

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, June 19, 1876.

PARENTAL RIGHTS.

We notice, with astonishment, that the *Argus*, the *Summerside Journal*, and the *Patriot*, argue that, in the matter of education, parental rights and parental duties and desires, should be subsidiary to the State. We notice, without the least surprise, that the opinions, on this point, of those who favor the introduction of religion into the public schools, have been grossly misrepresented. The *Patriot* of Thursday last has an article commencing with the following statement:—

"The denunciations talk and write of parental rights as if they held that children are the absolute property of their parents, and that they may do with them exactly as they see fit. They make it appear that the State acts oppressively when it interferes between parent and child."

What friend of religious education was ever heard to talk or write as if children were to be their children "exactly as they see fit," or as if the State acts oppressively when it "interferes between parent and child?" Will the *Patriot* name one? For our part we repudiate the statement. No man whose opinion is worth anything, could possibly have talked or written such nonsense. On the contrary, all intelligent men will agree that when a parent neglects to perform the duties to his children which the laws of nature (or in other words the laws of God) imposes upon him, the State has a right—it is its duty—to interfere. It is the duty of the parent to maintain his children until they are able to maintain themselves; to protect and guard them until they have reached the age of discretion; to educate them so that they may be able to provide for themselves and to fill, as efficiently as possible, the several stations to which they may be called. Should the parent neglect any of these divinely imposed duties, the State very properly steps in, and either forces him to afford the maintenance, protection, and education, (or if the parent is unable to do so,) provides them itself. In a Free State in which there is manhood suffrage, it is important that all its subjects or citizens should be educated up to a certain standard. And we are decidedly of opinion, that the Government of this Island would be perfectly justified in passing a law requiring the education of every child. Such a law would simply compel all parents to perform a duty imposed upon them by nature and reason. Blackstone, the great Commentator—a standard authority—whose opinion will, we feel quite sure, have some weight with the editors of the *Argus*, *Patriot* and *Summerside Journal*, says:—

"The last duty of parents to their children is that of giving them an education suitable to their station in life, a duty pointed out by reason, and of far the greatest importance of any. For, as Puffendorf very well observes, it is not easy to imagine or allow that a parent has conferred any considerable benefit upon his child by bringing him into the world, if he afterwards entirely neglects his culture and education, and suffers him to grow up like a mere beast, to lead a life useless to others, and shameful to himself. Yet the municipal laws of most countries seem to be defective on this point, by not constraining the parent to bestow a proper education on his children."

John Stuart Mill—another great authority on civil government—the greatest, perhaps, of modern times—was of opinion that the duty of parents to select the teachers of their children should be recognized, but that the education of all children should be required by the State. This, we believe, the proper position to take. Nor are we without hope that the editors of the *Argus*, *Patriot*, and *Summerside Journal* may yet be converted to the views of Blackstone and Mill. The difference between them is simply this: Blackstone and Mill would compel parents to feed the minds of their children—leaving them free to select the food. The sage trio of newspapers above mentioned would have the State supply a portion of the food, and prevent parents from supplying the balance which they deem necessary to their mental sustenance in the manner they believe to be best. They would have the State supply the bread and butter of education, and they would prevent the natural and legal guardians of children from supplying cake and fruit and wine at the same table. If parents agree to receive the bread and butter which the State provides, the State has of course the right to provide it. But, we submit, the State is not justified in preventing parents from supplying other kinds of food at the same table, if they see fit to do so; and it is not justified in fining, by double taxes, the parent who, because he cannot have his child fed by the cake and wine, refuses to accept of the bread and butter, supplied by the State. If there are divinely imposed duties to children which the State requires unnatural or ignorant parents to respect, there are also certain parental rights which the State has been careful to maintain. We hold that it is the right of the parent to direct where and how and by whom his child shall be educated. And we hold further, that the State exceeds the bounds of its duty when it punishes by the imposition of double taxes, the man, who from conscientious or other motives, refuses to send his child to State schools. By the laws of England, (and we believe, of every civilized nation which exists or ever has existed,) parents are entitled to the service and obedience of their children until their children reach the age of discretion, and are able to take care of themselves. Speaking generally, the parent may, under British law, control and govern the actions of his children until they reach the age of twenty-one years. He may tell them to go and come as he pleases, so long as he does not command them to commit crime; and if he resisted the State comes to his assistance, or he may administer reasonable punishment himself. This power is so settled and impious, that it may even extend beyond the limits of the parent's life; for the parent may, at his death appoint a guardian to control his children and all that belongs to them until they "come of age." The "empire of the father,"—as Blackstone puts it—has reference, particularly to the future well-being of his children. He may refuse his sanction to the marriage of a child in his minority, and no clergyman or magistrate dare perform the ceremony. In case of the marriage of his child (under age) with-

