

NEW SHIPMENTS of Sweater Wool

We are pleased to announce the arrival of some small shipments of

**CORTICELLI and REGENT
SWEATER WOOL**

BISHOP, SONS & COMPANY, Ltd.,

St. John's

MEN'S CAPS

We are now showing a big assortment of
**MEN'S BEST QUALITY
ENGLISH CAPS, 1.70 to 2.50**

Regular values up to 3.60

See Window

NEW COUNCIL TAKES OFFICE.

**Secretary - Treas. Says Deficit for
1921 Will Go Into Thousands.**

The new Council elected by the ratepayers on December 15th last, formally assumed office yesterday. Hon. Tasker Cooke being sworn in as Mayor by the Chief Justice in the forenoon who in summoning the Councillors to the regular meeting was called to order at 4.30 p.m., the full Council being in attendance.

His Honor Mayor Cooke in taking his seat spoke briefly, congratulating the Councillors who had been selected by the taxpayers, and asked that co-operation be given in every undertaking for the benefit of and advancement of the city. Wild schemes, he said, were out of the question. Sane government must necessarily be undertaken, and if conditions could be improved economy must be practised and every dollar of revenue used to the utmost advantage. It was very necessary, he said, that the financial standing of the Council should be first at hand before any move at expenditure be made. Rumors were abroad that the financial status of the Council did not stand 100 per cent. Personally he had not time to go into this matter, and he asked the Sec.-Treas. to state how conditions were.

The reply from Mr. Mahony was: "I am afraid, sir, we will have to face a very large deficit. It will probably be the largest on record. The past year's outlay has been enormous, and the collections not up to expectations."

Continuing Mayor Cooke said there was no need to further discuss the financial problem until such time as the Sec.-Treas. had a full statement ready which he ordered to be submitted at next regular meeting.

Councillor Dowden, complimented the Mayor firstly on his election to office, and secondly for the position he had taken as to financial affairs. So far as he was concerned he had no

other motive than to serve the city and to see that every dollar of revenue was judiciously spent. He regretted that the suggestions of the late Mayor or Morris. He agreed with Councillor Dowden that they should not have been published. Their publication was either a breach of faith or an oversight, but in either case it was improper.

Councillor Vincombe held similar views. In his opinion they should not have been published. He had never heard of the different proposals before, and it looked as if they were placed on the new Council as a legacy. The opinion was probably abroad that the proposals were the work of the old Council but he hoped such impression would be removed. As a member of the old Board he disclaimed any connection whatever with the programme, and believed the publication was unnecessary and uncalled for.

Mayor Cooke also regretted the publication but took the position that further discussion was useless and of no avail.

Councillor Dowden asked the question as to the expenditure covering the Municipal Election. The Sec.-Treas. was asked to read the minutes of the final meeting of the old Council, which showed that the total cost was in the vicinity of \$8,000.00 as per original bill presented by Returning Officer Doyle. The old Council had deducted from the original bill \$1,776.00. It had been ordered by the outgoing Board that the original bill and the bill as modified by the old Council be published.

Councillor Collier asked why it had not been published. In his opinion it should have been. The original bill asked for \$100.00 for four checkers. A large amount for cab driving and carting ballot boxes, etc. A great deal had been said about the Road de Luxe—but in his opinion the matter under discussion was of bigger magnitude and full publicity should be given.

After some further discussion in which Councillors Vincombe, Dowden, Outerbridge and Ryan took part, it was decided that the resolution of the old Board be complied with and the original bill and the other with deductions made by the Council be published.

and being put was carried unanimously.

Councillor Collier after congratulating the Mayor referred to the publication of the suggestions of ex-Mayor Morris. He agreed with Councillor Dowden that they should not have been published. Their publication was either a breach of faith or an oversight, but in either case it was improper.

Councillor Vincombe held similar views. In his opinion they should not have been published. He had never heard of the different proposals before, and it looked as if they were placed on the new Council as a legacy. The opinion was probably abroad that the proposals were the work of the old Council but he hoped such impression would be removed. As a member of the old Board he disclaimed any connection whatever with the programme, and believed the publication was unnecessary and uncalled for.

