

THE DAILY EXAMINER.

NOVEMBER 21, 1887.

The Issue.

The issue in the present contest is a simple one. The Scott Act has been treated with contempt in Charlottetown; drunkenness abounds; and perjury is added to the sin of the drunkard. This fact is admitted, or at least not denied, by those who still continue to advocate the retention of the Act. To continue its operation in the future as it has been operated in the past, is to perpetuate a fraud and to engender contempt for our laws.

Now, what guarantee has the elector that the law will be better respected or enforced than it has been? None whatever. The promoters of the Act, indeed, say that they will leave the working of the Act to the officials! True, they say that the present officials are to be discharged and others appointed. But what confidence can be placed in the talk of men who lately permitted two candidates, said to be largely interested in the liquor business, to be elected to the City Council without opposition? Actions speak louder than words. Can any reasonable man think, for a moment, that the experience of the future, as to the Scott Act, will be different from that of the past? If not,—the right, the honest, and the reasonable course to pursue is to repeal the Act, as far as Charlottetown is concerned.

But, it is argued, if we fall back upon the license laws, we shall be held responsible for the drunkenness and misery which the licensed taverns produce. Let us not deceive ourselves. If we have the Scott Act, and will not enforce it, we are, on the same principle, responsible for the drunkenness, misery, perjury, sneaking, crime and death produced as a result of such non-enforcement. We can't shake off our responsibility by merely voting for the Scott Act.

Two of the Quebec Resolutions.

RESOLUTION number twelve is in favor of abolishing the Legislative Council in the various Provinces where that branch of the Legislature is still in existence. How will this resolution go down with the Opposition in this Province, nearly all of whom at the last Council election voted in favor of retaining it?

Resolution number one asks that the Dominion Government be deprived of the power of disallowing provincial legislation, and that this power be vested in the Imperial Government. Now, whatever the Grit delegates may think about the power of disallowance, we believe that the people of Canada would not be willing to take away from their own Government the power of disallowance in order to give the British Government additional power to veto local legislation. For, are not their interests safer in the hands of a Government elected by themselves, than they would be in that of a Government over which they would have no control?

The people of this Island, especially, have no desire to go back to the old ante-Confederation days, when efforts to free themselves from the grinding tyranny of absentee landlordism were invariably treated with the greatest indifference, if not contempt, by the Imperial officials of Downing Street.

They have only to go back to the date of the Land Commission to see how the Imperial authorities dealt with them. The jurisdiction of this Commission, it is true, extended only to the landlords who had agreed to it; but as soon as they found out the character of the award they raised objections, and through the influence which they possessed at the Colonial Office the Act of the Island Legislature was disallowed and the award set aside. Thus, like all other previous attempts to settle the land question, the Royal Land Commission ended in failure.

Not till the year 1875, two years after we had entered the Confederacy, did our Local Legislature succeed in passing and getting sanctioned an Act that put an end to landlordism in this Island once for all. The Compulsory Land Act was passed, and owing to the fact that we had become a part of the great Dominion of Canada, and no longer an isolated Province dealing directly with Downing Street, the yoke of landlordism was removed from the neck of our long-suffering tenantry. If we had, at that time, to deal with the Imperial instead of the Federal Government, there is little doubt but the Compulsory Land Act would have met a similar fate to that of all previous endeavors to settle our land question.

Mr. Foster on Prohibition.

THE Hon. George Foster is generally regarded as the leader of the Temperance movement throughout Canada; and there is not in the country a truer or an abler temperance man. But he has not escaped the calumny of some violent and imprudent prohibitionists. A short time ago he addressed a meeting at Napanee, and after giving an interesting account of the rise and progress of the temperance movement he discussed the question of Prohibition; and is reported to have said:—

