

THE LOCAL LEGISLATURE ADJOURNED UNTIL THE 28TH

Five of the Members to Attend The-Win-The-War Convention in Montreal--- Request for a Week's Adjournment Came From Both Sides of the House--- Discussion Over Private Bills.

The Legislature on Friday evening adjourned until Monday evening, May 28th, at 8.30 o'clock. This arrangement was concurred in by the members on both sides. It was first proposed to hold sittings on Tuesday and Wednesday, and then adjourn over until the following Monday, but this would not suit the convenience of members living in distant parts of the province, and it was decided to take the entire week. Five of the members will attend the Win the War Conference in Montreal next week.

The House met on Friday at three o'clock.

Mr. Burchill presented the report of the Committee on Standing Rules. He said that he was desired by the Committee to bring before the House the question of the bills which were referred back to the committee. There were three of these bills, one relating to the City of Saint John, one to the City of Moncton, and one to the Town of Bathurst, each of which bills referred to separate and distinct matters. There were two considerations involved, one that if the bills were allowed to go through the House in the form in which they now stood there would be a loss of fees which would have to be paid had each matter been the subject of a separate bill; and again, the putting into one bill of several matters made it very hard to find any particular legislation under the general title which the bill would have. The committee offered no opinion as to what course should be adopted, but they desired the House to settle the point.

Mr. Tilley said that as a member of the Committee he desired to associate himself with what the previous speaker said. The whole matter was boiled down to two points, whether a separate fee should be paid for each distinct matter of the bill, or whether it would still be allowable to consolidate a number of different matters in one general bill, and the other was that it would be very confusing to have a lot of different subjects contained in a bill of which the title would probably refer to only one of them.

The Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. Byrne said the matter was an important one and was very properly brought before the House. As to the St. John bill, there could be no question that the several matters included in it were absolutely distinct and separate from each other, and it would be very easy to mislead anyone looking for legislation regarding any one of them under the title which the bill had. The Moncton bill was on a rather different principle. It related to different matters, it was true, but they all had to do with the civic government of the city. The same might be said of the Bathurst bill. The matters were distinct certainly, but they all came under the jurisdiction of the town council. In the case of the St. John bill, part of it related to the City of St. John, part to the county and part to a public institution which had no connection with either.

Mr. Tilley said that he was surprised to find the Attorney General referring to a rule under which the committee should have acted. As far as he (Tilley) knew, there was no such rule; that was precisely why the committee had come back to the House for guidance. His hon. friend seemed to wish to discriminate between the different towns. The bills from Moncton and Bathurst which he

(the Attorney General) was prepared to let go, happened to be introduced by members on his own side of the House, while the St. John bill, upon which he wanted three or four sets of fees paid, came from the opposition side. The object of the committee in referring the matter back to the House was not to compel the county of St. John to toe the mark, but simply to get a ruling on the practice to be observed for the future.

Mr. Potts said the House was looking for light from the Attorney General, but did not get it, and he for one was no wiser on the subject when the hon. gentleman sat down than he was before he got up.

Mr. Burchill said that he had just had another bill put in his hands, this one from the City of Fredericton. He had not had time to read it through, but from a casual glance at it he believed it was in the same category as the bills he had referred to in that it referred to several different matters.

Hon. Mr. Veniot said that he was very much interested in the Bathurst bill, which certainly could not be said to relate to three different matters in the same way as the St. John bill did. The practice which was now objected to was originated under the late government, and now hon. gentlemen on the opposition side wanted to go back on it in an effort to block the bill. It was vital to the Town of Bathurst that the bill should go through with as little delay as possible, as it was holding up the sale of their bonds, for which they had a very good offer.

Mr. Murray (Kings) said he regretted to see his hon. friends opposite try to make a party question out of it, as such a course was quite unworthy of the House. Nothing had been said by any member on the opposition side which would raise a party issue. The matter had been brought up and very properly brought up, by the hon. member from Northumberland for a ruling as to the practice to be followed. If the practice which had been followed for the last few years was objectionable, it should be wiped out.

Premier Foster.

Hon. Mr. Foster said that there was no need whatever for any feeling in the matter. If it was a question of consolidating bills to save fees, the better plan would be to reduce the fees and divide the bills. The committee might be instructed to make a recommendation as to amending the rule.

Mr. Campbell agreed with what the Premier said and there was no need whatever for any fireworks in connection with the discussion. The Standing Rules Committee were performing a great service in bringing the matter up. He had no knowledge whatever as to what was in the Bathurst and Moncton bills, but the St. John bill certainly appeared to him to need dividing into at least three parts. He also agreed that there was need for reduction in the scale of fees.

Hon. Mr. Robinson congratulated the committee on doing their duty so thoroughly. Such had not always been the case in his experience. He strongly approved of the proposal to have the bills divided up, as it would make it very much easier for reference and indexing. He was in no sense jealous of the City of St. John, but at the same time he noticed that there was a clause in the bill which affected every municipality in the province, and if the bill went through as it stood, no one would ever find this out.

