

no power so to enact. Westminster came to our assistance, and we are now permitted to legislate in reference to the "privileges, immunities, and powers" of our Senate and House of Commons, provided we do not go beyond those "held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House" at Westminster at the date of our legislation. We must do as they do, or do nothing at all.

In 1875, a Canadian statute, with reference to such a domestic matter as copyright within our own limits, was held to transcend our authority; and Westminster had again to be appealed to.

In 1878, our Parliament passed a bill with reference to the amount of space occupied by deck cargoes liable to tonnage dues. But Parliament exceeded, it was said, its power in legislating for all ships in Canadian waters. It should have confined itself to Canadian ships, and other ships were held unamenable to our legislation even while in our own waters (Hodgins, 58 d).

In 1886, Canada wished to add to her Senate some representatives from the North-West Territories, but she was powerless, and assistance once more had to be sought for at Westminster.

Concluding this enumeration, let me add generally that every law which we may think necessary to enact, but "which is or shall be repugnant to the provisions of any (Imp.) Act of Parliament extending to the colonies," is declared by imperial statute to "be and remain absolutely void and inoperative" to the extent of such repugnancy (Col. Laws Validity Act, 1865).

*Our Coasting Trade.* — A good example of this sort of limitation can be found in the former customs laws, by which the colonies were deprived of the power to impose protective duties upon British goods. We were not permitted to give