

means can be found to check the abuse of them. I find that view occurred in by many eminent men in the neighboring Colonies and in the United States. It would be, Sir, a work of supererogation to detail the reasons for the opinion that the general use of intoxicating beverages is an injury to society, it is idle, at this period of the history of the temperance agitation, to argue that it does not cause deplorable evils—evils affecting the condition of the people to an extent which seriously interferes with the prosperity of the country; and I say, Sir, that whenever immorality shall have extended to a degree affecting the well-being of the state, sapping the foundations of society, bringing men to poverty, interfering with the proper conduct of business, and causing excessive crime, it becomes the imperative duty of the Legislature to interpose and stop the cause of those evils. Experience has proved the impossibility of preventing the evils I have named, save by the entire prohibition of the traffic. I am aware, Sir, that it has been said that it would be difficult to obtain by law the object sought. That no means that could be devised by human ingenuity can prevent people drinking what they please; that the law will be evaded by artifice, fraud or connivance. Such arguments, however, have but little weight with me. The law at present regulates the importation of spirituous liquors, but no man can say that that law is in all cases complied with, that no liquor is imported except legally and on payment of the duties. All are aware that the law is evaded—that vast quantities are imported, on which no duties are paid—but no legislature has said, "because the duties are not in all cases paid agreeably to law, therefore we will not impose any duties at all." No, Sir, but it becomes the duty of Legislators to make the law as perfect as possible, and then to see that it is carried into operation as far as human means can be brought to bear in its favor. I agree to a certain extent with those who say that the law will be evaded, and, consequently, will not attain its professed object, namely, the total suppression of the traffic; but while I admit that a partial evasion may occur, the great and open traffic will be stopped, and time and experience will enable the Legislature to frame laws which will ultimately completely cure the evil. There are many other objections, Mr. Chairman, which have been offered against the passage of a measure of this nature, but they have been so often answered by men more competent than myself, that I refrain from occupying the time of the House, by reviewing arguments that have been worn threadbare. I shall be glad to see the question treated on pure constitutional grounds, and I hope that hon. members in the discussion will confine themselves strictly to the subject. It may be said that this is a matter seriously affecting those engaged in business—that a large amount of capital has been invested in the manufacture and purchase of intoxicating liquors—that their claims for compensation in those countries which have adopted the Maine law have not been recognised. I cannot see much force in that argument, for other people change the nature of their business on a change in the laws of the land, affecting their particular avocations. Still, Mr. Chairman, I would not advocate the passing of a law which would entail serious loss on individuals. In this Island, the manufacturers would be the parties principally affected by it—the importers would hardly feel the alteration. Now, Sir, the number of manufacturers is a very small proportion of the community. And, Sir, as one I would say that, rather than see such a measure defeated on those grounds, I would be willing to insert a clause providing compensation to them. It may have been urged with reason in other countries, that the amount to be provided for compensation would be too large for the respective Legislatures to grant—that is so far from being the case in this Colony, that I am willing to go for a liberal compensation. That, however, rests with the people themselves. As to my action on this question, I can honestly disclaim all hostility against any one engaged in the business. It may have been said, and, by some, supposed, that I advocate this measure because it will affect my political opponents. I solemnly disclaim any such motives. Numbers of my own political friends have a large amount of capital embarked in the business, but I am prepared to run the risk of their censure, and put in hazard their future support of myself; for I feel that I take my stand on the attainment of a good object, the scope and aim of which is the benefit of mankind. And to attain that benefit, I repeat that I would freely subscribe to any feasible scheme providing reasonable compensation, for I believe such compensation would be money well laid out. I consider the Legislature is imperatively called upon to take up the subject, and pass a law to arrest the clearly proved evils which result from the traffic in spirituous liquors, and which are steadily increasing with our population. A duty of high responsibility devolves upon us to provide for the morals of the rising generation. This House has already interfered by one act of legislation, which has said to parents, careless of the education of their offspring: "You must educate your children, that they may become more useful members of society, that they may be able to distinguish good from evil, for a virtuous education alone will teach them to shun vice and love virtue, if you do not, the strong arm of the law will interpose and direct you of your property to compel you." Now, Mr. Chairman, I can see no distinction between the principle of the two cases—the one is certainly not more arbitrary than the other. It has been generally admitted that spirituous liquors are unnecessary to man, and their use can be dispensed with without injury, and I cannot see that there is anything arbitrary in the legislature adopting that view, and prohibiting their use, to put a stop to the thousand evils which flow from their abuse. It is a restraint upon the indulgence of an appetite or fancy, and laws have been passed applying the principle to other subjects. It will, I think, be admitted by hon. members that there is nothing in my previous conduct to warrant the idea that I am carried away by excessive zeal on the subject. I entertain a sincere respect for the organization of the advocates of Temperance, but I do not belong to the order. I do not advocate their views as a partizan, or as one who has subscribed to their rules. I have never done so, and therefore I am not liable to the imputation of being influenced by improper motives. I am not pledged to abstain from the use of liquors, on the contrary I do use them whenever I see fit, but not often. If I were inclined to use them habitually, there is nothing to prevent me, but I, as an individual, am willing to abandon their use, if I can get the public to go with me; and it will be found that the privation to individuals will be but little felt, when once it becomes general through the length and breadth of the Island. If the present application should be successful, and a law in accordance with it should be passed, the rising generation,—those who are to be the men of the country when we shall have passed away—will be removed from a great temptation to err, and the country will receive the blessings of the change. The wisest of mankind has said, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it,"—and I say, train up a child to habits of Temperance, and great indeed must be the plunge, if, of sober habits, until he shall have arrived at man's estate, he should then become a tippler. If scenes of temptation are not presented to his youthful and experienced vision, such change is most improbable, and I believe that the suppression of the traffic is the only means of attaining the desired object. It has been said, Mr. Chairman, that this is a political question. It is possible, I will admit, that there may be persons who make use of it for political purposes, but there is no force in that argument, because if the measure be good in itself, it should receive our sanction; and any question, no matter of what nature or tendency, may be made the subject of political or party action, if parties are disposed to treat it as such. For myself, I regard it purely as a moral question, having

