

and, unfortunately, I must answer my question in the negative. Surprise has been expressed in certain quarters at the opposition which has arisen to this measure after all the advantages which we were promised should result from it. Thus it was said that under Confederation we should obtain coal from Nova Scotia without having any duty to pay. This reasoning might appear to carry a certain amount of force with it, but I must say that it is in fact captious, for we find at the present day that we can indeed get this coal, but by paying the export duty exactly like foreign countries. Would there, then, be no real free trade between the different parts of the same Confederation? Would the position of the provinces, in this respect, remain as it is to-day? The proof of what I state here is found in Hon. Mr. GALT's speech to his constituents:—

In Nova Scotia a considerable revenue was derived from a royalty on coal mines, and its representatives at the Conference stated that if the General Government imposed an export duty on coal it would annihilate one of their most important resources, and, therefore, Nova Scotia has been allowed to regulate herself the export duty on coal, precisely as New Brunswick enjoys that right as regards its timber.

This duty which Nova Scotia may impose on the export of its coal, whatsoever it may be styled, is then in reality an export duty, and the result, as regards ourselves, is to leave us still in the same position if we must pay the duty in order to get the coal of that province. The argument based on the fact that we could obtain coal from Nova Scotia without paying an import duty, is thus destroyed, since the duty will still exist. I have already stated that the plan submitted for our approval is exceedingly complex, and that it is not easy to foresee the difficulties that will arise between the local governments and the Federal Government. It may, perhaps, be asserted that these difficulties cannot be very serious, inasmuch as the local governments will not possess any large powers; but if it is designed to make them real governments, and not mere municipalities, they may be opposed to the Central Government on a host of questions. Take, for instance, the question of the fisheries. Article 17, of the 29th resolution, gives to the Federal Parliament the power of legislating on the "sea coast and inland fisheries." Under the 8th article of the 43rd resolution, the local legislatures will also have the right of legislating on the "sea coast and inland fisheries." Thus

the local legislatures and the Federal Legislature will have the right to legislate on the same subjects. And if the laws they make are in opposition the one to the other, what will be the result? And this may well happen, for we know that in the Gulf, for instance, there are fisheries which are of the highest importance for the people of Lower Canada, as well as for the people of the adjoining colonies, of which the latter have taken possession, and sought to exclude our people from them. Now, if the Local Government of Lower Canada made laws to protect its subjects and insure to them the right to these fisheries, would it not be in the power of the Federal Government to interfere and prevent it? And if this were to happen, would it not give rise to endless antipathies and struggles between the two governments? Lower Canada would not suffer such an interference without feeling it very strongly; and what I have just said with reference to the fisheries might also occur with reference to a large number of questions. And it is quite evident that if the Local Government, acting in the interests of a province, were arrested in its action by the Federal Government, the people would take sides with their Local Government and become disaffected towards the Central Government.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—This question of the fisheries is, no doubt, divided between the local governments and the Federal Government, but it is evident, that in order that justice may be done to each part of the Confederation in an impartial manner, the general legislation must be left to the General Government, while the application of the internal details within the limits of the fisheries of a province, must be left to the local legislatures.

HON. MR. OLIVIER—The argument I have brought forward, with reference to fisheries, is applicable to other questions, and is merely to show that the present plan is complex, that there are conflicting interests in the different colonies, and that the settlement of them, in one sense or in another, might be productive of discontent in the country, and create a spirit of dissatisfaction among the people. Some one has said that this project is viewed favorably in England, and that for that reason we ought to accept it in order to prevent the evil consequences that might arise from our opposition to the project. For my part, I do not believe that England would insist so strongly on the details as they are insisted on here, but I believe her desire is, that the plan should be just and acceptable,