

FRIDAY, APRIL 3.

Mr. BRECKEN. — When we look at the state of our prisons in this country, we should leave the question to the option of the City authorities. The cases where punishment has been inflicted by fine are few. If we had a prison where an improvement in the morals of criminals who have just started in their career of crime might be effected, it would be very well to abolish punishment by fine. The chief object in punishing a criminal is his reformation, but we know that in the present state of our prisons, this cannot be effected. The most dexterous shoplifters generally manage to get clear of punishment of any kind, while those who are not smart enough to do so are caught. In theory, punishment by fine may be wrong, but it is not a compulsory law for the City authorities to be bound to punish in this way. There are certain cases to which the principle would apply, such as that of young persons, who should not be put in prison with hardened criminals. A young girl should not be shut in with a hardened jail bird; for she would in all probability, come out a thousand times worse than when she went in. I therefore think it would be better to let the clause go as it is.

Hon. Mr. CALDWELL. — The arguments used by the hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Brecken) would rather induce me to oppose the system of punishment by fine than to support it. If an individual cannot pay the fine imposed upon him, he is imprisoned, and is then really punished, because he is too poor to help himself, while his richer partner in crime, exempt by paying the fine. The poor man, perhaps, cannot get a friend to help him, and thus his punishment is greater; therefore I think the mode of punishing criminals by fine is unjust.

Mr. BRECKEN. — It does not at all follow from the principle here laid down in this clause, that criminals who can pay the fine will be allowed to escape by doing so. If the City Council see that the man is encouraged to commit crime by imposing a fine upon him, they will send him to prison. I say, the fewer of our juvenile criminals they send to jail, the better for the morals of the community. They do not always inflict the same kind of punishment upon guilty persons, for the fine is harder for a poor person to bear, than for the rich man. But the youthful offender when sent to prison, is compelled to associate with those hardened in crime, and comes out of prison a worse member of society than when he went in. If we had reformatories here, I would vote for removing the system of fines altogether. The Committee then rose, the Chairman reported progress, and asked for leave to sit again.

House adjourned for one hour.

I. OXENHAM, Reporter.

On motion of Mr. Brecken, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole, to take into further consideration the Bill to amend the Charlottetown Incorporation Act.

Mr. McLENNAN in the Chair.

The clause was read relating to extending the Jurisdiction of the Police Court, and the imposing of a fine instead of imprisonment on juvenile offenders.

Hon. Mr. BRECKEN. — The object of punishment should be twofold; first the protection of society from the delinquent; and second, the reformation of the offender; and I do not see how these two objects can be accomplished without leaving a discretionary power in the hands of those whose duty it is to adjudicate upon the case. There may be cases in which taking into the circumstances into consideration, the offender may be more unfortunate than criminal. There was a case in the Police Court to-day—a young orphan girl who was tempted to commit a petty larceny; but his honor the Mayor, when acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, thought it his duty to be as lenient as possible, with a view to the reformation of the offender—he imposed a slight fine, which was paid by one of her friends. Now, if his honor, the Mayor, had no alternative but to send that person to jail, and such a jail as ours, she would probably become hardened in crime. In England, not many years since, it was thought better to give some young criminals a good, sound flogging, than to send them to jail among hardened criminals, where they would become more corrupt instead of being reformed.

Mr. PRYSE. — I cannot give my support to the clause as it is now, although I agree with part of it. It appears to me that if that clause be enacted it will give encouragement to the adept and successful thief. He can obtain his liberty to carry on his practices of theft, for a consideration; and it will also make a distinction between rich and poor—a rich man could easily pay a fine, but a poor man would have no alternative but to go to jail. If this fine is permitted, I think the money should be paid into the Treasury, so that the City Authorities might have no inducement to fine a man in preference to imprisoning him.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — I think that all that clause which gives power to the Court to fine for larceny be struck out.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT. — There may be youths brought up to the Court, whose parents are honest and industrious, and who would willingly pay a fine; whereas, if these children are put into jail, they may never be reformed. With respect to hardened criminals it might be better to imprison them; but to put a youth of ten or twelve years of age into jail, would, perhaps only be the means of hardening him.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — This clause makes no distinction—it applies to adults as well as to youths, and it seems to me that it would work injuriously; for, if a boy knew that when he committed a crime he would not be put into jail, but his parents would have to pay a fine, there would be no check upon him. I think it would be a most dangerous method to train up children in the opinion that they can commit crime without being punished in their own persons. If it was known that any young scamp, who does not know the difference between his own property and that of another person, would have to suffer in his own person the penalty for his crime, it would be a greater check upon boys, and would also make parents more careful to train up their children as Christians should.

