in some cases trespassed upon by outside parties, being other than the original occupants. Such a case is the one referred to of Adam Ferguson, Esq., in the report to Council of the 22nd December 1869. In this case Mr. Ferguson applied to the Department early in the spring of 1869, complaining of a party who was interfering with, and trespassing on a Fishery, which his father and his family had occupied on the shore of the Bay de Chaleur, below the mouth of the Restigouche River, for a period of 70 years. It was a settled policy of the Department, not to interfere to displace one man, and replace another in the possession of a Fishery—that I held at the time was a matter that should be settled in a court of law, and Mr. Ferguson was informed, that the Department could only instruct its officers to see that the Fishery regulations should be observed, and the law respected in the prosecution of these Fisheries, and that it would be in the last degree impolitic, to place in the hands of local Fishery officers—men suitable enough for the purposes for which they were appointed—viz. to enforce the Regulations and to guard against illegal fishing—but quite unsuited in a large majority of cases to perform the judicial functions which adjudicating upon the rights of fishing properties would involve. Mr. Ferguson, himself a resident of, and a fisherman on the New Brunswick side of the Restigouche River, and having other fishing properties thereon, then asked that the fishing just referred to, should be licensed to him by the Department, as he conceived that this would give him additional security, and would thus place upon the Department, the responsibility of directing its officers, to protect the licenses thus granted.

As this course involved an important principle, I did not feel at liberty to adopt or reject it without submission to Council, and while I did not believe that Government could, in the face of the pledges given in Parliament in 1868, by the Government of the day, impose upon the people of the Maritime Provinces the system which prevailed in old Canada, *without their consent*, I perceived the importance it would be to the applicant, to have the sanction of the Government authorities, and as he was willing to attorn to the Government, and desirous of obtaining a license as a protection, I felt it to be my duty to bring it before the Council, which, (as you must be aware) is usually done by a distinct recommendation. I would not sanction what is considered by the fishermen, as little short of confiscation by an enforced attornment to Government, which I conceive the present Regulations demand, and therefore made the application a special one, basing it upon the voluntary wish of the applicant as will appear by reference to the report of 22nd December 1869.

In the meantime several other cases arose, in which parties desired the protection of the Department, and it was deemed desirable to withdraw the special report above referred to, and submit a general Report applicable both to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—that report of the 27th January 1870, clearly shows that it was based (as the previous one was,) upon Licenses only being granted, at the *voluntary request of the occupants of the Fisheries* and was in their interests as appears by the following paragraph—viz.

"The undersigned would however respectfully suggest in all cases where it can be clearly shown, that parties are in the peaceable use of any salmon

apply for Licenses or Leases, that he be authorized to accede to their applications—this partial introduction of a system, which has proved beneficial to the fishing interest, and improved the public supply in other portions of the Dominion, might lead to the gradual extension of the system at such times and in such form as shall render it generally acceptable."

The second report, like the first, was not agreed to by Council, and was practically withdrawn; it was thought inadvisible to deal with so important a matter in that way, and as I could not in the face of the pledges given in Parliament, as well as from what I conceived to be proprietary rights of the fishermen (*rights which the Department under my administration always recognised and respected*) make any further recommendations of a more extensive character, the matter was dropped, and the several applications were refused.

I have thought it right to give this summary of the transaction, and as I have stated it from memory alone, I shall be glad to rectify any statement of detail that may be discovered on reference to the records of your Department, to be incorrect, on having my attention called thereto.

Now Sir, you base your statement in the paragraph of your letter which I have above quoted, "that it was my intention to make applicable to all the Provinces" the system you have just launched upon our fishermen.

This I must beg *most distinctly to deny: I never contemplated such an act of spoilation, or forcible expropriation, of what I believe to be the absolute and vested rights of the fishermen of these Provinces, but only contemplated what these Reports express; viz.—giving to the people of those Provinces, protection and security for those rights, by license when they voluntarily sought it.* Such a policy would not be objected to, and as a proof of it, I will venture to predict, that if you frame your Regulations upon the principles contained in those Reports, they will be accepted by the fishermen of my County.

Again I would refer you to the records of the Department, for proof to support the sacred character with which I viewed the riparian or proprietary rights of the people of the Maritime Provinces, in which an applicant for an exhausted river situated in the eastern part of Nova Scotia, for the purpose of fish breeding and stocking it for fishing purposes, was informed, that until he had obtained the written approval of every proprietor on the river, his application could not be considered.

