#### on or failure to of a cab license Council may by cancellation license in lieu of, aking proceedings

. SLATTERY, cretary-Treasurer.

Charged by Cabvners plying for

s, to or from any

. . . . . . 0.75 steamers or trains t and 7 a.m ... Double fare

.. .. \$1.00 than the foregoing. s, shall be paid for fraction thereof,

arter of an ersons ... . \$0.40 arter of an ersons . ional quarter

to apply on regatta li Lake, party up to .00, and if calling at 50 cents extra. khold's Cove

persons ....\$1.00 gnal Station s delay, one n within nine

n, over nine and not exmiles ..... 5.00

m the direct route to ort that will cause ne time under the will be considered charged for at the s per hour istance within

re miles .. . Lake, with ay, one to four

nent other than these ng within limits of hall be paid for at 00 for the first hour; he second hour; and ery hour afterwards point to be charged of 80 cents per hour

at Smithville in the afterng, party up to

only at Smithnces or parties after midnight, ir persons ... lding parties-Extra. from within

erty up to four amers or trains

at Mount Cashiks, party up to ther place, with elay ...

Waterford Bridge int within city, four persons .. 1.00 dropping a freight at tside the city within nile limit, other than specified, the charge

he rate of a fare and a aves a stand in respons liate call for a stated one or messenger, the shall begin from the

ing the stand. is not to apply in wineather conditions may oads almost impassable.



#### a trifle more for afe-Cabinet

will have a cabiloes all a wooden o plus this most ime om fire, theft, dust ure. Measured by ne, anyone can af-uy The Safe-Cabiasured by value, no afford to be with-

CHESMAN, Agt.

# Sir Robert Bond's Answer

### TO THE "DAILY NEWS,"

### And a Dignified and Convincing Reply

### to Sir Courtney Ilbert's Letter.

was debated in the British House

THE GRANGE,

April 4th, 1912. Editor Evening Telegram. Dear Sir,—I thank you for a copy of the Daily News of the 1st inst. aption "Where is Bond Now?" It rather ignoble production, and one which I would treat with silent contempt but for the fact that "the feature of the occasion," as you observed in your issue of Monday last, is the production of a letter from Sir Courtney libert, Clerk of the House of Commons, who records therein an in reference to gifts to the with an opinion that I ventured to express in the House of Assembly a few weeks ago. The sensational trappings in which Sir Courtney IIbert's letter is presented to the pub-lic portrays the capacity for the task if dealing with a great public ques-ion which the Daily News' writer ossesses and, I think, furnishes no outhers whatever of his trustworthiness either as a relater of facts or as ness either as a relater of facts of as a guide of public opinion. To the query "Where is Bond Now?" I deign to reply, precisely where he stood on the 22nd day of February last, unshaken in his position by anything centained in Sir Courtney Ilbert's letter, or by the virulent personal attacks of his pulitical aumonents. A tacks of his political opponents. A distinguished writer says "When the violence of personal attack deters a representative from pursuing the course which his honest and deliberjudgment dictates; when dread of to his own conception of it, requires; when to disarm hostility he shapes his conduct according to the wishes of his opponents;—then, he shamefully betrays his trust." This is a conception of duty that will appeal to all rational men, but not to individual rational uals such as the author of the article

The Daily News' writer makes a pathetic, though violent and offensive peal to me to withdraw my opposition to the acceptance by the Govern-ment of gifts from the Railway Contractors, based upon the incident that the Clerk of the House of Commons, Sir Courtney Ilbert, has expressed the tute and 18th century discussion," to gifts, as will appear from a perusal old Statute of Edward IV. of my speech in the House of Assemdisapproval of the conduct of the Government. Read in connection with ward Morris, it is evident, I submit, that there is nothing which would call for the distinction between the whole previous tenor of Sir Courtney Ilbert's letter and the lest sentence, but the desire and intention of disassociating the opinion which he expressed in the first paragraph, from an approval of the acceptance in this particular instance of gifts which he letter addressed to him by Sir Edparticular instance of gifts which place the Government of the Colony under an obligation to the Railway Contractors. The first point I raised in my objection was, as Sir Edward Morris admitted in his letter to Sir Morris admitted in his letter to Sir Courtney Ilbert, "an interesting question of constitutional law." But I am of opinion that the "Salus populi Suprema lex est"—the highest law is the safety of the State, and I am unable therefore to accommodate my opponents by withdrawing my opposition to the acceptance of gifts from the content of the Statutes. the Railway Contractors by the Government of this Colony. Permit me "The to review the "interesting ques-