out license, he may render the proceedings void by dissenting from them; and no license to marry can be granted unless an oath be made that the parties are of age, or that the consent of the parents or guardians has been obtained. Why such extreme care, on the part of the State that the rights of the parent, in this respect, shall be maintained? Simply, that the future well-being of the child may be assured, in so far as the parent can assure it. The State takes it for granted that the parent is the best judge—better than the child, better than the State itself—of what is best for his child; and it bears him out in his efforts to obtain that which will be most likely to secure his child's happiness. Education, it is admitted by all Christians, more or less affects the future well-being of all children, not only during the comparatively short space they are in this world, but throughout eternity. And why should the State assume to itself power, in respect to education, which it leaves to, and secures to, the parents with regard to marriage? Why should not a parent be allowed to be the best judge of the school in which his child should be educated as well as of the man or woman to whom his child shall be married? Why should parents, who conscientiously object to sending their children to secular schools, be compelled to pay taxes towards the maintenance of those schools, and be shut out from any participation in the fund set apart by the Legislature for the purpose of paying for the instruction of children in secular knowledge.

It is admitted by the *Patriot*, and all the secularists, that good secular instruction is imparted in all our denominational schools. Then why not pay for that education? Why put five-twelfths of the parents of this Island—parents who have the right to direct where and how and by whom their children shall be instructed—parents who contribute annually their fair share towards the educational fund—in the position of persons who, while allowed perfect freedom to worship where and how they please, are yet required to pay rates in support of an Established Church which they cannot attend?

In truth there is no sufficient reason. The "impracticability" argument is exploded. Mr. Davies' Parliamentary Committee did that. The argument that the State has nothing to do with religion is of none effect; for, under Mr. Pope's scheme the State is not asked to support religious schools, but to pay only for the secular instruction therein imparted. The "secularists" are certainly in a sad plight when they are reduced to the necessity of making an attack upon "parental rights"—rights which every Legislator in Christendom sedulously guards and maintains.

In England, although the State requires the education of every child, it has yet left the parent free to select what school he pleases, and all schools are, to a greater or less extent, assisted by the State. In Scotland the law of selection prevails. In Germany parents are required to send their children to be educated, but care has been taken that the spiritual adviser of the people of any district shall have a voice in the superintendence of the *dorf schulen*, or village school. In Upper and Lower Canada, the rights of parents in the matter of education are carefully secured. Mark how carefully the rights of parents and even of a minority of parents are secured by the following clause, respecting the schools of the Northwest—a clause which, if not actually written—as stated by Senator Miller—by the Hon. Mr. Laird, editor-in-chief of the *Patriot*, yet received his sanction and support:—

"The minority of the rate-payers therein, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein, and that in such latter case the rate-payers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools, shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they may impose upon themselves in respect thereof."

But says the *Patriot*:—"When discussing the education question from an ecclesiastical point of view the right of the parent, upon which such stress is now laid, immediately disappears, and the parent is taught in this matter that it is his duty to bow with submission to the authority of the Church, education being included in the domain of faith and morals, over which the Church to which most of them belong, claims to exercise exclusive right."

We submit that this is a consideration which does not come within the scope of the present discussion. The question for the people to declare their opinions upon at the coming election, is one between the State and the Parents. It has nothing whatever to do with the relationship in which Parents may stand to any Church or denomination. We may, however, remind the *Patriot* that this is a free country; and that no Church is—like the State—all-powerful. No man is bound by any denomination as he is bound to the State. If a parent believes that the denomination to which he belongs usurps his rights, he is free to leave it and he is at no financial or social loss. If a large body of Christians in the State choose to surrender their parental rights to their Church, the State has nothing to do with the transaction. There is no union of Church and State here.

