

the blood and undermine the constitution, to the destruction of both body and mind. How many lives have thus been wrecked in this little community? What profession, what trade, what family has escaped loss and shame, trouble and misery, due to the misuse of alcoholic liquors? We have a law which prohibits murders; but the red hand of the murderer has not plucked the lives away from a tithe of the men that have lost theirs by the use of alcohol. We have a law prohibiting theft; but all the thieves that ever existed have not stolen so much in value as has been robbed on account of the traffickers in strong drink. We have laws prohibiting vices of various kinds; but the misuse of adulterated and unadulterated spirits, resulting from the liquor traffic of these latter days, has caused more misery than all the other vices combined. Then, may not the traffic to which is due the loss of so many lives and so much property and happiness be prohibited, also?

It may be urged that there is a wide difference between drunkenness and such crimes as I have referred to. The drunkard injures himself; but in murders and thefts the injury comes from others. A man has a right to injure himself, should he choose to do so, but no one else has a right to injure him; and though laws may be made to prohibit others from injuring him, they may not be made to prevent him from injuring himself. To this the answer is, that a man cannot, possibly, live for himself alone. In the words of Mill: "No person is an entirely isolated being; it is impossible for a person to do anything seriously or permanently hurtful to himself without mischief reaching, at the least, to his near connections, and often far beyond them. If he injures his property he does harm to those who, directly or indirectly, derive support from it, and usually diminishes, by a greater or less amount, the general resources of the community. If he deteriorates his bodily or mental faculties, he not only brings evil upon all who depend on him for any portion of their happiness, but disqualifies himself for rendering the services which he owes to his fellow creatures generally; perhaps becomes a burden upon their affection or benevolence, and if such conduct were very frequent, hardly any offence that is committed would detract from the general sum of good. Finally, if by his vices and follies a person does no direct harm to others, he is nevertheless, it may be said, injurious by his example, and ought to be compelled to control himself for the sake of those whom the sight and knowledge of his conduct might mislead. And even if the consequences of misconduct could be confined to the vicious or thoughtless individual guilty of it, ought society to abandon to their own guidance those who are manifestly unfit for it? If protection against themselves is confessedly due to children and persons under age, is not society equally bound to afford it to persons of mature years who are equally incapable of self-government? If drunkenness is more injurious to happiness, and a greater hindrance to improvement than many or most of the acts prohibited by law, why (may it not be asked) should not law, so far as is consistent with practicability, endeavor to repress it also?

The liquor traffic is dependent for the most part on the habits of society. Few men drink to themselves or for their own gratification, merely, until the strong appetite which demands stimulants has been acquired. But men meet together, and take a social glass together, and have a "good time" together, and maintaining in this way the liquor traffic and making drunkards of themselves. Thus dependent upon society for existence, its evil results react upon society. Consider the time lost and the money squandered on account of it, and how much better off society might be if it were abolished; consider the crimes which are committed because of it, and what the community suffers in consequence, the prisons and poor houses which the State has to maintain on account of it; consider the misery which it entails upon those members of society who are near and dear to its victims; consider the precious lives which it cuts short—lives the fruits of which are lost to society—and I think it will be admitted that it is one of those things which conflicts with the rights and interests of society, one of those things in respect to which the liberty of the individual ought to give way to the good of society; one of those things in respect to which society is justified in taking away the freedom of the individual and in enacting a prohibitory law.

It will have been observed that while Sir William Blackstone condemned the law which forbade the fine gentlemen to wear pikes upon their boots as one that availed of oppression, he justified the law which prescribed woollen dresses for the dead on the ground that it encouraged a staple trade of the nation. It seems to me that the prohibition of the liquor traffic might be justified on much the same ground; for the wealth of the country would be materially increased by the stoppage of the habit of drinking liquor, as a beverage; and if the liberty of the subject may be interfered with for the purpose of saving the time and money, of preventing the loss, pain, sickness and premature death, of avoiding the expense of maintaining prisons and poor houses, which would result from the annihilation of the liquor traffic.

But, it may be asked, why should a man who can use liquor in moderation and unharmed be compelled by law to give up his liberty to do so? He might, he ought, as a Christian citizen to do so, of his own free will. But should the law stand between him and his desire to buy and drink?