"Does not the leader of the Government, the Rt. Hon. the Pre-Government, the Rt. Hon, the Premier, recognize that there is involved in this matter a Constitutional question of great importance, namely, whether the Crown has the right to receive a benevolence or gift for any public purpose without the consent of Parliment? For many years—from the time of Edward 4th down to 1794—the question of compulsory and voluntary gifts to the Crown

tion of constitutional law" which has so much excited the Government and

its ally, the Daily News. On the 22nd day of February last, as introductory

to my chief objections to the Govern-

ment accepting gifts from the Railway Contractors, I put forward the

of Commons from time to time, and there were different Acts time of Richard 3rd to the 13th Charles 2, which went directly against private gifts of any description. It proved a subject of much interesting discussion in Parliament and between the highest Constitutional authorities until it was set at rest by the passing of the Act 13 Charles 2. Its preamble declares 'all voluntary aids or benevolences from the people to the Crown are illegal, and there was special provision that the Statute should never 'be drawn into example for the time to come,' it having permitted the gift of £200 to the Crown. the discussion that arose in the British House of Commons in 1794 it was contended that the Act was still in force, and I can-not find that it has since been repealed. The purpose of that Act was to uphold. the dignity, authority and independence of Parliament. Sir, if it was regarded as improper that the Crown should receive gifts or benevo lences from the nobility of Eng land who were under no obligations to the Crown-a fortiori-it is most improper that it should receive gifts from those under contractual obligations for the

With the foregoing query and recital of Parliamentary history I a once passed to the gravamen of my indictment, namely, the impropriety om doing what his duty, according of the Government placing the ony under obligation to the Railway Contractors, and thereby fettering themselves, and their successors, in

proper performance of great pub-

Reference to the official report of Premier or any member supporting his party made any attempt to refute that portion of my argument directed to the desirability of the Government of this Colony being entirely unfettered in their dealings with a corporation which is under enormous contractual obligations to the people of this Colony. The Premier con-fined his criticism to the Statutes and discussions in the House of Commons I had quoted, and in doing so exhibwhich I referred in the course of my ited a complete lack of acquaintanc criticism, has no "real bearing on the with the Statutes and debate I ha criticism, has no "real hearing on the question whether acceptance of the gifts was constitutional or not." My opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the acceptance of the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said: "We have been told for sooth opposition to the said of the said: "We have been told for sooth oppositi opposition to the acceptance of those that there has been a breach of some my speech in the House of Assem- 2, who has been reposing for cen-was chiefly on the ground that turies in Westminster Abbey, and bly was chiefly on the ground that "the Government of the Colony, who are public trustees, should be in a position unhampered by any sense of obligation to the Railway Contractors," seeing that those Contractors "are engaged in the expenditure of millions of dollars on behalf of the public, and have entered into enormous contractual obligations to the public, extending over a number of years, for the proper performance of works essential to the conduct of trade and commerce and the general well-being of the people." That position is unaffected, unshaken, by any

uon is unaffected, unshaken, by anything that Sir Courtney Ilbert has written. In fact it must be clear to any unbiased mind that that gentleman delicately but clearly pointed out in the last sentence of his letter disapproval of the conduct of the ernment of the King to aid in the car-rying on of war both at home and abroad, and that they were passed to secure to the House of Commons the full power of the purse, and to pre-

> cited was erroneous, four days later concluded it was so important and so "interesting a question of constitu-tional law" as to warrant his forwarding the matter to Sir Courtney Ilbert, Clerk of the House of Com-mons, for his consideration and ad-