In the third paragraph of your letter you state in relation to riparian rights, that the opinion which I expressed "*is an error*"—"that the Fishery Act of 1868 licenses these rights, and the regulations in this respect in no way contravenes this proviso of the Statute." Now Sir, upon this point I believe *you* are *in error*, as the Fishery Act of 1868 does not absolutely license as you state it does, but merely states "that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may, *where the exclusive right of fishing does not already exist by law*, issue or authorise to be issued, fishing leases, not licences for fisheries and fishing, &c." You here have the power vested in you "*where rights do not exist*," and in such cases you can if you so choose, grant licenses, but you will perceive that you are wrong in saying "that the law licenses

contemplated by Parliament at the passage of the Act of 1868, and in using the language "where the exclusive right of fishing does not already exist by law." It can be no other than the landholders and fishermens' rights, which for three quarters of a century have been acknowledged and recognised in my county as sacred, and which the Local Parliament, and the Sessions of the several counties of New Brunswick sanctioned, and refused to disturb—it is these rights that the Act of 1868 excepts from the exercise of your power, yet it is these same rights which by your regulations you are now interfering with and confiscating.

Again, at the time of passing the said Act, the then existing regulations were practically adopted in Ontario and Quebec, and the same policy was applied to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, of adopting the then existing regulations in these Provinces; this was in accordance with the pledges given in Parliament. In the former Provinces the fishermen had, long prior to Confederation, given up their exclusive rights, while in the two latter Provinces they had retained them and refused to relinquish what they properly held to be their own property. A reference to the Act of 1868 will confirm these positions, and in the fishing regulations passed by the sessions of Northumberland in 1863, which are confirmed and continued in force by the Dominion Act, as well as by the Marine and Fisheries Department, (*both under my administration* and *your own*) clearly recognises the riparian rights of landholders fronting on the river, and which after stating the regulations and limiting the distances between nets, saves these riparian rights as follows; viz.—"Provided always that no person shall be deemed guilty of a violation of the preceding paragraph of this rule for *setting nets off his own lands where such person holds the possession of a less front than 50 fathoms, nor shall any thing herein contained, prevent any person from setting more than one sett of nets off his own lands.*"

Thus it will be seen that the local legislation of New Brunswick—the sessions of the county (having at that time the control of the fisheries)—the Dominion Parliament—and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, have each in turn recognised and confirmed the proprietary rights which you now attempt to ignore.

You do not distinctly take the ground that no riparian rights exist, though from your reasoning, I am led to assume that you ignore their existence. If this is the view you entertain, it would seem to me that the public are entitled, on so important a question, to a clear and distinct avowal of the principles and grounds upon which you base such conclusions. On the other hand I hold that these are proprietary rights which as I before stated, Parliament at the passage of the Act of 1868 contemplated respecting—these rights have for three quarters of a century been recognised and acted upon by the people of the Maritime Provinces, and of these rights they cannot be deprived by your arbitrary Regulations.

The Department from its formation *laid down and acted upon the distinct policy in relation to the Maritime Provinces, that those rights did exist in the possessors of fisheries*—those rights till now, were never questioned by any Government, Local or General, and though you say "that the records of the Department show" that it was my intention "gradually to make it applicable to all the Pro-

and I distinctly challenge you, with the records under your control, to produce from those records to which you appeal, any authority, upon which you can fairly base such a statement; certainly the reports you have already quoted do not do it. I admit that in certain cases there would be advantages to the holders of fisheries, to obtain a Government license, and when they wish it, I would be inclined to grant it, *but I distinctly disavow and deny, that I ever entertained the idea of forcing such a system upon the people of the Provinces*, and as a further proof, no effort was ever made by me, to extend the system either to the Maritime Provinces, or to Manitoba or British Columbia, except when it was asked for as above stated, and you have no authority, either from the records of your Department or otherwise, to sustain your statement. My policy was in a different direction—I acted in good faith with the people—recognised the rights that themselves and their forefathers had enjoyed, and believed themselves entitled to; though many of the regulations which I introduced, and which has had such a successful result in the restoration of our rivers, were distasteful at the time, they have been tolerably well respected by the people, and are now universally concurred in.

Again, if you deny the existence of proprietary rights, how is it that you explain the annual leasings, which you have tolerated by the Corporation of the City of St. John, of the Fisheries of that Harbour, and do you now propose to deprive them of a Revenue of several hundreds of Dollars per annum that the city has so long enjoyed therefrom.

I would also ask how you explain your pretension of *no proprietary rights* in the leasing of the Fisheries off Portage Island in the Miramichi by the Admiralty, who owned the Island and the receipt of a considerable Revenue annually therefrom by that Department.

The Fisheries of great value off Fox Island Beach, might also be quoted as an instance, and the frequent occurrence of sales by the occupiers or owners, for large sums of money is a point that, upon your theory it would be difficult to meet.

These are merely a few of the many cases that might be quoted against your theory—indeed it has been a common custom for the possessors of Fisheries to sell their stands, and such have had a marketable value in the County I represent, as well as in the adjoining ones, that custom or usage has been unnecessarily recognised and acted upon from time immemorial.

This state of things was known to the Department, was recognised during my administration, is, and has been continued up to last month under the same system by your own, and yet you now take a view adverse to, and ignoring the rights of these people. I feel it to be my duty to warn you that endless trouble will be the result of such a policy, and that I do not believe that the class of people of whom fishermen are composed, will quietly consent to have their privileges—if not their legal rights—which the usage of three-quarters of a century, had led them to consider sacred—thus unjustly taken from them.

