

FIRE!

FIRE!

FIRE!

Saved from the great fire at Sparrow Hardwick & Co's, Manchester,

A Large Quantity of DRY GOODS,

which have been slightly damaged by water. We have secured the following lines at a remarkably low figure, and are thereby enabled to give you the benefit of our purchase.

White Shirtings, 10c. Value
15c. ValueWhite Twill Sheetting, 70 inches wide, 55c. value
90 inches wide, 60c. value
90 inches wide, 70c. value

A BIG RANGE OF LADIES' BLACK AND COLORED SKIRTS.

LADIES' and MISSES' GABINETTES.

A SMALL LOT BLACK SILESIA, 18c. value

Now 7 cents per yard.
Now 10 cents per yard.Now 40 cents per yard.
Now 45 cents per yard.
Now 55 cents per yard.

70c. to \$2.80 each.

\$2.40 to \$7.20.

Now 12 cents per yard.

MARSHALL BROTHERS.

An Election Budget.

(Continued from 5th page.)

making is following in the footsteps of its predecessors. Now, the reduction which the Minister has made, in the manner in which it has been made, and the time in which it is being made, does not bring him the credit which the Minister hopes to attain by it. The responsibility for financing the affairs of the Colony during the greater portion of the time covered by the Minister's estimates for the year 1913-14.

WILL REST PROBABLY NOT ON HIM BUT UPON HIS SUCCESSOR IN OFFICE.

and he has made up as shown in his Budget Speech, as it appears to him at present, what the greatest of his financial operations for the year 1913-14 will be. He takes into account the reduction of taxation. He estimates that the revenue during that year will be \$4,000,000, the expenditure, \$3,734,189, and in round figures, as \$3,750,000, he thus counts upon a surplus of \$250,000. Now, I ask you to examine for a moment upon what the Minister bases these estimates, and I think that a more laughable, more unsatisfactory argument could not be addressed to a deliberative assembly than that placed here by the Minister of Finance and Customs. Now he takes into account the probability of the duty and how does he make it up? First he says:— "We are handing back \$400,000 by the remission of taxation and this amount will be debited to other articles so that we may conclude that at least \$100,000 of this amount will go to swell the Customs Revenue." Now, I would like the Minister to develop for the information of the House the premises upon which he bases the conclusion that it is a recognized principle in our "fiscal economies" that one-third of the earnings of the people come back to the Treasury in the payment of duties." Neither experience nor logic bears this conclusion out. I am talking about our own figures, and I will show the Minister from the figures of recent years that his conclusion is

NOT WARRANTED BY EXPERIENCE.

What does he mean by "earnings" the earnings of the people? Does he mean by that to test the earning powers of the people, the imports or the purchase power of the people as a whole? Are

these the earnings of the people? Does he contend that the whole \$400,000 will go out of the country to purchase imported goods that pay duty? That in itself is not correct. If that is so what becomes of the other parts of his Budget Speech where he points to local industries and to the development that is taking place? What becomes of the money that has been placed to the credit of the Savings Bank? If that is the case how is it that the Minister thinks these matters out of sight now when he wishes to justify a surplus. Now, sir, in 1902-3 before the reduction in the duties on lines, twines, kerosene oil, flour and other articles was made the amount received in duties was \$2,069,661.00, and the imports were \$1,416,337.36 and the imports were \$1,416,110.00 or four or five times the Customs duties. In 1911-12 the Revenue from Customs duties was \$3,024,261 and the imports \$14,733,490, or in round figures about five times the revenue. Now, to show more particularly the fallacy of the Minister's argument. Supposing that the duty of \$885,000 which was taken off last year had been taken off the year before and that \$385,000 had not been received, what would bring the imports up to five or six times the Customs revenue. Judging from the experience I fail to see upon what ground the Minister lays down this economic theory. I fail to see upon

WHAT PREMISES HE CAN BASE IT.

Perhaps, sir, he has some meaning in the phrase "fiscal economies" that is not clear to the ordinary reader. Perhaps he has some meaning in the words "earnings of the people" that is not clear to those who read the Budget Speech; but if the earnings of the people include more than the imports the Minister will see at once that the disproportion between his estimates and the facts will become greater and greater. I take what he calls in another part of his speech the "irreducible minimum" for the purposes of his own theory, and I take, sir, for the purposes of calculation, the figures as they were represented last year with the duties on, or one-fifth.