"The Act of 1661 (13 Chas. 2, Stat. 1, C. 4) authorized the King to issue commissions under the to issue commissions under the great seal for receiving subscriptions 'for supply of Your Majesty's pressing occasions.' A subscription for a Commoner was not to exceed £200; a subscription for a Peer was not to exceed £400. The commissions were not to be in force after the feast of St. John the Baptist in 1662. The Act has no preamble, and I cannot find in it any words declaring that "all voluntary benevolences from the people to the Crown are illegal." The Act was repealed as spent by a Statute Law Revisillegal. The Act was repeated as spent by a Statute Law Revision Act of 1887 (50 & 51 Vic., C. 59) with the exception of S. 5, which declared that.

'No commission or aids of this nature can be issued out

or levied but by authority of Parliament and that this Act and the supply hereby granted shall not be drawn into exam-ple for the time to come.'

The object of the surviving section was obviously to condemn the system of exacting benevo lences, which had been so much abused in previous reigns."

My statement was as follows: "For many years—from the time of Edward 4th down to 1794 —the question of compulsory and voluntary gifts to the Crown was debated in the House of Commons from time to time, and there were different Acts from the time of Richard 3rd to the 13th Charles 2, which went directly against private gifts of any description. It proved a subject of much interesting discussion in Parliament and between the highest Constitutional authorities until it was set at rest by the passing of the Act 13 Charles 2. Its pre-amble declares 'all voluntary benevolence from the people to the Crown are illegal,' and there was a special provision that the Sta-tute should never 'be drawn into example for the time to come,' it having permitted the gift of £200 to the Crown. In the discussion that arose in the British House of Commons in 1794 it was contended that the Act was still in force, and I cannot find that it has since been repealed. The purpose of that Act was to uphold the dignity, authority and inde-pendence of Parliament."

It will be observed that Sir Court-ney Ilbert, who, according to the Premier's letter, had before him a copy of my speech, does not question the accuracy of my statement, saying only that he says "The Act has no preamble, and I cannot find in it any words declaring that 'all voluntary benevolences from the people to the Crown are illegal.'" With regard to heir exception, I would observe that probably in looking into the question omewhat hurriedly Sir Courtney in is research did not go further than to examine the partly spent Act conained in the Statutes at Large which ecites the Act 13 Charles 2 without preamble, as follows:

"And be it hereby declared, that no commission or aids of this nature can be issued or lev-ied, but by authority of Parliament; and that this Act. and the Supply hereby granted shall not be drawn into example for the

time to come." But I cannot suppose the authority pon which I made the statement repecting the preamble was incorrect, eeing that the positive statement as o the preamble and its wording, made n the British House of Commons, was

mever questioned or challenged.

My statement was made from a copy of the official records of the British House of Commons, and, upon reference to these records for the year 1794 it will be found that Richard Brindsley Sheridan when intro-lucing a suite of Resolutions, based upon the Act 13 Charles 2, declared he Act to be "law to this day," and nuoted its preamble as containing the vords "all voluntary aids or benevo-lences from the people to the Crown are llegal." It is altogether unthinkable hat that great statesman could be n error as to the preamble, or that he House of Commons in debating t length the Resolutions he intro-luced would fail to detect and point out such, seeing that Mr. Sheridan's whole argument had special reference to the preamble. Mr. Sheridan is reported as fol-

"He now came to the Statute of "He now came to the Statute of the 13th Charles 2d, for a free and voluntary present to His Majesty," which in reality settled the point now under discussion, FOR THAT STATUTE IN ITS PREAMBLE DECLARED ALL VOLUNTARY AIDS OR BENEVOLENCES FROM THE PEOPLE TO THE CROWN TO BE ILLEGAL. But in consideration of the sudden and CROWN TO BE HALEGAL. But in consideration of the sudden and pressing necessity of the King, it did legalise a benevolence on that one occasion; under very strict limitations it directed, that the subscription of no commoner should exceed 2001, nor that of a peer 4001.; it limited the duration of the benevolence, and there was a special provision that this statute should never be 'drawn into example for the time to come.' This statute was the law to this day; no one proceeding in the This statute was the law to this day; no one proceeding in the shape of a law had taken place since that time; for the Bill of Rights confirmed by inference the 13th Charles 2d, though, like the Petition of Right it confined itself to benevolences at the requisition of the Crown."

