance by the Government of Canada.

That the Minister of Justice and the Government of Canada had, under these circumstances, no right to act on their opinion whatever it might be as to the propriety or impropriety of the said Act.

That it appears from the papers that no communication was had with the Government of Ontario on the subject of the said Act prior to the disallowance, nor was any opportunity given to the Government of considering or discussing the objections, or to the Legislature of Ontario to deal with the alleged defects.

That the papers laid on the Table show the importance of such communication; and the danger of action by the Minister of the *ex parte* statement and argument of a Petitioner against the Act.

That the said exercise of the power of disallowance was not in accordance with the principle of the constitution, and that the said Act should have been left to its operation.