

Mr. BROCKEN presented a petition of Bernard MacMahon and others, inhabitants of the North side of the Hillsborough River, setting forth that their names had been signed to a petition presented to the House in 1862, without their consent, and praying the House, to cause Mr. Kelly to account to the House how he came possessed of said petition. He (Mr. B.) thought a fair opportunity ought to be given to Mr. Kelly to explain and bring proof in the matter, and he would therefore move that the petition be referred to a special Committee to examine the same and report thereon.

The motion was agreed to, and the Committee appointed; whereupon Hon. Mr. Kelly presented a counter petition, which was referred to the same Committee.

Hon. Mr. KELLY moved the House into the order of the day, viz, Committee of the whole on the consideration of the several petitions praying an amendment in the Act 17th Victoria, Cap 7, relating to steam communication on the Hillsborough and Elliot Rivers.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES said he could not support monopolies except in very extraordinary cases. They might be useful to start certain undertakings, but were in general injurious. They might be compared to bounties in old times. Perhaps it would be said unless we granted a monopoly of the steam navigation of the East and West Rivers, there would be no steamers plying there and he would rather give a grant to encourage them, than at this time to grant a monopoly for a term of years.

Hon. Col. GRAY said the petitions prayed for what the Government always intended. All parties should have a fair scope to tender. The law required to be altered, as it provided that the communication should be every day, and this at present was not needed.

Hon. Mr. COLES thought it was necessary to have some regulations to the effect that the boat should leave the several stations at a certain time. He thought it was better to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, and would therefore move the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Act 17th Victoria, Chapter 7, authorizing the letting of contracts for the running of steamers on the Hillsborough and West Rivers, be amended so as to authorize the Government to advertise for tenders for the running of a boat or boats on either or both of said rivers, on such days as they—the Government—may think proper, with power to fix the points or places at which such boat or boats shall call, on their respective routes.

Hon. Mr. HENSLEY rose to second the resolution. Unless a monopoly was given there would be no security to the public that a boat would run, without indeed the Government thought proper to give a grant. Perhaps a monopoly of ten years was too long.

Hon. Col. GRAY thought that no person would build a boat, or send to Scotland for one, unless he had the monopoly of the route for at least ten years. The first few years would probably yield very little return, and no person could be expected to incur the risk without some such privilege. He was opposed to monopolies, but he thought one better in this case than giving a grant at present for the object.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH was interested in this question, as it was contemplated that the boat should run on the West as well as the East River. A monopoly was a thing that should not generally be granted; but in consideration of the advantage in this case, it would probably be desirable. There would be no safe guarantee for the investment of capital without some such privilege. With respect to the period, he thought ten years was short enough. In the case of the ferry between Halifax and Dartmouth, a monopoly of 50 years was given. This was too long; but no person could be expected to incur outlay, as in the case before the Committee, for a shorter period than ten years.

Hon. Mr. KELLY thought the resolution proposed would give satisfaction to all parties, he would therefore support it.

The resolution was agreed to, after which the House resumed and adjourned.

Monday Afternoon, April 11.

The amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Savings' Bank Bill were agreed to.

House went into Committee on the petitions relative to the shooting of wild fowl.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES.—They considered that the subject was one of importance, as was evidenced by the numbers and respectability of the names subscribed to the petitions. The petitions sought no exclusive rights, they merely asked that some measures should be adopted to prevent the expulsion of the birds from their usual haunts, which would be the result of the constant harrassing to which they were subjected. Last year thousands were destroyed in Richmond Bay.

Mr. McLENNAN said that finding that thousands of heads of game were last year exported, and that the Indians were being deprived of an important source of their livelihood, and that the petitions disclaimed all desire of excluding natives or foreigners from participating in the sport of shooting wild fowl, he thought the petitions should commend themselves to the favorable notice of the House.

Hon. Mr. HENSLEY.—There being no property in birds of passage, it would be strange to object to parties shooting them. Legislative action had frequently been interposed for the protection of birds attached to the soil, and if the intention of the advocates of the petitions is merely the prevention of the exportation, it would necessarily follow that any number of birds might be shot and allowed to rot.

Hon. Mr. McAULAY was of opinion that the Legislature should interpose. Great quantities of birds had been exported last year, and they had doubtless brought high prices, the benefit of which we lost. Unless we stopped the wholesale destruction of our resources, in a few years we would feel the consequences.

Hon. SPEAKER never saw an Act prohibiting the shooting and exportation of birds such as wild geese, brant, &c. He was at a loss to conceive how the people of the Island could be said to have lost the value of what they never owned. Game laws in Britain are applicable only to birds whose permanent home is there, such as pheasants, but not to migratory or birds of passage.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD was opposed to any legislation on the subject. If Americans made so much money by their shooting last year, our people could rival them next season.

After a short conversation, Hon Mr DAVIES seeing the opinion of the House was adverse to any action on the petitions, moved that the Speaker take the chair. Carried.

The House went into Committee on the presentment of the Queen's County Grand Jury.

The suggestions of the Jury on the subject of additional tribunals for the trial of criminals were unanimously disagreed to by the Committee as being attended with expense unnecessary to be incurred, the Supreme Court having time to transact the criminal, without obstructing the civil business.

The expediency of removing to the Asylum the prisoner Young, whose case was referred to on Saturday last by Hon. Col. Gray when he tabled the presentment, was discussed, all members who spoke agreeing that it was unjust to the unfortunate debtors to be confined in the same building with such a person who ought to be removed to the Lunatic Asylum where a strict watch could be kept