

MONDAY, June 10.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 3 o'clock.

BILLS.

Hon. Mr. HAMILTON, from Committee on Banking, Commerce and Railways, reported favorably on Bills: An Act to incorporate the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act to incorporate the Coteau and Province Line Railway and Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Superior Bank of Canada.

An Act to extend the Powers of the Montreal Telegraph Company.

An Act to incorporate the Anticosti Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence International Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Detroit River Railway Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ontario Shipping and Forwarding Company.

All these Bills were read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. DICKSON, from Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, reported favourably on Bills:

An Act to incorporate the Toronto Corn Exchange Association.

An Act to incorporate the Montreal and Chatham Board of Trade.

An Act to change the name of District Permanent Building Society of Montreal.

These Bills were read a third time and passed.

DUAL REPRESENTATION.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD moved the second reading of the Bill from the the House of Commons, with respect to Dual Representation in Parliament. In making the motion he said that he thought the principle established by the Legislatures of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia with respect to dual representation—that the Local Legislatures should be freed from any direct connection with Parliament—was correct and judicious. He was not aware of any change of opinion in the Province of New Brunswick on the subject. Under these circumstances he was favorable to the Bill.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST said that he objected to the bill, because it was partial in its operation, and he believed unconstitutional in character. He did not understand why the Provinces of Quebec, British Columbia, and Manitoba should be exempted from its provisions, whilst it applied to Nova Scotia, New

Brunswick, and Ontario. He was convinced that the members of the Government themselves would never have brought in a measure of such a character. It did not effect—a should be the tendency of all legislation of Parliament—an assimilation but actually a division of powers—for it sought to give to some what was not extended to other Provinces. If there was to be no duality of representation, let the Parliament pass a general law applicable to all the Provinces, and he would give it a favorable consideration, but he looked upon the bill as embodying a wrong and partial principle. He was even prepared to doubt the constitutionality of the measure, inasmuch as it was outside of our constitution to pass an Act which related to arrangements made by an inferior legislative power. In fact, Parliament was asked by the bill to delegate to an inferior authority the completion of a law. The constitution put into the hands of Parliament the sovereign power of controlling the representation of itself, but now they were asked to make it subordinate to the legislation of a Local Legislature. In this connection he referred to eminent American authorities to show that the bill was an infringement of the constitutional rights of Parliament, and called upon the Government to consider the question carefully before allowing it to proceed further. He did not wish to see personal or private legislation introduced into the Houses, and it was notorious to every one that the present bill was open to such an imputation. Whilst the bill concurred with the local enactments passed in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, it did not agree with the law passed in Ontario, where the local legislature had limited the time when the duality shall come into operation. It was well known that the object of the bill was to strike a blow at two prominent men in another branch, and he must express his strong disapproval of such personal legislation. When three provinces, representing three-fifths of the population of Canada, had declared against dual representation it was the duty of the Government to bring in a measure which will not be personal in its nature, but general in its operation. The second clause was a very extraordinary one for it gave great power to a person who might be the mere tool of a Government and disposed to use his authority unjustly and arbitrarily. The returning officer could strike off a 1 the votes of a candidate, and in fact exercise judicial power. If he was a strong partisan he was in a position to suit his party ends as