

PRINCE EDWARD

TODAY 3.15. TONIGHT 7 AND 8.45
Matinee, Adults 11c. Children 5c.
Evening, Orchestra 26c. Balcony 21c
Children 11c

THE LIMIT FOR THRILLS!

\$5,000,000 in gold missing. Scotland Yard gave it up.
"Boston Blackie" and Mary were safe—and wealthy for life. Then suddenly they returned the golden loot—WHY?



Everybody likes a good crook story—and here's the Big Ace of them all. With "Boston Blackie" and his dashing pal "Mary" the most beloved underworld characters in fiction, as the hero and heroine. In the exciting story of a \$5,000,000 revenge.

Alice Brady was never so beautiful and vivacious. Supporting cast includes David Powell, Riley Hatch and George LeGuere.

EILEEN SEDGEWICK IN "SHADOWS OF SUSPICION" AND "THE PATHE NEWS"

W.G.Y. Program

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11
WGY (Schenectady, N. Y.)
General Electric Company

Eastern Standard Time

12.00 m.—Time signals.
12.30 p. m.—Stock market quotations.
12.45 p. m.—Weather report.
6.00 p. m.—Produce and stock market quotations; news bulletins.

BELL GOVT.'S HUGE DEFICITS

At Dec. 31, 1918, Mr. A. W. Hyndman, Manager of the Royal Bank, and External Auditor for the Government, reported the net debt of the province to be \$1,006,991.71
At Sept. 8, 1919, Messrs. J. J. Hughes, M.P., and Mr. Hyndman, External Auditors showed the net debt to be \$1,193,829.77
An increase of \$186,838.06
At Sept. 8, 1919, Mr. John Anderson, Provincial Auditor, showed the excess of expenditure over receipts, less unearned subsidy, to be \$253,938.78
An excess difference of \$67,100.72

WHICH IS CORRECT?

These are two alleged audits in the interests of the Bell Government to the same date, showing a difference of \$67,100.72—both cannot be correct. Which does the Bell Government accept—is it going to turn down Mr. Hughes and Mr. Hyndman? If so, why?

ANOTHER REPORT

gain, the Provincial Auditor, at the request of the Public Accounts Committee of the session of 1920, submitted an official statement of the position of the province at Dec. 31, 1919, which took the place of the External Audit, showing the Public Debt at that date to be \$1,121,437.23

An increase over 1919 (the first year reported on by the Bell Government) of \$114,405.52
An increase over 1911 (the last year of the previous Liberal Govt.) of \$113,174.30

NOTE.—The Conservative Government erected 31 permanent bridges at a cost of \$116,366.80, besides purchasing two agricultural buildings in Charlottetown and Summerside respectively, and installing a complete new heating and lighting system in the Provincial Building.

THE BELL GOVERNMENT ENORMOUS DEFICIT AGAIN—

At Sept. 8, 1919, Mr. J. J. Hughes, M.P. and Mr. A. W. Hyndman, Bell Govt. External Auditors showed the Liabilities to be \$1,193,829.77
At Dec. 31, 1922, the Bell Government Provincial Audit, shows the Liabilities to be \$1,397,060.78

An increase of Public Debt of \$203,231.01
And they have nothing to show for it but ordinary roads.

According to these, their own official figures, THE BELL GOVERNMENT HAS GONE BEHIND \$50,800 PER ANNUM,—yet their excuse for increased taxes is "pay as they go," and they claim to have surpluses!

IT IS TIME FOR A CHANGE!

The Central Guardian The Mediaevalism Of Church Union

(By Professor Cyrus McMillan)

In these days, when the General Assembly is said to be the Church, I trust that there will be no resentment of the impudence of a mere layman in setting forth his views on the mediaevalism of Church Union. For many years the Church has been the object of a vast amount of criticism. We have been told that the church has lost its power. This criticism is on the whole far from the truth. The attacking of the Church is not a novelty; the twisting of the ecclesiastical lion's tail is an old recreation; it is as old as Christianity. Even in the days of Hugh Latimer, in the 16th century, it was a common thing to lay the ills of the world at the door of the Church and to look with pessimism on its endeavors. Latimer himself preached sometimes to empty churches, and he could say, "London was never so ill as it is now."