He thought the Moncton bill would be better divided too. A fee of \$50 on the introduction of a new bill and \$30 for one amending a previous act, did seem to him to be rather high, and the standing rules committee might very well take the question of fees under consideration, and make a suggestion for amendment.

Mr. McGrath suggested that if the bills in question were amendments to acts incorporating the towns of Bathurst or Moncton, they might come at the reduced rate.

Hon. Mr. Byrne said that he was sure hon. members would acquit him of any desire to create difficulty, but he certainly could not put the St. John bill and the Bathurst bill in the same category. The hon. member from the City of St. John (Potts) had complained that he (Byrne) had thrown no light on the discussion, but the House could not expect him to give a decided opinion until he had heard what other hon. members' views on the subject were. It would be absurd to suppose that if a town was incorporated by act of the Legislature they would need to bring in a separate bill to amend every section of the incorporation act as the occasion arose. The present bill before the House relating to the government of the town under the jurisdiction of the town council.

Hon. Mr. Foster suggested that the matter remain in abeyance pending the recommendation of the Standing Rules Committee.

The matter then dropped.

More Enquiries.

Notices of enquiry were given as follows:

By Mr. Smith (Carleton) as to why steps had not been taken to repair the bridge across the Shikhehawk stream, Carleton county. Also as to whether the government intended to proceed with the construction of a bridge between Cliffordvale and Ortonville; and also as to the purchase by the Department of concrete pipes for culverts.

By Mr. Young, as to improvements on the Herron Road, in the Parish of St. Marys.

By Mr. Grimmer as to improvements on the road from St. Andrews to St. Stephen.

By Mr. Hunter, as to the repairs to the Harvey-McAdam road.

Mr. Murray (Kings) introduced a bill to amend the Town's Incorporation Act relating to the Town of Sussex.

Mr. Crockett presented the petition of the City Council of the City of Fredericton in favor of the passage of the bill relating to the said city.

Hon. Mr. Veniot presented the petition of C. O. Foss, H. P. Robinson and Reid McManus, praying for the passage of a bill incorporating the Bathurst Electric Water Power Co.

Mr. Dysart presented the petition of the Richibucto and Rexton Electric Light district commissioners for the passage of a bill to amend the act relating to the said company.

Hon. Mr. Byrne introduced a bill to amend the Schools Act.

Hon. Mr. Robinson introduced a bill to amend the Schools Act relating to the City of Moncton.

Mr. Campbell introduced a bill respecting the assessing and levying of taxes for the City of St. John.

Hon. Mr. Robinson presented the petition of the Moncton Board of School Trustees for the passage of an

act relating to sinking funds. He explained that the trustees wanted authority to purchase Dominion War bonds. As it was a matter of public interest, it might be necessary later to withdraw the bill and pass a general act.

Hon. Mr. Robinson moved that rules 78 and 84 be suspended to permit the introduction of an act relating to the City of Moncton. He explained that the object of the bill was to enable trustees to be appointed to take charge of what is known as the Free Meeting House lot. The grant for this property had been made over a hundred years ago, and a church had been used by different religious organizations.

The trustees passed away some time ago and there was nobody now to look after the property. Notice of the bill had not been published and the petitioners had asked that they be relieved from payment of the fee.

Mr. Grimmer introduced a bill to enable Daniel Edward McKeown, Frances Maria McKeown and William Joseph McKeown to change their names.

Hon. Mr. Robinson in the absence of Hon. Mr. Murray, introduced a bill to amend the Consolidated Statutes respecting the solemnization of marriage.

Hon. Mr. Foster said it had been the custom in past sessions to adjourn the House on Friday evening until the following Monday evening. In view of the fact that Victoria day would fall on Thursday next and make a break in the week, hon. members on both sides had urged the advisability of adjourning over until Tuesday, the 29th. This would enable members who desired to do so to attend the Win the War Convention to open in Montreal on Wednesday of next week. He in-

"SALADA"

Tea is Clean and Free from Dust.

Sealed Packets Only. Refuse Substitutes.

— Black, Green or Mixed —

E 229

giving an expression of opinion on the question.

Mr. Murray (Kings) said he had also been spoken to on the subject of adjournment by hon. members on both sides of the House. He felt satisfied that the public interests would not suffer and gave assurance that there would be no opposition to the proposal from his side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Foster, with the unanimous consent of the House, moved, seconded by Mr. Murray (Kings) the following resolution:

Resolved, that five members of this Legislature be appointed to attend the Win the War Conference in Montreal, three of them to be nominated by the Government and two by the hon. leader of the opposition.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Foster, the House adjourned until Monday evening May 28th, at 8.30.

ITALIANS HAD GREAT SUCCESS

Rome, May 18 (via London).—Austro-Hungarian prisoners taken by the Italians in their offensive on the Julian front are known to number 6,432, says the official statement issued today by the Italian war department.