The Committee rose, reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again.

A message was received from the Legislative Council, saying that they had passed the Bill to incorporate the Minister and Trustees of the Baptist Church at Long Cove, without any amendments.

On motion of hon. Attorney General, the Bill to amend the Summerside Incorporation Act was read a third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Brecken, the House again resolved itself into Committee on the further consideration of the Bill to amend the Charlottetown Incorporation Act.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL. — A great deal has been said about the disgrace brought on parents by imprisoning their sons for crime, but this is no argument against it. The object of punishment for crime is to prevent its recurrence; and I do not think that when a youth has committed an offence, the payment of a small fine by his parents would have much effect in deterring him from a repetition of it. No doubt we all feel a degree of sympathy for a criminal, and a sympathy which even the murderer, arraigned before the bar of justice, claims the sympathy of his fellow mortals. A case was referred to by the hon. member for Murray Harbour (Mr. Henderson) which came under my own observation to-day, and it excited so much sympathy, that a person, almost a stranger to the party implicated, stepped forward, and offered to pay a fine, if the Court would impose one, instead of imprisoning the youthful offender; but, although this showed that the person who paid the fine was possessed of a kind and benevolent disposition, yet the effects on the guilty party of allowing her to go forth without any punishment, may be injurious.

Mr. BRECKEN. — The arguments advanced by the hon. Attorney General are perfectly sound, and I am very sorry to see that the present state of our prisons rendered this clause necessary. When we have a proper jail for this law be abolished; but at the present time we should look at the practical results of our legislation, and take into account the evil consequences which flow from the wretched accommodation our present jail affords to the juvenile offenders. It is a crying shame and a disgrace that juvenile offenders should be huddled in the same place with hardened criminals. In dealing with cases of this nature, three objects should be kept in view, first—reformation of the offender; second—the reformation of others from the commission of the same offence; third—the reformation of the offender—and I would ask, what chance would there be for the reformation of a juvenile offender, were he sent to associate

with persons deep dyed in crime. The probability is that he would come out of prison a far more corrupt than when he went in.

Mr. McNEILL. — I must say that the hon. member for Charlottetown has pleaded his cause very well, and while listening to his arguments I felt almost inclined to support the clause as it stands. We must remember, however, that imprisonment has a greater effect in deterring a person from committing crime than a fine, and if the latter is the only species of punishment inflicted, the probability is that the guilty party will commit a greater offence next time. No doubt it is a hardship to parents to see their children incarcerated for trivial offences; but to let a man go without any punishment at all, is a far greater hardship to the community. I believe that the quality of mercy is a very good thing, where it can be justly exercised, but it should never be coupled with justice. I would much rather leave it to the discretion of the person from whom goods are stolen to decide whether the juvenile offender is deserving of imprisonment or not, for cases may arise where youths, from mere thoughtlessness, will steal articles, and when the case would properly be referred to the owner of the stolen goods by the parents of the child, he would be the best judge of the matter. If this plan were adopted, I believe many cases would never come before the court at all, but would be amicably settled between the parties. If you pass a clause, like the one before the Committee, it will have the effect of encouraging the parents of the party at fault to impose a fine, until some great crime is committed. I quite agree with the opinion that a reformatory is necessary, and I think it would be better for the Corporation to establish such an institution, than to come to this House asking for such a law as this.