On the other hand, the Church cannot levy taxes; and, therefore, it has not the power of forcing a large minority of its followers to contribute towards the maintenance of schools which it may establish. The Church could not, if it would, treat five-twelfths of its people so unjustly and superciliously as the Government of this Province are now treating the remaining portion of the population.

ALBERTON NOTES.

(By our own Correspondent.)

ALBERTON, June 10th, 1876.—The *Sylvia* was got off yesterday morning and now floats safely in the harbor. She will sail for Pictou, and go on the ship for repairs. The *Lucy Pope* is being finished to-day outside the Harbor bar. Mr. Pope has begun a large ship 800 or 900 tons at Caspeque Point. Building is going on briskly at Alberton. Capt. M. Foley has just opened out in a new shop which will compare with some of the best in your city.

Queen's Birthday was celebrated by Alberton No. 1 Company, Prince County Battalion, from a *feu de joie*, near the residence of Hon. R. E. Reid, M. L. C.

A good Hairdresser can have steady employment and good wages at the Union House, corner of Queen and King Streets, by applying to Chas. Otto Winkler. If

NORTHWEST BY SOUTHEAST.

In discussing the School Question, or any other controverted subject, we always try to give our opponents credit for sincerity in their views. To our contemporaries (except one) from whom we differ on this point, we willingly give credit for being in earnest. Even the *Presbyter*, which has descended to the lowest depths of bigotry and profanity, may deserve a little consideration from the fact that it means what it says. But the one exception is the organ of the Minister of the Interior. We scarcely know anything more contemptible than the position which it occupies to-day. It is an insult to the intelligence and the honesty of the country that such a line of conduct should be openly adopted.

The *Patriot* of the 10th inst., speaking of denominational schools being paid for from public funds, says:—"If ever there was an unholy alliance this is one." "How conscientious people to whom religion is a reality can enter into so singular a compact, passes our comprehension." "They object to the State undertaking to pay for religious teaching of any kind, and they are right." "This system every institution could claim to be supported out of the peoples' taxes."

Plain enough words these—words which prate about "conscience." Well, these are for the Southeast. Let us turn to the Northwest. What is heard from the same source there? Listen:—"Where and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest, the Lieutenant Governor . . . shall pass all necessary ordinances . . . but it shall therein ALWAYS BE PROVIDED . . . that the minority of the rate-payers therein, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, may establish SEPARATE SCHOOLS THEREIN."

The *Patriot* has, before this, charged us with unnecessarily attacking Mr. LAIRD. We, therefore, to-day, make no further attack than to place side by side the two statements. They certainly do not speak the same language. Out of the same mouth proceeds blessing and cursing of separate schools. A very good authority has said that "these things ought not so to be." Even a heathen poet could put into the mouth of his hero the burning words:

"Who one thing thinks, another dares to tell, My soul abhors him like the gates of hell."

As we said in a previous article, while some are conscientious in their opposition to separate schools, others act in the matter with the utmost hypocrisy, and simply use the religious convictions of others for their own political or selfish ends. One most flagrant instance of this we have just given. We will state another. An inspection of the poll books of the Charlottetown electors, will show that there were men who chased Mr. Brecken about town to demand a pledge from him on the School Question, who yet—a few months after—voted for Mr. John A. McDonald—an avowed supporter of separate schools. No language is too strong to condemn such conduct.

However, we leave the "Patriot" for the present. It must have a profound and cynical contempt for the intelligence of the community, when it comes out as the opponent of denominational schools. There has, however, evidently been a twinge of conscience. In a late issue, the "Patriot" deprecates piteously, the bringing of Dominion issues into local politics. To do that, will, indeed, be death to the "Patriot."

LORD CARNARVON ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

THE following words of Lord Carnarvon, one of Her Majesty's constitutional advisers, apply as forcibly to this Island as they do to New Brunswick. We ask the loyal electors of this Province to consider them carefully ere they vote on Mr. Pope's scheme:—"At the same time there can be no propriety in my expressing the strong hope which I entertain that, as in other British communities, the majority of the population in New Brunswick, which through its representative system, has the right to elect members of the Province, may be disposed to adopt such modification of the existing rules as may render them less unaccepting to those who, from conscientious reasons have felt themselves obliged to protest against the system now in force.—Extract from the despatch of the Colonial Secretary, Lord Carnarvon, dated Oct. 18th, 1875."