"One says, I am conscientiously opposed to the principle of prohibition but I believe in license laws; another declares himself a prohibitionist but uncompromisingly opposes license laws. He, the speaker, was in favor

of both. Until complete prohibition was obtained he would place restriction after restriction around the permission to sell, and enforce them so far as public opinion would allow. When complete prohibition could be had he would gladly welcome the complete restriction in place of the partial. The only effectual part of a license law, so far as checking the evils of the traffic were concerned, were the prohibitions that formed a part of it. As between free sale of liquor and a license law or restricted sale, he was in favor of the license law; as between this and a prohibitory law, he was in favor of the latter. How could prohibition become law? Reason and experience alike taught us. Law is the result of a process of growth. The truth must be sown in the public mind, it must ripen into sentiment; this sentiment must become predominant, and must then express itself in statutory enactment. That is the way in which we get all laws. In one sense you can no more make a law than you can make a flower. Both must grow under favorable maturing conditions. So has it been and must be in temperance legislation. Every restriction which forms a part of license laws was obtained in this way. Local opinion was obtained in this way. Prohibition in other countries has been obtained in no other way, nor will it be in Canada. When the conviction of the majority ripens into the belief that a prohibitory law is necessary for this country, and sends its delegates commissioned with such mandate to the halls of parliament, then, and not till then, will prohibition come. It is the part of intelligent temperance workers to scatter wide the truth in the public mind, to carefully promote its growth and to train it to a consistent expression at the polls until its delegated voice is strong enough to secure and sufficient to enforce prohibition. When in any country this is done license laws will pass away, and prohibition will reign in the state as well as in the statute."

Certainly nothing against prohibition can be found in these remarks; and they are eminently reasonable. Yet they are the basis of a widely circulated slander to the effect that Mr. Foster has weakened in his advocacy of prohibition as a result of the demoralizing influences of office. The worst of it is that the slander has been disseminated by temperance men and women.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Bishop's Views.

SIR,—It has been canvassed against the Scott Act that those persons who are interested in retaining the Act were carrying on the contest without any reference to their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, and in opposition to the views and wishes of His Lordship Bishop McIntyre. Both statements are absolutely untrue. From the outset the temperance supporters have solicited the support and co-operation of the large body of Roman Catholics who are known to be in full sympathy with the temperance cause. With regard to the latter statement, the accompanying letter, which His Lordship has kindly permitted to be published, will show clearly that he is in full sympathy with the friends of temperance in this important issue.

T. C. JAMES, Secretary.

CH'TOWN, NOV. 21, 1887.

CHARLOTTETOWN, NOV. 19, 1887.

T. C. JAMES, Esq., Charlottetown.

My Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of this day's date, asking me if I would receive a visit of a Temperance Committee to-day, I have to inform you that, although my sympathies are in full with the temperance people and their cause, I do not intend interfering in any way in the election that will come off on the 24th inst.

I remain, my dear sir, Faithfully yours, PETER MCINTYRE, Bishop of Charlottetown.

A Merchant's Views.

SIR,—I observe that the editor of the Daily Patriot "twits me" for complaining in my last letter "of those who write over anonymous signatures" when I do the same myself. I can explain why I have done so on this occasion. I have written a good many letters over my own signature on public and political subjects during the past "decade." I court fair editorial criticism, or that by a writer over his own name; but I cannot stand being "pounced upon," possibly by a put up blackguard, who assails me over an anonymous signature, and can find ready access to the columns of the Patriot. When a man writes over his own signature, common decency would dictate that he should be treated with respect, more especially if he has occupied high positions and is in the decline of life.

To come back to the Scott Act: three parties may, I think, be fairly considered as running the liquor traffic, viz., the Dominion Government, the wholesale dealers and the illicit vendors. I will consider them co-partners in the business. The Dominion Government are the principals in the firm and rake the lion's share of the spoil into the public chest. But they say to their "partners": "You will have to run the business on the sly. We will supply the liquor to your Province, but at the same time we have an Act on the Statute Book which says it shall not be sold. You will have to take all the risks, and be subject to the penalties if you are caught!" In my first letter I said that I was not writing as a politician, and I think it but fair to say that the present Government are only doing the same as their predecessors did by obtaining all their cash out of the liquor traffic.

