

AN UNEXPLAINED INCIDENT

WHERE WAS MR. HARTT, M. P.?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some little time ago I referred to a scheme which was favorably considered by the minister in connection with the sardine fisheries in the counties adjacent to Charlotte. The idea was to give to Canadian buyers of sardines a preference over other buyers. My hon. friend stated that the object was to encourage the establishment of canning interests in Charlotte county promoted by the late Sir William Van Horne. After the decision had been arrived at to impose a condition upon the license that they should give a preference to the Canadian buyers, the resolution of the department was rescinded, and, to use the expression of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) the rescinding "synchronized" with the coming out of the provincial election. Owing to the agitation, I think, decision was suspended, and it never became operative afterwards. I am sorry my hon. friend who represents the county of Charlotte (Mr. Hartt) is not in his place, because I should like to give him an opportunity of explaining a letter which he wrote in this connection, which I propose reading. He wrote the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries approving of this proposed policy, but suggesting that the change when made should be printed in the regulations so as not to attract the attention of the fishermen. My hon. friend did not remember any such letter, but afterwards he was good enough to send me a copy of it. I do not wish to do my hon. friend from Charlotte any injustice and I think it only right that the letter should be placed on Hansard so that the fishermen of Charlotte county may have an opportunity of judging as to the action of the hon. member in that respect, and the hon. member may also have an opportunity of explaining his action, if he desires so to do.

Mr. HAZEN: Did not the hon. member for Charlotte suggest that this be printed in the license so that the fishermen should know it?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If that were so, it would have been a most admirable desire on the part of the hon. member for Charlotte, but his suggestion was that it should be printed in the license so as not to attract the attention of the fishermen. It is a curious letter. Let me read it:

House of Commons, March 2nd, 1912.
A. Johnston, Esq.
Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of February 29th re the proposed change in the wording of "Weir Licenses" received.

I approve of giving buyers for the Canadian sardine factories the second but similar privileges as the buyers of bait.

This will not injure the Canadian fishermen, but will make the supply to Canadian factories more certain. I think new licenses should be printed including this provision, and as licenses are not in the hands of fishermen yet, there must be time to make the change, and licenses that are in the hands of fishery inspectors I hope can be recalled and the new form sent out.

Please let me know if this can be done. I know the fishermen will pay less attention to the change if done in this way.
Yours truly,
T. A. HARTT.

What does that mean?

Mr. HAZEN: Does it mean that this being printed in the license, and the fishermen seeing it there will recognize it as being correct, whereas, if it is not in the license, they will imagine something is being done which is improper and against their interests, and will suspect it is desired to keep them in the dark about it? That is what Mr. Hartt tells me he meant by it—that he wanted the greatest publicity given to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hartt) has stated that it should be printed in the license, and he says:

I know the fishermen will pay less attention to the change, if done in this way. If it is printed in the license they will pay less attention to the change.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman is attaching to the word "attention" a different meaning from what the hon. member (Mr. Hartt) intended. What he meant to convey was that if this is printed in the license the fisherman will see it at once when he gets his license, he will know what the conditions are, and therefore it will give him less trouble, annoyance or worry than if this is not done later on when his attention is called to it in some other way. The word "attention" is being used in one sense by the hon. member for Charlotte and in another by my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. PUGSLEY: What other word would convey what was meant?

Mr. HAZEN: Perhaps he meant to say "disturbed" or something of that sort. I think I would have phrased it differently.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would be "disturbed" less?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Well I think that is about what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hartt) meant. He meant that if it was printed in the license the fisherman would not realize that it had been done and

there would be less dissatisfaction among them. It would not attract their attention. But the word "attention" is an ordinary English word the meaning of which is very well understood.

Mr. HAZEN: I think it is a most extraordinary thing to argue that the writer of the letter meant that it would not attract their attention so much if it was right there in the license where they could see it. Surely it was the very thing that would attract their attention.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But if it were interlined the fishermen would see that the minister meant imposing upon them the obligation to give Sir William Van Horne's canning industry the first right to buy. In other words, the policy which my right hon. friend determined upon at the request of Sir William Van Horne was that the fishermen would proceed with their catch first to the American buyers and if the Americans offered \$4 per hoghead, Sir William Van Horne's company would say that they would give \$4 and then the fishermen would be obliged to sell to Sir William Van Horne's company. In a few years the result would be that the American buyers would be driven out of the market completely and the fishermen would be at the mercy of Sir William Van Horne's company.