This is an important question. On the one hand it is certain that the State has no right to interfere with a man's liberty unless he does that which injures society, and the mere drinking of a glass of two liquor per day injures no one. On the other hand it may be urged—(1) that drinking even in moderation does no bodily person any good—though it may be used with good effect in cases of sudden illness, accident or other emergency; (2) that drinking in moderation is productive of ill-drunkness; (3) that drunkenness is exceedingly injurious to society; (4) that which lies at the root of the liquor traffic must be cut off if the evils which spring from drunkenness are to be abated; that the evils of drunkenness should be abated; that the State may, therefore, deprive a man of his liberty to drink in moderation.

On this point, I quote the opinions of several medical authorities. Dr. Carpenter, a noted physician of Great Britain, says: "In the average man, the habitual use of alcoholic liquors, in moderate or even in small quantities, is not merely unnecessary for the maintenance of bodily and mental vigor, but is unfavorable to the permanent enjoyment of health, even though it may, for a time, appear to contribute to it."

At a medical congress held in Philadelphia, it was set forth that "Alcohol is not shown to have a definite food value by any of the usual methods of chemical or physiological investigation," and "its use as a medicine is chiefly that of a cardiac stimulant." Dr. Benjamin Richardson says: "I find that alcoholic drinks give no strength, that they reduce the force of the blood vessels, that they build up no muscle, destroy its powers, and make less active for work—that the use of no to me or anyone else as a substance

this expression to their beliefs in respect to the use of alcoholic liquors—

"We, the undersigned members of the medical profession of Montreal, are of opinion (1) that a large portion of human misery, poverty, disease and crime is produced by the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage; (2) that total abstinence from intoxicating liquors, whether fermented or distilled, is consistent with and conducive to the highest degree of physical and mental health and vigor; (3) that abstinence from intoxicating liquors would greatly promote the health, morality and happiness of the people."

In fact, the medical profession, as a whole, class alcohol as a strong drug, from which a healthy person can receive no good, and may receive much harm. This being so, it seems to me that the State may, without unduly exerting its power, interfere with the liberty of individuals to drink alcoholic liquors in moderation, seeing that all the evils to society resulting from the liquor traffic rest upon the foundation of what is known as "moderate drinking."

It is conceded that the State has the right to set limitations to the liquor traffic—to hamper it by conditions as to how, when, where, by whom and to whom alcoholic drinks shall be bought and sold; and if the State has the right to do this, on what principle should it be restrained from prohibiting it altogether?

It may be urged that by prohibiting the traffic the State will but what the appetite for alcoholic stimulants; that revenue will be lost which will have to be made up in another way; that breweries and distilleries now in the trade may claim indemnity; that smuggling and illicit traffic in alcoholic drinks will be induced. These are questions of expediency and of detail. They are of more or less importance; and must, of course, be considered by the practical statesman. What the people have to be sure about is the right of the State to interfere with the liberty of the individual in respect to the liquor traffic, and to what extent the right may be enforced. It is upon these points that I appeal to the Literary and Scientific Society.

Upon a brief review of the whole matter, it seems to me that while prohibitions are exceptional, both in the Christian Dispensation and under the British Constitution, and while the evils which spring from drunkenness would be much more satisfactorily abated by a general free-will abstinence from the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage, the liquor traffic of this country may well, under all the circumstances, be prohibited by law, provided that regulations be made under which liquors can be quickly and easily procured for use in cases of illness.

What, then, should be the character and scope of a Prohibitory Liquor Law for Canada? It seems to me that the following might be included among its leading provisions:—

1. Absolute prohibition of the manufacture of alcohol in Canada. (The liquor that is required can be imported.)
2. The importation and sale of liquors to be restricted absolutely to bona fide druggists. (Liquors being strong drugs it is fitting that druggists should dispense them.)
3. All druggists to be duly qualified and registered as able to dispense medicines—men of good character and moderate habits; the qualifications to be ascertained by means of examinations to be held before competent persons, who shall grant to each successful candidate a certificate to his ability.
4. Any one selling liquors or other drugs without such certificate, to be subject to the penalties and disabilities of the law.
5. All druggists to be sworn and bound under penalties not to sell liquor to a drunkard or any one addicted to the liquor habit, unless directed to do so by the prescription of a physician in good standing, supplemented by the evidence of at least one respectable person, that each drunkard or person addicted to the liquor habit is seriously ill.
6. To persons of known temperate habits, liquors may be sold on requisition, blank forms of which shall be kept at each drug store—such requisitions to set forth the kind and quantity of the liquor required, the name of the person by whom required, and the reason why required; and to be retained and kept open to the inspection of officers of the law.
7. Persons obtaining liquors on false pretences to be liable to the fines and penalties imposed on those who obtain goods or money under false pretences.
8. Each sale of liquor by a druggist to be limited to a quantity not larger than one quart.
9. Fines and penalties to range from \$500 to \$1,000.
10. Officers of the Customs Department to be charged with the duty of preventing illegal sales.

