

SUGAR CRISP Corn Flakes

11c PACKAGE
TRY A CASE OF 36 PACKAGES
\$3.50.

ORANGES

NICE SWEET JUICY ORANGES
30c Dozen.

Best Large Lemons
35c Dozen.

Large Red Apples
6 for 25c.

DOM. SHORTENING

1 lb. Blocks 20c lb.
3 lb. Pail 54c.
5 lb. Pail 90c.
10 lb. Pail \$1.70
20 lb. Pail \$3.20

Pure Lard, 1 lb blocks,
25c lb.

SOAPS

FOR HOUSE CLEANING

6 cakes Service Soap 25c.
5 cakes Champlain Soap
25c.
4 cakes Surprise Soap
25c.
4 cakes Gold Soap .. 25c.
4 cakes P. & G. Soap
25c.

STARCH

Mixed Laundry 10c lb.
3 lbs. 29c.
Canada Corn Starch
10c pkg.
Herne Corn Starch
10c pkg., 3 for 28c.

TARTARINE

SUBSTITUTE FOR CREAM TARTAR
20c lb.

PURE
CREAM TARTAR
35c Pound.

NEW CANNED GOODS

Corn and Peas, 14c can
Tomatoes 15c can
Clarks Tomato Soup
10c can.
Clarks Vegetable Soup
10c can, 3 cans for 28c.
Pecher Salmon 22c can
Emblem Salmon 18c can

BULK TEA

Only 50c Pound.

YERXA
GROCERY
CO.
2 STORES

York St.
Tel. 305

Queen St.
Tel. 567

Answers to Enquiries in The Provincial Legislature

HON. MR. LEGER in reply to Mr. Boudage:

Q. 1. What is the total quantity of liquor and cash value of same, sold to vendors throughout the province by municipalities for the year ending October 31st, 1926?

A.—
Campbellton \$59,024.08
Dalhousie 34,891.44
Municipalities of Restigouche 34,059.84
Bathurst 31,236.80
Municipalities of Gloucester 13,499.56
Newcastle 50,554.88
Chatham 33,100.46
Municipalities of Northumberland 460.80
Municipalities of Kent 2,257.52
Moncton 88,525.20
Shediac 4,047.20
Sackville 4,498.04
Municipalities of Westmorland 2,568.80
Municipalities of Albert 6,628.64
St. John 245,367.11
St. Stephen 59,208.84
Milltown 17,413.40
St. Andrews 20,525.80
Fredericton 110,151.73
Woodstock 79,199.88
Grand Falls 61,203.05
Municipalities of Victoria 46,930.24
Edmundston 36,011.42
St. Leonard 42,267.34
Municipalities of Madawaska 81,263.18
Sussex 11,639.43
Municipalities of Kings 199.20

Q. 2. Who are the vendors in Kent County? What has been the total sales of each, dates of shipment, total quantity and value thereof and to whom consigned?

A. One vendor in Kent County, Alyre Maillet. Leon Daigle had an extension of license for one month, namely for Nov. 1926.

Total sales to each, during the present fiscal year:
Alyre Maillet \$127.80
Leon Daigle 69.60
Dates of shipment, total quantity and value thereof:
February 1st, 1927, 3½ cases \$127.20.
To Leon Daigle:
November 12th, 1926, 1 case \$38.40.
November 16th, 1926, 1 case \$31.20.
Shipments consigned to respective vendors.

Q. 3. Was any liquor sold by the Commission during the past year to any person in Kent County other than vendors?

A. None during the past fiscal year, but to one medical doctor during the present fiscal year.

Mr. A. D. Holyoke.
HON. MR. LEGER in reply to Mr. Lorton:

Q. 1. Under what capacity is Mr. A. D. Holyoke employed by the Government?

Q. 2. What salary was Mr. Holyoke paid for the year 1926?

Q. 3. What were Mr. Holyoke's expenses for the year 1926?

A. Mr. Holyoke is not a Government employee. He was appointed by the Government as President and Director of Saint John & Quebec Railway, for which he was paid \$500.00 for salary and \$75.00 for expenses last fiscal year.

Smuggled Liquor.
HON. MR. LEGER in reply to Mr. Boudage:

Q. 1. What quantity of liquor was purchased by the New Brunswick Liquor Commission from the Department of Customs and Excise of Canada from the first day of November, 1925 to date?