Mr. CAMERON. — I can see no valid objection that has been raised against the clause as it now stands. It is left open to the parent to send his child to prison, or to impose a fine, as will be thought best under the circumstances. If there is any hope of reforming the person, it is by letting him free, for we are all aware of the demoralizing effects of imprisonment. There is another evil effect of imprisonment—it deprives the country of the services of the person, and thus diminishes the wealth of the nation. I think a fine would have more effect in reforming a person than a term of imprisonment. I read a poem not long since, written by a prisoner, in which he was thanking the country for taking such good care of him, in providing him with comfortable lodgings and good, wholesome food, while others, far more worthy, were left without a home, and obliged to beg their bread from door to door.

Mr. BRECKEN. — I am moved that the blank in the clause be filled up, by inserting £20—giving the Police Court jurisdiction in cases of larceny where the value of the goods stolen does not exceed £20.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — The question now before the House is, whether the jurisdiction of the City Authorities should be extended to cases of larceny of small value, and making hardened criminals of juvenile offenders; and I think that when a youth steals goods to the value of £20, he deserves more than a fine.

Mr. BRECKEN. — The power of imposing different kinds of punishment is left optional; and I think we should have some respect for the judgment of the City Authorities, and not tie them up hand and foot, but permit them to exercise a little discretion, as high as £20. I would, therefore, move that £15 be inserted instead of £20.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — The hon. member for Charlottetown has made a comparison between the Court and this House, and argues that we must not tie up the hands of the Mayor and Councils because the country gives us the privilege of exercising our discretion. But there is no analogy between them, because by a fine the offender can get money into his own pocket. If, as was proposed by one hon. member, the fine was to be paid into the general revenue, it would be more reasonable. When the city is in a bankrupt state, there would be great temptation to the authorities to take a fine instead of imprisoning the offender, and thus they would actually be taking the wages of iniquity. One hour we should see the Mayor sitting on a case of theft, and imposing a fine on the offender, and the next day appropriating the money for macadamizing roads or building sidewalks.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD. — I think the city fathers receive no remuneration for their work, so the argument of the hon. member falls to the ground; even if they did take a fine, they would not be voting money into their own pockets, and I think we should have more respect for them, and consider them above such things. I think if a section of law power was left with the City Council, they would know which course was most likely to reform the offender. After some further discussion the clause was disagreed to, with certain amendments.

House adjourned.

Mr. BRECKEN. — I think that a good deal had been said about the horrors of sending a child to prison, but said he had opportunities of judging in such matters, and thought that in the Island, few hardened offenders were to be found, and believed it was a rule not to place juvenile offenders in the same room with any who had been previously convicted.

Mr. BRECKEN. — I do not agree with his hon. colleague, for he has known instances of juvenile offenders being placed in rooms where more hardened offenders were confined, and had been aware of four or five persons, being placed in the same room, which he regarded as highly improper, but as he had received no instruction from the City Council, he would not press the matter further.

Several hon. members on both sides continued the discussion for some time longer, when the clause was disagreed to.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; the Bill as amended was reported agreed to, when the House adjourned until ten o'clock to-morrow.

R. GORDON, Reporter.

On motion of Mr. Brecken, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole, to take into further consideration the Bill to amend the Charlottetown Incorporation Act.

Mr. McLENNAN in the Chair.

The clause was read relating to extending the Jurisdiction of the Police Court, and the imposing of a fine instead of imprisonment on juvenile offenders.

Hon. Mr. BRECKEN. — The object of punishment should be twofold; first the protection of society from the delinquent; and second, the reformation of the offender; and I do not see how these two objects can be accomplished without leaving a discretionary power in the hands of those whose duty it is to adjudicate upon the case. There may be cases in which taking into the circumstances into consideration, the offender may be more unfortunate than criminal. There was a case in the Police Court to-day—a young orphan girl who was tempted to commit a petty larceny; but his honor the Mayor, when acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, thought it his duty to be as lenient as possible, with a view to the reformation of the offender—he imposed a slight fine, which was paid by one of her friends. Now, if his honor, the Mayor, had no alternative but to send that person to jail, and such a jail as ours, she would probably become hardened in crime. In England, not many years since, it was thought better to give some young criminals a good, sound flogging, than to send them to jail among hardened criminals, where they would become more corrupt instead of being reformed.