Although modern criticism of the Church is largely unfounded there are, however, many laymen who are dissatisfied with the church's materialism. Its sense of God. There are many laymen who wonder why thousands leave the church for agnosticism, socialism, and other "isms" when the Church alone has the words of eternal life. To save itself from criticism the Church frantically resorts to all kinds of attractions to interest people. It shifts its activities into social civic political and economic reforms, and it urges very pretty schemes for Church Union and for the wiping out of denominations as a sure but none the less infelicitous plan for evangelizing the world. We are told that Church Union, on the basis of a great organization, is an infallible guide on how to find God. And all the while the church is afraid to venture on the purely spiritual life which the people crave and it is indifferent to the task of spiritualizing the world. The Church is too busy talking of organization and of economic power to think of spiritual things.

Now, we know that everyone who puts the things of material life above the things of the spirit is indirectly a party to a system of oppression. The trouble with the Church in the eyes of a layman is that it is too materialized already to effect great spiritual results. No change of name can help it. No union of denominations on a material basis can produce an organized power to bring in the Kingdom of God. For such a union rejects the central fact of the Kingdom of God, which is a supernatural power over all.

Yet, the pretty scheme of "one united union" has fascinated many people, and the result is a strange and pathetic exhibition of "organized emotion." Organized emotion is an accurate description of something which gravely threatens Canada to-day. Every student of literature and of history knows well what fearful mistakes demagogues have made under the influence of organized emotion and how as a result, thousands of men have taken leave of their judgment and brought all to the brink of ruin or beyond. The schemes of Church Union is based on organized emotion rather than on organized information and organized intelligence, or a realization of the facts of history.

The question of the value, or non-value of Church Union need not be here discussed. The truth is that union was first advocated over twenty years ago. For nearly a quarter of a century its advocacy has continued with a constant increase of opposition. The undeniable fact is that the advocates of Church Union have not been able to convince the Church of the efficacy or the desirability of their plans. Having failed to convince they now undertake to compel, and coercion takes the place of persuasion. The central objection of many of us who are opposed to union is not to the thing itself, but to the methods of compulsion in the Union Bill soon to be sent to Parliament. We object to a display of ecclesiastical tyranny which looks on man as a mere machine without a mind of his own, tyranny which, strutting in an ephemeral and temporary way through the corridors of the Church, give to a few self-styled leaders the right of doing our thinking for us and of taking our inherited property. We object to the use of compulsion to bring about what is supposed to be reformation. We object to the compelling of the will. The infidel says "I do not wish to do this." A small majority rises up in mighty indignation with a supposed mandate eight years old, with vigor and rigor and "soul on fire" with a misinterpreted book in one hand, a big stick in the other and a distorted prayer upon their lips and with pious platitudes says, "You must." The self respecting individual replies, "I will not." The result is a split Church, and the violation of union and unity.

The Church Union movement, in its methods at least, is distinctly mediaeval. It is a reversion to feudalism when everything was ordered by authority. In the middle of the fifteenth century the Western Church occupied a position without precedent in the Roman Empire. It ruled the Emperor and gave him his orders. They were orders directed especially to the extermination of all religious rivals. It required the Emperor to suppress the worship of idols, and he closed the pagan temples; sometimes he even authorized their destruction. The Church wished to get rid of descending sects, and the Emperor was ruled by ecclesiastics and schoolmen, for against her rivals the mediaeval Church brought to bear the weapons of condemnation and excommunication, and proceeded at times to extremes of persecution. The outstanding fact, in mediaeval life was the Church, whose consistent purpose was to bring all minds and wills into obedience. Like the Montreal Presbytery, it applied the "closure" in debate and denied the right of free speech.

