

D. D. D. for Eczema

The Standard Remedy

with thousands of endorsements from all over Canada to recommend it

A trial bottle only is required to stop the pain—the sleepless nights—the agony of itching. It was written by Mrs. J. W. Lewis, 35 Melbourne Ave., Toronto, one of the prominent business men of that city. A letter from you would reach me. I have been a sufferer for two years with eczema on the legs and ankles. I tried three or four different doctors. I went to a skin specialist. All of no use. I used one bottle of D. D. D.—that is all. Today I am perfectly well.

D. D. D. is a soothing, cooling fluid directly applied to the skin. This powerful agent instantly acts on the inflamed and tortured cells. The itching disappears at once. The pain is soothed. Under continued treatment the rough unightly surfaces assume the healthy normal look you have perhaps not known for years. Perhaps there is someone in your home who is suffering with some skin disease, a mild case of rash, a chronic eczema of long standing. Perhaps you have a friend, know a growing child, a tiny baby, who have tried other ways of relief without success. Why not try D. D. D.? Thousands of people in every walk of life have used it. It gives results in the worst cases, yet is mild enough to use on infants' tender skins.

A trial bottle will prove to you that D. D. D. is the REAL REMEDY, YOUR REMEDY. Do not make the mistake of neglecting to try this great medical discovery.

D. D. D. and D. D. D. Soap for sale at all druggists.

Mail the Coupon Today!

D. D. D. Laboratories, Dept. T.R., 27 Lyall Ave., Toronto

Gentlemen:—Please send me absolutely free a trial bottle of D. D. D. Prescription. Enclosed find ten cents for postage and packing.

Name.....
Address.....

She was not available as a witness before me, and I was not able to probe this matter fully outside the Department of Agriculture and Mines. I am satisfied that there was no wrong-doing in the Department in relation to it.

To enable the Government to perform this contract with Rogers, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines made a contract on 9th June, 1922 with Charles Bryant, of Port Union, by which it was provided:—

1.—The contractor agrees that he is in possession of necessary and suitable machinery to undertake the work of rossing pulpwood and that he is ready to proceed with the work immediately.

2.—To ross not less than 20,000 cords of unrossed pulpwood on the bank within 100 feet of high water mark in the various harbours or other places indicated by the Minister or his agents.

3.—The Minister undertakes to provide not less than 20,000 cords of unrossed pulpwood on the bank within 100 feet of high water mark in the different harbours and places in which pulpwood has been cut and delivered on Government account on or before 31st December, 1922 and to have said wood measured before it is delivered to the contractor for rossing. Each cord to contain 138 cubic feet of unrossed pulpwood. But should the Minister be unable to provide 20,000 cords the contractor is to be paid at the rate of \$2.25 per cord for the difference between the amount delivered and the 20,000 cords herebefore provided. Payment of such difference to be due and paid on 31st December, 1922.

4.—To pay the contractor fortnightly on the certificate of the scaler or inspector appointed by the Minister at the rate of \$2.25 per cord of 138 cubic feet of unrossed pulpwood except as provided in paragraph three hereof. The Minister undertakes to have such certificate issued promptly each fortnight.

5.—To reimburse the contractor to the extent of one half the cost of the removal of the rossing outfit incurred by him in moving the same from harbour to harbour or place to place where the wood has been deposited by the Minister for rossing.

And by a letter written the following day, the Minister undertook to bear the additional expense of assembling or delivering all piles under 100 cords to the rossing machines when placed for operation in the different bays. This operation, which at a very early stage was taken over by the Fishermen's Union Trading Company from Bryant, (indeed it was in reality the Trading Company's contract from its inception) also proved extremely costly. To hasten the output the Government bought two additional machines and later bought the five machines from the company, subsequently selling the whole seven at a considerable loss, and they supplemented the rossing with handpeeling at a high price. Altogether some 14,000 cords of wood were dealt with at a cost of about \$37,000. The Trading Company appears to have made a profit of \$10,000 out of it, but it is difficult to see where it produced any advantage to the Government.