You say in establishing the License system, prior occupancy will also be considered in the granting of licenses—may I ask where is the provision for that policy in the regulations—you may feel inclined to do so, but

of the class of Fishing Officials extending throughout those Provinces—Launching on a day such a change of Policy without notice or preparation upon thousands of Fishermen, and is this such a system as you, who have as you say, "*sympathies with the People of my Province*," should wish to see extended to it.

You further say that the system of taxing nets "has existed for many years on the Miramichi and Restigouche rivers"—with regard to the latter river, it is exceptional—being a boundary river between the two Provinces, and the system on the two sides have been different for perhaps forty years, each side governed by the local law of the Province of which it was the boundary. I am not aware that during the period from 1867 to 1873, while I administered the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that any tax was ever paid by the fishermen on the New Brunswick side—the method of taxing on the Canada side was in existence years before Confederation—and if it is as you state, that one dollar per barrel was paid on the catch of salmon on both sides of the Restigouche river last season, it must have been placed upon the fishermen on the New Brunswick side by yourself, and the establishment and extension of that system is what is complained of now. The fact that you imposed it last year, was assuming you had power to do it without submitting it to Parliament after the pledges given, is also highly objectionable, or it may be that the Restigouche fishermen asked, as Mr. Ferguson did, to have the licenses granted, which would entirely alter the case.

As to the Miramichi, no tax in that sense in which you mean it, or such as your present Regulations establish, ever did exist on that river. A local Registration fee, of I think, one cent for the first fifty fathoms of net, and half a cent for each additional fifty fathoms, averaging less than 50 cents a stand, was imposed many years since by the sessions of the County for the purpose alone of obtaining a record of the nets, and ascertaining the proprietorship, thus enabling the officers to ascertain the owners of illegal nets, but never any imposition by way of tax for revenue, and it is not only unwise but very unfair to attempt to justify your Regulations by quoting such a precedent.

I note your remark "*that your sympathies are with the people of your Province*," and the merit which you claim on the ground of impartiality, in "not asking rights or privileges for one Province which are refused to another." In other words you claim to be strictly impartial, in this matter. I wish it were so, for then the people of my county would in all probability have escaped the tax imposed, or at least have had the satisfaction of knowing, that they were fairly treated, by having been placed upon the same footing as those in other localities.

If as you say you desired to act impartially, why is it that certain Fish of commerce such as Salmon and Bass are alone taxed, these being chiefly taken in the four northern Counties, and comparatively few of them taken in any of the others, save one or two of the Counties on the St. John, while Shad which is equally valuable as a commercial Fish, is not included in your new system of taxation by weight and the trifling fee of *one Dollar for each weir*, is imposed, not for purposes of Revenue, but for purposes of Registration, while the net and other shad Fisheries escape any tax whatever—had the per weight system

the tax on salmon and bass, your shad fishermen would have had to pay like those a Revenue tax of thousands of dollars while with the system you have applied to them, the whole charge will probably not much exceed one hundred dollars, if it even reaches that sum.

Almost the entire catch of winter Bass (the period when they are specially valuable) are taken in Northumberland, and scarcely any shad, while the great salmon catch is taken in that, and the three adjoining counties of Kent, Gloucester, and Restigouche, except those taken in the St. John. The City of St. John claims the Fisheries of the Harbour of St. John, the most valuable in the Province outside of the four northern counties above named, and they are annually leased by the Corporation of that City *on the strength of the proprietary rights long* since vested in them. Comparatively few salmon are taken in your county and no bass of any moment, and as your own county of Westmoreland, and the waters of the the upper part of the Bay of Fundy on which it borders, is the principal seat of the Shad Fisheries of our Province, the method of applying the tax as above described would seem rather to ignore your pretension of having acted impartially. As I stated above, you in your own County impose only a tax of One Dollar for each weir, while the tax of *ten dollars per weir* is imposed elsewhere by your Regulations.

In the face of these facts it is perhaps questionable whether the public will sanction your pretension of having acted impartially in your method of applying the tax.

You refer to the large sums of money which have been spent in the cultivation and protection of the Fisheries as a justification for imposing a revenue tax upon certain classes of the fishermen of New Brunswick. I am not prepared to admit that the expenditure can be called large, as compared with the important interest it promotes—but assuming that you are right, in the term you use, has the outlay not been made in each of the four Provinces, and more recently in P. E. Island? then why should one Province alone be affected by the tax your Resolutions impose? In Ontario the same system which prevailed prior to Confederation was continued under it, and I believe exists still. That system was not for revenue purposes but was looked upon more as a system for regulation, and it cannot be contended (save in a few isolated cases where exceptional circumstances existed) that revenue was made the basis on which the leases were issued—these cases are so few that they cannot be quoted as establishing a principle.—Then why should the fishermen be specially taxed merely because you say "*the outlay for their protection is large*," and other interests, where similar grounds exist, be exempted. Your policy, if you desire to be impartial and consistent, should be to tax shipping for the maintenance of Lights &c.; but this I would not advise you to attempt, though it is a stronger case than the tax you have imposed upon our fishermen, inasmuch as foreign ships would have to pay equally with Canadian.