Mayor Cooke also regretted the publication but took the position that further discussion was useless and of no avail.

Councillor Dowden asked the question as to the expenditure covering the Municipal Election. The Sec.-Treas. was asked to read the minutes of the final meeting of the old Council, which showed that the total cost was in the vicinity of \$8,000.00 as per original bill presented by Returning Officer Doyle. The old Council had deducted from the original bill \$1,776.00. It had been ordered by the outgoing Board that the original bill and the bill as modified by the old Council be published.

Councillor Collier asked why it had not been published. In his opinion it should have been. The original bill asked for \$100.00 for four checkers. A large amount for cab driving and carting ballot boxes, etc. A great deal had been said about the Road de Luxe—but in his opinion the matter under discussion was of bigger magnitude and full publicity should be given.

After some further discussion in which Councillors Vincombe, Dowden, Outerbridge and Ryan took part, it was decided that the resolution of the old Board be complied with and the original bill and the other with deductions made by the Council be published.

Councillor Dowden supported the motion and also Councillor Vincombe



**Men of
Good Taste**
Appreciate the
choice selection of
CAPS shown at
our store.
Quality and style
in bountiful
measure.
Men of Wisdom
Appreciate the
Wonderful Values.
Caps from \$1.25 up
TEMPLETON'S

On motion of Councillors Outerbridge and Vincombe, supported by Councillor Dowden.

The following matters received attention:—
Patrick Mallard, Pleasant Street, asked compensation for damages caused his premises through overflow of gully on said street. The Engineer was instructed to report on same for next meeting.

Mr. Hibbs, Livingstone Street, called attention to defective water service, which was a source of great inconvenience and expense to him during the past year. The Engineer is to investigate and report.

A communication was received from J. J. Lacey, in reference to Taxes on Insurance, Stock and Loan Companies, etc., recently published in the daily papers. The Sections dealing with such taxes are, at present, law, and the Council has no power to make alterations.

The Secretary of the Newfoundland Board of Trade submitted report and recommendations of the subcommittee appointed to consider improved methods in connection with the watering of shipping. Deferred for consideration.

Applications were read from J. Fogarty and J. Morrissey for a position as Sanitary Inspector; also from J. Coady and Archibald Lock for a position as Impounder. No such positions are at present vacant, but the applications were ordered placed on file for future reference.

R. C. Hopkins, Contractor, asked permission to erect signboard for Barnes and Company, Waldegrave Street. This was referred to the City Engineer, and, if it meets with his approval, permit may be issued.

The matter of street crossings was discussed, and the Sanitary Supervisor was instructed to have same attended to by his Department.

A discussion took place on arrears due, account City Taxes, and it is the intention of the Council to have all delinquents in this respect prosecuted.

The financial position of the Council was also talked over, and it was ordered that statements be prepared and submitted for next meeting so that they may form an idea of their present standing.

Deputy Mayor Martin was appointed to represent the Council on the Committee recently formed to consider methods to meet the unemployment situation.

Reports of City Engineer, Health Officer, etc. for week were read; pay rolls and bills presented were ordered paid, after which the meeting adjourned.

Stafford's Phorphone, best for Coughs and Colds, 35c. per bottle.

M. C. L. I. Debate.

MANY SPEAKERS ON MOST INTERESTING SUBJECT.

Rarely if ever in fifty-five years has M.C.L.I. debated a resolution so heatedly and hence so interestingly as last night, when the subject of Competition vs. Co-operation came up to be thrashed out to the satisfaction of the very large number who had turned up. If last evening is to be taken as a criterion of the season, there is every reason for believing that the present will be the best in the long history of the well-known institute.

The Speakers.

The set speakers who opened up the fray were: affirmative, J. A. W. McNelly, Fred Gushue and William Crane; and negative, Albert Soper, C. F. Garland and Fred Edgecombe. The leaders started the ball rolling with each an exposition of what competition and co-operation was. The floor took up the threads of the argument, and a surprisingly large number mounted the tribune to outline their views. These members were: Joseph Moore, A. B. Parkins, George Jones, Capt. A. Kean, S. P. Whiteway, William Drover, A. E. Hayward, S. Bursey, Fred Moore, William White, Thos. Soper, J. S. Currie and J. R. Smallwood.