Again, Sir Courtney Ilbert says in his reply to Sir Edward Morris's let-

"The 18th century discussions. referred to in a note in Todd's Parliamentary Government in England, turned on the propriety of soliciting money from the peo-ple in aid of the maintenance of

armed forces. It was argued that this was inconstitutional, as being an invasion of the exclusive right and privilege of the Commons to grant supplies for the service of the Crown."

accuracy of my statement and the error of the Premier. He sets forth as facts that which I contended, and which Sir Edward Morris character-izer as error. Wherein then does Sir Courtney differ from me? He says "With all respect to Sir Robert Bond I do not think the 17th century Statute and the 18th century discussions to which he referred have any real bearing on the question whether ac-ceptance of the gifts from the Rail-way Contractors was constitutional or not." Then he furnishes the reason why he does not think so. Because, in his opinion, "the expediency, in any particular case, of laying the State or the Covernment of ing the State or the Government of the time under an obligation to a par-ticular person or body of persons is not a constitutional but a political question." My position was, and is still, that the "laying of the State or the Government of the time under an obligation to a particular person obody of persons" is both a constitu tional and a political question, and therefore "the 17th century Statut and the 18th century discussions" have not only a real bearing, but a most important bearing on the matte of the acceptance of gifts by the Gov ernment from the Railway Contract ors. My venturing to question the accuracy of Sir Courtney Ilbert's con-clusion will probably be regarded by some people as a piece of presumption. I will anticipate this, and say that I am sensible of the fitness of considering respectfully the opin-ions of men whose knowledge is greater, whose experience is longer and whose reason is more powerful than my own. But I also recognize the wisdom and duty of thinking for myself on all questions which I am capable of resolving, guided in public questions by these great masters of political wisdom whose learning and capacity comes down to us through the centuries, and after weighing well Lord Brougham is the authority fo the declaration that "the wisdom o

those who have lived in other times will never be rejected as a help or even as an authority (in deciding constitutional questions) unless it is quite clear, that the circumstances of the State are changed, and that improvements have subsequently been made which render the conclusion of former ages inapplicable to ou own." I have been guided to the con clusions at which I have arrived in respect to the conduct of the Govern ment in accepting gifts from the Railway Contractors without the pre-vious consent of Parliament by weigh ing well the matured opinions of those statesmen who have been fore most in contending for checks on Roy authority and Ministerial abuse, a well as in resisting invasion of th aclusive right and privilege of the ommors. The foundations of the onstitution under which our Govern-

nent is supposed to be conducted vere laid many centuries ago; there ore, I submit, I can hardly be con-icted of error in paying special reard to the views of those statesme f the 18th century whose wisdom cure. I repeat that with all due deference o Sir Courtney Ilbert I still think the 18th century discussions to which

int bearing on the question whether acceptance of gifts from the Railway Contractors without the previous consent of Parliament was constitution al or not." Prior to the passing 'the 17th Century Statute" Parl ment had acquiesced in the accept ance of gifts or benevolences by the Crown for public purposes without its previous consent. The passing of the Act 13 Charles 2 declared the impropriety, and determined the ending of that practice. The "18th Century discussions" indicate how strengous y the most brilliant statesmen of tha day opposed a return to a condition of things that "the 17th Century Statute" was intended to terminate "for he time to come." In "the 18th Century Statute" was intended to terminate "for he time to come." In "the 18th Century Statute of the stat cury discussion" Richard Brindsley Sheridan objected to the acceptance of gifts not previously sanctioned by Parliament on broad constitutional grounds, and without regard to the purpose to which they might be ap

"There can be no true sanctity for public liberty except on the ground that the Crown can neithground that the Crown can neither take nor use property to any public purpose without the vote of Parliament. It was not the boasted liberty of Englishmen merely that property was secured to them, but that no property, however it might come into the hands of the Crown, could be applied to any possible purpose, except such as had been previously authorized by Parliament; and that people cannot by any act of indiscreet benevolence present their gifts to the Crown except through the channel of Parliament. Would the House see the great and strong fence of all their great and strong fence of all their liberties, the power of the purse, invaded in the slightest manner; and would they say that we had any sensible, practicable security for any one privilege, if the Crown had resources independ-ent of the people."