Mr. NESBITT: Would they be obliged to sell?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes, obliged to sell to the Van Horne Company at whatever price the American buyer would offer. Right up to time the fish are actually taken off, the Van Horne Company had to have the first right, just as it was also provided with respect to bait. Such a condition was to remain in full force until the fish were taken from the weir and unloaded from the licensees' boats to the boats of the buyer. So that the fishermen were placed absolutely at the mercy of Sir William Van Horne's company. The fishermen were greatly opposed to it. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Hartt) saw, as a sensible man, that it would be opposed by the fishermen. He was so anxious to encourage the establishment of Sir William Van Horne's canning industry that he favored the change, and he requested the deputy minister to see that the license was changed, and that the change should be actually printed in the license and not interlined as he believed it would attract less attention from the fishermen. He says:

I think new licenses should be printed including this provision, and as licenses are not in the hands of the fishermen yet, there must be time to make the change, and licenses that are in the hands of fishery inspectors, I hope, can be recalled and the new forms sent out. Please let me know if this can be done. I know the

fishermen will pay less attention to the change, if done in this way.

Mr. HAZEN: It is that regulation still in force?

Mr. HAZEN: No, it never was in force.—House of Commons Debates, August 6, 1917.

CANADIAN DAIRY STATISTICS

Ottawa, August 9, 1917. In a press bulletin issued to-day the Census and Statistics Office reports on the total production of butter and cheese in the creameries and cheese factories of Canada for the year 1916, as compared with 1915, the report being based upon returns collected from the dairying branches of the Provincial Departments of Agriculture. The figures for 1915 represent approximate estimates, as the returns for that year are not quite complete. The total number of Creameries and Cheese Factories operating in 1916 is reported as 3,446, including 993 creameries, 1,813 cheese factories, 624 combined factories, 624 combined factories (cheese and butter) and 16 condensed milk factories. The total number of patrons contributing to creameries and cheese factories during the year 1916 was 221,192, the deliveries of milk amounting to 2,600,842,987 lb., and of cream to 157,020,636 lb. The two chief dairying provinces of the Dominion are Ontario and Quebec. Both manufacture cheese and butter: in Ontario more cheese is made than butter; in Quebec more butter is made than cheese. In Ontario the total number of establish-

ments operating in 1916 was 1,165 and the patrons numbered 87,885, whilst in Quebec the establishments numbered 1,984 and the patrons 79,145; so that the average number of patrons per establishment was 75 in Ontario and 40 in Quebec.

PRODUCTION AND VALUE OF CREAMERY BUTTER

The total production of creamery butter in Canada in 1916 is returned as 82,664,130 lb. of the value of \$26,966,357, as compared with 83,824,176 lb. of the value of \$24,368,636 in 1915. Comparing the relative production of the provinces the production in 1916 is highest in Quebec with 34,323,276 lb. of the value of \$11,516,148, as compared with 34,680,109 lb. of the value of \$8,031,998 in Ontario. These two provinces together produce about 70 p. c. of the total creamery butter of Canada. Of the other provinces the production and value of creamery butter in 1916 were in relative order as follows: Alberta 8,521,784 lb., value \$2,619,248; Manitoba 6,574,510 lb., value \$2,038,109; Saskatchewan 4,810,660, value \$1,338,180; Nova Scotia 1,586,679 lb., value \$505,000; British Columbia 1,243,292, value \$497,316; New Brunswick 790,832 lb., value \$236,294; and Prince Edward Island 613,880 lb., value \$184,154. The average price per lb. of creamery butter for all Canada works out to 33 cents in 1916 as compared with 30 cents in 1915. By provinces in 1916 the highest price was in British Columbia 42 cents and the lowest in Prince Edward Island 30 cents. In the other provinces the price per lb. for 1916 was as follows: Nova Scotia 32 cents; Quebec 34 cents; New Brunswick 33 cents; Ontario 33 cents; the prairie provinces 31 cents.

PRODUCTION AND VALUE OF FACTORY CHEESE

The total production of factory cheese in 1916 was 192,968,597 lb., of the value of \$67,887,775 in 1915. By provinces the total production in 1916 is taken by Ontario with a total quantity in 1916 of 126,015,870 lb. of the value of \$23,312,935. Quebec being second with 61,905,750 lb. of the value of \$11,245,105. These two provinces together account for 98 p. c. of the total production of factory cheese. The production and value of factory cheese in the other provinces in 1916 were as follows: Prince Edward Island 2,121,736 lb., value \$409,495; New Brunswick 1,185,664 lb., value \$210,692; Manitoba 880,728 lb., value \$158,931; Alberta 745,122 lb., value \$154,454; Nova Scotia 54,727, value \$16,959 and British Columbia 38,000 lb., value \$3,960. The average price per lb. of factory cheese for all Canada works out to 21 cents in 1916 as compared with 17 cents in 1915. In 1916 the average price is highest in British Columbia, 25 cents, in Quebec and Ontario the average price is 18 cents and in Alberta it is 21 cents.

Preserved Raspberries will keep their natural color if you use




Lantic Sugar
"Pure and Unaltered"
the "fine" cane sugar which dissolves at once. Order by name in original packages.