The Resolution

The wording of the resolution was: "That the public interests are better served by the competitive system than they would be by the co-operative system." Both sides explained what was meant by the two systems, and the two sides disagreed in their interpretation of what the systems were. Indeed, throughout the evening the affirmative and negative speakers treated the subject from almost divergent angles.

The Arguments.

The negative side maintained, for example, that while there is a competitive system of business there is no co-operative system as yet, whatever the future might bring forth.

Only scattered and varying examples of what the co-operative idea would be like are to be seen. The affirmative policy was to take these examples and, by contrasting them with the capitalist or competitive system, make them look very imperfect. The negative side maintained that by co-operative and competitive systems as mentioned, what was meant was systems of production and distribution of commodities and articles of universal use—not competition or co-operation in ideas or athletics or education, but in trade, commerce and industry. The affirmative maintained that co-operation in all things of life. The affirmative maintained that co-operation would destroy individual initiative. The competitive system, they said, brought out great individual efforts. Bible precedents of struggle, competition and rivalry were cited. One speaker mentioned a boat race on Quidi Vidi as an example of competition. Another pointed out that there was co-operation as well—co-operation in the individual crews, and competition between whole crews. The negative maintained that athletics had nothing to do with it. In fact, throughout the whole debate the two sides treated the subject from two different attitudes, altogether.

Difficult to be Impartial.

It is difficult for the writer of this article to be quite impartial in the presentation of the two sets of argument—he had his own side to support, and naturally is of the opinion that his side had the best of the argument. It may be remarked, however, that the negative side really did have the best of it so far as proof and logic went and the reason for the voice, which favored the competitive system, might indeed be what the leader of the negative said, in his closing speech: "If you don't vote for our side, the only thing I can think of is that you don't understand what co-operation is." (Laughter.) The negative side cited many results of extreme individualism and competition. Competition between nations resulted

in the Great War and the slaughter of fifteen millions. Competition as to

soned international relations as to make it necessary to maintain great navies and armies that drained the pockets of taxpayers. Competitive industry succeeds in exploiting the wage earner, produces slums, prostitution, vice, crime and sin. Competitive industry stands for profit, and co-operative business for service. Co-operation eliminates waste and conserves resources. Competition is stationary forces at play throughout the ages. It was not an end—it was a perfect—it was not final, it was but a stage. Evolution never stopped, and out of competition would grow up co-operation, just as out of feudalism grew up capitalism. It all comes in continuous, almost imperceptible change. Even now, within the husk of the old, we see the beginnings of the new, in the shape of co-operative societies. Co-operative societies would eventually merge into the grand whole of co-operative society.

Societies and Society.

The affirmative pointed to the failure of co-operative societies, their faulty construction and imperfections and shortcomings, as reasons against the co-operative system. They said that co-operative societies were business like every other business, for profit. They said that even if any country should go into co-operation on a national scale, and become a co-operative commonwealth, it would mean, simply, that in its relations with other nations the other nations would suffer.

Matter of Evolution.

The negative replied that that was so. But just as co-operative societies within any nation were the beginning of co-operative society in that nation, or preceded the co-operative commonwealth, so did co-operative commonwealths precede a world commonwealth of co-operation. It was all a matter of evolution. Change was usually steady and continuous and almost imperceptible. The negative set no time limit. The co-operative commonwealth might not come for many years, and the world co-operative commonwealth not for many years later. It was all a matter of evolution, and time was no object. It would come when things were ripe for it. The affirmative maintained that human nature contained much of selfishness. Selfishness was the core of the competitive system. To have a co-operative system it would be necessary to change human nature. The negative answered that it was true that that part of human nature would have to be changed and it would be changed. Human nature was not a fixed, stationary quality, but changing and evolutionary. We were not now so selfish, or rather our selfishness did not now take such virulent form as in ages past. Man is a social animal, gravitating to each and forming groups, first families, then clans, then tribes, then wandering nations, then stationary nations, then empires, and so on. If needs be, the affirmative was prepared to grow a generation in whom the co-operative idea was fostered and cultivated, and defer the co-operative commonwealth until then. (Laughter.) Seriously, though, human nature changed continuously to suit external conditions and systems.

