

should be to develop our mineral treasures as speedily as possible. No doubt capitalists should have a guarantee that they would have such a lease of their mines as would enable them to reap sufficient profit for their outlay. Owing to the arrangement made with the Mining Association the leases were limited to a short period. Capitalists were unwilling to invest any large sum of money on such terms, and therefore it was now for the house to consider the propriety of extending the leases to such a term as would encourage them to expend their capital in this country. Every year that passed necessarily made the difficulty greater, and it was necessary to deal with the matter without delay. Petitions on the table proved conclusively the opinion that was entertained by minded men in England in reference to the expenditure of their capital in our mines. Under these circumstances the house should not hesitate for an instant to adopt the policy of extending the leases. He did not think the suggestion of a fine was a bad one. As respects the royalty he would only say it might seem assuming too much to legislate for the future. That matter might be left open.

Hon Mr. McFARLANE said that if the house could impose a fine, it could with equal propriety define the terms of the royalty.

Mr. TOBIN considered the subject under consideration as one of no little importance. No restrictions were placed upon a man who received a grant of land from the Government, and he could not see the wisdom of a policy that imposed them upon a man who invested a large amount of capital in a mine, and did so much in that way to develop the resources of the country. He approved of the policy of extending the leases because it would stimulate the introduction of capital. No capitalists would develop our mines until they received such encouragement as the bill now offered to them. The first thing that a capitalist would do who thought of expending his money in this country would be to look at the legislation on the subject. If he found that the mining leases had only twenty years to run, he would hesitate before investing any of his money in this country.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that the question really before the house was whether it was proper to control the legislation of the Legislature 20 years hence. English capitalists merely stated that the tenure of the leases was too short, nothing more. In view of the probability of a change in the political condition of the country, it was advisable to let the term on which the leases should be extended an open question.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. again argued in favour of arranging the details of the measure. It was the duty of the Legislature to place capitalists beyond the least danger of being unfairly dealt with hereafter. Everybody knew that coal operations required the expenditure of a large amount of capital, and it was impossible for capitalists to invest their money profitably unless they had sufficient time. It would be very un-

wise to leave the present question in abeyance for twenty years, the province would lose a large amount of capital, and necessarily suffer a great pecuniary loss. No one, however, appeared to question the wisdom of extending the leases. Why then, take exception to the mere matter of detail, namely, the terms on which they should be extended? Capitalists required such guarantees as the bill gave them, and it was unwise to alter it as some gentlemen proposed. It was because the Government saw the importance of the revenue derived from the mines that they wished to fix the amount of royalty. It was, indeed, very questionable policy to impose any duty upon a product like coal, which was so intimately connected with the comfort and progress of the country. The public necessity was the only argument in favour of imposing any royalty. He knew of no countries where the State placed such restriction upon coal. As it was, however, the policy of this Province to tax this mineral, it was advisable to place it at such an amount that it would not cramp enterprise whilst it benefited the public revenues.

Mr. BILL doubted the wisdom of the policy adopted in the bill under consideration as it went too far.

After more desultory discussion to the same purport the Committee rose and reported progress.

The House adjourned.

FRIDAY, April 27, 1866.

HALIFAX GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Hon. PROV. SEC. moved that the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council in the bill in reference to Education, by which the clause relating to the Halifax Grammar School was struck out, be not agreed to.

Mr. BLANCHARD said that he would not oppose the motion if it were not that before another year matters would be altered by the sale and purchase of property. He had previously declined to divide the House because the representatives of Halifax had supported the existing arrangements of the school, but he would adopt a different course now as members of the Upper House representing Halifax had expressed different views.

Hon. PROV. SEC.'s motion passed 30 to 5.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. FIN. SEC. introduced a bill to provide for certain expenses connected with the Civil Government.

Mr. BLANCHARD submitted a report from the Committee on Humane Institutions. The Report was received and adopted.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON said that the Committee on School Lands, after carefully examining the subject had decided to report favourably of the bills to authorize the sale of school lands at Horton, Onslow and Truro, and to recommend that the bill relative to Digby school lands be deferred for three months.

Mr. WHITMAN submitted a report from the