But the districts in which there was wood to be cut were not the only ones in which there was destruction, and the Government embarked upon various schemes of unremunerative work with the object of providing relief. The most important of these was embodied in a contract, dated 3rd August, 1922, and made with the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company, by which it was recited that the Company in response to the Government's request might be of assistance in finding work for unemployed had agreed to anticipate certain works which in the ordinary course of its operations might have to be carried out during the next few years. The work in question included the making of roads, improvements to a stream and construction of a dam, at certain fixed prices per mile or cubic yard as the case might be. The company were to hire men and supervise the work, the Government furnishing the funds and providing tools and equipment and accommodation for the men. The cost at the agreed rates was to be paid by the company to the Government in equal instalments on 3rd August, 1923, 31st December, 1923, and 30th June, 1924, respectively. On the whole this venture seems to have worked out satisfactorily. With regard to most of the instances in which this class of relief was tried it was very difficult to follow the course of events or to determine what the result has been. From every quarter came urgent appeals to the Minister or to the members of the House of Assembly, and large and numerous sums were paid out by the Department to members who utilized chairman of road boards, ministers of religion and other prominent citizens in arranging for their distribution. The Minister could not be in personal touch with all the districts of a country like Newfoundland, and in seeking the assistance of the local members, who had better knowledge and means of knowledge of local needs, he took, in my opinion, a course which was perfectly proper at the time. The plan was to find work on improvements of public utility, and in some districts roads and bridges, and in others wharves and har-



at all stores.
GERALD S. DOYLE,
Distributor.

hours were repaired in this way, but much of the \$289,504 spent on this form of relief produced no return whatever. Many of those who received portions of this money were certainly failed to make the returns demanded of them, and it is impossible now to trace how much has been spent in direct relief, and how much in work, and whether the whole ever reached those for whom it was intended. That it was possible to keep account of it was shown by the careful conduct of some of the members who at once paid the amounts received into special account at a Bank and were prepared with cheques and vouchers, but no such system was enjoyed, and other recipients simply mixed the money up with their own and there is nothing but their word to show how it was disbursed.

Under this head of relief is included considerable purchase of junk and spilt. The buying was done without discrimination and there are no proper accounts of the disposal. It is said that the spilt has been consumed in various public institutions but there are no records of this and the department has not been credited with a cent in respect of it.

In the winter of 1921-22 there was reason to suppose that everything available in the way of food was being eaten, and that the proper reserve of seed potatoes was not being maintained, and the Government in fear that there would be no crop in the autumn resolved to supply seed to poor persons and to treat this as another form of relief to be included in the Pit Prop account. They consulted with members of the House of Assembly from whose estimates it appeared that the probable cost would be about \$450,000. This was considered too high, and the scheme was launched upon a basis of \$300,000; in fact \$57876 were spent upon it. The carrying out of the scheme was attended with many abuses; there is no doubt that seed potatoes were obtained under it by persons who were not of the class that it was intended to benefit and by persons who had no facilities for planting and never intended to plant, that a considerable quantity disappeared as food and that little or no work was ever given in return. The distribution in St. John's East which was under the control of Mr. Bayly an official of the Department of Agriculture and Mines was not inaptly described as 'Bedlam'. The office was besieged all day and although Mr. Vinnicombe, the member for the district, attended with the object of helping Mr. Bayly to discriminate, he does not appear to have done much good and the affair de-

generated into a mere scramble. Throughout the island the organization appears to have been inadequate and faulty, and as many districts have obstinately refrained from making proper returns, full details cannot be ascertained. The conclusion of the matter, however, is better than one would have expected—there was quite a fair crop in the autumn, and it has not been found necessary to repeat the experiment.

Individual items in the Pit Prop account were brought before me in great numbers, the majority being satisfactorily explained. Many would have needed explanation if proper records had been made and vouchers preserved, some at this distance of time could only be explained by guesswork. But there are two matters which in my view deserve and require to be specially dealt with:—

(a) Dr. Campbell's cab fares charged to the account; (b) payments made for extra remuneration given to members of the auditor and to the police. Among the cheques issuing out of the department were a large number given to cabmen in respect of hire for the ministers. In the period from 1st June, 1922 to 23rd May, 1923 the total reached \$1218 an average of a little over \$100 a month. During the first eight months, however, that figure was never approached while the last four showed—February \$103, March \$250, April \$375, and May to the 23rd, \$122. Dr. Campbell's evidence was that throughout the summer and