for its object the improvement of the moral condition of the Colony, and the consequent happiness and wealth of the people. I have merely, Mr. Chairman, dealt with the subject in a general point of view, because I am well aware that it has been studied by all who take an interest in the prominent topics of the day. They search for themselves, they read and observe the proceedings that have taken place on the subject, in the different colonies and the United States, and are consequently acquainted with all the various arguments, of great zeal and force, which have been brought to bear on the matter. For this reason I consider any detailed observations on the sad and most deplorable consequences of intemperance are unnecessary. The evils at present no man can dispute, and the only question is, is it expedient for the Legislature to interpose and grapple boldly with the subject? To that question, I reply, that it is peculiarly incumbent on them to do so. It is their imperative duty to arrest an admitted evil, and it can be done without injury to individuals; therefore I hope the measure will be adopted. I need not, Mr. Chairman, occupy the time of the committee any further. I know that many hon. members are desirous of expressing their opinions, and I shall listen to them with pleasure. In concluding my remarks, I shall merely say that I hope the discussion will be divested of rancorous feeling, and that hon. members will, in dealing with the subject, be influenced solely by a desire to do what they consider right and beneficial to society, and conscientiously discharge their duties as legislators. I now, Sir, move the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to prohibit by law—to take effect from the first day of the manufacture, importation and sale of spirituous and all other intoxicating liquors, except for medicinal, chemical and mechanical purposes, and the sacred ordinances of religion, and also to prohibit the keeping of such liquors for sale, except for the purposes aforesaid.

(To be continued.)

News by the last English Mail.

THE VIENNA FARCE AT AN END.