Altogether it was a debate sufficient to delight the heart of any controversialist and any lover of contention and debate. Many points were brought out, and the evening was one of the most enjoyable held in many a day.—J.R.S.

in the Great War and the slaughter of fifteen millions. Competition as to soned international relations as to make it necessary to maintain great navies and armies that drained the pockets of taxpayers. Competitive industry succeeds in exploiting the wage earner, produces slums, prostitution, vice, crime and sin. Competitive industry stands for profit, and co-operative business for service. Co-operation eliminates waste and conserves resources. Competition is stationary forces at play throughout the ages. It was not an end—it was a perfect—it was not final, it was but a stage. Evolution never stopped, and out of competition would grow up co-operation, just as out of feudalism grew up capitalism. It all comes in continuous, almost imperceptible change. Even now, within the husk of the old, we see the beginnings of the new, in the shape of co-operative societies. Co-operative societies would eventually merge into the grand whole of co-operative society.

Societies and Society.

The affirmative pointed to the failure of co-operative societies, their faulty construction and imperfections and shortcomings, as reasons against the co-operative system. They said that co-operative societies were business like every other business, for profit. They said that even if any country should go into co-operation on a national scale, and become a co-operative commonwealth, it would mean, simply, that in its relations with other nations the other nations would suffer.

Matter of Evolution.

The negative replied that that was so. But just as co-operative societies within any nation were the beginning of co-operative society in that nation, or preceded the co-operative commonwealth, so did co-operative commonwealths precede a world commonwealth of co-operation. It was all a matter of evolution. Change was usually steady and continuous and almost imperceptible. The negative set no time limit. The co-operative commonwealth might not come for many years, and the world co-operative commonwealth not for many years later. It was all a matter of evolution, and time was no object. It would come when things were ripe for it. The affirmative maintained that human nature contained much of selfishness. Selfishness was the core of the competitive system. To have a co-operative system it would be necessary to change human nature. The negative answered that it was true that that part of human nature would have to be changed and it would be changed. Human nature was not a fixed, stationary quality, but changing and evolutionary. We were not now so selfish, or rather our selfishness did not now take such virulent form as in ages past. Man is a social animal, gravitating to each and forming groups, first families, then clans, then tribes, then wandering nations, then stationary nations, then empires, and so on. If needs be, the affirmative was prepared to grow a generation in whom the co-operative idea was fostered and cultivated, and defer the co-operative commonwealth until then. (Laughter.) Seriously, though, human nature changed continuously to suit external conditions and systems.

Altogether it was a debate sufficient to delight the heart of any controversialist and any lover of contention and debate. Many points were brought out, and the evening was one of the most enjoyable held in many a day.—J.R.S.

Societies and Society.

The affirmative pointed to the failure of co-operative societies, their faulty construction and imperfections and shortcomings, as reasons against the co-operative system. They said that co-operative societies were business like every other business, for profit. They said that even if any country should go into co-operation on a national scale, and become a co-operative commonwealth, it would mean, simply, that in its relations with other nations the other nations would suffer.

Matter of Evolution.

The negative replied that that was so. But just as co-operative societies within any nation were the beginning of co-operative society in that nation, or preceded the co-operative commonwealth, so did co-operative commonwealths precede a world commonwealth of co-operation. It was all a matter of evolution. Change was usually steady and continuous and almost imperceptible. The negative set no time limit. The co-operative commonwealth might not come for many years, and the world co-operative commonwealth not for many years later. It was all a matter of evolution, and time was no object. It would come when things were ripe for it. The affirmative maintained that human nature contained much of selfishness. Selfishness was the core of the competitive system. To have a co-operative system it would be necessary to change human nature. The negative answered that it was true that that part of human nature would have to be changed and it would be changed. Human nature was not a fixed, stationary quality, but changing and evolutionary. We were not now so selfish, or rather our selfishness did not now take such virulent form as in ages past. Man is a social animal, gravitating to each and forming groups, first families, then clans, then tribes, then wandering nations, then stationary nations, then empires, and so on. If needs be, the affirmative was prepared to grow a generation in whom the co-operative idea was fostered and cultivated, and defer the co-operative commonwealth until then. (Laughter.) Seriously, though, human nature changed continuously to suit external conditions and systems.

