

To Arrange a Conference

City Council Wish to Meet the Port Angeles Ferry Promoters.

Company Wish to Withdraw Their Offer—Aldermen Modify Conditions.

Major Williams's Clover Point Range Plan Agreed to—An Appointment.

The feature of last night's meeting of the city council was the decision to invite the promoters of the Port Angeles ferry scheme to a conference for the purpose of arranging some terms of mutual satisfaction, or at least of arriving at a joint understanding. This ensued upon the receipt of a letter from President Cushing, of the Port Angeles Eastern Railroad Company, informing the council that the company could not accept the proposals contained in the by-law as so far amended.

Mr. Cushing's letter is printed in full in another column, and it made a deep impression on some of the aldermen, who expressed the opinion after the meeting was over that the letter contained more arguments than had yet been advanced.

Mr. R. H. Sperling received the appointment of electric wiring inspector under the newly adopted by-law.

All the aldermen had arrived at 8:10 when the mayor called upon the clerk for the minutes of the previous meeting; City Solicitor C. Dubois Mason and his partner, J. M. Bradburn, being also in attendance.

The minutes duly read and adopted on motion of Ald. Stewart and Humphrey, the council proceeded to the first order of business, communications, the first letter coming from Mr. H. M. Graham, agent for the Douglas estate, who called the council's attention to the

Condition of Cook Street from Fairfeld road to Dallas road. Mr. Graham pointed out that the property of the Douglas estate in that locality is assessed at \$100,000, and the annual taxes are \$1,120. The writer thought some portion, at least, of the revenue obtained from the property should be expended on the street.

Ald. Humphrey thought it had been decided to repair a portion of the street already, and it would not cost much more to repair it all. He moved to refer the letter to the city engineer for report and the motion carried.

Educating Deaf Mutes.
Secretary Frank H. Eaton, of the board of school trustees, replied to a communication from the council in regard to the education of deaf mutes, the matter having been brought up by an application from Miss Helen Willard Merritt for some financial aid to her school. The trustees thought the council would be justified in making a grant of \$100 for the support of the school until December 31st, the school to be conducted under the supervision of the trustees.

They also expressed the opinion that the amount now expended by the provincial government in the education of our deaf mutes in schools in other provinces would be quite enough to support a school in which all the deaf mutes in British Columbia should be educated. The trustees recommended the council to urge this on the government.

Ald. Stewart moved that \$100 be granted for the support of Miss Merritt's school, but the mayor thought the letter should go to the finance committee. Ald. Stewart moved in that direction, and Ald. Macgregor seconded the motion carried. Ald. Humphrey expressing the opinion that the proper way would be to instruct the trustees to expend \$100 on this purpose rather than hand the amount to any other person.

Port Angeles Ferry.
The following letter was then read:
Victoria, Oct. 23, 1899.

To His Worship the Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Victoria:
Gentlemen—I take this opportunity of informing you that the by-law now pending before you in relation to the Victoria and Port Angeles ferry, as amended and altered by you, cannot be accepted by us, and that further action by you in relation to the same would be useless, as far as we are concerned. We feel, however, that a proper respect for your honorable body and for those good citizens of your city who have unflinchingly borne the burden of advocating and representing the proposition demands from us at least a brief statement of the reasons and causes which at this time impel us to take the stand we do.

Some time ago it was deemed advisable by certain of your citizens and ratepayers to communicate with us as to the probability of procuring a car ferry and steamer connection between this city and the city of Port Angeles to connect with the Port Angeles Eastern Railroad. This led to a definite proposition by us to build and equip such vessels and make one trip daily between these two points, guaranteeing a continental connection via Port Angeles and Olympia, for a subsidy of \$17,500 per year for a period of 20 years.

A public meeting was called by your citizens to discuss the proposition, with the result that it was unanimously endorsed. A petition was duly signed by more than 10 per cent. of the ratepayers praying your honorable body to introduce a by-law embodying the proposition so endorsed, and in accordance with the prayer of the petition such a by-law was introduced, and at the present time it, or rather its mutilated remains, is in the hands of the committee, so altered and amended as not to be recognizable as the proposition we made, or as the by-law petitioned for by the ratepayers.