Mr. PRYSE. — I cannot give my support to the clause as it is now, although I agree with part of it. It appears to me that if that clause be enacted it will give encouragement to the adept and successful thief. He can obtain his liberty to carry on his practices of theft, for a consideration; and it will also make a distinction between rich and poor—a rich man could easily pay a fine, but a poor man would have no alternative but to go to jail. If this fine is permitted, I think the money should be paid into the Treasury, so that the City Authorities might have no inducement to fine a man in preference to imprisoning him.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — I think that all that clause which gives power to the Court to fine for larceny be struck out.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT. — There may be youths brought up to the Court, whose parents are honest and industrious, and who would willingly pay a fine; whereas, if these children are put into jail, they may never be reformed. With respect to hardened criminals it might be better to imprison them; but to put a youth of ten or twelve years of age into jail, would, perhaps only be the means of hardening him.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — This clause makes no distinction—it applies to adults as well as to youths, and it seems to me that it would work injuriously; for, if a boy knew that when he committed a crime he would not be put into jail, but his parents would have to pay a fine, there would be no check upon him. I think it would be a most dangerous method to train up children in the opinion that they can commit crime without being punished in their own persons. If it was known that any young scamp, who does not know the difference between his own property and that of another person, would have to suffer in his own person the penalty for his crime, it would be a greater check upon boys, and would also make parents more careful to train up their children as Christians should.

The Committee rose, reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again.

A message was received from the Legislative Council, saying that they had passed the Bill to incorporate the Minister and Trustees of the Baptist Church at Long Cove, without any amendments.

On motion of hon. Attorney General, the Bill to amend the Summerside Incorporation Act was read a third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Brecken, the House again resolved itself into Committee on the further consideration of the Bill to amend the Charlottetown Incorporation Act.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL. — A great deal has been said about the disgrace brought on parents by imprisoning their sons for crime, but this is no argument against it. The object of punishment for crime is to prevent its recurrence; and I do not think that when a youth has committed an offence, the payment of a small fine by his parents would have much effect in deterring him from a repetition of it. No doubt we all feel a degree of sympathy for a criminal, and a sympathy which even the murderer, arraigned before the bar of justice, claims the sympathy of his fellow mortals. A case was referred to by the hon. member for Murray Harbour (Mr. Henderson) which came under my own observation to-day, and it excited so much sympathy, that a person, almost a stranger to the party implicated, stepped forward, and offered to pay a fine, if the Court would impose one, instead of imprisoning the youthful offender; but, although this showed that the person who paid the fine was possessed of a kind and benevolent disposition, yet the effects on the guilty party of allowing her to go forth without any punishment, may be injurious.

Mr. BRECKEN. — The arguments advanced by the hon. Attorney General are perfectly sound, and I am very sorry to see that the present state of our prisons rendered this clause necessary. When we have a proper jail for this law be abolished; but at the present time we should look at the practical results of our legislation, and take into account the evil consequences which flow from the wretched accommodation our present jail affords to the juvenile offenders. It is a crying shame and a disgrace that juvenile offenders should be huddled in the same place with hardened criminals. In dealing with cases of this nature, three objects should be kept in view, first—reformation of the offender; second—the reformation of others from the commission of the same offence; third—the reformation of the offender—and I would ask, what chance would there be for the reformation of a juvenile offender, were he sent to associate

with persons deep dyed in crime. The probability is that he would come out of prison a far more corrupt than when he went in.