Halifax Kippers.
New Zealand Table Butter.
New York Fancy Baldwin Apples.
Large Messina Lemons.
California Oranges.

Mild Sugar Cured Canadian Bacon.
Country Eggs.
Boyer's Tomatoes, 10c. can up.
3 lb. tins Pears, 15c. up.
3 lb. tins California Egg Plants, 18c. up.
Hartley's Jams.
Crosse & Blackwell's Jams.

Buy the Higher Grade Teas AND EFFECT TRUE ECONOMY.

Purity, freshness and absolute cleanliness are factors that add their attractiveness to "Homestead" quality.

Duty free, at 40c. per lb., you cannot possibly buy better for the money.

For 5 lb. parcels 10 per cent. discount allowed.
STAR TEA, 33c. lb.; 3 lbs. for 85c.

C. P. EAGAN,
DUCKWORTH STREET and
QUEEN'S ROAD.

If you take it for granted or admit the assumption that every cent of this \$400,000 was spent in the purchase of imported goods and if you take the last proportion, or one-fifth, then, sir, instead of \$400,000 it brings it down to \$80,000 from this source. But, sir, it is not a large assumption to say that every dollar of that \$400,000 is going to be sent out of the country for the purpose of buying imported goods. I think that it is a fair allowance to say that one-half will go in that direction. Well, sir, allow \$250,000. If you take one-fifth of that it will give you from this source an increase of Revenue of \$50,000 or one-half that to which the Minister refers in his Budget. Now, sir, the next item upon which the Minister bases his calculation is an increase from wages and other profit earning industries, amounting to \$225,000. Now, if you apply to this item the same reason as I have just applied to the case of remitted duties you will see that from this source of Revenue an increase of

\$25,000 INSTEAD OF \$75,000

will accrue. But, sir, I should like the Minister to bear in mind in connection with this that the factors which go to make up this item in the Budget—this item of increase of revenue are the same factors which for the last eight or ten years have been operating in producing the normal increase of revenue; and while I am allowing it here on the same basis as the \$400,000 which was remitted, I think that in this case is a very liberal allowance and one upon which I do not think we can fairly calculate upon. The next, sir, is an increase of fifty per cent in the output of the Bell Island Mines. Well, I hope the Minister's anticipations in this respect will prove correct. But I do not think that the output a year from now is going to be fifty per cent greater than it is now. If it is twenty-five per cent greater it will be a very fair estimate of the increase in this direction; that would leave \$20,000 from this source. Then the revenue during the year 1913-14, according to the Minister is made up as follows:—He calculates on a normal revenue. If these duties were not taken off, on a revenue of \$4,200,000. He takes off \$400,000 and that leaves the

REVENUE AT \$3,800,000.

and I would remark, Mr. Chairman, that in this estimate the Minister allows the normal increase which the earnings of our people had produced from year to year for the last ten or twelve years. He takes the revenue as returned to the revenue from duties paid on the purchase of goods paying duties. Then he adds \$75,000 from the increased wages and profits of the kind that though that was already included in the normal increase. Then, sir, he adds \$40,000 for the increased output from the Bell Island Mines. He takes off \$400,000, or as he puts it, in round figures \$4,000,000. The revenue is one side of the account. Now, according to the position as it strikes me or as I understand it put it before the Committee, I take the Minister's figures of \$3,800,000 as showing the normal increase in revenue less remitted duties and I add \$50,000, \$25,000 and \$20,000, that will give \$3,895,000. Now, sir, the other side of the account is expenditure. The Minister places the expenditures in the estimates at \$3,679,094, and in the additional estimates as \$55,115, or a total of \$3,734,209, or he puts it in round figures at \$3,750,000. I take these estimated expenditures. Mr. Chairman, and I look back through the years, which this present administration has been in office, and I ask what have been the estimated expenditures been in conformity with actual expenditures, and I find that for the three years for which we have figures here before us, the years 1909-10, 1910-11, 1911-12, the total of expenditures over estimates was \$681,759 or

AN AVERAGE OVER EXPENDITURE OF \$227,223.