Scott Act men urge that it is more difficult to obtain liquor in the country, towns, and villages, than under the license system, and consequently there is less drunkenness. They take credit for the suppression of taverns in the country. They say their aim is "total prohibition;" but as the Government cannot run the "Ship of State" without the revenues derived from liquors, the Scott Act is better than nothing. They look upon it as the means to an end, and as merely inserting the end of the wedge.

I think these are fallacious notions. I am not one of your fire-side writers who fancy the Scott Act is doing good. I knock about a good deal in the prosecution of my business and can write from observation. That the country taverns and licensed store-groceries have been suppressed in the country, I am free to admit. But it was not the Scott Act that did it; it was the admirable "Bell Act" that did the work. Under this Act "no tavern or store-grocery" could be run in the country without the consent of a two-thirds majority of the respective school districts. When the Scott

Act came into operation two thirds of the taverns, etc., had been suppressed. I am perfectly willing to admit that the Scott Act completed the work. There is still a lot of liquor sold in the country. But it is on the sly, and the Scott Act is powerless to stop it.

I cannot for the life of me fancy a better system than that given us by the "Bell Act;" so long as the admission of strong drinks into the country is legal.

Now, supposing we could get "total prohibition," which the Scott Act men admit is not attainable at present, it would certainly be a strong and straightforward attempt to banish the liquor traffic. It is nonsense to say that the Government could not make up for the loss of revenue on liquor. They can do it by putting a high duty on tea and on some other necessities of life which the people could well afford to bear if they were compelled to give up strong drinks. Let us see how it would work in our Island Province. The profits to be made by smuggling would be enormous and the coast facilities for smuggling are very great. Then again, at the cost of \$200 or less, a man could set up "a still" in the woods or in a swamp, and if he could manage to run it for a couple of months he could afford to lose it. But still, total prohibition would be fairly grappling with the liquor traffic, which the Scott Act does not.

I come now to consider the "License System." As a practical man I am constrained to say it is the best. If the Bell Act were re-enacted, the country school districts could deal with taverns. It is more difficult to deal with towns and centres of distribution. But if a high license duty was enacted in the towns and the number of taverns limited—every tavern to have sufficient accommodation for boarding "man and horse"—the cellar taverns and the ever so sly would almost disappear; the city would derive a good revenue from licenses. The disgraceful exhibitions and alleged false swearing at the police court be done away with; and last—perhaps not least—the Island Guardian, the Patriot and the clergy could rest in quietness for three years, with the consciousness that they had done their duty according to their lights.

MERCHANT.

CH'TOWN, 21st Nov. 1887.

The Scott Act.

SIR,—Since the date of election for the repeal of the Scott Act was announced, we have been favored with the opinions of editors and clergymen on the question, and several correspondents have also taken the matter up. We are pleased to see THE EXAMINER, in the interest of temperance and for the good of the community, ably advocating the repeal of the Scott Act. The Guardian and rev. gentlemen opposing the repeal make use of the most intemperate and extravagant language in discussing this matter. Judging from Rev. Mr. Whitman's sermon, a summary of which recently appeared in your columns, he, at least, has viewed the question from an unbiased standpoint; and when he informed his congregation that the Scott Act, was tested long enough to prove its usefulness, and strongly advised the obtaining of some other law that would better restrict the evils of intemperance, the rev. gentleman was, I feel sure, giving expression to his honest convictions.

Those who urge a continuance of the Scott Act attempt to deceive the public with misleading figures as to the quantity of liquor consumed since the Act became law, desiring to make it appear that the consumption is less annually than prior to its adoption. I have already shown that correct figures of the number of gallons of spirituous liquors imported could not now be obtained at our Custom House, owing to the fact that large quantities are brought here duty paid from Halifax, St. John, Montreal and other places, and of which no entry was required to be made at our Custom House. Many temperance advocates themselves ought to be aware that this has been done. It is unlawful and injudicious, of course, for a certain class to purchase ale, porter, or liquors of any kind in Charlottetown; but supplies of this nature can be conveniently ordered, duty paid, from either of the places named, and the "goods" taken charge of by the consignee as soon as they arrive, without the slightest interference on the part of Customs officials. On arrival of the steamer M. A. Starr from Halifax, it is not unusual to see a large portion of the wharf covered with cases and cases of liquor and ale imported in the manner described. Therefore, such statements as have been referred to should, in the words of a "No Repeat" manifesto, be branded as "unmitigated lies."