A law something like this would, it seems to me, if put into operation, completely break down the existing liquor traffic, which does so much harm; it would yet afford means by which respectable men and women, the heads of families and others who may require liquor for medicinal purposes, could obtain it quickly and easily; and it would be perfectly consistent with the idea of Civil Liberty under which the freedom of the individual can be curtailed only in so far "as is necessary and expedient for the general advantage of the public."

(Gentlemen of the Literary and Scientific Institute what say you?)

Entertainment at Milton.

THE entertainment given at North Milton, on Thursday night last, was quite a success. The Hall was crowded to the doors. There was a large number of Charlestown people present, who had been tempted by the prospect of a pleasant moonlight sleigh drive. Every seat was occupied, and some who came a little after 7.30 were obliged to sit on the benches roost, first on one leg and then on the other. The best of order prevailed, and to judge from the frequent applause the programme was heartily appreciated.

Arthur Holroyd, Esq., occupied the chair. Miss Thomas had charge of the musical portion of the programme, and to her efforts and taste is mainly due the success achieved. There were several well-deserved encores. The singing of the children was very good. The dialogues between the boys created some amusement for the young folks. The programme presented a large number of names, and to individualize would scarcely be fair, for every number was well filled; yet the names of the Misses Westcott, Hooper, Coles and Rodd ought not to be omitted. The violin and piano duets by Misses Horne and Vessey received two well-merited encores.

M. Fitzgerald, Esq., read the adventures of a Scotchman named "Shamus O'Brien," only as a brither Scot could. How clumny those Scotchmen are! How well they understand each other's natures!

The readings by F. Horne, Esq., and Mr. L. Jenkins were well received. The two little daughters of Mr. James and David Hooper sang very sweetly, and were brought back again.

"Bonnie Charlie," by Miss A. Coles, was quite nicely sung. There were a number of old songs rendered, which awoke many pleasant reminiscences of former days. Miss Holroyd played a fine selection on the piano called "Airs of All Nations." Of course the pieces of the evening were the songs by Miss Thomas. This lady has a voice of fine compass, and she is not afraid to use it. The entertainment was closed at 10.30 by all singing God Save the Queen. We hope Milton people will shortly favor us with another evening's pleasure of the same class.

Bayard Interviewed.

THE U. S. SECRETARY OF STATE'S EXPOSITION OF THE FISHERIES TREATY.

The Herald's Washington correspondent telegraphs as follows:—The discussion about the Fishery Treaty and the opposition which has been developed to it here makes the following explanation of its terms by Secretary Bayard to your correspondent of general interest. What the Secretary says below explains his understanding of some of the provisions which have become subjects of discussion. "In the treaty just concluded and submitted to the Senate," said Secretary Bayard, "the United States have secured practically everything we have been contending for. I don't hesitate to say that if Canada had conceded to American fishermen in 1886 one fourth of the rights that are secured for them by this treaty, there would have been no trouble at all. We would not have had a single complaint because no grievance would have been felt. Every difficulty that the American fishermen have had to contend with has been removed by this treaty. The terms of the treaty explain themselves, and if any further explanation be needed it is provided in the accompanying message which the President communicated to the Senate. In that message the changes which will be brought about from the condition of affairs with which we have had to contend in the past are very plainly pointed out. Generally it can be stated that no fishing ground of any value whatever to American fishermen has been conceded to Canada by this treaty. There has been some adverse comment upon

THE DELIMITATIONS

particularly specified in regard to some Canadian bays, but in these nothing has been lost. Egmont Bay, in Northumberland Strait, is perhaps the largest bay for which the lines of delimitation are specially stipulated in the treaty. But there is no fishing whatever in that bay. Experienced navigators say that during the past twenty-one years no fishing vessel has been in that bay except in transit for some place else. Of all the bays and creeks thus conceded to Canada the only one which contains any bait or fishing is Chaleur Bay. Americans do not want it and could never use it for fishing purposes, and under the treaty it will be at their disposal for all the use they will want to make of it. They can enter it at any time as they can enter all other Canadian ports and bays for water, wood, shelter or repairs. Chaleur Bay is possibly twelve miles wide at the entrance, so that we give them a concession over and above the ten mile rule established for other bays."

ARTICLE 3.