The communication says that from Tolmino to the sea the artillery was active. Efforts made by the Austro-Hungarians against the new Italian positions on the Vodic and south of Grazigna were repulsed.

The Great Importance of Prohibition!



Hon. Nicholas Iserguine

Inspector of State Savings Banks of Russian Empire states, in regard to effect of Prohibition: "We have about doubled in less than three years the amount accumulated in seventy-three years previous to the outbreak of the war, for our State banks are about seventy-five years old."

Former Ator.-Gen. Baxter in introducing the Prohibition Act said: "I do not think that I need discuss the question of whether Prohibition prohibits. That depends upon you and me. If those in the community who hold the moral forces under their particular care—if they do their duty—if they let petty things go and if they stand back of the men who live under the law and persistently and insistently urge these men to respect the law—for without respect the law becomes of no value whatever—to respect this law as they would any other law, if the moral and social leaders of our country will but rise to the occasion and do their duty, there is no fear but that a prohibitory law, like any other law, can be enforced within the Province of New Brunswick."

Premier Foster

as leader of the Opposition, in speaking of Prohibition said: "That in his opinion the Temperance question is not a question of party politics. Prohibition, after all, affects everyone directly or indirectly and is therefore too big and broad a matter to be dealt with politically. The law is to-day on the Statute Books, and if we are returned to power when May 1st comes the Prohibition bill will be put into effect, and we will enforce it as far as it lies in our power to do so."

In these critical days when governing bodies the world over are imploring everyone to increase production of food, when our armies are crying for men, munitions, ships—when every resource, however small, is a vital asset—waste is intolerable.

New Brunswick stands second to none in her loyalty to the vital cause of the Empire. Of her sacrifices of precious boys, her wealth and resources she is justly proud. With effective Prohibition laws in force throughout the province, she will tolerate no waste due to lax enforcement of Prohibition. Her resolve, however, demands a united public opinion in favor of strictest enforcement.

Help to Enforce Prohibition

The "PIONEER" (published in Toronto) is authority for the statement that in Canada the total value of foodstuffs destroyed by the liquor traffic in 1916 was approximately \$4,244,090.22. Add to this the immense loss of transportation facilities, clogged and hindered by carrying the grain to destruction, and again conveying the product of the breweries and distilleries to make precious men less efficient in this solemn hour!

Russia—

Some idea of the enormous effect of Prohibition is afforded by the wonderful example of Russia. The whole country is "bone dry." The people declare they never will backslide to vodka. In spite of the fact that millions of producers have been in the army the savings of the people enormously increased. In 1912 and 1913 they were saving, per year, about \$20,000,000. In the first five months under Prohibition they saved \$60,000,000. In 1915 the banks took in \$265,000,000. For the first half of 1916, the Russian people saved \$300,000,000!

The shortage of revenue from the tax on vodka is gradually being made up by increase in other revenue, due to the savings and greater efficiency of the people. In spite of the ravages of war there is less begging and misery. "With vodka on her back, she could never

have held the Germans back. Russia has helped to save Europe."

On May 1st 1917, the putting into effect of the Prohibitory Act in New Brunswick placed in our hands a powerful instrument. The success of Prohibition depends upon our use of the instrument, just the same as success in battle depends upon the general's intelligent, vigorous use of his forces.

No matter where you live, whether your district is under the Canada Temperance Act or under the new Prohibitory Act, you are urged to use every legitimate means within your power of support and aid the officers of the law in their sworn duty of enforcement.

Use your influence to build up such a weight of public opinion in favor of strictest enforcement of both the Scott Act and the Prohibitory Act that the success of Province-wide Prohibition will be permanent.

MY TIRED FEET ACHED FOR "TIZ"

Let your sore, swollen, aching feet spread out in a bath of "Tiz."



Just take your shoes off and then put those weary, shoe-crinkled, aching, burning, corn-pestered, bunion-tortured feet of yours in a "Tiz" bath. Your feet will wriggle with joy; they'll look up at you and almost talk and then they'll take another dive in that "Tiz" bath.

When your feet feel like lumps of lead—all tired out—just try "Tiz." It's grand—it's glorious. Your feet will dance with joy; also you will find all pain gone from corns, callouses and bunions.

There's nothing like "Tiz." It's the only remedy that draws out all the poisonous exudations which puff up your feet and cause foot torture.

Get a 25-cent box of "Tiz" at any drug or department store—don't wait. Ah! how glad your feet get; how comfortable your shoes feel. You can wear shoes a size smaller if you desire.

Dominion Temperance Alliance

NEW BRUNSWICK BRANCH

DONALD FRASER, President
Plaster Rock, N.B.

REV. THOS. MARSHALL, Vice-President
Fredericton, N.B.

W. G. CLARK, Treasurer
Fredericton, N.B.

REV. H. C. ARCHER, Executive Secretary
Fredericton, N.B.