We feel that before closing this communication we should briefly refer to a few of

the amendments that you have seen fit to make.
First, you cut the subsidy down one-half; this is not the time or place for us to show that our proposition was a liberal one; that matter was considered by the ratepayers when they endorsed the proposition. Suffice for us to say at this time that we made no proposition to give this service and connection for the sum of \$5,750, and the ratepayers did not petition for the introduction of such a by-law. The next amendment requires us to make two trips daily with the passenger steamer, instead of one as contained in our proposition, and as contemplated by the by-law petitioned for by the ratepayers. That is also what you cut the subsidy in two, and then you double the service. It goes without saying that a steamer company will make as many trips as will pay, but to be compelled to make two daily trips without regard to whether or not the business demands it, is certainly an onerous exaction. We would be only too willing to make two or three trips daily if the business would warrant it, but we cannot be bound to do so, without regard to the demands of the traffic. We made no such proposition; the ratepayers petitioned for no such by-law, and we are compelled to reject it.

The next amendment is that the steamer and the car ferry shall be built in Victoria. We feel that the steamer which supported this amendment have not fully considered the sweeping effect of its provisions. It lacks all the elements of a business proposition. The by-law provides that the steamer shall be built in Victoria within one year from a certain date of this year. It also provides that a failure on our part to have the steamer running by that time shall work a forfeiture of the subsidy. The amendment limits us to the shipbuilders and foundries of Victoria.

Assuming that the shipyards and foundries of this city are equipped to build such vessels, what is the result of this amendment? We are simply at the mercy of the shipbuilders; they can charge us what they please; they have, under this amendment, an iron-rod monopoly. To earn this subsidy we have within a limited time to provide and have running two steamers—one a car ferry and the other a steamer of a high rate of speed, and both to be built in this city.

What is to hinder these shipbuilders from demanding from us and enforcing their demand, whatever price they please? Absolutely nothing. Again, it is usual to demand from the shipbuilders a bond for the faithful performance of the contract according to the plans and specifications within the time provided. Could we make any such demand from the shipbuilders of Victoria? They would simply laugh at us, and point to our amendment and tell us with we had not give them the right to demand any bond; in other words, they could charge us what they please, and give us any old thing for a vessel, and we have to submit.

Gentlemen, it is not in accordance with our business methods, and all deference to the opinions of the mover and supporters of this amendment, we beg leave to doubt that it is not in accordance with any known business methods. We therefore respectfully decline the amendment and reject the by-law as so altered.

In conclusion, it is a matter of sincere regret to us that we are compelled through your actions to take this step. We believe—mistakenly, it may be—that the people of this city desire this connection. We are desirous to cultivate closer relations with you, believing that it would be mutually beneficial. We believe that your citizens, if given the opportunity, would have so expressed themselves.

In any event, the matter would have been decided. You have come to a different conclusion, and it is not for us to say nay. We feel that the majority of your gentlemen are opposed to this by-law; that the amendments as far as concerned us, are utterly destructive of our proposition; that we are in the position of guests who are in danger of outstaying their welcome. We therefore, while it is time, withdraw, thanking you one and all for the attention you have devoted to this matter.

Respectfully yours,
C. A. CUSHING,
President Port Angeles Eastern Railroad.

Ald. Hayward said that when the first clause of the by-law came before the committee, it was decided the subsidy should be \$5,500. That was a practical business decision, and Ald. Hayward took it to mean that the council contemplated the remainder of the by-law being taken as it stood. The council, however, after cutting the subsidy in two, had doubled the service to be provided, and made other onerous conditions which made it impossible for the promoters to accept the proposal. It was apparently unanimously agreed by the aldermen that the connection is worth something, and Ald. Hayward thought it would be in the interest of the ratepayers if the council arranged for a conference with the promoters of the ferry scheme.

Ald. Beckwith made a long speech, the tenor of which was that Ald. Hayward should inform the council what authority he had for the statement that the promoters were willing to accept less than the amount mentioned in the original by-law. Ald. Macgregor seconded the motion, but did not know whether any good would come of the proposal to hold a conference. The members of the council are so far apart on the question he was afraid it was impossible for them to come together. The people are more in favor of the by-law than the aldermen.

Ald. Beckwith made a long speech, the tenor of which was that Ald. Hayward should inform the council what authority he had for the statement that the promoters were willing to accept less than the amount mentioned in the original by-law. Ald. Macgregor seconded the motion, but did not know whether any good would come of the proposal to hold a conference. The members of the council are so far apart on the question he was afraid it was impossible for them to come together. The people are more in favor of the by-law than the aldermen.