Mr. McNEILL. — I must say that the hon. member for Charlottetown has pleaded his cause very well, and while listening to his arguments I felt almost inclined to support the clause as it stands. We must remember, however, that imprisonment has a greater effect in deterring a person from committing crime than a fine, and if the latter is the only species of punishment inflicted, the probability is that the guilty party will commit a greater offence next time. No doubt it is a hardship to parents to see their children incarcerated for trivial offences; but to let a man go without any punishment at all, is a far greater hardship to the community. I believe that the quality of mercy is a very good thing, where it can be justly exercised, but it should never be coupled with justice. I would much rather leave it to the discretion of the person from whom goods are stolen to decide whether the juvenile offender is deserving of imprisonment or not, for cases may arise where youths, from mere thoughtlessness, will steal articles, and when the case would properly be referred to the owner of the stolen goods by the parents of the child, he would be the best judge of the matter. If this plan were adopted, I believe many cases would never come before the court at all, but would be amicably settled between the parties. If you pass a clause, like the one before the Committee, it will have the effect of encouraging the parents of the party at fault to impose a fine, until some great crime is committed. I quite agree with the opinion that a reformatory is necessary, and I think it would be better for the Corporation to establish such an institution, than to come to this House asking for such a law as this.

Mr. CAMERON. — I can see no valid objection that has been raised against the clause as it now stands. It is left open to the parent to send his child to prison, or to impose a fine, as will be thought best under the circumstances. If there is any hope of reforming the person, it is by letting him free, for we are all aware of the demoralizing effects of imprisonment. There is another evil effect of imprisonment—it deprives the country of the services of the person, and thus diminishes the wealth of the nation. I think a fine would have more effect in reforming a person than a term of imprisonment. I read a poem not long since, written by a prisoner, in which he was thanking the country for taking such good care of him, in providing him with comfortable lodgings and good, wholesome food, while others, far more worthy, were left without a home, and obliged to beg their bread from door to door.

Mr. BRECKEN. — I am moved that the blank in the clause be filled up, by inserting £20—giving the Police Court jurisdiction in cases of larceny where the value of the goods stolen does not exceed £20.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — The question now before the House is, whether the jurisdiction of the City Authorities should be extended to cases of larceny of small value, and making hardened criminals of juvenile offenders; and I think that when a youth steals goods to the value of £20, he deserves more than a fine.

Mr. BRECKEN. — The power of imposing different kinds of punishment is left optional; and I think we should have some respect for the judgment of the City Authorities, and not tie them up hand and foot, but permit them to exercise a little discretion, as high as £20. I would, therefore, move that £15 be inserted instead of £20.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — The hon. member for Charlottetown has made a comparison between the Court and this House, and argues that we must not tie up the hands of the Mayor and Councils because the country gives us the privilege of exercising our discretion. But there is no analogy between them, because by a fine the offender can get money into his own pocket. If, as was proposed by one hon. member, the fine was to be paid into the general revenue, it would be more reasonable. When the city is in a bankrupt state, there would be great temptation to the authorities to take a fine instead of imprisoning the offender, and thus they would actually be taking the wages of iniquity. One hour we should see the Mayor sitting on a case of theft, and imposing a fine on the offender, and the next day appropriating the money for macadamizing roads or building sidewalks.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD. — I think the city fathers receive no remuneration for their work, so the argument of the hon. member falls to the ground; even if they did take a fine, they would not be voting money into their own pockets, and I think we should have more respect for them, and consider them above such things. I think if a section of law power was left with the City Council, they would know which course was most likely to reform the offender. After some further discussion the clause was disagreed to, with certain amendments.

House adjourned.

Mr. BRECKEN. — I think that a good deal had been said about the horrors of sending a child to prison, but said he had opportunities of judging in such matters, and thought that in the Island, few hardened offenders were to be found, and believed it was a rule not to place juvenile offenders in the same room with any who had been previously convicted.

Mr. BRECKEN. — I do not agree with his hon. colleague, for he has known instances of juvenile offenders being placed in rooms where more hardened offenders were confined, and had been aware of four or five persons, being placed in the same room, which he regarded as highly improper, but as he had received no instruction from the City Council, he would not press the matter further.

Several hon. members on both sides continued the discussion for some time longer, when the clause was disagreed to.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; the Bill as amended was reported agreed to, when the House adjourned until ten o'clock to-morrow.

R. GORDON, Reporter.

On motion of Mr. Brecken, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole, to take into further consideration the Bill to amend the Charlottetown Incorporation Act.