P. E. ISLAND ELECTIONS.

[From the St. John Freeman.]

Politics appear to be badly mixed in P. E. Island at present. The general elections are at hand—some say they will be held in July—and the school question, we are told, will be the issue at the polls, although it is exceedingly difficult to make out how that can be the question, unless there be an entire reconstruction of parties and an entirely new departure. For years those who talked loudly in support of non-religious schools told their followers that the system in the Island was strictly non-sectarian, and as such should be maintained inviolate. Late investigations have shown that some of the most violent of these very men did themselves in schools under their control cause the Presbyterian Catechism to be regularly taught, while in many other schools the Catholic Catechism was taught. The whole system was a sham, and moreover was a failure. In the present Government, we are told, are men who have delivered the confidence of the advocates of religious schools by having always resisted every attempt made to alter the law so that Christian doctrine may be openly taught in the schools, and with them for this purpose a number of leading men of the Opposition always united. On the school question and the land question the *Patriot*, the chief organ of the Opposition, says, "the policy of the Government has been the policy of the Opposition." The Government cannot, therefore, be charged by the Opposition with not having done what they ought to have done in school matters. Any charge made against the Government in this respect must also be a charge against the Opposition according to the *Patriot*. It is always absurd to talk as many do of the burden of separate schools, as the existence of such schools does not in the slightest degree add to the burden of taxation, but it is particularly absurd in the Island after the revelations made before the Legislative Committee last session. Perhaps the *Patriot* wishes for a union of men of both existing parties, whom it names with honor. Perhaps, indeed, such a coalition, is contemplated. Perhaps it is possible, notwithstanding recent exposures and the fact thereby established, that the majority of the people are in favour of denominational schools, to work up the No-Popery feeling in favor of such a combination; but it is surely very extraordinary to find the *Patriot*, while proclaiming that the school question is the issue, or other is to be the issue, warning its friends to be cautious, telling them that:—"Without moderation and regard for the feelings and prejudices of those whose cooperation we require, nothing can be done." "What can this mean?" It is possible that those who profess to be friends of religious education may be seduced by the artifices of the advocates of the godless school system to support the candidates of that party?

THE SUPREME COURT.

OUR APPEAL CASE.

OTTAWA, June 8.—The case to-day came on before the Supreme Court this morning for argument was that of Kelly v. Sullivan. This was an appeal from the decision of the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island relative to an award made by certain Commissioners, who awarded to Miss Sullivan \$81,500 as the price of all her township lands on the Island. There appeared as counsel for the appellants, Mr. Cockburn, Q. C., Mr. F. Brecken, and Mr. Louis H. Davies; for the respondents, Mr. M. C. Cameron, Q. C., Mr. Edward H. Ferguson, and Mr. J. H. Bell.

The forenoon was occupied in arguing a question of jurisdiction. An appeal lies to the Supreme Court from the courts of last resort in the different provinces, and the respondents allege that there exists in Prince Edward Island another court above the so-called Supreme Court to which the appellants should have applied before applying to the Supreme Court here. In proof of this they referred to the various royal instructions to the Governors constituting them in Council Courts of Error and Appeal, and instructing them to hear appeals from the other courts; and in all the other British Colonies there have been Orders in Council passed to enable parties to appeal direct from the Supreme Courts of the respective Provinces to the Privy Council, without recognizing or appealing to the intermediate Court, composed of the Governor in Council, but that in Prince Edward Island no Order in Council or Act of Parliament has been enacted or affected the law as it once stood; that by various Acts of the Legislature of the Island, this Court is recognized to have an existence; that the decision in *re Cambridge*, shows that in the year 1841 the Privy Council decided that an appeal would not lie to them from the Courts of the Island except through the Governor in Council; and that the practice in appeals to the Privy Council must be followed in similar cases in the Supreme Court here.

On the part of the appellants it was urged that the Court never had an actual existence in point of practice, and it never transacted any business; that the instructions to the new Governors avoided the instructions to the former ones, and that the late instructions do not contain any powers for the Council to act as a court of law. The Court then took recess.

After recess the Chief Justice said that certain documents, such as those of the Vice Commission to Governor Fanning, should be obtained, as well as those to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island, before they could give any opinion on the question.