Then appeared slowly, but surely, the idea of the right of the individual to differ in polity and dogma. The fact of "difference" is the condition of all progress. It is behind all intellectual advancement. From the beginning of time men have insisted on differences from their neighbors. The struggle between authority and liberty is as old as religion. It was fought out between priest and prophet in Old Testament times. In modern times from Huss questioned the right of the Church to suppress this liberty of difference. He believed that in the intellectual life there is always dispute, that the liberty of difference enlarges human knowledge that intellectual sterility exists largely because of the authority of ecclesiastics. The Council of Constance told Huss that if the Council stated he had only one eye he must agree that he had but one. Huss was burned, not for his attitude to the scriptures, but for his claim to the right to have ideas at all and to think for himself.

In our own nation the greatest of our literary men have stood firmly for this liberty of difference. Its light dawned on the Scottish heather and the English laws with its beams. In the 14th century Wycliffe represented it. He believed that political liberty could not exist without religious liberty, and that the Great Charter in itself was of little value without spiritual freedom. And so he broke away from his Church and determined to give the common people the Truth by giving them a translation of the Bible. Wycliffe was a separatist. The English Bible is a product of much-hated sectarianism and demagogicalism. In the early 16th century Tyndale carried on the work of Wycliffe. He, too, was a separatist who refused to be coerced; he was driven from his country and stranded in a foreign land for his views, but his doctrine of the liberty of difference still survived. In the 17th century Milton stood with Cromwell as an advocate of religious and political freedom. "What some lament of," he said, "we rather should rejoice at; we should rather praise this forwardness among men to re-assume the departed care of their religion into their own hands again. I fear that this iron yoke of outward conformity will wear a slavish print upon our necks" the liberty of difference was behind the revolution of 1649, which brought democracy into being. Locke's philosophy stated that no man is good enough to govern another man without the other man's consent, in matters either religious or political. That is the basis of modern freedom. John Bunyan refused to obey the "Act of Uniformity," and defied the King and the Church; he was thrown into jail for his pains but the gospel he preached could not be silenced, and the second revolution on behalf of popular rights in 1688 was a result of his doctrine and that of others like him. In the 18th century John Wesley saw the need for deepening the spiritual life of England, not by a great organization, but by the fervent work of free individuals. Wesley broke away from his own Church and headed a separatist movement. He believed in the right of the individual to the liberty of difference, and he believed, too, in the sanctity of the individual. It is sometimes amusing to a student of literature to hear Wesley quoted as a great advocate of "one big union." The literary masters of our nation, from Chaucer to the present day, have all been advocates of individual freedom in Church and State. The facts of history are plain; they show that if you curb religious freedom, civil liberty will not long endure.

Now, the elements which made these men who purchased the liberty of difference, sometimes with their blood, are still present in the world. The heart of man rebels against superficial conformity. The cry "we must all think alike" has never rallied men since Liberty first burst upon the world. The proposal, "We must all belong to one organization" is a proposal that has always ended in disaster. The pro-unionists suppose that intellectual disagreement is a thing equalled our own in the variety of such disagreement. We see it in politics; we have more political parties today than in any period of our history. The pro-unionists forget that union cannot be bought by money; it cannot be moulded by machinery, or bullied into being by a great combine. They forget that no authority is superior to the authority of conscience, and that economic power has never carried nations to the Rock of Ages. We are sometimes told that the Union Movement is a great adventure, the result of a great vision, a new thing upon the earth. But this plan is not a new experiment, it is a plan that has been tried many epochs when practically all inhabitants of a land conformed outwardly to one observance, but these epochs were not seasons of great spiritual power. Once upon a time, there was one organization and none other. Once upon a time, all power was vested in one Church, and the result was that it brought about the darkest days of Christendom. The pro-unionists forget that there was a time when Union was a curse rather than a blessing, that out of it the noblest spirits of our race fought through schism and separation to liberty, and that they counted sectarianism the high, hard way to Truth, and the only road to a release from tyranny. It was not a great organization that kept our devout ancestors in the Church, or kept the Church alive. It was the liberty of difference. The method of coercion, now being practiced by the pro-unionists, may, however, result in good in the end. For history testifies that coercion has produced reformation and history does not lie. It was the coercive methods of Queen Mary that hastened reform. It was coercion that brought to this country the New England Puritans, who in 1620, asked only "for freedom to worship God." John Knox long uttered his doctrines with a voice that puff'd up your feet and caused a thunder, but it was the coercion of Laud that hastened the realization of his dreams. Laud did what he most desired to prevent, because, like the pro-unionists, the avowed enemies of the pro-unionists of today, he left no man's nature out of account. When never going to bother you any more, a whole year's foot comfort guaranteed.