Take the estimated expenditures of the Minister for 1912-13 and add the average over-expenditure for the past three years. The expenditure will be \$3,794,209. The estimated over-expenditure will be \$227,223 or a total expenditure of \$3,961,432. These figures, Mr. Chairman, which I think are reasonable give the Current Account for the year 1913-14 as follows:—Revenue, \$3,890,000; Expenditure, \$3,960,

000, or a deficit of \$70,000. But there is another item in the revenue for the last year which the Minister includes in his calculations. It is profit upon coin. We cannot expect any profit upon coin for the year 1913-14. Of course,

PROFIT UPON COIN IS NOT REVENUE AT ALL.

For every dollar which we send out in silver or copper we should have some reserve in the Treasury to meet it, and the profit made between the difference in the cost of purchasing and minting and the money received when it is put into circulation should be placed as a gold reserve and not included in the current account at all for the purpose of spending as ordinary revenue. Even if you enter it in your system of book-keeping as revenue that you cannot count on it for the year under consideration 1913-14.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL

In his report has over and over again pointed to the fact that profit on silver and copper coin is not a revenue at all, it is a liability. Now it appears from his Report just tabled this season that there was an issue of \$200,000 of copper and silver coin; of that \$200,000, \$87,545 went to pay the costs of bullion minting, etc., and \$28,454 of that is entered as profit. There is a balance at that time of \$84,000 in silver in the vaults of the Treasury and there is a balance of \$76 copper coin. These figures would therefore lead a person to believe that even if you improperly entered coin as revenue you cannot count on a profit of coin as an element in your revenues for 1913-14. If you allow nothing for no income from this source, the account would show a deficit of \$100,000 for 1913-14, made by adding to the \$70,000 deficit already referred to, the \$30,000 profit on coin. There is, however, another way of testing this and if you test it by the surpluses which the Government has had during its term of office, there is a balance of \$76 copper coin surplus for the term was about \$240,000, that is taking the 3 years for which we have figures before us at present. The average would be about \$240,000. Now if you continued during the years 1913 and 1914, the duties that are now being taken off tea sugar, etc., the surplus in the figures that I have worked out and on the result which I have placed before the Committee, would work out about the

AVERAGE SURPLUS

which the Government has heretofore enjoyed. Therefore, I think that the situation points the logic—and from the position which I have, I think, placed before the Committee. The Minister, in making his calculations, as I pointed out before, takes one-third of the earnings of the people to come back to the Treasury in payment of duties. This he lays down as a recognized principle of our "fiscal economies." He applies this to the amount remitted in duties, he applies it to the amount of increased earnings but when he proceeds to deal with the wages earned at the railway work, he has reduced this one-third to one-tenth of a dollar? He gives on the return of wages on the railway only half the amount which I in my calculation based the other items of the account, so if you take his figures as applied to railway work, and apply them to the other factors in his calculation, you would have a larger deficit than that to which I have referred. He says, referring to the men spending their wages in the colony, work: "As the greater portion of what the men spend by their wages is

Don't Put Off

seeking relief from the illnesses caused by defective action of the organs of digestion. Most serious sicknesses get their start in the bowels of the stomach, liver, bowels—troubles quickly, safely, surely relieved by

BEECHAM'S PILLS

Sol. everywhere. In boxes, 25 cents.

the articles such as flour, molasses, etc., which are admitted duty free, they would not pay into the revenue more than an average of

TEN PER CENT.

of their whole earnings which would be ten per cent. or \$400,000 per year." The same conditions apply to the other factors and one-tenth would have been a fairer basis in all cases, but I gave the Minister the benefit of every conservation. He wishes to apply a different test to the conditions which are past and which have the test of reality to judge them by, but when he speculates as to what is going to happen in future, he applies a different measure in order to show a surplus which he hopes will result from the financial operations of the coming year. Of course it must be borne in mind in connection with these figures that a general election will take place between this and the time when the logic of facts can be applied to the Minister's figures, and it is the hope of the Minister that the electorate will take his figures at their face value and not consider the effect of their finances. But I would like to say just here that the people are well able to judge of these matters, and if the Hon. Minister heard the criticisms upon his speech that have been made in the various places of resort—the clubs, halls and other centres, where men gather, he would find that very few take the basis upon which he calculates his figures, at all seriously; his budget is regarded as

"AN ELECTION BUDGET."