You also point to the outlay for Fish Breeding Establishments, and specially refer to the one on the Miramichi, and imply that because the catch of salmon has increased from 543,000 lbs. in 1872 to 1,341,498

could scarcely be due to the results of the Breeding Establishment, though doubtless largely due to the thorough protection which the Department afforded, since 1867, in guarding the salmon rivers; and it is most satisfying to me to find, that the policy of the Department in these years, has proved so beneficial to the public. But may I ask, why you overlooked the most efficient and costly Salmon and Whitefish Breeding Establishment in the Dominion, viz.—that of Mr. Wilmot on Lake Ontario, and why are the Salmon and Whitefish catch of Ontario not taxed, if outlays on these valuable establishments are to be put forward as a reason why fishermen should be taxed elsewhere.

You indicate in the concluding portions of your letter, that you will be prepared to "consider favorably" an application for relief. If you admit the force of the fisherman's case, as I have put it, and of the necessity for relief as you evidently do, why not at once suspend until next year the objectionable regulations, and thus while allaying the excitement and hostility they have created, do a generous, as well as a just act to a suffering interest, as the Fishery interest certainly now is. I have been advised that you have had forwarded you a petition numerously signed from my county, asking relief from these objectionable Regulations, and I myself have had numerous complaints from the same quarter, and therefore trust that you will promptly meet the just wishes of the people, by removing the grounds of complaint.

Again may I ask why it is that while you issue your regulations to govern the Nova Scotia Fisheries, you have exempted their Salmon and Bass Fisheries entirely from taxation?—They as well as in New Brunswick, and other Provinces, have had outlays for protecting the Fisheries, and the results have been satisfactory in the restocking of their Rivers, and Salmon is now a considerable commercial item in the production of that Province.—It competes in the markets of the United States and Europe, with the Fish taken in New Brunswick—*the latter is heavily taxed* while the former *is not taxed*.

The Public will be anxious to know why this is?

Then again we all know that the Rivers of the Pacific coast teem with Salmon, and that immense preserving establishments are in operation in that section, and that the salmon of British Columbia and the vicinity, compete with, and are actually driving the produce of our New Brunswick Fisheries out of the markets of the world; yet British Columbia fishermen go untaxed, while you now compel New Brunswick fishermen to pay a *heavy Revenue tax*. I however desire to prevent my views from being again misunderstood in relation to Fishery Policy, and my language must not be construed to express a desire to tax the Fish productions of the Provinces of Nova Scotia, British Columbia, Manitoba and P. E. Island. I believe that *no special Revenue tax should be imposed upon the Fishery interest*, but if the imposition of a Revenue tax is to be the policy of your Government, *then deal fairly and tax all alike.*

I regret that I cannot view your letter of the 19th ult., as a satisfactory reply to the just complaints which my first letter contained, and I would observe that you have altogether omitted to notice the pledges which were given in Parliament by Sir John Macdonald and myself at the time of the passage of the Fishery Act of 1868, and which were acted on and adopted as the policy of the Department up to the

remark, that if the public pledges given in Parliament by the Ministers of the day, as to the nature and effect of a measure which may at the time have been under consideration, are to be deliberately ignored and set aside by their successors, such a course cannot be beneficial to the public, and must lead to a want of confidence in any ministerial statements which may be made hereafter.

I trust therefore that under the circumstances you may see your way to suspend the objectionable portions of the regulations during the present season, and thus give time to the parties interested to lay their case before Parliament should they desire to do so.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obt. serv't,
P. MITCHELL,
M.P. for Northumberland Co.,
Province of New Brunswick.

HON. A. J. SMITH,
Minister of Marine & Fisheries,
Ottawa.

REPORTS TO COUNCIL.

[COPY.]

Department of Marine & Fisheries,
Fisheries Branch,
Ottawa, 22nd Dec., 1869.

The undersigned has the honor to submit for the consideration of Council, the annexed application of Adam Ferguson, Esq., of the County of Restigouche, in the Province of New Brunswick, for a license to fish on a station which he and his family have occupied for the last seventy years.

The system of granting leases and licences for fishing stations has prevailed for many years in the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, at rates varying in different parts of these Provinces from a nominal sum in some portions of the Province, to an actual cash value in other portions.

The Department, prior to its present organization, found it most difficult, and considered it unwise, to adopt a uniform system which would materially unsettle existing arrangements.

At the time of the Union, systems of governing or regulating the fisheries of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, prevailed more or less perfect, and when the Fisheries Act of 1868 was passed, certain restrictions were introduced and limitations of the Law as applied to these latter provinces, and hitherto no change has been applied to them in the direction of leasing or licensing the commercial Fisheries, it being hitherto considered unwise as a matter of policy to resort to that system.