PRODUCTION AND VALUE OF CREAMERY BUTTER

The total production of creamery butter in Canada in 1916 is returned as 82,664,130 lb. of the value of \$26,966,357, as compared with 83,824,176 lb. of the value of \$24,368,636 in 1915. Comparing the relative production of the provinces the production in 1916 is highest in Quebec with 34,323,276 lb. of the value of \$11,516,148, as compared with 34,680,109 lb. of the value of \$8,031,998 in Ontario. These two provinces together produce about 70 p. c. of the total creamery butter of Canada. Of the other provinces the production and value of creamery butter in 1916 were in relative order as follows: Alberta 8,521,784 lb., value \$2,619,248; Manitoba 6,574,510 lb., value \$2,038,109; Saskatchewan 4,810,660, value \$1,338,180; Nova Scotia 1,586,679 lb., value \$505,000; British Columbia 1,243,292, value \$497,316; New Brunswick 790,832 lb., value \$236,294; and Prince Edward Island 613,880 lb., value \$184,154. The average price per lb. of creamery butter for all Canada works out to 33 cents in 1916 as compared with 30 cents in 1915. By provinces in 1916 the highest price was in British Columbia 42 cents and the lowest in Prince Edward Island 30 cents. In the other provinces the price per lb. for 1916 was as follows: Nova Scotia 32 cents; Quebec 34 cents; New Brunswick 33 cents; Ontario 33 cents; the prairie provinces 31 cents.

PRODUCTION AND VALUE OF FACTORY CHEESE

The total production of factory cheese in 1916 was 192,968,597 lb., of the value of \$67,887,775 in 1915. By provinces the total production in 1916 is taken by Ontario with a total quantity in 1916 of 126,015,870 lb. of the value of \$23,312,935. Quebec being second with 61,905,750 lb. of the value of \$11,245,105. These two provinces together account for 98 p. c. of the total production of factory cheese. The production and value of factory cheese in the other provinces in 1916 were as follows: Prince Edward Island 2,121,736 lb., value \$409,495; New Brunswick 1,185,664 lb., value \$210,692; Manitoba 880,728 lb., value \$158,931; Alberta 745,122 lb., value \$154,454; Nova Scotia 54,727, value \$16,959 and British Columbia 38,000 lb., value \$3,960. The average price per lb. of factory cheese for all Canada works out to 21 cents in 1916 as compared with 17 cents in 1915. In 1916 the average price is highest in British Columbia, 25 cents, in Quebec and Ontario the average price is 18 cents and in Alberta it is 21 cents.

No Dentist
In Saint Andrews During Winter Months

DR. WORRELL has decided to close his office in Saint Andrews on or about October 1st, probably until about May 1st, 1918.

He therefore invites all his patients who have not been recently attended to, to come in at the earliest opportunity and have their teeth examined and attended to if necessary, in order to avoid suffering or inconvenience during his absence.

Do not wait until the last week in September and then expect to get fixed up, but come in while the coming is good.

J. F. WORRELL, D.D.S.
Office in Residence
Montague and Princess Royal Streets
TELEPHONE 33-11

KENNEDY'S HOTEL
St. Andrews, N. B.
A. KENNEDY & SON, PROPRIETORS

Beautifully Situated on Water Front. Near Trains and Steamboats.
All Rooms Steam Heated and supplied with Hot and Cold Running Water.

RATES—\$2.50 to \$3.00 per day. Special rates by the week.

THE ROYAL HOTEL
LEADING HOTEL AT
ST. JOHN, N. B.


Conducted on European Plan in Most Modern and Approved Manner
NEW GARDEN RESTAURANT
200 Rooms 75 With Bath

THE RAYMOND & DOHERTY CO., PROP.

YES

if You Need a PUMP For Any Purpose We Can Supply You

T. McAvity & Sons, Ltd.
ST. JOHN, N. B.



THE GUARANTEE of quality that goes with every package of KING COLE TEA, is as binding to-day as it was in days before the war.

It COMPELS us to give the same exacting care in the selection and blending of teas used in each grade of KING COLE.

THE GUARANTEE is plainly printed on every KING COLE package and it is the most positive assurance of high quality that the buyer can possibly have, for it provides redress if for ANY reason there should be dissatisfaction.

The different grades of KING COLE TEA are—

Crimson Label	- - - Today's Retail price	55c.
Green Label	- - - " " "	60c.
Blue Label	- - - " " "	65c.
Gold Label	- - - " " "	75c.
King Cole Orange Pekoe	- - - " " "	70c.

Prices may change up or down owing to market conditions but the QUALITY of each grade must be maintained at the same ORIGINAL STANDARD.

See that you get the grade you want

G. E. BARBOUR COMPANY, LIMITED
ST. JOHN, N. B.

Advertising Pays---Try a Beacon Adv.