

Mr. DONKIN presented a petition from James Emery and others of Amherst, in reference to the Union of the Colonies; also one from Charles Porter and others against the school bill.

Mr. ROSS presented two petitions from Baddeck on the subject of Confederation.

Mr. HAMILTON introduced a bill to incorporate the Oak Point Pier Company. He said that the object of the bill was simply to give the company power to manage the wharf.

On motion of hon. Mr. Shannon, the house went into committee on bills, and passed the following:—

To incorporate the Cape Breton Coal Mining Company.

Mr. BOURINOT objected to the name, as he was afraid it would lead to confusion—there being so many Cape Breton Coal Mining Companies. He would suggest that it be called the Inverness Coal Mining Co., which would be much more suitable, as the works were situated in that county.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said that the parties were very anxious to retain the name, as it was established in connection with another company of the same name in Massachusetts.

Mr. MILLER agreed with Mr. Bourinot, that the name ought to be changed.

After a few further remarks, Mr. Bourinot moved that it be called the Cape Breton Coal Mining Company in Inverness, which motion was lost, 19 to 10.

Several clauses passed. Mr. MacDonnell thought the powers conferred were larger than in other bills of a similar nature, and he would move that the words "not contrary to existing laws" be inserted.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON explained that there was a saving clause to that effect, and that the bill was precisely similar to others that had been passed.

After some further discussion Mr. Shannon agreed to the amendment, and the Bill passed.

The Committee adjourned.

Mr. BOURINOT referred to a petition he had presented a few days before from Cow Bay on the subject of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. Longley was proceeding to make some remarks upon the subject, but the hon. Prov. Sec. objected to any discussion that would interfere with the order of the day, upon which Mr. Longley said that rather than do that he would postpone his remarks.

Mr. GEORGE BROWN from the committee on land damages reported.

Mr. LOCKE asked the government to lay upon the table a detailed statement of the cost of survey of the railway from Truro to Pictou showing the amount paid to the several engineers, cost of labor and other expenses connected therewith and any information in their possession other than the report of Mr. Flemming respecting the length and probable cost of said road.

SCHOOL BILL.

Hon. PROV. SEC. then moved the second reading of the Education bill and in doing so, suggested to the house the propriety of allowing the bill to go to committee for the purpose of expediting public business at that late period of the session. Even those opposed to the principle of assessment would see that it was perfectly consistent for them to agree to

that course, for when the bill was in committee they could move any clause embodying their views.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that every gentleman was disposed to perfect the present law on the statute book, and to refuse to go into committee would be to perpetuate that law which was felt so objectionable. Every gentleman could suggest these amendments which he was desirous of having made in committee.

Mr. LOCKE asked if the bill was allowed to go into committee at once without any division, would not every gentleman be committed to the principle of the bill.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that he would be simply committed to the principle that it was desirable to amend the existing law.

Mr. LOCKE said that a gentleman who might not now oppose assessment might be supposed committed to that principle.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that the present bill might be rejected, and yet the principle of assessment was firmly established by the law now on the statute book.

Mr. LOCKE said that he had no objection to allow the bill to go into committee, if it was understood that no gentleman was committed to assessment.

Mr. ARCHIBALD said that the principle of assessment was already the law of the land. Any gentleman could allow the bill to go into committee and then move against the clause arranging assessment.

Mr. MILLER said that he could not understand the position of hon. gentlemen; something had come over them since the last time the bill was before the house. He was opposed to the principle of assessment on any terms they could give it to him. He did not see how he could support the second reading of the bill without committing himself to the principle. Under these circumstances he felt it was his duty to press a division on the question.

Mr. BLANCHARD said there were a good many portions of this bill to which he personally felt opposed, but there were also others which he would be sorry to move against.

Hon. PRO. SEC. said that he had no desire to put any gentleman on either side in a false position. It would be distinctly understood that no gentleman, in allowing the bill to go into the committee, would be pledged to the principles thereon contained. What he desired was to take that course which would be most conducive to the advancement of the public business.

Mr. LEVESCONTE said that the hon. leader of the government and the member for Colchester had misrepresented the words which he addressed to the House then moving the clause in reference to Separate Schools,—that he had stated that the teacher, either Catholic or Protestant, ought "to pervert" the children. He had not used such language—no one could say that any clergyman and teacher who wished to inculcate what he considered were the true principles of faith was perverting. He considered that now was the time to test the opinion of the House on the principle of the bill. He would not vote for it, as he had stated on the previous evening, unless the government allowed the clauses he had introduced to be incorporated into its provisions.

Mr. MILLER moved a resolution to this effect:—Resolved that the principle of assessment for the support of common schools as