By the annexed application it will be seen that Adam Ferguson, Esq., who is a descendant of one of the oldest settlers and fishermen on the Restigouche, and who with his ancestors have fished the station for the last 70 years, now voluntarily asks that the protection which the license system affords, and which he has seen the benefit of on the Canadian side of the Restigouche, be extended to him, the better to ensure him the quiet occupancy, and the legal recognition in his station.

This being the first case of an application for license by the occupant of a station in New Brunswick, the undersigned has deemed it his duty to submit the same to Council, and begs to recommend that a license at a valuation by the Local Inspector be granted to Mr. Ferguson for the station asked for.

Respectfully submitted,
P. MITCHELL,
Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

[COPY]

Department of Marine & Fisheries,
Fisheries Branch,
Ottawa, 27th Jan'y, 1870.

The undersigned has the honor to bring under the notice of the Privy Council certain provisions of the Fisheries Act respecting the issue of leases and licenses for fish-

stands for whitefish and salmon in the lakes and tidal waters; also for angling stations in the salmon rivers emptying into the Gulf and River St. Lawrence.

In the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick no system of the kind was established under the Provincial Acts and regulations, although in the first named Province the Local Government was in the habit of renting to individuals exclusive privileges of fly fishing for salmon.

The Statute passed in the first Dominion Parliament was made applicable to the various provinces, but left in force certain of the fishery laws and regulations then existing in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

The Canadian Act does not forbid any kind of fishing without leases or licenses, but permits of their being granted by this Department *when the right remains public*, and provides a penalty against other persons fishing within limits so let for exclusive occupation. It has been found in most cases occurring in Ontario and Quebec by parties who desire to carry on their fishing operations without molestation, and who wish to secure themselves permanently in establishing the fisheries and trade arrangements connected therewith, the whole involving considerable capital; that the leasing system affords them greater security and enhances the value of their outlay as a matter of commercial business. They have therefore been wishing, (and in many cases even anxious) to obtain such titles and pay rents for them; with the exception of places for which there was much competition, the majority of stations are rented at nominal rates,—the Government considering the system as a means of protection and regulation, rather than a source of direct revenue.

There are doubtless in the maritime districts numerous fishing stations, where the parties have been in peaceable occupation for a long time, *and being in instances riparian proprietors* they think they have acquired a sort of possession by such prior occupancy. They may also desire to secure their holdings by lease or license.

The undersigned does not consider it desirable at present to recommend the application of the same system to Nova Scotia & New Brunswick. The condition of the Fisheries in these Provinces, and the fact of the local fishery laws never having until lately been enforced in an effective manner, renders it probable that the people would be very impatient under the necessary restrictions.

The undersigned would however respectfully suggest in all cases where it can be clearly shewn that parties are in the peaceable use of any salmon fishing station in the Provinces, and apply for leases or licences, that he be authorized to accede to their applications.

This partial introduction of a system which has proved beneficial to the fishing interests and improved the public supply in other portions of the Dominion, might lead to a gradual extension ot the system *at such times, and in such forms as shall render it generally acceptable.*

The whole nevertheless respectfully submitted,
P. MITCHELL,
Minister of Marine & Fisheries.

Personal.

MR. S. BENSON, of Chatham, we are pleased to learn, passed his examination for Attorney, at Fredericton, on Friday last. Mr. Benson is a son of the late Stafford Benson, Esq., M. D., of Chatham. He pursued his studies in the office of W. Wilkinson, Esq., of the same town.

MR. WILLIAM J. WILKINSON, of Chatham, has succeeded in carrying off the Alumni Gold Medal at the Provincial University at Fredericton. The award was unanimous. Mr. Wilkinson, we understand, is studying for the Ministry. His success will be a source of gratification to his many friends in this quarter.

MR. A. SILLIKER, of Newcastle, a student of the Provincial University, has been extremely fortunate in carrying off the Dufferin Gold Medal. He also obtained an honor certificate in English.

MR. A. A. DAVIDSON, son of Allan A. Davidson, Esq., of Newcastle, at the closing exercises of the Encœnia of the Provincial University last week, was awarded an honor certificate in English.

MR. HEDLEY V. WILLISTON, son of His Honor Judge Williston, has just completed his term at the Wesleyan College at Sackville, obtaining the degree of B. A., after a very flattering and successful course. We understand that our young townsman has chosen the medical profession in which to make use of his talents and superior education, and in order to obtain the necessary qualifications for so important a profession, will enter upon a course of study in M'Gill College, Montreal, in October next.

R. F. QUIGLEY, ESQ., LL. B., of Harvard and Boston Universities, will practice his profession in St. John.—He makes an excellent start by associating himself with Charles Duff, Esq., Q. C., a lawyer of considerable ability and high professional standing in the city of St. John. Mr. Quigley commenced his studies in the office of S. Thomson, Esq., Newcastle.