Mr. McLENNAN in the Chair.

The clause was read relating to extending the Jurisdiction of the Police Court, and the imposing of a fine instead of imprisonment on juvenile offenders.

Hon. Mr. BRECKEN. — The object of punishment should be twofold; first the protection of society from the delinquent; and second, the reformation of the offender; and I do not see how these two objects can be accomplished without leaving a discretionary power in the hands of those whose duty it is to adjudicate upon the case. There may be cases in which taking into the circumstances into consideration, the offender may be more unfortunate than criminal. There was a case in the Police Court to-day—a young orphan girl who was tempted to commit a petty larceny; but his honor the Mayor, when acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, thought it his duty to be as lenient as possible, with a view to the reformation of the offender—he imposed a slight fine, which was paid by one of her friends. Now, if his honor, the Mayor, had no alternative but to send that person to jail, and such a jail as ours, she would probably become hardened in crime. In England, not many years since, it was thought better to give some young criminals a good, sound flogging, than to send them to jail among hardened criminals, where they would become more corrupt instead of being reformed.

Mr. PRYSE. — I cannot give my support to the clause as it is now, although I agree with part of it. It appears to me that if that clause be enacted it will give encouragement to the adept and successful thief. He can obtain his liberty to carry on his practices of theft, for a consideration; and it will also make a distinction between rich and poor—a rich man could easily pay a fine, but a poor man would have no alternative but to go to jail. If this fine is permitted, I think the money should be paid into the Treasury, so that the City Authorities might have no inducement to fine a man in preference to imprisoning him.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — I think that all that clause which gives power to the Court to fine for larceny be struck out.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT. — There may be youths brought up to the Court, whose parents are honest and industrious, and who would willingly pay a fine; whereas, if these children are put into jail, they may never be reformed. With respect to hardened criminals it might be better to imprison them; but to put a youth of ten or twelve years of age into jail, would, perhaps only be the means of hardening him.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION. — This clause makes no distinction—it applies to adults as well as to youths, and it seems to me that it would work injuriously; for, if a boy knew that when he committed a crime he would not be put into jail, but his parents would have to pay a fine, there would be no check upon him. I think it would be a most dangerous method to train up children in the opinion that they can commit crime without being punished in their own persons. If it was known that any young scamp, who does not know the difference between his own property and that of another person, would have to suffer in his own person the penalty for his crime, it would be a greater check upon boys, and would also make parents more careful to train up their children as Christians should.

The Committee rose, reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again.

A message was received from the Legislative Council, saying that they had passed the Bill to incorporate the Minister and Trustees of the Baptist Church at Long Cove, without any amendments.

On motion of hon. Attorney General, the Bill to amend the Summerside Incorporation Act was read a third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Brecken, the House again resolved itself into Committee on the further consideration of the Bill to amend the Charlottetown Incorporation Act.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL. — A great deal has been said about the disgrace brought on parents by imprisoning their sons for crime, but this is no argument against it. The object of punishment for crime is to prevent its recurrence; and I do not think that when a youth has committed an offence, the payment of a small fine by his parents would have much effect in deterring him from a repetition of it. No doubt we all feel a degree of sympathy for a criminal, and a sympathy which even the murderer, arraigned before the bar of justice, claims the sympathy of his fellow mortals. A case was referred to by the hon. member for Murray Harbour (Mr. Henderson) which came under my own observation to-day, and it excited so much sympathy, that a person, almost a stranger to the party implicated, stepped forward, and offered to pay a fine, if the Court would impose one, instead of imprisoning the youthful offender; but, although this showed that the person who paid the fine was possessed of a kind and benevolent disposition, yet the effects on the guilty party of allowing her to go forth without any punishment, may be injurious.

