

tuted by other interpreters as synonymous with the text, they have led to a perversion of its true meaning.

And, moreover, it is not surprising that in the interpretation of a Constitutional Act, not yet twenty years in existence, many questions should arise difficult of solution; for, in the neighboring Republic of the United States, after an existence of one hundred years, questions are still presented as to the constitutionality of the methods of taxation adopted by the local governments. There is a further reason for the more frequent occurrence of these questions in this Dominion, from the fact, that, in the distribution of powers in the United States Republic, the Local Legislatures are possessed of general powers, and the Federal Legislature is clothed with enumerated powers only; while in this Dominion, a system, the reverse of this, has so restricted the scope of Provincial Legislation, that in cases of conflict with Federal Legislation, the sphere of the former has been held to be subordinate to that of the latter. And therefore, while each legislature is supreme in its own sphere, when their spheres of action come in collision, Provincial legislation must give way to Federal legislation.

It is a matter for congratulation that their Lordships of the Privy Council, as the court of ultimate resort, cannot be swayed by any local opinions or prejudices, and will not be diverted in their interpretation of the Constitutional Act from a careful consideration of its precise language, by any forms of expression which may have been accepted in this Dominion, as of synonymous meaning with the text of the Act. And the authoritative decision of such a tribunal can alone satisfactorily adjust and settle questions of such magnitude, involving such nice distinctions and requiring such unbiased discrimination.