Altogether it was a debate sufficient to delight the heart of any controversialist and any lover of contention and debate. Many points were brought out, and the evening was one of the most enjoyable held in many a day.—J.R.S.

Societies and Society.

The affirmative pointed to the failure of co-operative societies, their faulty construction and imperfections and shortcomings, as reasons against the co-operative system. They said that co-operative societies were business like every other business, for profit. They said that even if any country should go into co-operation on a national scale, and become a co-operative commonwealth, it would mean, simply, that in its relations with other nations the other nations would suffer.

Matter of Evolution.

The negative replied that that was so. But just as co-operative societies within any nation were the beginning of co-operative society in that nation, or preceded the co-operative commonwealth, so did co-operative commonwealths precede a world commonwealth of co-operation. It was all a matter of evolution. Change was usually steady and continuous and almost imperceptible. The negative set no time limit. The co-operative commonwealth might not come for many years, and the world co-operative commonwealth not for many years later. It was all a matter of evolution, and time was no object. It would come when things were ripe for it. The affirmative maintained that human nature contained much of selfishness. Selfishness was the core of the competitive system. To have a co-operative system it would be necessary to change human nature. The negative answered that it was true that that part of human nature would have to be changed and it would be changed. Human nature was not a fixed, stationary quality, but changing and evolutionary. We were not now so selfish, or rather our selfishness did not now take such virulent form as in ages past. Man is a social animal, gravitating to each and forming groups, first families, then clans, then tribes, then wandering nations, then stationary nations, then empires, and so on. If needs be, the affirmative was prepared to grow a generation in whom the co-operative idea was fostered and cultivated, and defer the co-operative commonwealth until then. (Laughter.) Seriously, though, human nature changed continuously to suit external conditions and systems.

Altogether it was a debate sufficient to delight the heart of any controversialist and any lover of contention and debate. Many points were brought out, and the evening was one of the most enjoyable held in many a day.—J.R.S.

Societies and Society.

The affirmative pointed to the failure of co-operative societies, their faulty construction and imperfections and shortcomings, as reasons against the co-operative system. They said that co-operative societies were business like every other business, for profit. They said that even if any country should go into co-operation on a national scale, and become a co-operative commonwealth, it would mean, simply, that in its relations with other nations the other nations would suffer.

Matter of Evolution.

The negative replied that that was so. But just as co-operative societies within any nation were the beginning of co-operative society in that nation, or preceded the co-operative commonwealth, so did co-operative commonwealths precede a world commonwealth of co-operation. It was all a matter of evolution. Change was usually steady and continuous and almost imperceptible. The negative set no time limit. The co-operative commonwealth might not come for many years, and the world co-operative commonwealth not for many years later. It was all a matter of evolution, and time was no object. It would come when things were ripe for it. The affirmative maintained that human nature contained much of selfishness. Selfishness was the core of the competitive system. To have a co-operative system it would be necessary to change human nature. The negative answered that it was true that that part of human nature would have to be changed and it would be changed. Human nature was not a fixed, stationary quality, but changing and evolutionary. We were not now so selfish, or rather our selfishness did not now take such virulent form as in ages past. Man is a social animal, gravitating to each and forming groups, first families, then clans, then tribes, then wandering nations, then stationary nations, then empires, and so on. If needs be, the affirmative was prepared to grow a generation in whom the co-operative idea was fostered and cultivated, and defer the co-operative commonwealth until then. (Laughter.) Seriously, though, human nature changed continuously to suit external conditions and systems.