Ald. Hayward said his statement was based on good authority. He had reason to believe the promoters would accept \$12,500 a year, and it would be remembered that his own estimate of the value of the service was \$10,000, but he had no reason to believe the promoters would accept that sum. He had the best of reasons to believe they would have accepted \$12,500.

Ald. Beckwith moved and Ald. Brydon seconded an amendment to receive and file the communication, the latter saying the promoters of the scheme evidently thought the council should accept the by-law just as it was submitted, without any amendment. That was with inference to be taken from Mr. Cushing's letter.

"He seems to regard the people of Victoria as rogues and thieves," indignantly said Ald. Brydon, in answer to an interjected remark by Ald. Hayward.

"Address the chair," Alderman Brydon, said the mayor, and Ald. Williams rose to ask whether his worship thought Ald. Brydon was speaking to the aldermen when he said rogues and thieves, whereat the council laughed.

Ald. Macgregor said it was enlightening and informing the aldermen wanted, they should certainly willingly agree to the proposed conference. They could then ask the promoters all the questions they wish and it could hardly be possible that the council was sincere in their really needed light and yet defeated the proposal made by Ald. Hayward. Ald. Macgregor mentioned incidentally that it is an open question whether the council has the authority to reduce the proposed subsidy. He had the opinion of a very able lawyer to the effect that they had no such authority.

Ald. Beckwith said if the conference were to result in so much information being obtained, he would be willing to enable them to ascertain from what source Ald. Hayward derived his authority for saying the promoters would accept a substantial reduction.

Ald. Hayward was surprised that Ald. Beckwith should so frequently refer to that subject. If Ald. Beckwith really wished to know the authority Ald. Hayward had no objection to giving it to him for his private information, but was not prepared to do so. There were two cases of conversation he had during the week.

Ald. Kinsman wanted to know whether, if the amendment carried, the council could vote on the proposed change of the by-law, and the general opinion was in the affirmative.

Ald. Hayward could not understand why Ald. Beckwith should oppose holding a conference. There were two cases of conversation he had during the week.

Ald. Brydon asked the city solicitor, through his worship, whether the council had the right to change the amount of the bonus contemplated by the by-law.

Ald. Hayward's motion looking to a conference was carried by a vote which appeared to be 11 to 4. The affirmative vote was 11, the negative being Ald. Beckwith and Brydon. Ald. Beckwith denied, however, having cast his vote against the motion, and a second show of hands being taken it was found that he was not therefor counted in the affirmative. Ald. Hayward was desirous that Ald. Beckwith should be shown on the minutes as not having voted, but the mayor could find no authority for this discrimination.

It was informally agreed that the date of the proposed conference be left open for future arrangement.

Electric Wiring Inspection.
R. H. Sperling, a candidate for the position of electric wiring inspector, wrote to the council as far as concerned his appointment. He wishes to state that he is willing to make the necessary inspection provided by the by-law at half the rates contemplated by the schedule.

Accompanying this was a letter from Mr. Humphrey, the contractor for the Electric Light Company, who stated that his company is willing to pay one-half the cost of the necessary inspection, the consumer paying the other half.

Both letters were received and filed.

Sauce for the Goose.
Mr. Whitaker, the Government street barber, called the attention of the council to the fact that the barber's pole in front of his premises has been removed because of the exigencies of sidewalk repair. He asked permission to erect a new one, in the same position in the permanent sidewalk.

This was a question no alderman seemed desirous of tackling; it being evident that the general desire was to accommodate Mr. Whitaker. Finally Ald. Humphrey said he was afraid the council had no authority to do so. Mr. Whitaker as to everyone else. He moved that the writer be informed that no poles can be allowed in the permanent sidewalks.

Ald. Stewart seconded the motion, saying that while he would very much like to oblige Mr. Whitaker, they could not say "yes" to him and "no" to everyone else.

Engineer's Report.
City Engineer Topp reported as follows, the report being taken up clause by clause:
1. Re letter from Messrs. R. Porter & Sons, asking for a stone crossing at the intersection of Courtney and Government streets. Recommending that the work be done at an estimate cost of \$25, exclusive of stone on hand. Adopted.

2. Re Mr. A. T. Goward's request that guard rails be laid on Rock Bay bridge. This is much needed and should be provided; estimated cost \$90, the question of who shall bear the expense being left to the council.

The mayor said the rail was partly for the benefit of the company.