James Fox took similar grounds in the following language:—

"I look upon every glit as an injury to the Constitution. "Suppose," he added, "that the House of Lords were to offer out of their private pockets to contribute to the exigencies of His Majesty's Government, would you

not spurn the proposal as an en-croachment upon your rights?"

this was inconstitutional, as being an invasion of the exclusive right and privilege of the Commons to grant supplies for the service of the Crown."

My statement during the debate in reply to Sir Edward Morris's observations was that the Statutes I had quoted and the discussion to which I had referred "had reference not to personal gifts to the King, but to gifts both compulsory and voluntary furnished to the Government of the King to aid in the carrying on of war both at home and abroad," and that the object of the same was "to secure to the House of Commons the full power of the purse, and to prevent any interference with the high privilege of Parliament to determine what should be done as regards public expenditure." It will be observed again that Sir Courtney Ilbert confirms the accuracy of my statement and the exclusive rights?

Surely, viewed in the light of the Premier's letter accepting the Railway Contractors' gifts, and acknowledging the obligation of "relief to the public Treasury" the 17th century discussions have a "real bearing" on the question whether acceptance of those gifts was constitutional or not. I submit that if it was unconstitutional for the Crown in the 17th and 18th centuries to accept gifts or benevolences without the previous consent of Parliament it is so to-day, for the structure of the constitution, as Lord Broughham says, "has never been destroyed and improved." In the course of my contention before the House of Assembly I did not refer to Todd's "Parliamentary Government" which contains the statement that "the Crown is not at liberty to invite or receive gifts or loan of money for any public service" at liberty to invite or receive gifts or loan of money for any public service" because I thought it superfluous, but I point to it now as indicative of the fact that at the comparatively recent date of that publication the same principle that prompted "the 17th century statute and the 18th century discussions" was considered as vital and binding.

Sir Courtney Ilbert says, "it has never to my knowledge been construed as prohibiting or condemning

never to my knowledge been con-strued as prohibiting or condemning the receipt by the Crown, without the previous consent of Parliament of gifts for artistic, scientific or philan-thropic purposes, or for other pur-poses of general utility." That may be so, and it may be so because Par-liament was not moved to consider the liament was not moved to consider the question in regard to such gifts, or, the law of the constitution may have been adapted to the existing circumstances. Many writers on the English, Constitution commend its powers of adaptation to existing circumstances but, any adaptation could only take place by consent of Parliament. Cirimstances might warrant such in England, while circumstances might not warrant such in this Colony, and therefore Sir Courtney Ilbert's re-ference to certain occurrences in Eng-land, I respectfully submit, does not touch in any way the question as to "whether acceptance of gifts by the Government of this Colony without the consent of Parliament was or was not constitutional." What is the meaning of the word "Constitutional"? An answer is furnished to the question by Lord Brougham, world famed as an autherity on constitutional questions, and for his political philosophy. He says, in its logical and strictest sense it "Signifies that which it is always important to regard with due attention." Surely it was important for the logical type "to regard with due at Legislature "to regard with due at-tention" an undertaking by the Execu-

tive Government to "relieve the Treasury of a burden" by placing the Colony under an obligation to a corporation with vast contractual obligaions to the Colony unfilled. Surely it was important for Legislature "to regard with due atten-tion" the acceptance of such gifts when the Board of Trade of the Colony and the general public are complaining of the manner in which those public servants, the Railway Contractors, are carrying out such obligations.
Surely it would be important for the egislature "to regard with due attention" the acceptance by Ministers of he Crown of any gifts, for any pur-poses whatsoever, from a wealthy

corporation which while under vast ave made notorious efforts within the past few years to dominate the Legislature. If it is admitted, as I think it must be, that it was important "to regard with due attention" such maters, then, according to the interpreation of Lord Brougham as to what s to be regarded as constitutional, the ecceptance of gifts from the Railway contractors by the Government was not only impolitic, but unconstitution-il as well, and, I am happy in being supported in my view of the case by authorities no less illustrious than Bir Courtney Ilbert.