Mr. Brecken said the case was important and urged that it be heard on its merits, leaving the question of jurisdiction in abeyance. The case was then called, and Mr. Brecken, on behalf of the appellants, commenced his argument. He gave a history of the land tenure in Prince Edward Island, and of the circumstances under which the Land Purchase Act of 1875 had been passed; and stated that the award in this case should be sustained, because the Commissioners had complied with section 28. Several facts and circumstances are contained in that sub-section which were only intended as beacons to light their way to a conclusion. Moreover, section 45 of the Act takes away the ordinary jurisdiction of the Court, and declares that no award shall be voided by reason of defect in informality. In fact, he said, the whole case depended on the interpretation to be given to clause 28 of the Act. The learned counsel cited numerous authorities in his factum in reference to the finality and uncertainty of the award, the jurisdiction of the Court to set the award aside, and the non-payment of the award into the Treasury.

OTTAWA, June 9.

In the Supreme Court this morning, in the Prince Edward Island Case, Mr. Cockburn, Q. C., followed Attorney General Brecken. He said: We submit that the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island had no jurisdiction to declare the award void; when there is no submission to make the award a rule of the Court, there is no jurisdiction. We therefore argue that the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island had no right to take jurisdiction in this case in the summary way it did, by allowing a rule nisi to set aside the award. No Court, by the summary exercise of its powers, has a right to exercise its jurisdiction over awards where there is no submission. The learned counsel then cited Canadian authority in support of his argument. As to the uncertainty of the award, we contend that all the estate of Miss Sullivan having been awarded upon there was no necessity of describing the lands by notes and bounds. By the notice Miss Sullivan received under the section of the Land Purchase Act, she was informed that the Government intended to purchase "all her Township lands on the Island, liable to the provisions of the Land Purchase Act." When the quantity of land is readily ascertainable, the award cannot be set aside on the ground of uncertainty. Now, as to the contention that the award is not final because it did not award on the subject which the 28th section of the Act directs that the Commissioners shall take into consideration, it is well to remark that a similar clause is inserted in the Public Works Act, where arbitrators in taking lands are to consider certain things in making their award. Now, in cases which have been brought out before Courts, we cannot find any decision which has declared a unanimous award void on the ground of its being silent on some of these considerations. In this case the only duty of the commissioners was to award on the amount of money to be paid.

Mr. Davies argued that the intention of the Legislature with reference to the duties of the commissioners was to find but one thing; that is, the amount to be paid. In section 27 of the Act it is stated that "the object of this Act is to pay every proprietor a fair indemnity, or equivalent for value of his interest, and no more." Now, the intention of the Legislature is certainly well expressed, viz., to find the amount to be paid. Further, by section 28, the commissioners are ordered what to do: "After hearing the evidence adduced before them, the commissioners shall award the sum due to such proprietor."

At one o'clock their Excellencies Lord Dufferin and the Countess of Dufferin, accompanied by the Premier, visited the Court.

Mr. Cameron, for the appellants, argued with reference to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to set aside the award. It does not matter whether the award is brought before the Court by *certiorari*, or a rule to show cause, or because the Court is seized of the award by its being filed there, as an Appellate Court never interferes with the practice of the Court appealed from. As to the jurisdiction of the Court to enquire into the matter, the Commissioners under the Act were an inferior Court, and the Supreme Court has a right to interfere to prevent an inferior Court acting in excess of its powers. This Court (the Commissioners) was without jurisdiction, as by the

proceedings returned it does not appear that the commissioners were sworn as the Statute requires; that it appears that only one, J. G. Halliburton, was sworn, and that was at the time he took his seat; that to give the commissioners jurisdiction, it was necessary that the Commissioner of Public Lands should have given notice setting out the parcels of land that he wished to take on behalf of the Crown, and the notice given only speaks of them without specifying them. The Statute requires the commissioners to publish the time and place of their meeting for three consecutive weeks before the time of meeting; that the first notice was on the 7th of August, and the last on the 21st, and the meeting was held on the 23d, so that three weeks did not intervene between the notice of the sitting; the commissioners were therefore not a legally constituted Court, and were powerless to award; and appearing before them, being an inferior Court, was no waiver of their want of jurisdiction. The award was bad by reason of its not finding and describing the lands with reference to which they awarded the sum of \$81,000. The Statute itself was *ultra vires*, as it is not competent for a Local Legislature to deprive a man of his property, except for the public good, and it could not be said that it was for the public good that the Crown should resume property which had once been granted and was in course of cultivation by the tenants of the proprietor. The award was also bad for excess of authority in appropriating the whole of Miss Sullivan's land, instead of allowing her 500 acres, which the Statute permits. The learned counsel referred to several clauses of Statute and a number of authorities to sustain his position.