Ald. Humphrey thought the company should bear the cost; the rail is needed only for their traffic.

The council recommended the council that guard rails had generally been paid for by the Tramway Co. The one on James Bay bridge was an exception, but that was an oversight. He moved that the Tramway Co be requested to immediately lay the necessary guard rail, at their own expense. Adopted.

3. Re application for stone crossing at westerly junction of Broughton and Government streets, to complete the permanent sidewalk work. Recommended this be done; estimated cost \$30, exclusive of stone on hand. Adopted.

A Petition.
F. W. Vincent and 53 others called at

the council, and the mayor, and Ald. Williams rose to ask whether his worship thought Ald. Brydon was speaking to the aldermen when he said rogues and thieves, whereat the council laughed.

Ald. Macgregor said it was enlightening and informing the aldermen wanted, they should certainly willingly agree to the proposed conference. They could then ask the promoters all the questions they wish and it could hardly be possible that the council was sincere in their really needed light and yet defeated the proposal made by Ald. Hayward.

Ald. Macgregor mentioned incidentally that it is an open question whether the council has the authority to reduce the proposed subsidy. He had the opinion of a very able lawyer to the effect that they had no such authority.

Ald. Beckwith said if the conference were to result in so much information being obtained, he would be willing to enable them to ascertain from what source Ald. Hayward derived his authority for saying the promoters would accept a substantial reduction.

Ald. Hayward was surprised that Ald. Beckwith should so frequently refer to that subject. If Ald. Beckwith really wished to know the authority Ald. Hayward had no objection to giving it to him for his private information, but was not prepared to do so.

Ald. Brydon asked the city solicitor, through his worship, whether the council had the right to change the amount of the bonus contemplated by the by-law.

Ald. Hayward's motion looking to a conference was carried by a vote which appeared to be 11 to 4. The affirmative vote was 11, the negative being Ald. Beckwith and Brydon. Ald. Beckwith denied, however, having cast his vote against the motion, and a second show of hands being taken it was found that he was not therefor counted in the affirmative.

Ald. Hayward was desirous that Ald. Beckwith should be shown on the minutes as not having voted, but the mayor could find no authority for this discrimination.

It was informally agreed that the date of the proposed conference be left open for future arrangement.

Electric Wiring Inspection.
R. H. Sperling, a candidate for the position of electric wiring inspector, wrote to the council as far as concerned his appointment. He wishes to state that he is willing to make the necessary inspection provided by the by-law at half the rates contemplated by the schedule.

Accompanying this was a letter from Mr. Humphrey, the contractor for the Electric Light Company, who stated that his company is willing to pay one-half the cost of the necessary inspection, the consumer paying the other half.

Both letters were received and filed.

Sauce for the Goose.
Mr. Whitaker, the Government street barber, called the attention of the council to the fact that the barber's pole in front of his premises has been removed because of the exigencies of sidewalk repair. He asked permission to erect a new one, in the same position in the permanent sidewalk.

This was a question no alderman seemed desirous of tackling; it being evident that the general desire was to accommodate Mr. Whitaker. Finally Ald. Humphrey said he was afraid the council had no authority to do so.

Mr. Whitaker as to everyone else. He moved that the writer be informed that no poles can be allowed in the permanent sidewalks.

Ald. Stewart seconded the motion, saying that while he would very much like to oblige Mr. Whitaker, they could not say "yes" to him and "no" to everyone else.

Engineer's Report.
City Engineer Topp reported as follows, the report being taken up clause by clause:
1. Re letter from Messrs. R. Porter & Sons, asking for a stone crossing at the intersection of Courtney and Government streets. Recommending that the work be done at an estimate cost of \$25, exclusive of stone on hand. Adopted.

2. Re Mr. A. T. Goward's request that guard rails be laid on Rock Bay bridge. This is much needed and should be provided; estimated cost \$90, the question of who shall bear the expense being left to the council.

The mayor said the rail was partly for the benefit of the company.

Ald. Humphrey thought the company should bear the cost; the rail is needed only for their traffic.

The council recommended the council that guard rails had generally been paid for by the Tramway Co. The one on James Bay bridge was an exception, but that was an oversight. He moved that the Tramway Co be requested to immediately lay the necessary guard rail, at their own expense. Adopted.

3. Re application for stone crossing at westerly junction of Broughton and Government streets, to complete the permanent sidewalk work. Recommended this be done; estimated cost \$30, exclusive of stone on hand. Adopted.