In order either to give force to his personal attacks on me, or to emparrass me in dealing with this matter he Daily News writer deliberately alsified the Journal of the House of Assembly, by stating that I have term-d Sir Courtney Ilbert "the highest uthority in the British Empire on constitutional" procedure." Being onstitutional procedure." Being juite sure that Sir Courtney libert loes not claim that distinction, or inallibility, and, as I am not aware that uch distinction has ever been accorded to him I could not and did not at any time refer to that gentleman as "the highest authority in the British Empire on Constitutional proce-lure." I have written of him as 'One of the highest authorities upon British Constitutional procedure occasion will be found reported in the Journal of the House of Assembly, 1909, and page 347. The circumtances in connection with which I expressed that opinion were as fol-

ows, namely: "Under date the 12th November, 1908, Sir Edward Morris had written the then Governor, Sir William Macaregor, advising him as to what he onceived to be constitutional procedure. Sir William sent the letter to be for consideration. Having duly me for consideration. Having duly considered it, I called at Government House and advised the then Govern that Sir Edward Morris' views in re gard to Constitutional procedure were entirely erroneous. But as some doubt was expressed on the matter I

### THE WARTS DISAPPEARED

Mr. Kingshaw Found the Right Remedy.

It is certainly not for lack of so-called "Cures" that people put up with unsightly and uncomfortable warts. But somehow or other most of these "Cures" fail to work. Mr. J. S. Kingshaw, of Bent River, Out., very sensibly tried Douglas' Egyptian Liniment on them, and found it was a real cure. He says:

Egyptian Liniment on them, and found it was a real cure. He says:

"I was greatly annoyed with warts on my hands and face, but after using Douglas' Egyptian Liniment for a short time they all disappeared as if by magic. I have found it an excellent remedy for cold sores, in fact it is a cure for every ill in our house. We would not be without it."

Scarcely a week passes but Douglas'

Scarcely a week passes but Douglas' Egyptian Linement would save some member of your family from pain and suffering if you had a bottle of it handy. And it's just as good for your stock. 67 25c. at all druggists, Free sample on request. Douglas & Co., Napanee, Ont.

Duckworth Street



MAKES LIGHT

the work of washing, does Sunlight. Brightness and sweetness reign in the home when Sunlight Soap helps you. at at at

**SUNLIGHT** SOAP

SUNLIGHT

pinion of Sir Courtney Ilbert, and under date the 17th November I wrote Sir William MacGregor a letter i which the following occurs, namely, "I further submit that the opinion expressed by Sir Edward Morris that "Your Excellency would not be justi-"fied in being a party to the filling of "any office in the Civil Service now "vacant, or the making of any con-"tracts, and that the powers and "privileges of your Ministers should "be limited entirely to the transaction" "of codingry, routing business" "of ordinary, routine business" amounts to a perfect absurdity, for there can be no limitation of confi-dence between the Crown and its responsible advisers, and so long as Ministers retain their position under the Crown they of right exercise full Executive power and authority. the interview that I had the honour receiving at Your Excellency's hands on Saturday last, I stated this as my opinion, and intimated that I had subnitted my views for the opinion of British Constitutional expert. I am pleased to be able to state that the correctness of the views I then ex-

pressed to Your Excellency and which now embody in this communication has been completely borne out by the reply received to-day from Sir Courtney Peregrine Ilbert, K. C. S. I. who will be readily recognized by Your Excellency as one of the highest authorities upon British Constitutional procedure."

cabled to London and obtained the

In conclusion I would say that while Sir Courtney Ilbert differs from me in part in the present instance that difference I am satisfied is occa sioned by his not having before him the full facts in respect to the un-paralleled position in which the Railway Contractors, as donors of Yours truly

A Simple Treatment that Will Make Hair Grow Now Sold in Newfoundland.