Previous to last election, an excitement existed similar to that which has prevailed for the past few weeks. Impressive sermons and speeches were delivered, many prosecutions were brought on, the choicest campaign literature was circulated; and the friends of the Act, not feeling confident of their own ability to convince their leavers, reported an orator from New Brunswick to enlighten the electors and assist the cause. We were then assured that if the Act was re-adopted it would be most stringently enforced, that every place where liquor was sold would be "wiped out" in a short time, and that we would become a prosperous and happy community. But what do we find? For the three months immediately following the election only three prosecutions were instituted, and we have ever since been "going from bad to worse." Instead of suppressing the liquor saloons in existence at that time, the number has been more than doubled, and we now find ourselves in a worse position, as regards liquor selling, than at any time in the history of the city. What guarantee have we that the same order of business will not be adhered to, under the Scott Act, for the time to come. None—whatsoever. Every impartial man must admit that this law has not prohibited, restricted nor curtailed the traffic in intoxicating liquor among us, but that the traffic has largely expanded since its operation.

If the Scott Act is repealed on the 24th inst., what do we propose to have in its place? In answering this question the "free run" phantom will not be noticed, but arguments will be advanced showing the most practical way of dealing with the evils of intemperance.

YOURS, &c.,

NOVEMBER 21, 1887.

The great sale of dry goods is now going on at James Paton & Co. s

GREAT DRY GOODS SALE

STANLEY BROTHERS' ANNOUNCEMENT.

We don't believe in Clearance Sales at this busy season of the year; its not business and its not right. But to meet those who have started it, we will offer our whole stock at Large Reductions for Cash, as we are bound not to be undersold.

Our Goods are all maked in plain figures, so that you can see for yourselves the regular price and the marked down price. This is a bona fide Clearance Sale. Come and get Bargains.

ANY GOODS THAT ARE CHARGED MUST BE ENTERED AT THE REGULAR PRICE.

STANLEY BROS.

Ch'town, November 21, 1887.

GREAT DRY GOODS SALE.

BIG DISCOUNTS.

TREMENDOUS STOCK.

J. B. MACDONALD will offer his entire stock of Dry Goods and Clothing at a Great Sacrifice, bound not to be undersold by any house in the trade.

Come right along; you will find that no one can attempt to undersell us.

J. B. MACDONALD.

Ch'town, Nov. 21, 1887.

GREAT DRY GOODS SALE.

Forced to throw our stock away, and we are going to do it

There are always a firm or two in a city who believe in ruining trade by advertising big discounts.

Every one knows by this time, it is the biggest farce that ever was paraded before the public; looking at it from a business stand point, there is no sense, business, or anything else in it.

But, since it is the case, we can afford to throw away our profits, and more, too, in order to show those people we will not let our customers go.

Our whole stock will be marked down so low that we defy competition. Big discounts on every line of goods. Thousands upon thousands of dollars worth of Clothing and Dry Goods. We care not whether you believe our advertisement or not, as long as you come and see prices. We mean what we say.

This Sale for CASH ONLY.

L. E. PROWSE,

SIGN OF THE BIG HAT, 74 QUEEN STREET.

Ch'town, Nov. 21, 1887.

GREAT DRY GOODS SALE

AND OPENING OF THE WINTER CAMPAIGN.

We find our premises are at present entirely too small for our increasing trade, and contemplate adding to the rear of our large store a two-storey brick building.

In order to do this it is not necessary to advertise such enormous discounts off our already very Low Prices, as the public are well aware that our prices are away below those who are continually advertising 20, 30 and 40 per cent discount.

FOR CASH

We guarantee as much Dry Goods for one dollar as any store in the city.

JAMES PATON & CO.

Ch'town, Nov. 19, 1887.