OTTAWA, June 11.—In the Supreme Court yesterday, Mr. E. J. Hodgson, from the Province of Prince Edward Island, who argued the cause before the Supreme Court in the Island, followed Mr. Cameron on behalf of respondent. He said:—

My co-associate counsel, Mr. Cameron, has so ably commented on the arguments in favor of respondent's pretension, that it will not be necessary for me to trouble your Lordships at any length. There are, however, one or two points which I wish to argue before a decision is arrived at. The first ground I will take is that there is no analogy between the principles of Law which govern an arbitration and those which are applicable to the case now before the Court. In an arbitration we cannot object to a decision arrived at by the arbitrators, but in this case it is provided by Statute that we can apply to the Supreme Court to remedy any error, omission or informality. The Supreme Court has a statutory jurisdiction to remit an award or to correct any error or omission. Now, how can we find if there has been any omission, when there is but one thing mentioned in the award?—the amount of money to be paid by the Crown. When a statutory power is given to deprive a person of his lands, that is not for the benefit of the public, the strictest interpretation must be given to the Statute, and every means afforded to the proprietor to find out if any omission or error has taken place.

The Chief Justice—Is not this provision in the Statute for the express purpose of giving you an opportunity of applying to the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island to have the omission you complain of corrected?

Mr. Hodgson—This is not a proceeding *in personam*; we argue that the award, being void, we could not believe the Commissioner of Public Lands would ever attempt to enforce it. This is not a proceeding *in personam*, but a proceeding *in rem*, and although it is true we appear by counsel, there can be no waiver when a question of jurisdiction arises. When an officer derives his authority from the Statute—not from the proprietor—and there is irregularity in his proceedings, no waiver will be recognized. In answer to the pretensions of counsel for appellant, that in this case it would have been impossible for the Commissioners to find no matters and things contained in sub-section 28 of the Act, as they did not apply to this case, I will refer you to the Fifteen Years' Purchase Land Act. Here we find the question of quit rents and hiring reserve set at rest, but not a word is said with reference to the non-performance of the settlement clause. By the 20th section, the Commissioners are required to ascertain the facts necessary to carry this into effect, and the meaning of these facts, which it is their duty to ascertain, in order to give full effect to this Act. Now, as to describing the metes and bounds of the land, it was impossible for us to see whether they have made any error. Surely it could not have been contemplated by the Act that the Commissioners should frame their award in such a way as not to allow us to see if there were any omission? We claim that we were not bound to set aside the instrument.

Mr. Davies replied at length on the part of the appellant, and in the course of his reply read the following extract from Commissioner Phillips' (?) memorandum, written at the request of the Governor General:—"The Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island have held that, instead of simply awarding in each case the sum due to the proprietor, it was our duty to incorporate in our awards some hundreds, in fact some thousands, of decisions on matters—some small, some great, some of law, some of fact, and some of mixed law and fact, apparently in order that each of them might if necessary, be considered by the Supreme Court in event of proceedings being taken to send back our award for corrections." In Miss Sullivan's case it would have been necessary to appoint an army of surveyors to examine minutely the proprietor's accounts for many years past, with above a thousand farmers to enquire on the spot as to the actual particulars of squating operations by several hundred persons during the last thirty years. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the Act, it would be absolutely unworkable under the interpretation put upon it by the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island.

This being the last case, the sessions closed.

We had occasion a short time ago to refer to the somewhat low conception of honesty which existed among the trading houses in the United States. Apropos of this subject we are to notice a most successful instance of thieving at the Annapolis Naval Academy. Nine Cadet midshipmen, from the ages of seventeen to twenty-one, have been detected in a robbery of wearing apparel from a Baltimore dealer, who visited Annapolis to get notice of stolen goods to the midshipmen. His room was broken open, and silk stockings, neckties, shirt studs, sleeve buttons and other costly samples were carried off. The rooms of the midshipmen were searched and the stolen goods discovered. The nine offenders were requested to resign, which they did; but so low is the tone of sentiment at the Academy that it is expected they will be allowed to return shortly. A case is cited where a midshipman stole a valuable gold watch from a citizen and was expelled, but six months after he was taken back to his old class. It is evident that there is more truth than poetry in the remark of an old citizen of Annapolis that "there is some pretty tough cattle among 'em." If such a successful crime is tolerated among those who are presumed to have some claim to the title of gentlemen, what may be expected from those of inferior station.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

TRADE SALE BY AUCTION.