A. 1887, 1-12 cases.
Q. 2. What was the price paid for each brand?

A. Price was the amount of duty for each brand.
Q. 3. What was the quantity of liquor turned over to the New Brunswick Liquor Commission by the Chief Inspector under the New Brunswick Liquor Act or any other inspector under the same Act from the first day of November, 1925 to date?

A. Nil.
Q. 4. What was the value of the said liquor so turned over by the said inspectors?

A. Nil.
Minto Commission.
HON. MR. RICHARDS in reply to Mr. Niles:

Q. 1. Give detailed particulars of item appearing on page A14 Auditor General's Report, 1926, in re Minto Coal Commission, amount \$2,581.02.

A. See page 193, Public Accounts, 1926.

Special Warrants.
HON. MR. LEGER in reply to Mr. Niles:

Q. 1. What are the detailed items making up amounts of \$15,000.00 and \$13,573.33 as appearing on page A8 of the Auditor General's Report of 1926, for which special warrant was asked?

Q. 2. Give particulars or indicate where same may be found in the Auditor General's Report for amounts chargeable to Capital Expenditure in excess of legislative appropriation as appearing on page A8, Auditor General's Report of 1926, the two amounts totalling \$442,136.00.

Q. 3. What are the particulars of these items?

A. To No. 1. The item of \$13,573.33 as appearing on Page A8 of the Public Accounts 1926 represents an over-expenditure on Road Patrol appropriation and the details are included in statement on Page 137 and following pages of Public Accounts 1926.

Respecting the item \$15,000.00 on same page, only \$11,641.26 of that warrant was expended and represents an over-expenditure on Ordinary Roads caused by flood damage, \$10,952.65 of the amount are accounts payable to the year 1926 as stated on page A43 of Public Accounts 1926.

A. to No. 2. The special warrants totalling \$442,136.00 for capital road expenditure passed on October 29, 1926, and January 4, 1927, are in addition to borrowings authorized under Act 16 Geo. V, Chapter 34, and will cover a period from 1st November, 1926, to 30th April, 1927. Of the same amount, \$347,187.39 was expended to date. Detailed accounts are referred to Public Accounts Committee.

A. to No. 3. Answered by answers to No. 1 and No. 2 questions.

Sub-Inspectors.
HON. MR. LEGER in reply to Mr. Boudage:

Q. 1. How many inspectors and sub-inspectors under the Prohibition Law were there in Kent County at the beginning of the year, 1926?

A. Two.
Q. 2. Were there any dismissals in 1926, and if so give names.

A. There was one dismissal—Edward Depres.
Q. 3. If any dismissals give reasons for dismissals?

A. For the good of the service at the request of the Chief Inspector.
Q. 4. How many appointments have been made in 1926 and give name.

A. There were two appointments made in 1926—Edward Despres and Anselme Bastarache.

Pulp Licenses.
HON. MR. RICHARDS in reply to Mr. Michaud:

Q. 1. Were there any "1926 Pulp and Paper Licenses issued on or before the 1st day of January 1926? If so, to whom, for what lands, where situated and area of each license. What was the bonus paid by each Licensee of such 1926 Pulp and Paper Licenses?

A. No.
Q. 2. If such bonus has not yet been paid, has the amount been determined by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council? When is such bonus payable by the Licensee?

A. No.
Q. 3. Were any provisions, regulations or resolutions made by order-in-council under Section 4 of Chapter 41, 16 George V, 1926?

A. No.

Inglewood Claim.
HON. MR. REILLY in reply to Mr. Michaud:

Q. 1. Has the claim of the Inglewood Pulp and Paper Company against the New Brunswick Power Commission for land damaged on the Musquash been paid? If not, why not?

A. No. On the thirtieth day of October, 1926, Mr. Justice LeBlanc made an award, but during the month of November, 1926 the Inglewood Pulp and Paper Company (Limited) gave notice that an appeal to the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court from the award of Mr. Justice LeBlanc would be made and that at the next sitting of the said Court they would move to have the said award varied, increased, or set aside. This Appeal has since then been heard but no decision has been rendered.

Q. 2. If paid, what amount was paid and when paid?

A. Answered by reply to question 1.

Sales of Liquor.
HON. MR. LEGER in reply to Mr. Niles:

Q. 1. What is the total quantity of liquor and value of same sold by the New Brunswick Liquor Commission for fiscal year 1925-26?