Altogether it was a debate sufficient to delight the heart of any controversialist and any lover of contention and debate. Many points were brought out, and the evening was one of the most enjoyable held in many a day.—J.R.S.

Societies and Society.

The affirmative pointed to the failure of co-operative societies, their faulty construction and imperfections and shortcomings, as reasons against the co-operative system. They said that co-operative societies were business like every other business, for profit. They said that even if any country should go into co-operation on a national scale, and become a co-operative commonwealth, it would mean, simply, that in its relations with other nations the other nations would suffer.

Matter of Evolution.

The negative replied that that was so. But just as co-operative societies within any nation were the beginning of co-operative society in that nation, or preceded the co-operative commonwealth, so did co-operative commonwealths precede a world commonwealth of co-operation. It was all a matter of evolution. Change was usually steady and continuous and almost imperceptible. The negative set no time limit. The co-operative commonwealth might not come for many years, and the world co-operative commonwealth not for many years later. It was all a matter of evolution, and time was no object. It would come when things were ripe for it. The affirmative maintained that human nature contained much of selfishness. Selfishness was the core of the competitive system. To have a co-operative system it would be necessary to change human nature. The negative answered that it was true that that part of human nature would have to be changed and it would be changed. Human nature was not a fixed, stationary quality, but changing and evolutionary. We were not now so selfish, or rather our selfishness did not now take such virulent form as in ages past. Man is a social animal, gravitating to each and forming groups, first families, then clans, then tribes, then wandering nations, then stationary nations, then empires, and so on. If needs be, the affirmative was prepared to grow a generation in whom the co-operative idea was fostered and cultivated, and defer the co-operative commonwealth until then. (Laughter.) Seriously, though, human nature changed continuously to suit external conditions and systems.

Altogether it was a debate sufficient to delight the heart of any controversialist and any lover of contention and debate. Many points were brought out, and the evening was one of the most enjoyable held in many a day.—J.R.S.

Societies and Society.

The affirmative pointed to the failure of co-operative societies, their faulty construction and imperfections and shortcomings, as reasons against the co-operative system. They said that co-operative societies were business like every other business, for profit. They said that even if any country should go into co-operation on a national scale, and become a co-operative commonwealth, it would mean, simply, that in its relations with other nations the other nations would suffer.

Matter of Evolution.

The negative replied that that was so. But just as co-operative societies within any nation were the beginning of co-operative society in that nation, or preceded the co-operative commonwealth, so did co-operative commonwealths precede a world commonwealth of co-operation. It was all a matter of evolution. Change was usually steady and continuous and almost imperceptible. The negative set no time limit. The co-operative commonwealth might not come for many years, and the world co-operative commonwealth not for many years later. It was all a matter of evolution, and time was no object. It would come when things were ripe for it. The affirmative maintained that human nature contained much of selfishness. Selfishness was the core of the competitive system. To have a co-operative system it would be necessary to change human nature. The negative answered that it was true that that part of human nature would have to be changed and it would be changed. Human nature was not a fixed, stationary quality, but changing and evolutionary. We were not now so selfish, or rather our selfishness did not now take such virulent form as in ages past. Man is a social animal, gravitating to each and forming groups, first families, then clans, then tribes, then wandering nations, then stationary nations, then empires, and so on. If needs be, the affirmative was prepared to grow a generation in whom the co-operative idea was fostered and cultivated, and defer the co-operative commonwealth until then. (Laughter.) Seriously, though, human nature changed continuously to suit external conditions and systems.

DALE & CO., LTD.,

Marine and Fire Underwriters.

Head Office--CORISTINE BUILDING, MONTREAL.

Branch Offices--Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto,
Quebec, Halifax, St. John's.

BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA BLDG.,

PHONE 967.

Your Account Books for 1922

We have them.

DICKS & COMPANY, LIMITED,
BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS.

Clearance Sale of Valenciennes Lace!

WE OFFER

**3000 Yards Dainty Valenciennes
Lace and Insertion**

at

Only 1 Cent Per Yard

The beginning of our Stock-Taking Bargains.

ALSO SPECIAL CUT PRICES ON ALL WHITE GOODS

Marshall Bros.