WEEKLY CALENDAR—JUNE.

New Moon, 6th day, 6h. 33m., morn., S.E.
First Quarter, 13th day, 6h. 6m., after., S.
Full Moon, 21st day, 10h. 13m., morn., E.N.E.
Last Quarter, 28th day, 10h. 36m., morn., E.N.E.

DAY of Month.	DAY of Week.	Sun rises	Sun sets	High water morn.	High water after.	Moon sets morn.	Day's length.
		h m h	m h m	h m	h m	h m	h m
9	Sunday	4 14	7 44	0 2	9 0	15 30	
10	Monday	4 14	7 45	0 26	9 26	15 31	
11	Tuesday	4 13	7 45	1 12	10 7	15 32	
12	Wednesday	4 13	7 46	1 57	10 42	15 33	
13	Thursday	4 13	7 46	2 42	11 3	15 33	
14	Friday	4 13	7 47	3 27	11 26	15 34	
15	Saturday	4 13	7 47	4 16	11 49	15 34	

Mails—Summer Arrangements.

The Mails for this Neighbouring Province, &c., will until further notice, be made up and forwarded as follows:

For Nova Scotia, via Pictou, every Monday and Thursday, at 12 o'clock, noon.

For New Brunswick, Canada, and the United States, via Shediac, every Tuesday and Friday morning, at a quarter past 8 o'clock.

For Newfoundland, every Monday, at 12 o'clock, noon.

For England, Bermuda, and the West Indies, every alternate Monday, at 12 o'clock, noon, viz:

Monday, April 29; May 13, 27; June 10, 24; July 8, 22; August 5, 19; September 2, 16, 30; October 14, 28; November 11, 25.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

[Continued from our last.]

Hon. Mr HAVILAND.—I beg to differ with the hon. member. When in power, one case occurred in which they put in a proprietor—Mr Fergus—but it was only throwing a sprat to catch a whale,—a sop thrown out to induce Land proprietors to believe they were very liberal in their views. But they took good care to have a handsome majority at the Council Board before that gentleman was nominated. It is open to that abuse, not only here, but in the neighboring Colonies. How, I ask, would the present Council stand as regards the late Government were they to succeed the present? They would, no doubt, prove an obstructive body, as this last Chamber was to us when we came into power. Now, unless we altered the principle on which that Chamber is at present constituted what would be the result? The result would be that they would be obliged to infuse new blood into the upper Chamber—in other words, to put men there to enable the lower House to carry their measures. We have heard much of a contemplated third-party, who are to drive both parties now present out of these Legislative Halls. Earnest of the Country are to arise in their power and majesty, to advocate the interests of the country. Then both sides now existing will be compelled to hide their diminished heads;—and when they come into power, under the existing system, there must be of necessity a great increase made in the Legislative Chamber. There are only two principles on which the upper Chamber can be properly constituted, that is, to give it stability and to enable it to exercise its functions and powers as a conservative body. These are either on the principle of Hereditary succession, like the House of Lords, or Election. In all countries, nominated Chambers have proved failures. It was discovered in Canada years ago that it was impossible to carry on the Government on the Province on that principle, and in 1853 a petition was sent from the House of Assembly to the Queen, praying for an alteration in the Constitution of that Chamber, and an address on the subject, was carried by a majority of four-fifths of the lower House. The idea of an hereditary upper Chamber in any of these Colonies, cannot be entertained for a moment. When we consider the peculiar construction of the House of Lords, we find it is not the mere creation of yesterday but the result of two or three centuries; for, its power and influence have grown with the growth of the British Constitution. An elective Chamber then appears to be the only alternative. This Chamber is elective in Australia, the Cape of Good Hope and Canada, and, if I mistake not a Bill for this purpose was introduced this Session in the Legislature of New Brunswick. Hon. members opposed to this Bill may think that in Canada the principle has not worked well. In that Colony, a few years ago, they experienced some difficulty because the upper Chamber there is a mongrel institution. They did not do as we purpose to do, to sweep the whole body out of existence and put in another entirely new. They used a little of what is called *trimming*; they only elected a certain number, and left at the Council Board the nominated members who were put there when the Colonies were united in 1841. A schoolboy might have foreseen there would have been a lack of harmony in any body so constituted. How could there be unanimity between those who only held parchment titles, and those elected by the votes, and according to the wishes of the people? But this difficulty did not arise in the other Colonies where the elective principle was properly dazzled out. In Canada their system was neither elective nor nominative, hence the difficulty which arose. I may refer to the elective system which has been in operation in a kingdom in Europe since 1831 till the present time. It is a limited Monarchy with an elective upper Chamber which is not composed of Peers though there are Peers in the body: I allude to Belgium. This kingdom has a population of about 6,000,000, and a Constitution as nearly assimilated to that of Britain as is possible. This principle has been fully tested there and has given entire satisfaction. In Britain all statesmen of any note—Whigs, Tories, Conservatives and Radicals—leading men in these four classes have concluded that the days of nominated Chambers are numbered. This is the opinion of the present leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords, who, so to speak, is the quintessence of Toryism and Conservatism, Lord Derby, and the last man one would have thought who would have assented to the elective principle. The nominative system has been tried in France, Spain, Portugal and in the Republic of America in its earlier history, and failed. It may be said a Chamber constituted on the elective principle would be liable to be influenced by the popular feeling of the day; but we know the popular breeze sometimes blows to the detriment of those who fan it. Some may imagine it would save trouble and expence not to have a second Chamber at all; but I trust no gentleman in this House is tinged with any such notion. We know that men frequently pass measures, which, had they but time to reflect they would not have passed, and that is one reason why we should have a second branch to revise measures adopted in the lower branch of the Legislature. Bills sometimes pass through the House of Commons full of errors, notwithstanding all the able men there are in that body. Lord Brougham argued on the necessity of a second Chamber two or three years subsequent to the passing of the Reform Bill. The House of Commons stood out firmly for their privileges under that Bill, and consider the House of Lords almost a nonentity. On one occasion a Criminal Law was passed in Commons, which, when it went to the upper House was found to contain errors of a character so extraordinary, that had the Bill passed the House of Lords, it would have paralyzed the Criminal Justice of England for twelve months. The House of Commons would not give in, but no injury was done as the law was not passed that year. This is one instance, out of many which might be cited, to show the necessity of having a second Chamber. This question has been before the House so frequently, that hon. members must have their minds made up. As regards the details of the Bill I may state the Government are not wedded to them. They may be altered in Committee. It is somewhat different from the one introduced by me in 1860, which was founded upon sound principles, at least upon principles considered sound; viz., that no person should have a second vote according to wealth and population. The Bill of last year proposed to give 3 members to Princes, 3 to Kings's, and 3 to Queen's County. In population they are not always able to carry out their views. As to general system, as to public affairs, there must be a system of policy and action adopted. If the present system, [illegible] upon having two votes, [illegible] would soon come to an end. As regards the Bill of last year, [illegible] double that of the Bill of 1860, [illegible]