A. \$1,144,764.18.
Q. 2. How much for each Municipality, City and Town in the province?

A.—
Campbellton \$59,211.63
Dalhousie 34,891.44
Municipalities of Restigouche 34,591.84
Bathurst 31,264.15
Municipalities of Gloucester 13,676.56
Newcastle 50,622.48
Chatham 33,609.10
Municipalities of Northumberland 466.40
Municipalities of Kent 2,257.52
Moncton 88,474.75
Shediac 4,073.55
Sackville 4,502.04
Municipalities of Westmorland 3,033.00
Municipalities of Albert 7,327.64
Saint John 294,350.41
Fairville 440.00
Municipalities of Saint John 366.35
St. Stephen 59,537.24
Milltown 17,413.40
St. George 1,486.70
Municipalities of Charlotte 4.75
Fredericton 110,204.67
Devon 35.52
Municipalities of York 602.16
Woodstock 79,658.18
Hardland 2.00
Municipalities of Carleton 77.26
Grand Falls 61,544.81
Municipalities of Victoria 46,939.74
Edmundston 36,147.02
St. Leonard 42,298.06
Municipalities of Madawaska 31,623.18
Sussex 17,682.39
Municipalities of Kings 307.90
Municipalities of Queens 67.79
Municipalities of Sunbury 6.00

Q. 3. How much for each vendor in the Province?

A. On May 31st, 1921, an Order-in-Council was passed which is still in force prohibiting the giving of such information.

Nashwaak Road.
HON. MR. STEWART in reply to Mr. Lorton:

Q. 1. How many tenders were received for the building of the Nashwaak Road?

A. Eleven tenders.
Q. 2. Give names of firms and individuals who tendered and amount of each tender?

A.—
G. R. Jonah & N. M. Hanson \$61,062.20
F. Brown & M. Dunphy 60,191.40
Armstrong Brothers 67,999.50
Currier & Seymour 69,218.00
Burpee Construction Co. 70,019.00
J. Stanley Scott & C. C. Camp 73,672.40

Dexter & Richards 77,620.00
Telfer & Horgan 78,589.00
G. R. Mavor & G. McPhail 78,949.90
J. A. Gregory & J. E. Kane 88,366.50
Canada Construction Co. 89,996.00
Q. 3. To whom was contract awarded?

A. Contract awarded to Currier & Seymour.
Q. 4. Was lowest tender accepted? If not, why not?

A. Lowest tender was not accepted for the reason that the Department did not consider that this firm was capable of carrying on and completing to the satisfaction of the Department a contract of this magnitude. (Q. 5. Why was contract not awarded to Forbes and Brown?

A. Tender of Forbes & Brown was rejected because it was not complete, several items having been omitted from their tender.

Forest Fires.

HON. MR. RICHARDS in reply to Mr. Michaud:

Q. 1. What is the estimated area of Crown Lands burnt for each year from 1917 to date?

A. The area of Crown Lands burned during each year from 1917 to 1926 is as follows:

1918 19,080 acres
1919 11,557 acres
1920 60,444 acres
1921 42,981 acres
1922 3,028½ acres
1923 350,613 acres
1924 9,940 acres
1925 1,372 acres
1926 9,562 acres

Q. 2. Where each of said areas is located?

A. 2853 fires on Crown Lands have occurred since 1917. No summary tabulation showing location of these fires has been made. To give the location of each area at this date would involve a very great deal of labor, which does not seem justified. Full information respecting any particular fire may be obtained at Crown Land office.

Q. 3. Do the regulations made and approved on the first day of August, 1926 for regulating the cutting of lumber on Crown lands, contain any provision in reference to lumber damaged by fire?

A. Yes. Section 4 of the Timber Regulations permits the removal of fire killed spruce, pine and fir, at one-half the regular rate of stumpage.

Q. 4. Were any special concessions made since the 1st day of August, 1926 to any firm, corporation, company or persons, for cutting from the Crown Lands lumber damaged by fire? If so, what were said concessions, privileges or agreements? To whom were they made?

A. No special concessions were made to any firm, corporation, company or persons. A special rate of stumpage was made for pulpwood killed by fire in 1923 to induce its removal, the wood being considerably damaged by decay and wood borers. The rate of stumpage fixed was 35 cents per cord, manufactured in Canada and 50 cents per cord when exported unmanufactured.