The next item in the Budget Speech is that wherein the Minister discusses the reduction of the duties on the previous tariff charges, but I have already briefly referred to this matter. I have shown how the statements which the Minister tabled last year, did not properly represent the reduction in taxation effected during the year. This, as it stands, of course, can only have been introduced into the Minister's Budget Speech under the head of "Juggling with the Tariff." This shows that he could not have been introduced for any other reason. The next item the Minister deals with is the Public Debt. This debt at the time the present administration took power was \$22,577,000. To-day the Public Debt is \$23,676,000. The Minister, however, only brings this Public Debt down to the 30th June of this year. He does not refer at all in his Speech to the fact that since the 30th June the

PUBLIC DEBT HAD INCREASED BY \$2,500,000.

This \$2,500,000 was made up of the recent Railway Loan and the \$250,000 granted last year for other purposes. This shows that there was a total increase during the administration of the present Government in the Public Debt, of about \$7,200,000 in round figures. During the late administration, the Public Debt was increased by \$5,300,000 during their nine (9) years tenure of office. Of this increase by the late administration, the greater portion of it, in fact, nearly the entire increase (with small exceptions), was due to the

RAILWAY AND TELEGRAPH AWARDS

amounting in the neighborhood of 4½ million dollars. The increase in the Public Debt from other sources during the administration of the Bond Government was only in the neighborhood—including Municipal and other guaranteed debt—of about \$700,000. Now it has been charged in this House that the late administration—by comparison, had increased the Public Debt in a greater ratio than the previous administration. The difference, I think, might be stated in this way, that the administration of Sir Robert Bond increased the Public Debt by trying to remove a legacy of oppression left to it by its predecessors, while the present Government has created a debt which leaves a legacy of obligation to those succeeding them. If you consider what the increase in the Debt during the Bond administration consisted of, you will see that what I say is correct—that this increase in the Debt of the Colony was not due to any want of care or lack of statesmanship on the part of Sir Robert Bond. The Debt was made up as follows: \$1,000,000, paid for the purchase of the Railway from the Reid

Nfld. Co., then the late Sir R. G. Reid, with about \$200,000 interest on that purchase money for the time the Colony had the money paid to the Reid Nfld. Co. for the purchase of the Railway. It is also made up of about \$900,000 paid to liquidate the award made by the Lytleton Arbitration for rolling stock piece on the Railway system by the Reids. And, further, it was made up of about \$850,000 paid for lands taken back by the Colony from the Reids, and also made up of 1½ millions of dollars paid to liquidate the award made for taking back the Telegraph system from the Reid Nfld. Co. I do not think that any reasonable person looking back now at the situation in which the Colony found itself in 1901, when the contract of that year was passed.

WILL QUESTION THE WISDOM

of getting back the reversion of the railway. I do not think any person will question the honesty and advisability of paying the "amount of the Lytleton Award or paying for the lands taken back, and certainly I do not think any business man will question the advisability of taking back the Telegraph system. Look at the first, the question of the purchase of the reversion of the railway. It had been pointed out by the Premier this session that the years were slipping by when the contract of 1901 would expire. That is true, and at the end of that time, the railway that was constructed by the Colony for \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000, will again revert to the Colony. That fact had been always accompanied by a counter-statement when referred to by those who supported the contract of 1898, by referring to the alleged enormous amount the Colony must pay the Reid Nfld. Co., at the expiration of that time for the rolling stock and other equipments which the Reid Nfld. Co. will then have on the line. Under the contract as it stands to-day, when 1951 arrives, the contract will expire; we will have then the valuation of the property belonging to the Reid Nfld. Co. upon a line in its then condition and the Colony will be in the position of having to pay for that rolling stock and equipment that belongs to the Company, or making some other arrangement whereby the

OPERATION OF THE LINE WILL BE CONTINUED.