autumn he was using his own motor car and had comparatively little need of cabs, assuming that to be true, and ignoring the earlier items the figures for the winter months are sufficiently startling. From \$73 in January and \$108 in February to \$256 in March and \$375 in April is a big rise which followed as it was by a sharp fall in May suggests some special activity in the two heavy months. And there was a special account on 3rd May there was a general election and Dr. Campbell was a candidate for St. John's West. One of the cabmen to whom were paid \$21 on April 20th and \$51 on April 25th, and who drove Dr. Campbell at no other time, described how he used to call for Mr. Fitzgibbon, Dr. Campbell's fellow candidate, pick up Dr. Campbell and drive the men canvassing, how he saw Dr. Campbell go to houses and heard him ask the inhabitants for support. Another cabman deposed to driving him with Mr. Fitzgibbon about the same time. I can see no indication that relief was more exacting than usual during those two months and though election time is calculated to increase the chances of disorder I cannot think that that was enough to account for the difference. I felt forced to come to the conclusion that the cabs charged to the Pit Prop account in fact included a large number of the minister's electioneering drives. Dr. Campbell agreed that there might be some overlapping, but he declared that as a set off there would be found among his election expenses cabs which were really hired on the business of the department. Unfortunately, however, returns of election expenses are not insisted on, and there are no records that I could examine and his idea appeared to me to be merely a guess or a forlorn hope. No doubt the strain of a contested election superimposed upon the labours and worries of his office would make him careless and forgetful even where he ought to have been punctilious, and mistakes might have arisen here and there, but this discrepancy was too marked. When the Model Farm account came under review an equally startling set of figures were disclosed—January, \$97; February, \$110; March, \$284; April, \$446; and May, \$301. In the month of April no less than \$321 were charged for cab hires against the account under his control, about four times as much as was sufficient two months before. Mr. Bayly, the Secretary of the Agriculture Department, could not suggest any reason for the increase and I can only find it in the election. I find that the allegation that Dr. Campbell paid his own private cab fares to a very substantial amount out of the public funds under his control is fully proved.

From the Pit Prop account, from the Model Farm account and from the Relief account under the office of Public Works money was paid to officials in the public service by way of extra remuneration; in one or two cases fortified by an Order in Council, but generally by the simple direction of the Minister concerned. I

do not doubt that the administration of relief in all its forms entailed a great deal of extra work and that many, perhaps all, of those who received this additional pay richly deserved it. It certainly is not necessarily misconduct in them or their chief to think so, but it is questionable whether the right methods were adopted and whether the safeguards which the law provides were heeded. It is expressly provided by the audit act (section 34) that no payment shall be authorized by the controller and auditor general for any extra salary or additional remuneration of any kind whatsoever purporting to be payable to any deputy, head officer or employee of the Government or to any other person permanently employed in the public service. In each of these cases the official from the audit department who actually conducted the audit was among the recipients of the minister's bounty. I do not say that he did not deserve it, but a practice under which a minister distributes among his staff at his own discretion presents from the public funds and adds a similar gift to the only person whose duty it is to check his actions seems to me to be fraught with mischievous possibilities and not to be in accordance with the law of the land.

During the hearing I was several times reminded by witnesses "this was relief and not a business proposition," and that seems to have been the view of all classes. But it is not mine. It is true that the ques-

tion of profit and loss was not the main consideration but business methods and business principles were still essential, and it was a business proposition in the sense that it deserved and required that the best should be made of it, and that it should be carried out on business lines, and with due appreciation of the fact that it was the administration of a great public trust. Generosity to those in need of relief did not necessarily exclude justice to those who had to pay for it. The need was great and urgent, the means were novel and experimental, relief was the first thought but it was not the only thing to be thought of and in my view money was lavishly and often recklessly poured out and sometimes selfishly and improperly received. For some of the steps taken I could find no adequate authority in law, but I accept Dr. Campbell's statement that no new move was made without consultation with his colleagues in the Council. Much new and difficult work was thrown upon him and his unlettered staff and they worked early and late to achieve what I think was too much for them; I cannot altogether wonder if they did not always wait for formalities. Fresh phases, foreign to its ordinary scope, were continually being added to the labours of the department; even the bureau of the prevention of disorder and the shadowing of agitators was laid on the shoulders of Dr. Campbell and his energy overflowed into the office of

(Continued on page 7.)

Report of T. Hollis Walker, K. C.

(Continued from page 4.)

same price rossed wood for the said clean peeled wood and of cutting and sap peeled new wood as part of the said 18,000 cords.