Q. 5. Has the Government or the Minister of Lands and Mines received any protest or complaint against the rate of stumpage as established. If so, from whom?

A. Yes. A protest was made by representatives of the Lumbermen's Association to the Government.

Q. 6. What is the date of the order-in-council approving the regulations and stumpage rates for the year 1926-1927?

A. August 27th, 1926.
Q. 7. Why was not this order-in-council passed on the first day of August, 1926, as the law provides and directs?

A. The order-in-council was passed in conformance with Section 4 of Chapter 11, 1913.

Export Permits.
HON. MR. RICHARDS in reply to Mr. Michaud:

Q. 1. What, if any, regulations were made in addition to Schedule "A" Cap. 10, 1 George V., 1911, in reference to export of wood cut on Crown Lands?

A. In addition to Schedule "A" Cap. 10, 1 George V., 1911 and amending Acts in reference to the export of wood cut on Crown Lands the following Orders-in-Council have been passed:

November 11th, 1919, fixing the penalty to be collected from licensees of Crown Lands exporting unmanufactured softwoods at \$2.00 per cord.

October 19th, 1920, permitting the export of unmanufactured softwoods from Crown Lands tributary to the River St. Croix.

May 25th, 1926, permitting the export of unmanufactured softwoods from the Crown Lands tributary to the River St. Croix to continue till May 25th, 1927. The stumpage to be \$1.00 per thousand in addition to the regular rate fixed by the Timber regulations.

December 14th, 1926, permitting the exporting of burnt pulpwood removed from the land burnt over by the fires of 1923 at a stumpage rate of 50 cents per cord.

Q. 2. Has the Government or any member or official thereof, since November 1, 1925, given any permit or permits to any person, persons or Corporation for leave to export out of Canada in an unmanufactured state, wood cut on crown lands of this province?

A. (a) Pulpwood killed in the fires of 1923 has been permitted to be exported due to the inability of the Canadian Market to take the quantity available, which, unless utilized, will shortly be a total loss. Permission was granted under Order-in-Council of December 14th, 1926, cited in Answer to No. 1. (b) Licensees of Crown Lands tributary to the river St. Croix are allowed to export unmanufactured softwoods under authority of Orders-in-Council of October 19th, 1920, and May 25th, 1926, cited in Answer to No. 1.

Q. 3. If any such permits were given to whom, for what quantity of wood, where to be shipped and when to be shipped?

A. Railway shipping permits have been issued for the following amounts of fire killed pulpwood:
Sudney Lumber Company,
(Continued on Page 51x)

There are many ointments
but **ONLY ONE**
Zam-Buk
THE GREAT HERBAL SKIN BALM

SEEDS - SEEDS

NO. 1. TIMOTHY SEED

NO. 2 TIMOTHY SEED

RED CLOVER SEED

ALSIKE CLOVER SEED

MAMMOTH CLOVER SEED

at LOWEST MARKET RATES

G. W. HODGE

PALMER'S
Moose Head Brand
Hunting & Fishing Boots

For generations hunters and fishermen all over the continent have appreciated the utter dependability, honest materials and sterling construction of these time-tested boots.


Through bush, streams and the roughest going, these sturdy yet flexible boots will ensure your entire foot comfort. And their wear is proverbial.

Knee High, waterproof with noiseless flexible Sewed-on Sole of heavy oil-tanned leather.

Hand made to your individual measure.

Send for Catalogue, showing our complete line.

A Boot For Every Purpose
JOHN PALMER CO., LIMITED
FREDERICTON, N. B.



You will Make no Mistake

IF YOU PURCHASE

MINER RUBBERS

Everytime we make a sale of a pair of Miner Rubber Shoes the purchaser comes back in about a year's time for another pair.

We also sell the famous

MOOSEHEAD BRAND SHOEPACKS

which everybody knows are the Best on the market.

We sell the Best Quality of Farmers' and Lumbermen's Footwear and Clothing. Also Ladies' Overshoes and Rubbers, as well as Groceries, and OUR PRICES ARE THE LOWEST POSSIBLE.

We Buy and Sell
HOME MADE SOCKS and MITTS

CURRIE BROTHERS

Call on us for Bargains.