

and Canada to the terms of the Manitoba Act so much Bill of Rights that it is easy to purpose was to put into legal reach.

ANGELIC CLAIMS IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY.

Ottawa Citizen, Jan. 16, 1894.

Mr. Joseph Pope To Rev. Mr. Baum.

Editor Citizen:—May I beg the favor of the use of your columns in which to say a few words in reply to Dr. Baum's criticism of my lecture on "Anglican Claims." Theological discussions, at any rate by those who are not theologians, are commonly deprecated as leading to strife and bitterness. The points raised by me, however, are not theological, but historical. They are simply questions of fact, requiring no great erudition for their determination.

SUBJECT OF DISPUTE.

I have said (1) that for long years, reaching at any rate far back into the Saxon period, the English Church acknowledged the supremacy of the Holy See; (2) that the Anglican Orders are at best, exceedingly doubtful. In both cases I have supported my position by numerous and precise references to eminent Protestant historians. I have done this in temperate language, boldly, over my own signature, in the light of day. I, who am speaking for those who are by nature and training "Jesuitical" and "underhand," and "evasive" and "sly." I have made no disparaging allusions to anyone who has not been dead three hundred years. I have purposely avoided any reference to what one of our Bishops has called the "extreme divergencies of doctrine," which distract the Establishment. How am I met? Firstly, a series of anonymous letters to the newspapers, from writers who make all sorts of wild statements, under cover of a pseudonym. "The substance of one of these letters is, that while the writer himself cannot do it, he has a big brother, who can. A few days later, I received—again from an anonymous source—three tickets marked "complimentary," for Dr. Baum's lecture. I presumed that these cards were sent by some one authorized to do so, and considered that it would be only courteous in me to accept the invitation. Accordingly, I attended the first lecture—the guest, as it were, of the Managing Committee. Under these circumstances, with no opportunity of saying a word, my presence was rudely and offensively remarked upon by the lecturer, under cover of vulgar allusions to my name, which appeared to divert him exceedingly. I do not hold the St. Andrew's Brotherhood responsible for this gross breach of courtesy, which I am sure they do not regret more than I did. It will, I trust, be a lesson to them not to bring a lecturer here again without first assuring themselves that he possesses some acquaintance with the amenities of civilized life. That this treatment of an opponent commends itself to my Anglican friends in general, as being fair, or even decent, I cannot believe.

At this lecture I saw some pretty views, and heard an immense amount of extravagant assertions, but no mention of any historical name in support of any proposition in which I was interested. It is true the lecturer alluded to two historians—Macaulay and Froude—who, it appears, have the misfortune to differ from him, and he ridiculed the idea of anybody of intelligence accepting either as an authority. Without directly saying so, he conveyed, by one of the tricks known to the professional lecturer, the impression that I had been guilty of this impropriety. Now I never mentioned Froude's name, and if I quoted Macaulay, it was in reply to Mr. Mucklestone who had invoked him against us. Whatever one may think of Macaulay, this use of him is surely justifiable. According to this statement of the lecturer one of two things is clear: either Mr. Mucklestone, who introduced Macaulay, is a person of no intelligence, or Macaulay is an authority only when he says something against the Catholic Church, and is of no account when he makes any statement in her favor.

ROME SUPREMACY IN ENGLAND.

During the course of the lecture at which I was present, no attempt was made to disprove any of my statements, and only one was specifically challenged. I said that at the Council of Whitby, held in the year 664, the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome in England was formally acknowledged. Dr. Baum asserted that that was not true, and I see by the papers that he reiterated his statement last night, and declared that the Roman supremacy was not acknowledged in England for four hundred years after that date. Now, here is an important question of fact. If my statement can be shown to be unfounded, a great deal will have been accomplished for the Anglican position. I affirm, he denies. How is the question to be settled? How, but by an appeal to history? Mere assertion, even when backed up by a magic lantern, is no proof. The people whom this subject interests are surely not going to be satisfied of the correctness of the assertion respecting the outcome of the Council of Whitby, because they are shown a picture of St. Columba, or the Colliseum. These pictures are, no doubt, interesting, but they do not prove whatever may happen to be said in the intervals between them. To ascertain what was done at the Council of Whitby, we must look on that ancient assemblage, not by the aid of a magic lantern, but view it as it stands revealed in the clear light of history. Now, it is a fact that every historian of whom I have any knowledge bears out my statement in terms more or less explicit. John Richard Green is perhaps as high an authority as we possess. Speaking on this point, he says: "The issue of the Synod

(Whitby) not only gave England a lead in the religious unity of western Christendom, it gave her a religious unity at home." (Green's Making of England, Ed. 1881, p. 325.) And, further down on the same page: "From the channel to the Firth of Forth, the English Church was now a single religious body within the obedience of Rome."