THE SUBSCRIBERS WILL SELL AT THEIR SALESROOM, On Wednesday next, 21st inst., AT ELEVEN O'CLOCK:

- 150 bbls. CANADA FLOUR,
- 175 bbls. K. D. CORNMEAL,
- 20 puns. BARBADOS MOLASSES,
- 5 bbls. SUGAR,
- 5 " English Refined "
- 10 bbls. CRUSHED "
- 15 " GRANULATED "
- 15 " WHITE BEANS,
- 25 casks AMERICAN KERSENE, 150°
- 20 " Atlantic "
- 10 rolls SOLE LEATHER,
- 50 boxes LAYER RAISINS,
- 20 drums FIGS,
- 10 boxes TOBACCO,
- 25 " BROWN SOAP,
- 20 " TOILET "
- 10 doz. WASHBOARDS,
- 15 " BROOMS,
- 20 boxes CONFECTIONERY,
- 10 keg. BAKING SODA,
- 10 casks WASH TUBS,
- 10 casks WASHING SODA,
- 15 cases MATCHES.

FENTON T. NEWBERRY & CO. June 19, 1876.—no pat ar lin

AUCTION SALE.

We will sell by Auction, on THURSDAY, the 22nd inst., at the hour of 11 o'clock, a. m.:

- Tea, Tobacco, Crackers, Digby Herring, Soap, Potash, Wrapping-paper, Twine, Brooms, Buckets, Tubs, Hay Hakes, Forks, &c., &c.
- MACKENZIE & STUMBLE, Ch'town, June 19, 1876. Auctioneers.

Valuable Property, DWELLING HOUSE AND LAND.

I AM instructed by the owner, to sell at AUCTION, on the premises, on Thursday, 20th instant, AT 12 O'CLOCK: That very valuable and beautifully situated property on Richmond Street, fronting on Hillsborough Park (at present occupied by W. C. Hopkins, Esq.) being part of Town Lots No. 92, and 93, in the second hundred. The land fronts 40 feet on Richmond Street, and extends back 160 feet. The Dwelling House is a three-story wooden building, (flat roof) containing ten rooms—Bath and Outer Kitchen is in thorough good order, with a prime frost-proof Cellar, and is fitted throughout with gas. Stable and other out-buildings in the rear. We would call the attention of capitalists to the site of this valuable property, so beautifully situated and adapted in every way for a gentleman's private residence. Terms—25 per cent of the purchase money down, the balance in two years, with interest at 6 per cent, to be secured by mortgage on the premises. WILLIAM DODD, Auctioneer. June 19, 1876.

Midsummer Holidays.

TEACHERS and Trustees in Charlottetown, Georgetown and Summerside, are hereby informed that the Board of Education has directed the public schools, in each of the forementioned towns, shall take their summer holidays from Monday, the 3d of JULY, till Monday the 14th of AUGUST next, inclusive. By order, DONALD McNEILL, Sec'y. Education Office, June 16, 1876.—In [Jun 19

Salt! Salt! Salt!

5000 BAGS OF LIVERPOOL SALT, due here per Steamer "Prince Edward," due here the 30th inst., which will be sold low whilst landing. PEAKE BROS. & CO. Ch'town, June 19, 1876.

FAMILY MOURNING. New Goods.

WE have just opened a large variety of Mourning Dress Fabrics! CRAPES, Gloves, Ribbons, etc., for Family & Complimentary Mourning. Funerals Supplied! ECONOMICAL PRICES! W. A. WEEKS & CO. QUEEN STREET. June 19, 1876.

CUSTOM TAILORING!

EVERY DESCRIPTION MADE TO ORDER BY THE BEST WORKMEN. NEW SCOTCH & CANADIAN CLOTHS AND TWEEDS JUST RECEIVED. We Guarantee Satisfaction to all who may Patronize us. W. A. WEEKS & CO. Ch'town, June 19, 1876.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

P. E. I. RAILWAY.

Dominion Day—July 1, 1876.

