

not in name alone. I should like to be fully informed as to whether an export duty is to be levied on coal in Nova Scotia, no matter whether it is intended for another part of the Confederation or for a foreign country.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The royalty collected on coal in Nova Scotia is similar to the stumpage duty on timber in Canada, which is paid no matter where the timber is exported to. It may well be, therefore, that when coal is exported from Nova Scotia to another province it will contribute to the revenues of the Local Government of Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.)

HON. MR. REESOR—There are several other provisions in the proposed Constitution which seem to be ambiguous in their meaning, and before discussion upon them it would be well to have them fully explained. In the eleventh clause of the twenty-ninth resolution, for instance, it is declared that the General Parliament shall have power to make laws respecting "all such works as shall, although lying wholly within any province, be specially declared by the acts authorizing them to be for the general advantage." It would appear from this, that works like the Welland canal, which yield a very large revenue, will be given over to the General Government; and this being the case, surely this is a sufficient set-off, five times over, for the railways given by New Brunswick, without the annual subsidy proposed to be given to that province of \$63,000.

HON. MR. MACPHERSON—The cost of these works forms part of the public debt of Canada, which is to be borne in part by the Lower Provinces under the Confederation.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—The honorable gentleman will see that there are some works which, although local in their geographical position, are general in their character and results. Such works become the property of the General Government. The Welland canal is one of them, because, although it is local in its position, it is a work in which the whole country is interested, as the chief means of water communication between the western lakes and the sea. Other works, in the Lower Provinces, may be of the same character, and it is not safe to say that because a certain work lies wholly in one province, it is not to belong to the General Government.

HON. MR. REESOR—I do not object to the General Government having the control of these works. It is, I believe, a wise provision to place them under such control. But

I do say that it is unfair that an express stipulation should be made to pay one province a large sum per annum for certain works, while, at the same time, we throw in our public works, such as the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, without any consideration whatever. This, I think, is paying quite too much for the whistle. Then the answer of the Commissioner of Crown Lands about the export duty on minerals in Nova Scotia is not at all satisfactory. Whatever dues may be levied on minerals in Canada—and Canada, although it may contain no coal, is rich in gold, silver, copper, iron, and other ores—in the shape of a royalty or otherwise, go to the General Government, while in Nova Scotia they accrue for the benefit of the Local Government.

HON. MR. ROSS—No, they will not go to the General Government.

HON. MR. REESOR—Well, there is nothing to the contrary in the resolutions, and you may depend upon it that whatever revenues the General Government may claim, under the proposed Constitution, will be fully insisted upon.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—My honorable friend, referring a moment ago to the Welland and other canals, objected to certain works being considered as belonging to the General Government, because they are local in their geographical position.

HON. MR. REESOR—I do not say that they should not go to the General Government, but what I do say is that they are a sufficient set-off for the works given by the Lower Provinces, without paying them a special sum from the general revenues of \$63,000 per annum.

A Message from the Legislative Assembly interrupted further discussion upon the subject, and the House afterwards adjourned without resuming it.

—o—

MONDAY, *February 13, 1865.*

HON. MR. REESOR—Honorable gentlemen, as the question now under consideration involves a change in the constitution, not only of this House but of the whole of the British American Provinces, I think that more time ought to be given to it; and my object in now rising, is to urge upon this Honorable House the propriety of adjourning this debate—say for ten days. (No! no!) Many new features have been developed since the