A Petition.
F. W. Vincent and 53 others called at

the council, and the mayor, and Ald. Williams rose to ask whether his worship thought Ald. Brydon was speaking to the aldermen when he said rogues and thieves, whereat the council laughed.

Ald. Macgregor said it was enlightening and informing the aldermen wanted, they should certainly willingly agree to the proposed conference. They could then ask the promoters all the questions they wish and it could hardly be possible that the council was sincere in their really needed light and yet defeated the proposal made by Ald. Hayward.

Ald. Macgregor mentioned incidentally that it is an open question whether the council has the authority to reduce the proposed subsidy. He had the opinion of a very able lawyer to the effect that they had no such authority.

Ald. Beckwith said if the conference were to result in so much information being obtained, he would be willing to enable them to ascertain from what source Ald. Hayward derived his authority for saying the promoters would accept a substantial reduction.

Ald. Hayward was surprised that Ald. Beckwith should so frequently refer to that subject. If Ald. Beckwith really wished to know the authority Ald. Hayward had no objection to giving it to him for his private information, but was not prepared to do so.

Ald. Brydon asked the city solicitor, through his worship, whether the council had the right to change the amount of the bonus contemplated by the by-law.

Ald. Hayward's motion looking to a conference was carried by a vote which appeared to be 11 to 4. The affirmative vote was 11, the negative being Ald. Beckwith and Brydon. Ald. Beckwith denied, however, having cast his vote against the motion, and a second show of hands being taken it was found that he was not therefor counted in the affirmative.

Ald. Hayward was desirous that Ald. Beckwith should be shown on the minutes as not having voted, but the mayor could find no authority for this discrimination.

It was informally agreed that the date of the proposed conference be left open for future arrangement.

Electric Wiring Inspection.
R. H. Sperling, a candidate for the position of electric wiring inspector, wrote to the council as far as concerned his appointment. He wishes to state that he is willing to make the necessary inspection provided by the by-law at half the rates contemplated by the schedule.

Accompanying this was a letter from Mr. Humphrey, the contractor for the Electric Light Company, who stated that his company is willing to pay one-half the cost of the necessary inspection, the consumer paying the other half.

Both letters were received and filed.

Sauce for the Goose.
Mr. Whitaker, the Government street barber, called the attention of the council to the fact that the barber's pole in front of his premises has been removed because of the exigencies of sidewalk repair. He asked permission to erect a new one, in the same position in the permanent sidewalk.

This was a question no alderman seemed desirous of tackling; it being evident that the general desire was to accommodate Mr. Whitaker. Finally Ald. Humphrey said he was afraid the council had no authority to do so.

Mr. Whitaker as to everyone else. He moved that the writer be informed that no poles can be allowed in the permanent sidewalks.

Ald. Stewart seconded the motion, saying that while he would very much like to oblige Mr. Whitaker, they could not say "yes" to him and "no" to everyone else.

Engineer's Report.
City Engineer Topp reported as follows, the report being taken up clause by clause:
1. Re letter from Messrs. R. Porter & Sons, asking for a stone crossing at the intersection of Courtney and Government streets. Recommending that the work be done at an estimate cost of \$25, exclusive of stone on hand. Adopted.

2. Re Mr. A. T. Goward's request that guard rails be laid on Rock Bay bridge. This is much needed and should be provided; estimated cost \$90, the question of who shall bear the expense being left to the council.

The mayor said the rail was partly for the benefit of the company.

Ald. Humphrey thought the company should bear the cost; the rail is needed only for their traffic.

The council recommended the council that guard rails had generally been paid for by the Tramway Co. The one on James Bay bridge was an exception, but that was an oversight. He moved that the Tramway Co be requested to immediately lay the necessary guard rail, at their own expense. Adopted.

3. Re application for stone crossing at westerly junction of Broughton and Government streets, to complete the permanent sidewalk work. Recommended this be done; estimated cost \$30, exclusive of stone on hand. Adopted.

A Petition.
F. W. Vincent and 53 others called at

the council, and the mayor, and Ald. Williams rose to ask whether his worship thought Ald. Brydon was speaking to the aldermen when he said rogues and thieves, whereat the council laughed.

Ald. Macgregor said it was enlightening and informing the aldermen wanted, they should certainly willingly agree to the proposed conference. They could then ask the promoters all the questions they wish and it could hardly be possible that the council was sincere in their really needed light and yet defeated the proposal made by Ald. Hayward.