The Mediaevalism Of Church Union

(By Professor Cyrus McMillan)

In these days, when the General Assembly is said to be the Church, I trust that there will be no resentment of the impudence of a mere layman in setting forth his views on the mediaevalism of Church Union. For many years the Church has been the object of a vast amount of criticism. We have been told that the church has lost its power. This criticism is on the whole far from the truth. The attacking of the Church is not a novelty; the twisting of the ecclesiastical lion's tail is an old recreation; it is as old as Christianity. Even in the days of Hugh Latimer, in the 16th century, it was a common thing to lay the ills of the world at the door of the Church and to look with pessimism on its endeavors. Latimer himself preached sometimes to empty churches, and he could say, "London was never so ill as it is now."

Although modern criticism of the Church is largely unfounded there are, however, many laymen who are dissatisfied with the church's materialism. Its sense of God. There are many laymen who wonder why thousands leave the church for agnosticism, socialism, and other "isms" when the Church alone has the words of eternal life. To save itself from criticism the Church frantically resorts to all kinds of attractions to interest people. It shifts its activities into social civic political and economic reforms, and it urges very pretty schemes for Church Union and for the wiping out of denominations as a sure but none the less infelicitous plan for evangelizing the world. We are told that Church Union, on the basis of a great organization, is an infallible guide on how to find God. And all the while the church is afraid to venture on the purely spiritual life which the people crave and it is indifferent to the task of spiritualizing the world. The Church is too busy talking of organization and of economic power to think of spiritual things.

Now, we know that everyone who puts the things of material life above the things of the spirit is indirectly a party to a system of oppression. The trouble with the Church in the eyes of a layman is that it is too materialized already to effect great spiritual results. No change of name can help it. No union of denominations on a material basis can produce an organized power to bring in the Kingdom of God. For such a union rejects the central fact of the Kingdom of God, which is a supernatural power over all.

Yet, the pretty scheme of "one united union" has fascinated many people, and the result is a strange and pathetic exhibition of "organized emotion." Organized emotion is an accurate description of something which gravely threatens Canada to-day. Every student of literature and of history knows well what fearful mistakes demagogues have made under the influence of organized emotion and how as a result, thousands of men have taken leave of their judgment and brought all to the brink of ruin or beyond. The schemes of Church Union is based on organized emotion rather than on organized information and organized intelligence, or a realization of the facts of history.