The correspondent called the Secretary's attention to Article 3 of the Treaty, which says: "The three marine miles mark, but at every bay, creek or harbor not otherwise specially provided for in this treaty, such three marine miles shall be measured seaward from a straight line drawn across the bay, creek or harbor, in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten marine miles," and enquired if the drawing of the straight line at the ten mile width was not a retention of the headland theory of the Canadians.

The Secretary said it was not. The headland theory of the Canadians, for instance, would draw a straight line from one end of Prince Edward Island to the other, enclosing a semi-circular piece of water forty or fifty miles in width and many hundred square miles in extent, or from one fork of Cape Breton to the other, which would have a similar effect. The ten-mile width was simply a convenient extension of the six-mile width for measuring three marine miles from each shore. No United States vessel could enter a bay six miles wide at the entrance. One of the reasons for drawing the line at ten miles is that the American fishermen lose nothing thereby, while the terms of the treaty are reciprocal. The Canadians are to have the same privileges in our bays that we have in theirs, and as we have perhaps fifty large bays for their one, the ten-mile width suits us better. A to

ARTICLE FIFTEEN

of the treaty, which stipulates for larger privileges in Canadian waters, on condition that the United States remove the duty from Canadian fish and fish oils, Secretary Bayard says the treaty is complete without it. The British and Canadian plenipotentiaries were eager to have the duty removed, and to get a *quid pro quo*. But the American negotiators firmly declined all offer to stipulate for any change in the tariff or even for any recommendation to Congress to make any change in the tariff. And while this hypothetical provision is inserted in the treaty, where it can do no harm, but where it requires a *quid pro quo* should Congress make the change referred to, no communication, no recommendation will be made to Congress on the subject. It is for Congress to do just what it pleases about the matter without any suggestion from the Executive. For the *modus vivendi*, which is to endure for two years, Secretary Bayard takes no responsibility. It was freely given by the other side and nothing asked in return. It calls for no legislation on our part, and no executive action on our part. It is entirely for the benefit of our people and to be executed entirely by the other side. The Secretary, however, believes that many of the United States fishermen might find it very profitable to pay \$1.50 per ton for the advantage offered them. The

PRIVILEGES OF TRANSHIPMENT.

he thinks, might be very valuable, and the average tonnage of the vessels, he says, is not over seventy tons. All the waters secured exclusively to Canada, by the treaty, the Secretary says, do not contain as much as one per cent. of the fishing open to the United States fishermen, and he refers to the testimony of the late Professor Spencer F. Baird that these same exclusive waters of Canada have no value whatever for the fishermen of the United States. For fishermen with the purse seine used by the United States fishermen it would be profitless and positively dangerous to fish in the shallow waters and among the rocks of the Canadian harbors.

Sullivan is only 28 years old, and yet the record would make him appear to be a knock-kneeguarian. A sea-faring man is generally a far-seeing man.

Read the Following PROGRAMME,

And you will at once decide to spend

Next Tuesday Evening, 6th Inst.,

—IN THE—

Y. M. C. A. HALL,

WHERE AN EXCELLENT

ENTERTAINMENT

—WILL BE GIVEN—

In Aid of Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.

Instrumental.....Prof. Logan  
Vocal Solo.....Miss Shenton  
Instrumental Duet.....Miss Weeks and Mr. Earle  
Reading.....Rev. J. Carruthers  
Vocal Solo.....Mrs. M. McLeod  
Violin Duet.....Misses Beer and Findlay  
Vocal Solo.....Miss Knight  
Piano Solo.....Miss Hensley  
Vocal Solo.....Mrs. J. Carruthers  
Reading.....Rev. S. Weston-Jones  
Piano Solo.....Prof. Logan  
Vocal Solo.....Miss Earle  
Violin Solo.....Mr. Vinnicoe

Tickets for sale at G. H. Hazard's and at the door.  
Doors open at 7.30. Concert to begin at 8.  
H. N. GOFF,  
Acting Secretary.

ROOM PAPER.

The house cleaning time draweth nigh, When you will be eager to high From the choicest designs, In all the new ligus, ROOM PAPERS which please every eigh.

ROOM PAPER.

If our excellent stock you look through, It will prove to be handsome and nough, For you'll find evermore At the DIAMOND BOOKSTORE, ROOM PAPERS to satisfy yough.

ROOM PAPER.

THEO. L. CHAPPELLE,  
Diamond Bookstore,  
Ch'town, March 3—3i cod.

THE

Clearance Sale

—AT THE—

LONDON HOUSE

Is Still Going On.

Many Fine Grades of Goods.

LARGE DISCOUNTS,

And every effort made to meet the requirements of CASH BUYERS.