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES.

Mr. Emerton, Professor of History at Harvard University, in his "Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages" (ed. 1889, p. 112), speaking of this period, says: "Many meetings were held and the discussions were hot enough; but as might have been expected, the Roman speakers, with all their great history, and the splendid system of Rome behind them, prevailed. The Council of Whitby settled the question of the allegiance of the Anglo-Saxon Church."

Low and Pulling's Dictionary of English History is a standard work. In the edition of 1884, p. 262, it is written that "at the Synod of Whitby (664) the Northumbrian Kingdom adopted the Roman use; and from that time England obtained ecclesiastical unity as a daughter of the Church of Rome."

HERE IS A CHALLENGE.

I will not take up your space with more quotations. I repeat that I do not know of a single English historian of any eminence, who does not support my contention. In the face of overwhelming testimony such as this, it is preposterous that the people of Ottawa should be asked to believe on the mere *ipse dixit* of any man, however distinguished, much less that of an irresponsible lecturer who is here to-day and gone to-morrow, that all the historians in England are in error upon this point? It must certainly seem so to any fair-minded man, yet the "uninstructed churchmen" applauded to the echo—as they would have applauded any statement against Catholicity—this audacious, yet apparently successful attempt, to impose upon their credulity. I am so desirous to see a representative member of the Anglican Church assume the responsibility of this utterance that I would go almost any length to entice one of them from the shelter of his anonymity. I, therefore, make the following proposition. I agree to submit this question of fact to the editor of the Citizen, the editor of the Journal, a member of the Royal Society, or perhaps better still, to that Presbyterian clergyman who enjoys in an especial manner the esteem and regard of the whole community. Let the evidence on which we respectively rely be submitted to any one of these gentlemen; and if it should be decided by him that the judgment of history is that the Synod of Whitby did not result in the submission of England to the Roman obedience, I pledge myself to use whatever influence I possess with the Catholic Truth Society to withdraw my pamphlet from circulation, and I will retire from the field. It would not bring long: the whole matter could be settled in the Parliamentary Library in half an hour. Should my position be sustained, I shall be content to accept from the Brotherhood of St. Andrew any form of *amende* which their sense of propriety may dictate. Now let my Anglican friends clearly understand what I am saying. The subject of this proposed reference has nothing to do with Queen Mary, or the Inquisition, or the false decretals, or the massacre of St. Bartholomew, or the Province of Quebec. It is the Council of Whitby and its results—that, and that alone.

ONE WORD AS TO THE ANGLICAN ORDERS.

The lecturer is reported in the newspapers as having said that no intelligent member of the Roman Church to-day looked with doubt upon their validity.

THE ANGLICAN CLAIM WEAK.

"Meaty jelly," said Mr. Silas Wegg, on a memorable occasion, "is very mellowing to the organ," and it is recorded of that gentleman that he did not indicate which organ, but spoke with a cheerful generosity. Our censor of the Roman Church, equally with the distinguished student of the Roman Empire, whose words I have quoted, is where in Europe and will be most happy to conduct you over ground that I am now convinced is new to you. I wish you, my dear brother of the Holy Roman Church, two great blessings. The first, that you may yet enjoy the blessings of a good all round common school English education, which will wonderfully expand your knowledge of English history. Surely in those youthful days that I am constrained must have been yours, instead of improving the "shining hours" you must have played "hockey."

THE COUNCIL OF WHITBY.

With this touching allusion to our part I come to your historical statement. I am sorry to state that there is not a word of truth in your assertions regarding the history of the Anglican Church. You asked that the question of Whitby be left to three men, but neither of them can I regard as a friend of the church. I would as soon refer the subject to yourself to be decided in committee of the Whole. However, I make you this proposition. I will leave the questions at issue to three honorable laymen of the Roman Church and the same number of Churchmen. We will each take an hour—and I am willing to abide the result. The editor has given me one column this morning and I am to have one to-morrow, as I have asked for as much space as was occupied by Mr. Pope. I will therefore end the part of my reply this morning with a consideration of the Council of Streathamshelch Abbey near Whitby, commonly known as the Council of Whitby, which Mr. Pope