The question of the value, or non-value of Church Union need not be here discussed. The truth is that union was first advocated over twenty years ago. For nearly a quarter of a century its advocacy has continued with a constant increase of opposition. The undeniable fact is that the advocates of Church Union have not been able to convince the Church of the efficacy or the desirability of their plans. Having failed to convince they now undertake to compel, and coercion takes the place of persuasion. The central objection of many of us who are opposed to union is not to the thing itself, but to the methods of compulsion in the Union Bill soon to be sent to Parliament. We object to a display of ecclesiastical tyranny which looks on man as a mere machine without a mind of his own, tyranny which, strutting in an ephemeral and temporary way through the corridors of the Church, give to a few self-styled leaders the right of doing our thinking for us and of taking our inherited property. We object to the use of compulsion to bring about what is supposed to be reformation. We object to the compelling of the will. The infidel says "I do not wish to do this." A small majority rises up in mighty indignation with a supposed mandate eight years old, with vigor and rigor and "soul on fire" with a misinterpreted book in one hand, a big stick in the other and a distorted prayer upon their lips and with pious platitudes says, "You must." The self respecting individual replies, "I will not." The result is a split Church, and the violation of union and unity.

The Church Union movement, in its methods at least, is distinctly mediaeval. It is a reversion to feudalism when everything was ordered by authority. In the middle of the fifteenth century the Western Church occupied a position without precedent in the Roman Empire. It ruled the Emperor and gave him his orders. They were orders directed especially to the extermination of all religious rivals. It required the Emperor to suppress the worship of idols, and he closed the pagan temples; sometimes he even authorized their destruction. The Church wished to get rid of descending sects, and the Emperor was ruled by ecclesiastics and schoolmen, for against her rivals the mediaeval Church brought to bear the weapons of condemnation and excommunication, and proceeded at times to extremes of persecution. The outstanding fact, in mediaeval life was the Church, whose consistent purpose was to bring all minds and wills into obedience. Like the Montreal Presbytery, it applied the "closure" in debate and denied the right of free speech.

Then appeared slowly, but surely, the idea of the right of the individual to differ in polity and dogma. The fact of "difference" is the condition of all progress. It is behind all intellectual advancement. From the beginning of time men have insisted on differences from their neighbors. The struggle between authority and liberty is as old as religion. It was fought out between priest and prophet in Old Testament times. In modern times from Huss questioned the right of the Church to suppress this liberty of difference. He believed that in the intellectual life there is always dispute, that the liberty of difference enlarges human knowledge that intellectual sterility exists largely because of the authority of ecclesiastics. The Council of Constance told Huss that if the Council stated he had only one eye he must agree that he had but one. Huss was burned, not for his attitude to the scriptures, but for his claim to the right to have ideas at all and to think for himself.

In our own nation the greatest of our literary men have stood firmly for this liberty of difference. Its light dawned on the Scottish heather and the English laws with its beams. In the 14th century Wycliffe represented it. He believed that political liberty could not exist without religious liberty, and that the Great Charter in itself was of little value without spiritual freedom. And so he broke away from his Church and determined to give the common people the Truth by giving them a translation of the Bible. Wycliffe was a separatist. The English Bible is a product of much-hated sectarianism and demagogicalism. In the early 16th century Tyndale carried on the work of Wycliffe. He, too, was a separatist who refused to be coerced; he was driven from his country and stranded in a foreign land for his views, but his doctrine of the liberty of difference still survived. In the 17th century Milton stood with Cromwell as an advocate of religious and political freedom. "What some lament of," he said, "we rather should rejoice at; we should rather praise this forwardness among men to re-assume the departed care of their religion into their own hands again. I fear that this iron yoke of outward conformity will wear a slavish print upon our necks" the liberty of difference was behind the revolution of 1649, which brought democracy into being. Locke's philosophy stated that no man is good enough to govern another man without the other man's consent, in matters either religious or political. That is the basis of modern freedom. John Bunyan refused to obey the "Act of Uniformity," and defied the King and the Church; he was thrown into jail for his pains but the gospel he preached could not be silenced, and the second revolution on behalf of popular rights in 1688 was a result of his doctrine and that of others like him. In the 18th century John Wesley saw the need for deepening the spiritual life of England, not by a great organization, but by the fervent work of free individuals. Wesley broke away from his own Church and headed a separatist movement. He believed in the right of the individual to the liberty of difference, and he believed, too, in the sanctity of the individual. It is sometimes amusing to a student of literature to hear Wesley quoted as a great advocate of "one big union." The literary masters of our nation, from Chaucer to the present day, have all been advocates of individual freedom in Church and State. The facts of history are plain; they show that if you curb religious freedom, civil liberty will not long endure.