The great farce of the Vienna Conference has terminated—terminated, as we have all along predicted it would, in an abrupt and point blank refusal on the part of Russia to accede to any terms that would limit the dangerous preponderance she has acquired in the Black Sea, or in the slightest degree diminish her power of ultimately accomplishing the hereditary designs of her Czars upon the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire. No other result was to be anticipated. When Russia, in the spring of 1853, bade defiance to all the laws of the civilized world, and marched her armed battalions across the waters of the Pruth, she did so not in the inconsiderate haste of a splotic or passionate moment, but in the deliberate and long-premeditated spirit of aggression and conquest. She knew perfectly well what she was about. Aspiring, for ages, to the possession of Constantinople, she believed that the hour had at last arrived when her ambition was to be gratified. The voice of prophecy urged her to the enterprise—the circumstances of Europe and of the East were apparently favorable to the fulfilment of her long-cherished designs. For more than thirty years she had been laboriously preparing the means by which to strike the final blow upon the throne of the Sultans. The Luxine was swept by her ships of war; Sebastopol had grown into a fortress which subsequent experience has shown us she might well be justified in regarding as invulnerable; the "siek man" had sunk, as she conceived, into a condition of hopeless decrepitude; the powers of western Europe were too deeply engaged in the pursuits of commerce—too strongly wedded to the love of peace—too mutually jealous of each other to dream of drawing the sword in the cause of an insulted and injured ally. A friend of "forty years standing" was at the head of affairs in England; France, though newly resolved into an Imperial form of Government, was still staggering under the effect of recent internal convulsions; Austria was bound by a debt of obligation for the Russian suppression of the Hungarian revolt; and Prussia, united by blood with the Muscovite throne, might be safely relied upon for doing nothing opposed to Muscovite dictation. Such were the circumstances that presented themselves to the calm and calculating gaze of the Russian Czar in the earliest months of the spring of 1853—such were the circumstances under which Prince Menshikoff was instructed to make his imperious and insulting demands upon the Porte—such were the circumstances under which the Russian army was ordered to cross the Pruth, and invade the dominions of the Ottoman Empire. All was premeditated and prearranged. The probabilities of success or failure had been deliberately weighed—the chances of the war so warily provoked were coolly calculated—the fanaticism of the Russian people was blasphemously appealed to, and all the protestations of Western Europe were either wholly unheeded or haughtily despised.

Our readers will naturally be curious to know under what circumstances this famous but fruitless Conference was brought to a close. Those circumstances will be best gathered from the brief but significant statement made by Lord Palmerston in the House of Commons on Monday evening. "It is well known," said Lord Palmerston, "that the English and French Governments, in concert with the government of Austria, had determined that the proper development of the third point, which regarded the treaties of 1841 with respect to the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, should, among other things, be that the preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea should henceforth be made to cease. That was the principle laid down by England and France, and agreed to by Austria; and that principle was, in the abstract, accepted by the Russian plenipotentiary. On Thursday last, at a conference, at which were present the English, French, Austrian, Turkish, and Russian plenipotentiaries, the plenipotentiaries of England, France, Austria, and Turkey proposed to the Russian as a mode of making to cease the preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea, which, in principle, had been admitted and accepted by Russia—they proposed as the method of carrying that principle into execution, either that the amount of Russian naval force in the Black Sea should henceforth be limited by treaty, or that the Black Sea should be declared neutral ground entirely, and that all ships of war of all countries should be excluded from it, so that henceforth it should only be a sea for commerce. The Russian plenipotentiary required 48 hours to take that proposal into consideration; and these 48 hours elapsed on Saturday. On Saturday another conference was held, and at that conference the Russian plenipotentiary absolutely refused to accept either of those alternatives—those alternatives being pressed by the four other plenipotentiaries unanimously. Thereupon the conference adjourned sine die, and my noble friend the member for the City of London, and the French Minister, M. Drouin de Lhays, immediately took their departure from Vienna." The noble Lord further stated, in reply to a question from Sir H. Willoughby, that "Russia had made no counter-propositions of any kind whatever." This fact of no counter-proposition having been made assumes a greater importance, and presents nothing short of the most dogged determination of Russia to go on with the war at all risks, when it comes to be viewed by the light of the explanation given by Lord Clarendon upon the subject in the House of Lords. "When the third point came under discussion," said Lord Clarendon, "the representatives of the Allied Powers, in order to prove that they had no wish to humiliate Russia, but, on the contrary, desired to consult her dignity, proposed to the Russian representatives themselves to take the initiative as to the means by which they would give