Mr. BRECKEN. — The arguments advanced by the hon. Attorney General are perfectly sound, and I am very sorry to see that the present state of our prisons rendered this clause necessary. When we have a proper jail for this law be abolished; but at the present time we should look at the practical results of our legislation, and take into account the evil consequences which flow from the wretched accommodation our present jail affords to the juvenile offenders. It is a crying shame and a disgrace that juvenile offenders should be huddled in the same place with hardened criminals. In dealing with cases of this nature, three objects should be kept in view, first—reformation of the offender; second—the reformation of others from the commission of the same offence; third—the reformation of the offender—and I would ask, what chance would there be for the reformation of a juvenile offender, were he sent to associate

LIFE IN A PILL BOX
EXTRAORDINARY EFFECTS
FROM
MAGGIELL'S
Anti-Bilious Pills.
One Pill in a Dose.
One Pill in a Dose!
One Pill in a Dose!

WHAT one hundred letters a day say from patients all over the habitable globe, prove the quality of the blood. These Pills possess and exert three qualifications in an extraordinary degree. They enable the stomach to digest any ordinary food, increase the secretory powers of the liver, cleanse and purify the blood, expel all morbid matter, and throw into the circulation the pure elements for sustaining and repairing the frame.

FOR ALL DISEASES OF THE
KIDNEYS, RETENTION OF THE
URINE, &c.,
Maggiell's Pills are a Perfect Cure.
ONE DOSE WILL SATISFY ANY ONE.

FOR FEMALE DISEASES,
Nervous Prostration, Weaknesses, General Lassitude, Want of Appetite, MAGGIELL'S PILLS will be found an effective remedy.
Maggiell's Pills and Salve are almost universal in their effects, and a cure can be almost always guaranteed.

MRS. WINSLOW,
An experienced Nurse and Female Physician, presents to the attention of mothers her
Soothing Syrup,
FOR CHILDREN TEETHING,
which greatly facilitates the process of teething, by softening the gums, reducing all inflammation, will allay all pain and spasmodic action, and is SURE TO RELIEVE THE TROUBLE.

ROBINSON'S
Patent Corn Solvent.
FOR SALE BY
W. R. WATSON,
Drug Store, December 23, 1867.

1063
CUSTOMERS WANTED!
The Large and Choice Assortment of
BOOTS & SHOES
advertized in another column, and which are just received, opened, and on sale at
W. E. DAWSON'S,
June 1, 1868.

Bristol Line to New York
VIA BRISTOL, R. I.
FARE: Cabin, \$9.
Cars leave the Depot of the Boston and Providence Railroad, Pleasant street, daily, Sundays excepted.
At 5.30 P. M.
For steamer PROVIDENCE, Capt. Benj. M. Sigmond, on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.
For steamer BOSTON, Capt. Benj. H. Brayton, on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays.
Passengers going by this line to Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington, can connect with the New Jersey and Camden and Annapolis Railroad. This line connects also with the Athens line going to Saratoga and the West, landing at the Beakage checked through.
Tickets, State Rooms and Berths can be secured at the Agents' office, Old State House, corner Washington and State streets, and at the Boston and Providence Railroad Depot.
GEO. SHIBBERG,
Superintendent and Freight Agent.
May 23, 1868.

A LARGE SUPPLY.
OF THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES, constantly on hand, viz:
Syrups, Jam, Marmalades, Pickles, Canned, Cereals, Confectionery, all kinds of Cakes, Currants, Figs, Raisins, Lemons, Currants, Citrus Peels, all kinds of Spices, Baking Powder, Cocoa, Tea, Coffee, Flour, Flats, Dandelion, Citron, Taylor's, Homoplastic Cocoa, Corn, Starch, Maize, Tapioca, Arrow Root, Mustard, Ginger, Pepper, Black White and Cayenne; Tooth Brushes, Nail Brushes, Hair Brushes, Cloth Brushes, Hair Brushes, Perfumery, Hair Oils, Hair Washes, Pomades, &c., &c.
A large Supply of Patent Medicines, together with Drugs, Chemicals, &c., &c.
For Sale Cheap at the Cash Drug Store,
No. 10, Wash Street, Wash., D. C.