Now, the elements which made these men who purchased the liberty of difference, sometimes with their blood, are still present in the world. The heart of man rebels against superficial conformity. The cry "we must all think alike" has never rallied men since Liberty first burst upon the world. The proposal, "We must all belong to one organization" is a proposal that has always ended in disaster. The pro-unionists suppose that intellectual disagreement is a thing equalled our own in the variety of such disagreement. We see it in politics; we have more political parties today than in any period of our history. The pro-unionists forget that union cannot be bought by money; it cannot be moulded by machinery, or bullied into being by a great combine. They forget that no authority is superior to the authority of conscience, and that economic power has never carried nations to the Rock of Ages. We are sometimes told that the Union Movement is a great adventure, the result of a great vision, a new thing upon the earth. But this plan is not a new experiment, it is a plan that has been tried many epochs when practically all inhabitants of a land conformed outwardly to one observance, but these epochs were not seasons of great spiritual power. Once upon a time, there was one organization and none other. Once upon a time, all power was vested in one Church, and the result was that it brought about the darkest days of Christendom. The pro-unionists forget that there was a time when Union was a curse rather than a blessing, that out of it the noblest spirits of our race fought through schism and separation to liberty, and that they counted sectarianism the high, hard way to Truth, and the only road to a release from tyranny. It was not a great organization that kept our devout ancestors in the Church, or kept the Church alive. It was the liberty of difference. The method of coercion, now being practiced by the pro-unionists, may, however, result in good in the end. For history testifies that coercion has produced reformation and history does not lie. It was the coercive methods of Queen Mary that hastened reform. It was coercion that brought to this country the New England Puritans, who in 1620, asked only "for freedom to worship God." John Knox long uttered his doctrines with a voice that puff'd up your feet and caused a thunder, but it was the coercion of Laud that hastened the realization of his dreams. Laud did what he most desired to prevent, because, like the pro-unionists, the avowed enemies of the pro-unionists of today, he left no man's nature out of account. When never going to bother you any more, a whole year's foot comfort guaranteed.

In our own home towns and villages, hosts of satisfied friends buy RED ROSE TEA today, as they did 28 years ago—because it is still the same good Tea.



Buy a can of RED ROSE COFFEE flavour will surely please you.

ing the spiritual life of England, of our history. The pro-unionists not by a great organization, but by the fervent work of free individuals. Wesley broke away from his own Church and headed a separatist movement. He believed in the right of the individual to the liberty of difference, and he believed, too, in the sanctity of the individual. It is sometimes amusing to a student of literature to hear Wesley quoted as a great advocate of "one big union." The literary masters of our nation, from Chaucer to the present day, have all been advocates of individual freedom in Church and State. The facts of history are plain; they show that if you curb religious freedom, civil liberty will not long endure.