effect to the principle of that proposition. The Russian plenipotentiaries acknowledged the courtesy of the proceeding, but asked for time to refer to their Government. That time was given. The answer from St. Petersburg arrived, and it was that the Russian Government had no proposition to make. The allied plenipotentiaries on the following day brought forward their proposals, and the Russian plenipotentiaries asked for 48 hours to consider them. That time was also given, and on Saturday last they absolutely rejected the proposals both as to limitation in, and exclusion from, the Black Sea." From these circumstances it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that Russia never had the slightest intention of yielding to any terms that might be based upon the most important of the "four points"—that her profession of a readiness and even of a desire to entertain negotiations for a restoration of peace has been a mere pretence and sham from the commencement; and that her only object in embarking in the conference at all has been to amuse the mind of Europe with a shadowy hope and prospect of peace, whilst she herself has gained time to arm herself at all points for an obstinate and determined prolongation of war.

The delusion is now at an end. Russia openly declares that she will neither propose nor accept a peace. The sword, therefore, can be the only arbiter in the mighty struggle that must instantly arise between the two opposing principles of despotism and freedom—between Russia, embodying the principles of slavery and conquest, and France and England representing those of liberty and progress. We cannot doubt but the strife will be fierce and bloody; and that it will sorely tax the patience, the energy, and the resources of Britain; but unless the Ministers of Britain shall continue to fail in capacity and duty as grossly and unpardonably as they have done during the last two years (which we would fain hope is impossible), the final issue of the contest cannot admit of doubt. The savage barbarism of the East must quail before the enlightened valour of the West.

(From the News of the World, April 29.)

SIEGE OF SEBASTOPOL.

The bombardment of Sebastopol is vigorously continued. The latest accounts from the Crimea inform us that several of the most important works of the enemy have been effectually silenced, and that the garrison replies but feebly to the uninterrupted fire of the besiegers. Still, it is said, that an immediate result is not anticipated by the Allied commanders, their plan being to effect a gradual but certain reduction of the place by the superiority of their fire, rather than to incur the fearful sacrifice of life which must necessarily attend a hurried assault, however brilliantly successful such a movement might be.

Acting with this view, the Generals appear to have determined to limit the fire of their batteries to the extent necessary to damage the works of defence, and to prevent the enemy, at the same time, by an uninterrupted cannonade, from repairing by night the injuries inflicted in the day. By thus husbanding their resources, the Allies will be enabled to await the arrival of the reinforcements that are required for ulterior operations, and will likewise avoid the disastrous effects experienced in the first bombardment of Sebastopol. On that occasion the absence of sufficient supplies of ammunition prevented the Allied batteries from maintaining an uninterrupted cannonade, and the enemy were therefore enabled to repair in the night the great damages sustained in the day. The Allies are, at the present hour, in a position to continue the bombardment for several weeks on the same extensive scale, and the terrible effect created by their continual fire may be conceived from the result of the first few days' cannonade. We are assured that, on the 13th inst., the formidable Russian works of the Mamelon and Malakoff tower were reduced to nearly complete silence by the over-mastering fire of the British batteries; and that our Allies, the French, had so far damaged the great Flagstaff battery, as to disable it from returning more than one shot to every three directed against it. At other points of attack similar advantages had been gained; and on the 14th, one of the ablest of our correspondents writing from the spot says—"The result of each day's bombardment continues to be most favourable to the Allies. The Flagstaff still makes an heroic defence, but is evidently sinking fast. The Redan is still vigorous; but on the whole line the enemy's fire is not half of that of the Allies. To-day our superiority has been much more marked than ever, the Russians not replying one gun to our three or four."

Later accounts forwarded by the electric telegraph, and published in the French *Moniteur*, tell us that up to the 17th the superiority of the Allied fire was steadily maintained—that a series of ambulances in front of the central tower had been successfully carried, and were now comprehended within the lines of the besiegers; and that a mine had been sprung in immediate proximity to the Flagstaff Bastion, giving to the French a new parallel, which they had successfully joined with their other works of advance.

All this would certainly lead to the conclusion that the bombardment, if not so rapidly triumphant as our sanguine hopes had induced us to anticipate, is still steadily and surely tending to the end we all so earnestly desire—the final downfall and destruction of this stronghold of Russian tyranny in the south.