Every up-to-date woman should have radiant hair. There are thousands of women with narsh, faded, characterless hair, who

do not try to improve it. In England and Paris women take pride in having beautiful hair. Every Canadian woman can have lustrous and luxuriant hair by using SALVIA, he Great American Sage Hair Tonic. Every reader of the Telegram can have an attractive head of hair in a

ew weeks by using SALVIA. McMurdo & Co. sells a large bottle for 50 cents, and gurantees it to banish Dandruff, stop falling hair and itching scalp in ten days, or money

SALVIA is a beautiful, pleasant. nonsticky Hair Tonic.

"The Third Degree."

Another large audience greeted the Selman Stock Company at the Casino Theatre last evening in their repro-duction of "The Third Degree." The stage settings were as perfect as the previous evening and everything went along smoothly. Mr. Selman, in the role of "Judge Brewer," gave a clever delineation. In fact all the parts were ably sustained and the performers were deservedly applauded. Miss MacKenzie, the comediene, captivated the audience with her vocal numbers. To-night "The Third Degree" will be staged for the last time, and to-morrow night the public will be given an opportunity of witnessing "The Light That Failed."

If you are troubled with a pain inder your shoulder, take HILL'S PILLS and see how quickly it will lisappear. HILL'S PILLS will puriy your blood, removes pimples and leanse the entire system. A sure cure for Constipation and all disorders arising from a disordered liver and stomach. Price 25c. a box. Sold at McMURDO'S.

#### Littledale.

On next Tuesday, as stated a few days ago, the pupils of Littledale Academy will appear at St. Patrick's Hall in a strikingly pretty drama. The talent of these young ladies is of a high order, as St. John's audi-onces can testify. True, the hour for commencing—4 o'clock afternoon—is somewhat inconvenient, but as a hall cannot be procured for a later hour, it is the best possible under the cir-cumstances. The affair is under the cumstances. The affair is under the distinguished patronage of His Grace the Archbishop, and His Excelency the Governor has very kindly inti-mated that he will be present, accompanied by Lady Williams and suite,

### Annual Tea.

The members of the Cathedral Band of Hope will have their annual tea this afternoon, to be followed by an entertainment which will be given by the children in the Synod Hall at 7.30. A fine programme has been arranged and a large number will participate.

GETTING READY. -The fishermen at the Southside and Battery are now getting ready for operations on the local grounds. Several of the venturesome ones will be beginning next week. We learn that motor boats will be very much in evidence on the local grounds this year.

## New Goods for Easter.

CARROTS, PARSNIPS and CRANBERRIES,

Large Messina Lemons Pulled Smyrna Figs, 20c. lb. Pulled Turkey Figs, 20c. box. Ben Davis Apples. American Cabbage.

Pan Yan Pickles, 5c. and 25c. Bottle Tomato Catsup, 15c. Bottle. Lemon Cheese, 20c. Crock. Heinz Apple Butter, 45c. quart crock. Lunham's Irish Bacon (boned). Pure Canadian Butter, 1 lb. Blocks.

Flett's 1 lb. Pot Raspberry Jam, 25c. 31b. Tins Cal. White Cherries. Flett's 1 lb. Pots Strawberry Jam. 25c. Bird's Custard, Powder. Sliced California Peaches, 3 lb. tin, Foster Clark's Custard (tins).

Huntley & Palmer's Cakes and Biscuits.

Moir's Cakes. Mooney's Biscuits, Hartley's Jams & Marmalade, 1 & 21b pots Crosse & Blackwell's Jams, 1-lb. Vacuum Glass Jars Fresh Country Eggs,

C. P. EAGAN,

Fig Marmalade, 25 cts. 1-lb. Glass.