acknowledged the supremacy of Rome. One of the Anglo Saxon kingdoms—Kent—had been converted by Italian missionaries under a monk, by the name of Augustine, sent out from Rome by Gregory the Great (he it was who said that any one claiming to be universal Bishop was the forerunner of anti-Christ. What do you say, Mr. Pope, to that?) The other kingdoms had been converted by Celtic missionaries from Iona and Lindisfarne. Each kingdom had its own Bishop. The two most powerful Princes were the Kings of Northumbria and Kent, Oswy and Egbert; Oswy had been converted by St. Aidan and adhered to the British customs. His wife Eaulfeula had been educated in Kent, and of course followed the Roman customs. There was a point of difference in the two rituals that gave the King trouble, viz., the crucifixion of our Lord took place on the 14th of the Jewish month. Nisan, and the Churches of Asia accordingly at first kept Easter on the third day after that date, regardless of the day of the week. The Council of Nice, 325, ordered that Easter day should always be a Sunday. The British Church conformed in always keeping it on Sunday, but in their computation often brought it on a Sunday earlier than that observed on the continent, and they did not adopt the general rule now observed until the eighth century, viz., that Easter day should be "the Sunday after the full moon, which happens upon or next after the 21st of March. In 663 it happened that the King of Northumbria was keeping Easter when his Queen was beginning the solemnities of Holy Week. To put an end to such a state of things he called a conference at Whitby to explain to him the rival customs. Coleman, St. Aidan's successor, and Bishop of Lindisfarne defended the old British customs. Wilfred who with Benedict Biscop, had been frequently down to Rome defending the Roman usage. Coleman claimed St. John for his authority and Wilfred St. Peter. The King was still puzzled, but the tact of Wilfred (Jesuitical) won the recently converted pagan King—for he said Christ said, "thou art Peter," etc., and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of God." The King could not run the risk of not keeping St. Peter's customs lest he be refused admittance to the kingdom of Heaven. Bishop Coleman and his clergy at once left the Kingdom of Northumbria and went back to Iona. Now, Mr. Pope, this question of Easter and that of one of the tonsur were the only ones discussed. Was the King or the Bishops and clergy the Church? and if the latter did they accept the customs of Rome or repudiate them? For a most interesting account of the whole affair I refer you to Montalambert's "History of the Monks in the West,"—your own great historian, who will tell you a great deal you evidently do not know at present. Another column is allowed me still for to-morrow to complete my reply, to one who has in fine Christian spirit called your visitor a foreign missionary. H. M. BAUM.

Ottawa, Jan. 16.

Rev. H. M. Baum to Mr. Jos. Pope.

Ed. Citizen:—About a month since when I was arranging several courses of lectures from prominent centres in Canada I received a letter from a gentleman of Ottawa, asking me if I could come to this city. This led to my coming here. I had never heard of Mr. Pope and did not see his pamphlet until 3 o'clock of the afternoon I started for Ottawa. I did not come, therefore, as Mr. Pope seems to suppose, to answer his little pamphlet. It appeared to me to be the result of an over-zealous young writer's efforts in a new field, who had mistaken historians for history. I was amused over the fact of his having taken up points that the great masters of Roman controversy have been glad to avoid. On account of the difficulty experienced in turning sharp corners. The real grievance seems to have been my friendly allusion to him, as I surely intended it to be, when I remarked that I was glad too, that Ottawa was the "fountain of Catholic Truth and that the Pope himself resided here." If this was vulgar, pray what is this I read in the Citizen this morning, viz., that they will not "bring a lecturer here again without assuring themselves that he possesses some acquaintance with the amenities of civilized life." Preposterous that the people of Ottawa should be asked to believe in the *ipse dixit* of any man, however distinguished, much less that of an irresponsible lecturer who is here to-day and gone to-morrow."

A WRITER OF EMINENCE.