PATRICK PURCELL, ESQ., a well known railway contractor, was a passenger on board the stmr. *Miramichi*, on Friday last, *en route* to England.

CORRECTION.—We hasten to apologize to all concerned, for a mistake which occurred in the notices under the head of "Personal," in last week's issue. It was stated that Mr. Wilkinson, son of Judge Wilkinson, Chatham, was in Fredericton, passing the regular examination for Attorney.—We should have said that Mr. E. PERLEY WILLISTON, of Newcastle, son of His Honor Judge Williston, Judge of the County Courts, was in Fredericton, and not Mr. Wilkinson, who is studying for the ministry. We are pleased to hear that Mr. Williston passed the regular examination at Fredericton on Friday last. Having obtained his degree at the Provincial University, Mr. W. commenced his legal studies with Samuel Thomson, Esq., and for the last two years continued the same in the office of David Shank Kerr, Esq., of St. John.—Again expressing regret for the mistake which occurred in our last issue, we join with many others in wishing our young townsman a career of success and usefulness.

EXCURSION.—The Excursion on board the "Andover" on Wednesday evening last, which was participated in by about 120 persons, was a very pleasant and successful affair. The steamer proceeded down river as far as Oak Point, turned and steamed up to the point below Newcastle, then took the down track again, leaving passengers at Chatham

Publishers' Notice.

After the 1st of July next, Subscribers to the Advocate will receive their papers free of postage, at the offices of delivery. We have made arrangements to prepay all the postage at the office here, and as this will involve an additional outlay on our part, all we ask in return is, that our patrons will be prompt in paying up their subscriptions, and all other demands which we may have against them.

The ADVOCATE will be issued at the usual rate, $1.50 per annum.

Notes from Douglastown.

Ernest Hutchison, Esq., is building an extensive wharf opposite his property, below the mill wharf of R. Hutchison, Esq. This wharf will be a very great accommodation to vessels discharging ballast.

Messrs. Gilmour, Rankin & Co.'s steam mill is running night and day.

Mr. John Troy is erecting a very fine dwelling house.

Other improvements are going on in our modest little town.

Mr. Thos. Ramsay has the contract for extending the public or ferry landing, which when completed will be a great accommodation to the river steamers and public generally.

The Temperance Hall, where religious services are also held, has been repainted, which has added greatly to its appearance.

Mr. R. Wilson, a respected townsman, has been for some time engaged in improving the breed of fowl, and has brought the same to a high degree of perfection. The breed is a cross between a Russian and a Prussian fowl, and then a cross between the above and the blue nose or native fowl.

[Our correspondent sends us two eggs laid by these Czar-Bismarkian-blue nose fowl, and they are whoppers. One weighs 4 ounces, measuring 7¾ inches around the egg from tip to butt, and 6¼ inches around the centre; the other weighs a little over 4 ounces, and measures 7 7-8 inches lengthwise, and 6 1-2 around the centre. If any of our farmers can beat these specimens let us hear from them.]—EDS.

Auctions.

Mr. C. Marshall will sell a waggon, in front of the Waverley Hotel, to-morrow, at noon.

At the same time and place, he will sell the lease of two public Lots on the Public Wharf. See advts.

Mr. C. C. Watt will sell in front of his store to-morrow, at noon, a raft of logs. See advt.

☞ The St. John *News* has our sympathy. It must certainly be a difficult thing to support an administration with which it is not really in accord, and we are therefore not surprised at the precarious position of that journal. We are not at all hurt that the fishery contributor chooses to term the utterances of this paper on the fishery question as displaying ignorance for all the papers which have expressed opinions in opposition are placed in the same category. We reassert the remarks made last week, can prove the statements made, and can afford to laugh at the lame attempt of the departmental scribe to refute the same. In so doing he shows himself wofully ignorant, and wilfully perverts facts. What we stated with regard to Gaspereaux seining was that the limits extended too far up the river, by which great injury was done to the gaspereaux and shad spawning grounds. This could be remedied without abolishing the mode of fishing, as proposed by the wiseacre of the *News*. With regard to the statements made in the *Advocate* respecting the habits of the fish which frequent the Miramichi and its tributaries, those better posted in the matter than the Fishery writer in the *News*, those who have made the matter a study from their boyhood, can corroborate what we stated last week. The fact is, the Regulations need a thorough overhauling, and when the Government choose to enter upon this very necessary duty, they will do well to avoid such bigots as the one who has been airing himself in the *News* for some weeks past. The information to be obtained from such sources is generally unreliable, and calculated to place any Government at a disadvantage when discussions arise on their policy regarding the fisheries or any other matter.

HARPER'S MONTHLY.—The illustrated articles in the number for July are—Newburyport and its neighborhood; A glance at the Island of Lewis; Caricature in the Revolutionary Period; Wanderings in Brittany; The story of a Trombone; Echoes of Bunker Hill; The Stone Age in Europe; Garth; Miss Angel; some of which are exceedingly interesting. A number of other articles, with the usual Editorial Departments, make the issue for July a very readable production. J. & A. M'Millan, St. John, are Agents.