Independent of the material employed in the actual process of the siege, the means placed at the disposal of the Allied Commanders for operations of another character are rapidly attaining the proportions demanded by circumstances. We believe we are correct in stating that at the present moment above 100,000 British and French troops are encamped before Sebastopol, while a corps of 25,000 excellent Turkish and Egyptian soldiers, commanded by Omar Pasha, swell the strength of the Allied Armies. Within a few weeks the Sardinian contingent and a large reinforcement of French troops will have disembarked at the seat of war; and the deficiency in cavalry experienced by the Allies will have been partially removed by the arrival of the British regiments from India.

Supported by these reinforcements, the Allied Commanders, even if an assault on Sebastopol should not prove so successful as is confidently anticipated, will be in a condition to take the field with a fine army, and to establish, if necessary, a free basis of operations.

When the last accounts left the Crimea, a considerable body of Russian troops was showing itself upon the heights of the Woronzow-road, opposite to Bala Clava, and there appears to be little doubt but that the enemy will sooner or later strive to effect a diversion by attacking that place. We are led to believe, however, that any attempt of that kind will be indeed but a forlorn hope. Omar Pasha, with 15,000 chosen Turks, has marched into the fortified lines of Bala Clava, where he will be supported by the gallant remnant of the British Guards, and an ample force of British artillerymen. Thus established in a strong position, all that the old warrior deigns to say to the Russian legions, is—"Come, if you dare." If they venture to attack him, there can be no question but that he will give a good account of them.

EXTRAORDINARY MANŒUVRES OF THE RUSSIANS—FURTHER DETAILS OF THE FIRST DAY'S FIRING.

English Camp, Heights of Sebastopol, April 10.

At about four o'clock yesterday, all the enemy's lines and batteries suddenly sprung into life and vigour. Volleys of from 100 to 250 guns were fired at once from the Redan, the Flagstaff, Barracks, Garden and Malakoff Batteries, even the Mamelon, which all thought destroyed and untenable, fired five or six guns in rapid succession. Their shot came in