EXCURSION TICKETS, at single fares, will be issued to and from all stations. In addition to the regular trains several special excursion trains will run, of which due notice will be given by handbills. Wm. MCKENZIE, Supt. C. J. DAVENON, Gen. Supt. Govt. Railways, June 19, 1876.

SHIRTS, SHIRTS.

Just Opened.

White Shirts, Colored do. with Collar, Men's Linen Collars, Silk Scarfs and Bows. The best value in the City. GEO. DAVIES & CO.

Straw Hats.

Ladies', Men's and Boys' STRAW HATS. Marked at Special Low Prices to Clear. GEORGE DAVIES & CO.

Ladies' Cashmere and CLOTH SACQUES!

SLEEVELESS JACKETS. Lace Shawls & Costumes. All at Low Prices to clear. GEORGE DAVIES & CO.

AMERICAN & ENGLISH PRINTS.

White Piques, Grenadines and Light Dress Materials. VERY CHEAP AT THE LONDON HOUSE. June 12, 1876.

ANNUAL PICNIC!

OF THE B. I. SOCIETY, Wednesday, June 21st, 1876. THE ANNUAL PICNIC of the B. I. SOCIETY will come off on Wednesday, the 21st June inst., and will consist of the following: Procession, A Procession of the members of the B. I. Society, will be formed at their room, at the hour of 8 o'clock, a. m., and will march from thence to the R. R. Station, headed by Galbraith's Band, and all aboard for HUNTER RIVER. Games, Sports, and Exercises of various kinds, will take place on the ground. Dancing Booths will be kept open during the day and will be under the direction of the Committee. Refreshments will be supplied at reasonable rates. Trains will run between Charlottetown and Hunter River, and Summerside and Hunter River at single fares. Tickets to the grounds will be 25 cents for adults, for children under 12 years of age, 10 cents. They can be had at the stores of Messrs. Watson, Connolly, and the Medical Hall, and also from the following Committee:—James Reddin, Chairman; Charles Kelly, Secretary; P. H. Trainor, P. C. Kelly, Angus Murphy, Artemus Murphy, Joseph Doyle, James Edmunds, Andrew McCarron, John A. McKenna, M. Hennessey, John Doyle, James Wade. By order of the Committee, CHAS. E. KELLY, Sec'y. Ch'town, June 12, 1876.—h.

TEA PARTY

AT FORT AUGUSTUS! Best of the Season. A TEA PARTY will be held at Fort Augustus, on the premises of James Duffy, Esq., adjoining the Church-land, on Monday, the 10th July, next. Tea on the tables at 12 o'clock. The Steamer "Tea-Party Belle" will make two trips to Hickey's Wharf on that day, leaving Charlottetown at 8 o'clock, a. m., and 11 a. m., returning at 3 and 6 p. m. Fare in Steamer and ticket for Tea, 50 cents. Ticket for Tea, 25 cents, to be had at the stores of Hon. P. Walker and Owen Connolly and John Gahan, Esquires. June 12, 1876.—till tea.

JUST OPENED

Bremner Bros., To Complete Stock: SMITH'S Advanced Arithmetic, Anthony's Cuesar, Ollendorf's French, Liddel and Scott's, Gr. Eng. Lex., White & Riddle's Latin Dictionary, Grammaire des Grammaires, McCulloch's Course of Reading, Irish National Book-keeping, Shakespeare Readers, Copy Books, &c., &c. Beaton's Household Management, A Lot of Poets, Artemus Ward, Mark Twain, History of Protestantism (elegantly illustrated). A further supply expected daily. June 12, 1876.—21

CHEAP

BOOTS! BOOTS! I HAVE received a large Stock of BOOTS and SHOES, which will be Sold Cheap for Cash. WE HAVE A Good Man's Shoes for \$1.25. ALL KINDS AND SIZES IN Leather & Prunella, Laced & Elastic. REMEMBER THAT I am the man who don't refuse To make new boots and mend old shoes; My leather is good, my price is just, And times are hard and can't give less. BOOT & SHOE FACTORY, West Side Queen Square. JOHN MCKENZIE. Ch'town, June 16, 1876.—lmo