If the railway is to be of benefit to the Colony by the year 1951, it will be the greatest asset of the country; it will be the backbone of the prosperity of the country; it will be the life blood of the trade of the Colony; and if you are to take the figures in connection with the railway, which have been presented to us by the Minister of Finance, in his Budget Speech, to show the manner in which the traffic has developed on the line across country, if that condition continues until 1951, and I hope it will continue, and progress more rapidly and I believe it will, by 1951 you will have this position—that the Reid Company will be prepared to enter into a further arrangement, if the Colony is willing, much more advantageous for the maintenance and operation of that railway than either the contract of 1898 or of 1901. You will have then, if you will ever have, a profit-earning railway, a railway that will pay to operate and bring in a large revenue to the Colony. That will be worth a great deal more than the rolling stock or equipment on it that belongs to the Reid Nfld. Co., and the Colony will be in this position, it will own the railway and will be able to make a further, a better and a more advantageous arrangement with the Company, or say to it—here, take your money, we will pay the Colony to operate the line itself under a

BOARD OF INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONERS.

that will earn a profit. That will more than pay the Colony the interest upon any amount we have got to pay. I believe this increased earning power years it will more than pay for the amount to be paid at that time, and when we sought the reversion in 1898 we were giving these prospects to the Reid Co. for \$1,000,000. It was good statesmanship and good business to get back for the Colony the greatest asset it possesses and who ever is here to represent the people in 1951,

I am sure will be pleased to know that the reversion of the railway is vested in the Colony, which will be in a position then to make a bargain with the Reid Nfld. Co. or other Contractor to operate the line, or failing to make such arrangement for the Colony under a Board of Independent Commissioners. It was a mistake from beginning to give away that line, as it was giving away the line to the Reid Nfld. Co. It will be remembered that \$1,000,000 was paid. It will also be remembered that in the year 1898 the contract Mr. Reid undertook to operate and maintain the line for ten years which was afterwards extended to eleven. At the time of the passing of the 1898 contract there was a quantity of rolling stock on the line belonging to Mr. Reid. In the contract by which the reversion of the line was sold to the Reid Co. no provision was made that the rolling stock then on it should remain their property, but on the contrary the Colony had to take over that rolling stock from him in order to give it to him with the reversion and had to pay and did pay before the Winter Government went out of power

OVER \$1,000,000

towards the payment for this rolling stock and equipment. In other words they gave Reids for this rolling stock the \$1,000,000 that he was to pay the Colony for the reversion of the line. Now, under the Lytleton award on the arbitration held after the reversion of the railway had come back to the Colony, only the balance of Mr. Reid's claim in connection with this rolling stock had to be paid for up to 1901 when the line reverted to the Colony. This was paid for under the Lytleton Award. The Colony got according to the finding of the arbitrator with which, however, all do not agree, cent per cent the value of the money in property transferred from the Company to the Colony.

(To be continued.)

Stafford's Liniment!

Numerous testimonials have been received in reference to Stafford's Liniment. Below we publish a few of them.

"I have used almost two bottles of your Liniment and I must say it is all you claim for it."

"I have used your Liniment and have found it to be the best Liniment I ever used."

"We have used your Liniment in our home and find that it is as represented."

"I can highly recommend your 'Queen of Liniment.' My mother has been an invalid for two years; she praises it more than any other remedy she ever used."

"We have used a great many bottles of your Liniment in our family, and are selling dozens. We find it the best, and everyone that uses it says the same."

The above Testimonials are the exact words copied from a few of the letters which we have in our possession, and can be seen by calling at our Drug Store, Theatre Hill, St. John's.

Fish Propagation.

Editor Evening Telegram.
Dear Sir,—I notice in a letter appearing in the Herald of April 4th, to the effect that the following paragraph:—"Mr. Neilson came here on the 15th February, 1889, in connection with the Fisheries of the country, he was not as Judge Prowse states the first to attempt the artificial rearing of fishes in this Colony." Six years prior to the arrival of Mr. Neilson, Mr. John Martin was hatching trout at Long Pond. Now, sir, for the information of the Judge and Mr. LeMessurier I can safely say that neither Mr. Neilson nor Mr. Martin were the first to take up the incubation of fish in this Colony, for in the year 1879 I know a gentleman on Water Street who received a quantity of trout ova from the late Commissioner, through Morrison's Express Agency, and hatched out quite a number in a double percolated pen in his bath room and placed the fish in Quidi Vidi Lake.

J. E.

Address