BOGUS BANK BILLS.—The Truro *Sun* warns its readers that bogus five dollar bills are in circulation. The counterfeit paper is a clever photograph of a five dollar bill of the Bank of British North America. It is not likely that in these hard times the public will be burdened with many bank notes of any kind, but still a sharp look out should be kept for the bogus notes.

LARCENY.—Five young boys, ranging from eight to thirteen years, were yesterday arrested by Policeman Mathews, on a charge of entering St. James' Church on Friday and Sunday last, and abstracting money contained in the boxes in which the collections are kept. The complaint was entered by R. R. Call, Esq., one of the Trustees of the Church, with whom the collections are deposited. The trial will come off before Justices Lawlor and Niven, this morning at 9 o'clock. M. Adams, Esq., appears for the defence.

☞ The 73rd Battalion will go into camp for the annual drill on the 19th of July next. The camp will be form-

☞ Lewis Carvell, Esq., late General Superintendent of Government Railways in this Province, while passing through Moncton a few days ago, was presented with a handsome testimonial, by the officers and employees of the railway. The testimonial was in the form of a bank certificate of deposit for $853, and was accompanied with an address which evidenced that a very warm friendship existed between the recipient and his late railway associates. The deposit was made on the 8th of May last, when Mr. Carvell retired from the management of the road.

☞ Parties in want of a powerful Organ, nine stops, including subbass and coupler, can be suited by making application to J. J. Anslow. The instrument is well adapted for a small church or public hall. Organs by the leading American makers, from $60 upwards. Pianos, of good tone, and superior construction, at prices ranging from $225 to $1,000. Every instrument warranted, and liberal discounts made for cash.—Sheet music and instruction books ordered on application.

☞ The Rev. James Anderson, Pastor of St. James' (Presbyterian) Church, of this town, will by the kindness of the congregation, shortly leave for a three months tour in Scotland. The Rev. gentleman has the pastoral charge of a very large flock, and the change and relaxation for a season from his onerous duties, will doubtless the better fit him for the faithful discharge of his ministerial obligations. Mr. Anderson, we understand, will leave early in July.

☞ The men employed in rafting at the South West Boom have been on a strike since last week. We understand that they ask more wages, their pay once a fortnight, their full earnings up to the date of each payment. Keeping back two weeks of their pay is a system which they do not favour. Up to yesterday at noon, the strike still continued. The lock cannot long continue if the mills are to be kept going.

☞ W. S. Brown, Esq., of Redbank, North West, has just received one of the well known rotary saw mills from the Waterous Works, Ontario. Also a shingle machine, all of which will be driven by water power, a patent turbine wheel being used instead of the old fashioned water wheel. We trust that Mr. Brown's enterprise will be rewarded with a good measure of success.

☞ Several of the saw mills on our river are running night and day. Whether this is the result of an improvement in prices on the other side we are unable to say, but it certainly looks very much like it. In the interests of our lumberers, some of whom have been compelled to dispose of stocks at unremunerative prices, we sincerely hope that such is the case.

☞ Joe Quigley, (not a relative of the family of this name in town) one of the prisoners who a few days ago escaped from the County Gaol, was recently re-taken at Black Brook by one of the Chatham Police Force, and brought back to his old quarters. On Monday he obtained his discharge, and is once more "free to roam."

☞ The Rev. J. Waterhouse, Wesleyan Minister, will hold services on Sunday next, as follows:—Derby, 11 a. m..; Newcastle, 3 p. m.; Chatham 6¼ p. m. The change in the hour for holding service in Newcastle is occasioned by the absence of the assistant Minister, the Rev. J. Crisp.

☞ The Jacques-Cartier Bank, of Quebec, has suspended. A reliable return will be issued in a few days.—Depositors and bill-holders it is said, need have no anxiety about the ability of the Bank to meet demands, though it may take a little time.

SEIZURE.—At Rock Heads, on Wednesday last, Overseer Amos Perley seized a number of bag nets from parties engaged in illegal fishing. The parties were fined as the Law directs.

☞ The New Brunswick and P. E. Island Methodist Conference opens its annual session at St. John this morning. About 70 clergymen are expected to be present.

☞ Mr. W. Murray has performed his contract in painting the exterior of the Methodist Church, in excellent style, and to the entire satisfaction of the committee.

☞ The Rev. Mr. Feltwell, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, will lecture at Chatham this evening. See Advertisement.

☞ A Reformed Episcopal Church is about being established at Indiantown, St. John.

☞ The First of July has been proclaimed a Holiday by His Honor the Lieut. Governor.

Died.