F. W. MOORE,  
Assignee of HARRIS & STEWART.  
Ch'town, March 2, 1888.

Houses For Sale and To Let.

THE Subscriber, having in view giving up house-keeping, offers for sale the Dwelling House and Premises occupied by him on Dorchester Street, with Stable and Out-building, and one-half a Town Lot of Land. The house is well finished and commodious in every respect, and the Rooms are large and conveniently arranged.

Also, To Let—The New Dwelling House on corner of Prince and Dorchester Streets, containing nine Rooms, and heated by

Hot Water Heating Apparatus.

Also—The new Dwelling House fronting on Prince Street, adjoining the last-mentioned House, and of the same size.

Tenants seeking good comfortable Dwellings are invited to examine these. Immediate possession. For terms apply to

GEORGE ALLEY.  
Ch'town, March 3, 1888—2aw pat guar

P. E. Island Railway.

SEALED TENDERS, addressed to the undersigned, and endorsed "Tender for Steam Coal," will be received until SATURDAY, March 24th, instant, inclusive, for the supply of Six Thousand Five Hundred (6,500) Tons of the best fresh-mined ROUND STEAM COAL for Locomotive use.

Tenders to state the price per ton of 2,240 lbs., delivered as follows:—  
Charlottetown.....3.250 Tons.  
Summerside.....2.400 "  
Georgetown.....400 "  
Souris.....300 "  
Cape Traverse.....150 "

At least one-quarter of the whole quantity required at each of the above-mentioned Stations to be delivered on or before the 30th day of June next, and delivery of the whole to be completed on or before the first day of October, 1888. The first payment will be made in July, and retained from each payment until the final and satisfactory completion of the contract. The Department does not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender.

J. UNSWORTH,  
Acting Superintendent.  
Railway Office,  
Ch'town, March 1st, 1888.  
mch2-dy 2i wky 1st pat

Telephone Company of P. E. Island.

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the Shareholders of this Company will be held at the Office of Palmer & McLeod, Charlottetown, on WEDNESDAY, the 14th day of March, inst., at 8 o'clock, p. m., for the election of Directors and the transaction of general business.

GEO. R. BEER,  
Secretary.  
Ch'town, March 1, 1888.—pat 2aw but guar

GREAT CLEARANCE SALE

—OF—

BOOTS & SHOES,

—AT THE—

Dominion Boot & Shoe Store.

During the Month of March,

J. B. MACDONALD

—WILL CLEAR OUT HIS—

Entire Stock of Boots and Shoes at a Discount of 20 per cent. off his usual low prices.

The Stock is nearly all New last Fall. Customers are sure to get the best value for their money at THE DOMINION BOOT AND SHOE STORE.

J. B. McDONALD,  
PROPRIETOR.  
February 20—dy & wky

OVERCOATS, SUITS.

Heavy All-Wool Pants, a Specialty.

KNIT SHIRTS, ALL STYLES.

Flannel Shirts, Linders, &c.

ALL AT AWAY DOWN PRICES.

GEO. E. FULL,

SIGN OF THE LION, QUEEN STREET.  
Ch'town, Feb. 18, 1888.

March, 1888.

GREAT CLEARANCE SALE

—OF—

D-R-Y G-O-O-D-S.

JAMES PATON & CO.

Must clear out Surplus Stock to make room for Large Spring Importations. Bargains will be given in every Department during this Month.

Ladies and Children's HOSIERY,  
KID GLOVES and MITTS,  
ULSTER and MANTLE CLOTHS,  
CORSETS, all sizes (from best makers),  
White and Cream LACES and EDGINGS,  
Wool and Tapestry TABLE COVERS,  
DRESS GOODS (in newest shades),  
Men's Heavy OVERCOATS and REEFERS,  
SILK and FLOTT HATS,  
RUBBER and CLOTHING,  
LINDERS and DRAWERS,  
CARDIGAN JACKETS,  
SILK HANDKERCHIEFS and SCARFS,  
LINEN COLLARS and CUFF.

SCOTCH TWEEDS—Nice patterns, selling very cheap,  
TRUNKS and VALISES, all sizes,  
ROOM PAPER—The latest patterns, the largest assortment, the lowest prices.

JAMES PATON & CO.,  
March 1, 1888—dy & wky  
MARKET SQUARE.

EMBROIDERIES.

AN IMMENSE STOCK.

Nice Patterns, All Widths,

—AND—

PRICES LOW.

Above Goods just received via Capes Route.

STANLEY BROTHERS

BROWN'S BLOCK.  
Ch'town, March 1, 1888.—abd & wky.