THE ROAD TO HEALTH
AND LONG LIFE
WILD CHERRY BALSAM
OF
HOLLOWAY'S PILLS.
THE GREAT REMEDY FOR
CONSUMPTION,
and acknowledged by many prominent physicians to be
the most reliable Preparation ever introduced
for the RELIEF and CURE of all
LUNG COMPLAINTS.

Impurities of the Blood.
In selecting the most appropriate medicine for a particular ailment, there may be some difficulty unless one can be found to purify, regulate, and improve the quality of the blood. These Pills possess and exert three qualifications in an extraordinary degree. They enable the stomach to digest any ordinary food, increase the secretory powers of the liver, cleanse and purify the blood, expel all morbid matter, and throw into the circulation the pure elements for sustaining and repairing the frame.

Females of all Ages & Classes.
The name of these Pills is partly based upon the beneficial effects they have upon the constitutions of females. From the domestic servant to the peeress, universal favor is accorded to them for their invigorating and purifying properties, which render them so safe and invaluable in all disorders peculiar to the sex. Obstructions of every kind, either in young persons or those of the most critical period may be radically removed by a recourse to these Pills.

All Disorders affecting the Liver, Stomach and Bowels.
Whenever the stomach, liver, or bowels are disordered by high living, climate, over-indulgence, undue exertion or other causes, these fine regulating Pills will soon rectify the evil, and speedily bring back energy, strength and cheerfulness to the frame where previously all was lassitude, gloom and dejection.

Dependancy, Low Spirits.
The misery occasioned by a disordered digestion is, unfortunately, felt by most. These famous Pills should be taken in appropriate doses to adjust the disordered functions. They dispel melancholy, lift disturbed functions, and all similar ailments. A course of these invaluable purifying Pills never fails in removing the cause of such morbid affections, without subjecting the sufferer to any inconvenience.

Influenza, Diphtheria, Bronchitis, Coughs and Colds.
In our changeable climate few persons escape without colds, sore throats, influenza, diphtheria, or bronchitis, for all of which these famous regulating Pills may be taken with the certainty of effecting a cure. While in the throat, they expelling all impurities from the body generally. Holloway's Ointment should be well rubbed upon the chest and throat, it will penetrate the skin, reduce inflammation, and restore lasting soundness.

Watches, Clocks, Chains,
BRACELETS, EARRINGS, PENDANTS,
BUCKLES, STUDS,
and a large assortment of
BLACK EAR RINGS, BROOCHES AND CHAINS.
ALSO—A varied assortment of SPECTACLES and EYE GLASSES to suit any sight, for sale by the Subscriber, opposite the City Hall.
ROBERT H. SHELTON, Watch Maker,
511 State Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
June 15, 1868.

Wool! Wool!
THE STANFIELD WOOLLEN MILLS at
TRAYON, having been thoroughly re-constructed and enlarged with additional Machinery and Steam Power, will now produce the finest Cloth from cotton wool as heretofore, and at the usual rates. Having doubled their facilities for manufacturing and procuring skilled operatives for every department, the Company feel confident that their customers greater satisfaction generally, by manufacturing a better quality of Cloth, and making quicker returns for wool left with them. In addition to the various kinds of Cloth previously made, they are manufacturing several new styles for men's wear, and all wool Blankets, Mats and coarse cloths, and of good quality, may be left at Hon. H. J. Calbeck's, Charlottetown, or at the Mill.
STANFIELD WOOLLEN CO.,
Tryon, May 18, 1868.

NOTICE!
To Tenants upon Township No. 18.
THE TENANTS upon that portion of Township No. 18, formerly owned by the late Mrs. Mary Stewart, of Charlottetown, desiring to be re-underlaid, in conjunction with her deceased husband, Mary and Ellen Stewart, are hereby notified that the single lots of the said township, held by them, being now exclusively vested in her, she ALONE is legally authorized to receive the rents accruing thereon.
MARGARET STEWART,
Charlottetown, July 6, 1868.

WANTED TO CHARTER
VESSELS TO CARRY DEALERS
FROM BUCHTOWEN AND RIGBY
TO LIVERPOOL AND
BRISTOL CHANNEL.
CARVELL BROS.,
Charlottetown, P.E.I.