Ald. Macgregor mentioned incidentally that it is an open question whether the council has the authority to reduce the proposed subsidy. He had the opinion of a very able lawyer to the effect that they had no such authority.

What is CASTORIA

Castoria is for Infants and Children. Castoria is a harmless substitute for Castor Oil, Paregoric, Drops and Soothing Syrups. It contains neither Opium, Morphine nor other Narcotic substance. It is Pleasant. Its guarantee is thirty years' use by Millions of Mothers. Castoria destroys Worms and allays Feverishness. Castoria cures Diarrhoea and Wind Colic. Castoria relieves Teething Troubles, cures Constipation and Flatulency. Castoria assimilates the Food, regulates the Stomach and Bowels of Infants and Children, giving healthy and natural sleep. Castoria is the Children's Panacea—The Mother's Friend.

Castoria is an excellent medicine for children. Mothers have repeatedly told me of its good effect upon their children." DR. G. C. OSOOND, Lowell, Mass.

Castoria is so well adapted to children that I recommend it as superior to any prescription known to me." H. A. ARCHER, M. D. Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE FAC-SIMILE SIGNATURE OF



APPEARS ON EVERY WRAPPER.

THE MARKETS.
(Revised every Wednesday.)

There is little change in the local markets this week, prices remaining at about the old figures. The ruling prices are:

The following are the ruling prices:

Wheat (whole), per ton	27.50	25.00
Graze		
Wheat, per ton	27.50	25.00
Graze (whole), per ton	27.00	24.50
Graze (cracked), per ton	27.00	24.50
Oats, per ton	28.00	25.50
Onions, per lb. bulk	40¢	35
Boiled oats (B. & K.), 70 sack	94	80
Feed—		
Hay (baled), per 100 lbs.	13.00	12.00
Straw, per bush	50¢	45
Middings, per ton	22.00	21.00
Bran, per ton	22.00	21.00
Ground feed, per ton	25.00	24.00
Vegetables—		
Potatoes (new), per 100 lbs.	1.00¢	1.15
Watermelon, per bunch	40¢	35
Cabbage, per lb.	10¢	9
Carrots, per bunch	10¢	9
Onions (pickling), per lb.	8¢	4
Gherkins, per lb.	3¢	5
Tomatoes, per lb.	1¢	1
Beans, per 5 lbs.	25	25
Peas, per 5 lbs.	25	25
Cucumbers, Island, 3 for	10	10
Cucumbers, Cal., per doz.	25	25
Radiishes, 2 bunches for	5	5
Cauliflower, per doz.	12	12
Turnips, per lb.	2	2
Fish—		
Salmon (smoked), per lb.	15	15
Salmon (spring), per lb.	8¢	10
Oysters (Olympian), per pt.	50	50
Oysters (Eastern), per lb.	50	50
Cod, per lb.	8	8
Haddock, per lb.	6	6
Herring, per lb.	6	6
Smelts, per lb.	10	10
Crabs, 3 for	25	25
Farm Produce—		
Eggs (Manitoba), per doz.	25	25
Eggs (Island, fresh), per doz.	40	40
Butter (Delta creamery),	15¢	30
Best dairy, per lb.	15¢	30
Butter (Covilian creamery),	15¢	30
Cheese (Canadian), per lb.	15¢	20
Lard, per lb.	12½¢	15
Meats—		
Hams (American), per lb.	17	17
Hams (Canadian), per lb.	15	15
Bacon (American), per lb.	15	15
Bacon (Canadian), per lb.	14¢	16
Bacon (rolled), per lb.	12	12
Beef (round), per lb.	12	12
Beef (leg), per lb.	10	10
Beef (flank), per lb.	8	8
Mutton, per lb.	10	10
Veal, per lb.	12	12
Pork, per lb.	10	10
Fruit—		
Bananas, per dozen	20¢	40
Lemons (California), per doz.	20¢	25
Lemons (small), per doz.	10¢	15
Valencia oranges, per doz.	25	35
Apples, per box	1.10¢	1.25
Pineapples, per crate	75¢	1.00
Pears, 5 lbs. for	25	25
Grapes, per lb.	10	10
Blackberries, per lb.	15	15
Peaches, per lb.	15	15
Cranberries, per lb.	12½	12½
Poultry—		
Dressed fowl (per		