upon our works like hail. On every point along our lines balls were to be seen bounding and plunging, and shells bursting like fireworks in the air. Never, perhaps, was such a concentrated and destructive cannonade witnessed since the commencement of the siege. All felt that if it continued two or three hours our works would be levelled with the dust, as, though both English and French kept up a terrific fire, the enemy, in spite of our utmost efforts, gave five guns in reply to our one. The rapidity and deafening uproar of the fire brought all who were at leisure to the front, and the oldest and most experienced artillery officers argued very unfavourably of our prospect of taking a fortress which could command such a fierce cannonade. Suddenly, and in the midst of such remarks, the enemy's batteries made a dead pause. For nearly a quarter of an hour not a gun was fired. The Allies kept up their bombardment; the French battered the Flagstaff and works to the left; our shot ploughed into the Redan and Malakoff, and our 13-inch shells burst in regular succession in the centre of the Mamelon; but not five guns did the Russians give in reply. Nearly twenty minutes passed on their side in this state of unaccountable inactivity, when again suddenly the Redan and Flagstaff broke out in heavy volleys, and maintained them. This was at about five o'clock, and from this time until the fire of the long guns discontinued for the night, except by occasional guns, few and far between, no other Russian works but the Redan and Flagstaff took part in the contest. Our long guns ceased firing a little after seven, the enemy's about eight, and then both Russians and allies resorted to their mortars. The fire of these latter was maintained all night. Every five minutes one of our 13-inch shells was dropped into the Mamelon, and from the advanced work, at the same intervals, 10-inch were thrown into the Malakoff. The French directed their bombs into the Flagstaff, and our left attack threw them into the Redan. On the extreme left of the French rocket battery sent their burning missiles in all directions, except into the town, their orders to spare that being still in full force. The enemy replied with mortars from the rear of Malakoff, the Redan and Flagstaff works; but we were evidently two to one superior to them in such ordnance. This deficiency they occasionally compensated for by the use of their guns, when fired in volleys, which are by no means to be trifled with. The advantage of the whole day's fire is evidently with the allies. Whatever is the reason the enemy most certainly are not fighting with their usual vigour. We have not yet destroyed their works—their guns are still good and servicable, yet still they continue silent under our cannonade during the greater part of the day. The conduct of the enemy is, on the whole, so extraordinary, that even the wildest conjectures to account for it gain but temporary credit. According to some, the garrison is not sufficient to man all the defences, and this being also, I believe, the opinion of General Jones, is generally believed. Another rumour ascribes it to the want of ammunition, which is certainly less probable, as up to the moment of our opening fire, the enemy have wasted it in the most reckless manner, as if their stores of it were inexhaustible. Some, remembering Bala Clava and the subtle attack of Inkermann, look on their want of activity as a mere ruse to induce the allies to storm.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Sir,—I observe that the last *Islander* endeavours to make it appear that the Hon. Mr. Coles voted against the One-ninth Bill in 1849, and that the Tories carried it in 1854. In that paper Mr. Coles is charged with falsehood for having said that he and his party were instrumental in getting the Bill passed. Now, Sir, instead of Mr. Coles voting against the One-ninth Bill in 1849, as stated by the *Islander*, I find that the very reverse is the fact. I read in the Journal of the Assembly for that year that Mr. Coles obtained leave to introduce the One-ninth Bill, and the same was read a first time on the 5th April (see page 76); at page 80, I find, on motion of Mr. Coles, that the Bill do pass, Messrs. Douse and Yeo recording their names against it. In the Legislative Council Journal for the same year, I find that Mr. Hall—the leader of the late Tory Government, of which the *Islander* was the organ, and the proprietor of that paper the Queen's Printer—voted against the Bill, and ultimately succeeded in getting it thrown out. By the Journals of the Assembly in 1851, page 93, I perceive that Mr. Coles again introduced the Bill, and carried it through the House. At page 54 in the Legislative Council Journal for the same year, I observe that Mr. Hall again voted against the Bill. In the House of Assembly Journal for 1853, page 24, I find that Mr. Coles again introduced the same Bill under a new title. It passed the three branches of the Legislature—went to England in the summer following, and in the same year a despatch came out from the Secretary of State, stating the readiness of Her Majesty to assent to the Bill, on a certain amendment, which was suggested, being made to it. This amendment was sent down to the House of Assembly, in the next Session, by Sir Alexander. The Tories were then in the ascendancy, and Mr. Hall at the head of the Government. They well knew that if they did not pass the Bill in its amended form, the Governor would send them adrift much sooner than he did. To avoid this unpleasant alternative, Mr. Hall bolted his objections, and got his party to pass the Bill.

Now, Sir, let me ask who is the man that deserves the thanks of the tennantry of this Island for strenuously and unceasingly protecting their interests? Mr. Coles, the Leader of the Liberal party, who was constant in his efforts to get the Bill passed; or Mr. Hall, the Leader of the Tory party, who, with the exception of the Session of 1854, was as constant in his efforts to destroy the Bill? The answer must be in favour of Mr. Coles; and therefore what reliance can be placed on the unsupported assertions of the *Islander* regarding this matter?

Yours truly,  
A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

May 14.

THE EXAMINER.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., MAY 14, 1855.

THE EX-COMMISSIONER OF SMALL DEBTS AT ST. ELEANOR'S.

THERE appeared in the *Islander*, about three weeks ago, a letter from Mr. James Campbell, of St. Eleanor's, resigning his office as Commissioner of Small Debts, and giving, as a reason for doing so, the circumstance that Government had made some unworthy appointments to the Commission of the Peace—intimating that some, whose names he did not give, were guilty of very serious offences, and stated that he would only be "compromising his principles" if he remained any longer in office with such people in the public service. A letter was sent to Mr. Campbell from the Secretary's Office, desiring him to name the officials gravely accused by him, in order that enquiries might be instituted, and the guilt or innocence of the parties fairly proven. Mr. Campbell, finding that he had placed himself in a hazardous predicament, and likely to give work to the lawyers in prosecutions for libels, shrank from naming the individuals whose official and private characters he would fain have destroyed—stating that they were so well known in the community as to render the publication of their names unnecessary. These facts we gather from the correspondence which followed Mr. Campbell's letter. Now we ask, why has not the whole of this correspondence been published? There has been quite a