OBITUARY.—God is gathering his children home, another of the old pilgrims has been welcomed to his Father's house. JAMES DONALDS, Esq., of Blackville, County Northumberland, departed this life on the 31st May, in sure and certain hope of a glorious resurrection through Jesus Christ his Saviour. Till within the past year his constitution was strong and gave no evidence of dissolution. During the winter however he visibly failed and spoke often of his approaching death, gladly welcoming the time when God in his mercy should take his spirit to rest. As a christian he waited for the final summons with earnest trust and lingered lovingly on the promise of his Saviour. His experience was:—

O when will the period appear
When I shall unite in your song,
I'm weary of lingering here,
And I to your Saviour belong.
I'm fettered and chain'd up in clay,
I struggle and pant to be free,
I long to be soaring away,
My God and my Saviour to see.

Yours truly,
W. M. EDWARDS.
(Christian Visitor please copy.)

At Lower Douglastown, on Wednesday, 16th inst., of scarlet fever, JOHN, eldest son of David Scott, farmer.

Shipping Intelligence.

PORT OF NEWCASTLE.

ENTERED—June 16—stm'rs Secret, Davison, Pictou, flour, R. R. Call; Flamborough, Telfer, Montreal, do., do.

17—Bark Laura, Sundene, Barrow, steel rails, I. C. R. Com.

18—Stm'r Miramichi, Bacquet, Quebec, flour, R. R. Call.

19—Schr. M. R. M'Kenzie, Hains, Pictou, coals, R. Russell; brig Eva Parker, Slocomb, Boston, cargo, J. J. Miller & Co.; brig [illegible] do., Miller & Co.; brig [illegible] & [illegible]

16—Schr. Foam, LeBlanc, do., do., R. R. Call.

18—Schr. Lady Belleau, Savard, Montreal, building stone, Jos. Goodfellow.

21—Schr. Zetland, Grant, Pictou, refuse deals, R. R. Call.

PORT OF CHATHAM.

ENTERED—June 14—bark Najaden, Bourgesson, Derry, ballast, Guy, Stewart & Co.

16—Stm'r Secret, Davison, Pictou, cargo, Wm. Muirhead; stm'r Flamborough, Telfer, Montreal, cargo, do., do.; sch'r Louise, Sonier, Tracadie, ballast, master.

17—Bark Crown Jewel, Delap, Grimsby, ballast, Guy, Stewart & Co.; bark Baltcola, Tjommesen, Cork Quay, deals, Guy, Stewart & Co.; bark Helene, Olsen, Conway, deals, Guy, Stewart & Co.; schr. Barbara, Blanchard, St. Pierre, lumber, G. R. & Co.; schr. Mary Charles, J. Babin, Charlottetown, lumber, Wm. Muirhead; schr. Maria, Curry, Halifax, shingles, J. B. Snowball.

19—Bounty, Doucette, Rustico, produce; True Love, Gillis, Tignish, do.; Mystery, Matthews, Cascumpec, do.; Albion, M'Kie, New London, do.; bark Harmoni, Hansen, Norway, ballast, W. Muirhead.

CLEARED—June 12—bark Marie, Johannesen, Dublin, deals, Wm. Muirhead.

14—Bark Annie, Evenson, Dublin, deals, Guy, Stewart & Co.

15—Octavon, Fallman, Dublin, deals, A. Morrison.

16—Lammergier, Crosbie, Belfast, timber and deals, Wm. Muirhead.

17—Schrs. Mary Charles, Babin, Charlottetown, lumber, W. Muirhead; Maria, Currie, Halifax, shingles, J. B. Snowball; barks Baticola, Tjommesen, Cork Quay, deals, Guy Stewart & Co.; Helene, Neilsen, Conway, do., do.

18—Hebe, Taarvig, London, do., do.; sch'r Barbarie, Blanchfield, St. Pierre, lumber, G. R. & Co.

19—Bark Orion, Hansen, Liverpool, deals, A. Morrison.

Newcastle Police Court.

BEFORE JOHN LAWLOR, J. P.

May 27th.

Stephen Mitchell, South West, drunk.—Fined $2 and costs.

Lizzie Bear, squaw, disorderly. Let go with a caution.

June 3rd.

George Graham, ship "Lyman Cann," drunk. Eight days in gaol.

5th.

George M'Coombes, Nelson, drunk.—Fined $4 and costs.

7th.

Thomas Sinnott, Newcastle, drunk. Fined $2 and costs.

14th.

Robert Wilson, Nelson, drunk. Eight days in gaol.

15th.

Welsh Norman, Derby, drunk. Fined $4 and costs.

16th.

George M'Coombes, Nelson, drunk and insulting persons on the street. Fined $8 and costs or one month in gaol.

James Weldon, Newcastle, drunk and shouting. Fined $10 and costs or 5 weeks in gaol.

22nd.

Stephen Blanchard, Doaktown, drunk.—Fined $2 and costs.

METEOROLOGICAL.

Reported for the Dominion Gov't by G. A. Blair, Esq.

JUNE.

DATE.		Time.	Height of Bar'r	Thermometer.	Maximum Thermometer.	Minimum Thermometer.
Sun.	13	8 20 a.m	29 73	65 6