

Navigation Company, praying that the papers relating to a contract entered into by the Government with them to run the Steamer "Princess of Wales" on the North Shore in 1865, may be submitted to a Committee of the House to be investigated and reported on.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the matter had been before the Government, but as it was a delicate matter, it was thought best to let it go to a Committee, and in accordance with the notice of motion the papers would be submitted without the formality of an Address.

MILLS, ETC.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN moved for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Act Incorporating the Albert Bank.

Leave granted and the Bill being brought in was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. FISHER presented a Petition from the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of the City of Fredericton, praying that the Corporation may be empowered to contract a loan in aid of the Fredericton Railway; and as action had only lately been taken on the subject he prayed that the rule might be suspended, which being done, leave was granted, and the Bill read a first time.

PROCLAMATION—FISHERIES.

Mr. SMITH asked the Provincial Secretary, whether, in accordance with the statement put forth the other day, that the proclamation of Union would issue on the 20th instant, the Government had received any intimation of the fact from England.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the Government had not received any communication from England on the subject yet. He had promised to reply to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Cale) with regard to the Fisheries on the North Shore, and would now say, that there were a number of vessels on our coasts—one of which had lately gone from Saint John to Grand Manan—under the direction of the Admiral, which were authorized to see that our Fisheries were protected. He was not informed as to their number, but His Excellency the Administrator of the Government was now in communication with the Admiral of the Station on the subject, and he had no doubt that they would attend to their duty thoroughly.

Mr. SMITH enquired if the same arrangement with regard to the licences to American fishermen would be entered into this year as last?

Hon. Mr. TILLEY thought that probably the same principle would be continued, but that it was contemplated to advance the rate till measures were taken by the General Parliament.

Mr. CAIE asked what privileges the licencees conferred upon American fish-

ermen, and if they were allowed to cast their bait close in shore.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY believed that the taking out of licencees put them on the same footing as our own fishermen, but he was not quite sure of the exact privileges conferred.

Mr. SMITH said he understood that the licence gave them exactly the same privileges as they enjoyed under the Reciprocity Treaty, and he thought that on examination this would be found to be correct.

PETITIONS, BILLS, ETC.

Hon. Mr. CONNELL presented a Petition from James McIntosh and C. D. Everett, of the City of Saint John, praying that the Act relating to the formation of Oyster Beds might be amended.

The Petition was received and referred to the Committee appointed to take into consideration all matters connected with the Fisheries of the Province.

Mr. CAIE presented a petition from over four hundred persons, inhabitants of the County of Kent, praying that the road known as the McLaughlin Road might be placed upon the Great Road List.

The Petition was received and referred to the Chief Commissioner of the Board of Works.

SPECIAL DAY FOR ELECTIONS.

Mr. YOUNG moved the House into Committee on a Bill relating to the election of members to serve in the General Assembly, so far as relates to the County of Gloucester.

Mr. QUINTON in the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG explained that this Bill had been before a Special Committee, who had reported favorably upon it. It was simply to make it binding on the Sheriff to cause elections to take place on Monday, instead of leaving it to his discretion. Great inconvenience was felt from the course usually pursued and Monday being the day which would interfere less than any other with the duties of the fishermen, it was considered important the change should be made. The Bill provided that elections should take place on the Monday following the day of nomination, but three whole days must intervene between that day and the day for polling.

Hon. Mr. TILLEY thought that this was interfering with the privilege of the Sheriff. It had been found very satisfactory to leave the appointment of the day entirely in the Sheriff's hands, and to deprive him of power which was conferred upon those of every other County might lead to difficulties. Moreover, the Sheriff might appoint Saturday as the

day for nomination and then three days notice could not be given, and this would be contrary to the General Election Law.

Mr. SMITH said this difficulty could not occur, for the Bill specially provided that three whole days must elapse, consequently the Sheriff could not appoint Saturday for nomination, but must make it Friday. The people of Gloucester were largely fishermen, and it was in the interest the Bill was brought in. They return from their duties on Saturday to go to Church Sunday, and are at home ready for an election on Monday, but if appointed for any other day they have to leave their occupation and return specially for the purpose of voting. So far as the principle was concerned, he thought it quite fair, but he would again ask the Attorney General, as he had asked two or three times before, how far the provisions of the Imperial Act of Union was in force, and if we had the power to legislate upon such questions as these?

Hon. Mr. FISHER had told the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Young) when the Bill was submitted that if it only contemplated the fixing of a certain day, and did not interfere with the other provisions of the Election Law, he would support it. With regard to the question of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Smith) as to how far the Imperial Act of Union was in force, he could, of course, express his private opinion, and he would say that he thought this Bill did not in any way interfere or conflict with the provisions of that Act. He had now expressed his private opinion on the matter, but the hon. member must know that he ought not to ask any such question. It was evidently done only to bother and annoy him.

Mr. SMITH was quite sincere in asking the question, and he was surprised at the remark of the Attorney General. He (Mr. Fisher) had given his private opinion, but it was certainly his duty to give a public and official opinion upon this question. If the Attorney General had not looked into the matter, he should have done so, and been in a position to tell the House when they met just how far that Act extended to our legislation at the present Session. The Attorney General had said that the House could make the change in the law asked for in the Bill, but he (Mr. S.) had grave doubts on the matter, for the Imperial Act was based upon our laws as they were at the passage of that Act, and was therefore binding upon us, so far as making an alteration in our laws was concerned. He should not, however, oppose the passing of the Bill, for he believed the change would prove beneficial to the people of Gloucester.

Hon. Mr. FISHER said that if the Bill merely required the Sheriff to appoint a