Now, the elements which made these men who purchased the liberty of difference, sometimes with their blood, are still present in the world. The heart of man rebels against superficial conformity. The cry "we must all think alike" has never rallied men since Liberty first burst upon the world. The proposal, "We must all belong to one organization" is a proposal that has always ended in disaster. The pro-unionists suppose that intellectual disagreement is a thing equalled our own in the variety of such disagreement. We see it in politics; we have more political parties today than in any period of our history. The pro-unionists forget that union cannot be bought by money; it cannot be moulded by machinery, or bullied into being by a great combine. They forget that no authority is superior to the authority of conscience, and that economic power has never carried nations to the Rock of Ages. We are sometimes told that the Union Movement is a great adventure, the result of a great vision, a new thing upon the earth. But this plan is not a new experiment, it is a plan that has been tried many epochs when practically all inhabitants of a land conformed outwardly to one observance, but these epochs were not seasons of great spiritual power. Once upon a time, there was one organization and none other. Once upon a time, all power was vested in one Church, and the result was that it brought about the darkest days of Christendom. The pro-unionists forget that there was a time when Union was a curse rather than a blessing, that out of it the noblest spirits of our race fought through schism and separation to liberty, and that they counted sectarianism the high, hard way to Truth, and the only road to a release from tyranny. It was not a great organization that kept our devout ancestors in the Church, or kept the Church alive. It was the liberty of difference. The method of coercion, now being practiced by the pro-unionists, may, however, result in good in the end. For history testifies that coercion has produced reformation and history does not lie. It was the coercive methods of Queen Mary that hastened reform. It was coercion that brought to this country the New England Puritans, who in 1620, asked only "for freedom to worship God." John Knox long uttered his doctrines with a voice that puff'd up your feet and caused a thunder, but it was the coercion of Laud that hastened the realization of his dreams. Laud did what he most desired to prevent, because, like the pro-unionists, the avowed enemies of the pro-unionists of today, he left no man's nature out of account. When never going to bother you any more, a whole year's foot comfort guaranteed.

"Tiz" For Swollen Tired, Aching Feet
The minute you put your feet in a "TIZ" bath you feel pain being drawn out and comfort just soaking in. How good your tired, swollen, burning feet feel, "TIZ" instantly takes the poisonous exudations that puff up your feet and cause sore, inflamed, sweaty feet. "TIZ" and only "TIZ," takes the pain and soreness out of corns, callouses and bunions. Get a box of "TIZ" at any drug or department store for a few cents. Your feet are never going to bother you any more. A whole year's foot comfort guaranteed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXPRESS COMPANY

Your Paying Teller—in every town!

SEND money quickly—and above all safely—by Canadian National Express Money Orders. The rates are as low as, and sometimes lower than by other methods. A Money Order for \$5.00 costs only 3 cents—\$30.00 costs 10 cents, etc.

Currency or coins sent in a letter may be stolen, destroyed by fire, or lost. If a Canadian National Express Company's Money Order is lost, the amount is recoverable. Over \$100,000,000 reached the right hands last year through the medium of Money Orders.

These Money Orders are easy to purchase. No application blank to fill out. On sale at all hours of the day and evening at 3465 express offices—at thousands of sub-agencies in cities and towns. Payable immediately on presentation, practically any merchant or storekeeper will cash them or accept them. Can be endorsed any number of times. Are often used for paying home bills.

FOREIGN DRAFTS
The Company issues drafts in Foreign Money for any amount at lowest current rates of exchange payable by leading Banks and Bankers throughout the Commercial World.

FOREIGN POSTAL REMITTANCES
Immigrants and others sending money abroad profit by using Foreign Postal Remittances issued by the Canadian National Express Company, payable through Foreign Post Offices. The Company also transfers money by Cable or Telegraph.

TRAVELERS CHEQUES
Travelers' Cheques issued by Canadian National Express Company, invaluable to tourists and commercial travelers. With the assistance of the paying agent, no further identification is necessary. They are accepted in hotels, merchants and storekeepers everywhere. If lost the amount is recoverable.

& Service is yours

WEST ELECTRIC HAIR NETS
are considered the best make on the market. They are extra fine quality of hair, are well fashioned and give good service.
Double Nets 2 for 25c.
Single Nets, 3 for 25c.
We have all colors.
The White Drug Store
J. G. JAMIESON Druggist

KLENZO DENTAL CREAM
For White Teeth and Healthy Gums
is fast becoming the accepted tooth paste. It preserves the teeth and keeps the gums healthy. Used from coast to coast. Two convenient sizes.
Try a tube next time.
MCKINNON DRUG CO.
The Rexall Kodak Store
Phone 219