(par 5) The delivery of the said 18,000 cords and other wood shall be made between 15th July, 1923, and 15th October, 1923.

This was in form an unsatisfactory bargain and in execution it was more unsatisfactory still. The total amount brought in by it hardly exceeds \$20,000, against that must be set the heavy expenses of rossing and handpeeling, and Mr. Rogers alleging many breaches of it on the part of the Government, has instituted a huge claim for damages which is still pending in the Courts. I think that there has been gross mismanagement in this matter. The original contract was made without adequate enquiry into the power to perform it, and when the inevitable trouble over it arose the Government was frightened into its improvident successor, Sir Wm. F. Coaker who actually negotiated the first contract, denounces the second and disclaims any responsibility for it; Dr. Campbell does not profess to have sufficient knowledge of the subject to be able to deal with sales, and he left the matter to his colleagues on the executive council; a mysterious individual named Colishaw was mixed up with it in some undefined way and was originally to have had a commission of a dollar a cord out of it;

(par 2) The amount of 70,000 cords is hereby reduced to the number of cords actually delivered by the Government.

(par 3) The entire quantity of rough wood delivered by the Government shall be paid for by the contractor at the price of \$3.00 per cord.

(par 4)—18,000 cords of clean peeled pulpwood shall be secured by the Government and delivered in accordance with the terms of the contract at \$5.00 per cord. The Government shall also have the privilege if it so desire, of substituting at the

Wet Weather Bargains
KNOWLING'S SHOWROOM NOW OFFER
ASTOUNDING VALUES
Raglans, Rubber Coats, Umbrellas, etc.

- LADIES' RAGLANS**
In shades of Fawn, Navy, Grey. Extraordinary value 7.95, 10.95.
- LADIES' MACKINTOSHES**
Colors: Fawn, Saxe, Navy, Black and Shot effects, 2.95 to 9.90.
- LADIES' KHAKI OIL COATS**
Velvet collar, large pockets and full belt, 2.95
- UMBRELLAS**
A great variety of shapes to select from 1.25 to 15.50
- BLACK LEATHERETTE COATS**
5.75
- CHILD'S & MISSES' RAGLANS**
Colors: Fawn and Tan, well made and finished, lined and unlined, belt and pockets; sizes 24 to 39 inch. 2.37 to 6.50.
- CHILDREN'S NAVY MACKINTOSHES**
Size 36 only. 5.65.
- CHILDREN'S & MISSES' DULL RUBBER COATS**
Just the thing for school wear; sizes 6 to 16 years. 3.95, 4.25, 4.50.
- CHILDREN'S & LADIES' RAIN HATS**
In several shapes, materials to match Coats. Prices 35c. to 95c.

G. Knowling, Ltd.

Fresh Fruits, Fresh Vegetables, etc.

NOW BEING PLACED IN STOCK

- SPANISH VALENCIA ORANGES 35c. Doz.
- MESSINA LEMONS 30c. Doz.
- GRAPE FRUIT 90c. Doz. up.
- CALIFORNIA ORANGES 50c. Doz. up.
- EXTRA FCY. WINESAP TABLE APPLES— 45c. Doz. up.
- FLORIDA CELERY, RIPE TOMATOES, RIPE BANANAS, FRESH PEARS, WASHED AMERICAN PARSNIPS, CARROTS and BEETS, NEW CABBAGE, NEW Laid EGGS, AMERICAN & SPANISH ONIONS, NEW YORK CORNED BEEF, MONTREAL SAUSAGES.

Uneda Biscuits,

In Cartons and by the Pound.

FIG NEWTONS—SHORTBREAD, GINGER SNAPS—LEMON SNAPS, GRAHAM WAFERS—CHOCOLATE SNAPS, MALLOMARS—SOCIAL TEA, Etc., Etc.

C. P. EAGAN

TWO STORES
DUCKWORTH STREET & QUEEN'S ROAD.

Special to Motorists

Have you seen the latest TUBE PATCH? If not, call at our store and see 'The Dandee' It is the quickest, best and most economical patch ever invented. The Hotter the Road, the Tighter it Holds! Put up in two size packages and retails for 50c. and \$1.00 each.

It doesn't cost you anything to call at our store and we will demonstrate it for you in a few seconds.

Martin Royal Stores Hdw. Co. LIMITED.