

regard to their own. On the other hand, Mr. SPEAKER, the disallowance of a measure sanctioned by the local governments is limited as to time, and must be declared within twelve months, whereas, under the present system, it can be done within two years. This is a restriction which has been granted in favor of Lower Canada and of all the other provinces of the Confederation; it is a restriction favorable to the people, but the honorable member will refuse, no doubt, to acknowledge that this concession to the people is our work. Moreover, why should we be afraid of this veto? In our Local Legislature we assuredly have no intention to be unjust towards a portion of the population, but propose to act towards them, as in times past, as towards equals; we intend, in short, to be as just to that part of the population as we were when they were a feeble clement in it. This has not prevented the honorable member for Hochelaga from telling the English members from Lower Canada that they must be on their guard and take care of themselves. Well, Mr. SPEAKER, I shall not offer such an insult to the race to which I belong. The French-Canadians have always acted honorably towards the other races who live among them, and they will certainly not take advantage now, any more than they have done in times past, of the majority they may have in the Local Legislature to molest or persecute the minority. This is the reason why we have no fear nor misgiving relative to the right of veto. Moreover, we are not to suppose that the intention of the two clauses which I have already quoted, is that every bill passed in the local legislatures will be reserved for the sanction of the Central Government. That reservation will take place only in respect of such measures as are now reserved for Her Majesty's sanction. So that the honorable member for Hochelaga is widely mistaken when he reproaches the present Government for having agreed to those two clauses. Another question on which the hon. member has also called us to account, relates to the export duties on timber and coals. In clause 29, which relates to the powers of the Federal Parliament, the third section reads as follows:

The imposition or regulation of duties of customs on imports or exports, except on exports of timber, logs, masts, spars, deals, and sawn lumber from New Brunswick, and of coal and other minerals from Nova Scotia.

The fact that this power has been conferred on the Government does not imply that it will be exercised. The power was granted

simply because it might be necessary in certain cases mentioned. Now this is the reason for the second part of the clause which I have just read to the House, and which I cannot better explain than by citing some expressions of a speech by the Hon. the Minister of Finance on the subject. Nevertheless, as there are several honorable members in the House who do not understand English, I think it will perhaps be better to explain them in French. Here then was the thought of the Convention: as in New Brunswick the Government had found that it was a great disadvantage to collect the duties on timber according to the system formerly adopted, and they had substituted an export duty which superseded all other dues on that product, it was no more than right that this source of revenue should remain in New Brunswick, to which province it was an object of absolute necessity to defray its local expenses. In Canada we retain, under the new Constitution, our own method of collecting similar duties. As to New Brunswick, the duty on the article in question is their principal revenue, as coal is almost the sole revenue of Nova Scotia; and if they had been deprived of them, they would have peremptorily refused to join the Confederation. (Hear, hear.) Their demand was perfectly just, and could not therefore be refused. Moreover, we have no right to complain, for they leave us all our mines and our lands, and we shall now, as heretofore, collect the proceeds for our own use and profit. The honorable member for Hochelaga says that it will be impossible to administer the affairs of the local legislatures without having recourse to direct taxation; but a man of his experience ought not to have made that assertion. Instead of attempting to trade on popular prejudice, he ought to have admitted at once that the right granted by the new Constitution of levying direct taxes, is the same that already exists in the present Constitution; it is the same right that all our municipalities possess. It does not follow that the right will be exercised. But the honorable member knows well that the people are not in favor of direct taxation, and that they would be unwilling to adopt it as a system, in place of indirect taxes; hence his attempt to use it as a bug-bear in order to alarm the people of Lower Canada. We must bear in mind that the proceeds of the local revenue of Lower Canada will be employed in defraying local expenses. The Hon. Minister of Finance has stated that in Lower Canada the local revenue will be \$557,000, besides the 80 cents per