Now I leave to those who heard me on the three evenings, the questions, viz., if either of us is a gentleman, which has the clearest right to the title? I am called an adventurer, and irresponsible lecturer. Well, from my ancestors in England, the Masons, and my distinguished uncle, Benjamin Franklin, down, I am the first to have this ended. It was not the fault of my ancestors that I am not a gentleman. I must charge the blame to Mr. Pope. I am an irresponsible lecturer. Well when a man has edited the largest quarterly review in the world for a dozen years, and fifty-nine genuine Catholic Bishops (no Roman taint about them) have certified over their signature that the publication stands at the head of American Church literature; and the London Guardian has said that it is the equal if not the superior in some respects of the great English quarterlies; then can such a man be put down as irresponsible. My work on church law has been the acknowledged authority in the American church since it was published in 1879. Now, Mr. Pope I have taken the public into my confidence and told them who I am; will you please do the same? My dear sir, I have studied the Roman question in old St. Peter's itself, and the canon law of the Catholic Church in the Sorbonne and elsewhere in Europe and will be most happy to conduct you over ground that I am now convinced is new to you. I wish you, my dear brother of the Holy Roman Church, two great blessings. The first, that you may yet enjoy the blessings of a good all round common school English education, which will wonderfully expand your knowledge of English history. Surely in those youthful days that I am constrained must have been yours, instead of improving the "shining hours" you must have played "hockey."

Rev. H. M. Baum to Mr. Jos. Pope.

Ottawa Citizen, Jan. 18.

Ed. Citizen.—The conference of Whitby, as we see from the account given of it, was simply for the purpose of settling domestic affairs in the Capital of Northumbria, and we see that the British Bishop and clergy repudiated the decision of the King and left his kingdom. The supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was not considered. The Bishop of Rome did not at that time claim!!! all things—the earth. RESULT OF THE WHITBY CONFERENCE. The See of Canterbury now became vacant. The British Bishops refused to consecrate a Bishop for Canterbury and the Kings of Northumbria and Kent had to send to the Bishop of Rome for help. No Italian priest would come. But Theodore, a Greek monk, a native of St. Paul's City, Tarsus, offered his services. He was duly consecrated for the See of Canterbury. Now if the Bishop of Rome had any jurisdiction outside of Rome, this man would have been most likely to have recognized it. Did he? In a short time this same Wilfrid objected to Theodore's plans for subdividing the See of York. Wilfrid did what no man had ever done before. He appealed to the Bishop of Rome against Theodore. How was it received? As a matter of course the Bishop of Rome decided in favor of Wilfrid. Theodore told Wilfrid that the Bishop of Rome had no jurisdiction in England. He repudiated the very idea, paid no attention to the Bull and the King of Northumbria and his council imprisoned Wilfrid for appealing to a power outside the kingdom, and in the end he was banished from Northumbria. So that the King never intended in his household conference at Whitby to acknowledge the right of the Bishop of Rome to interfere in ecclesiastical matters in his kingdom. These are the facts, and now Mr. Pope, where do you stand? From what I understand is the sentiment in Roman circles here they are not only anxious that you should withdraw your pamphlet from circulation but also yourself.

THE GREAT ENGLISH ROMANIZER.

Dunstan was the great defender of Roman innovations like that of the celibacy of the clergy and the multiplying of monastic establishments. Remember that over two hundred years had passed away and we hear nothing of the Bishop of Rome in England. He had enough of the Greek Theodore. He turns up in the case of the unfortunate Edwy the Fair and his beautiful cousin-queen. Edwy had married his

cousin in defiance of the laws of the Church. Dunstan excommunicated him. Edwy appealed to the Bishop of Rome. Ah! here was the golden opportunity for the Pope. He commanded Dunstan to restore Edwy; he refused flatly to do so, replying that the Bishop of Rome had no right to interfere with affairs in England. The Church of England never acknowledged the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

I care nothing about what historians say. Until it can be shown that the Church of England, assembled in national council, acknowledged by formal decree the supremacy of the Pope, what individuals did amount to nothing. This she has never done. I came here to lecture on Church History, as we find it in the acts of the Church of England, and not in church histories. What this or that historical writer has said (and many have no greater claims to be called historical writers than Mr. Pope) is not to the point. The fact is not in the Canada an "uncivilized, vulgar, foreign mercenary," and declaring that Canada is a part of the United States, does not make it so.

WHAT IS THE TROUBLE AND THE CAUSE OF THESE FREQUENT ATTACKS FROM ROME?

My glorious good friend the Archdeacon of Ottawa stated the case exactly yesterday, when he said "Rome would give all she has to exchange places with England." They look with longing eyes on God's fair heritage stretching away from the seat of the British Empire into all parts of the world, carrying the blessings of His Word, religious and constitutional liberty, and Christian civilization. They see the Christianity of England obliterated civil boundaries and making a great race one in the struggle for God and humanity. It is that bond which links the British Isles with Jerusalem in her happier days, reaches over the Atlantic and makes me feel that notwithstanding your abuse, if I ever have the gripe again I prefer to have it in Ottawa among good, sound Catholics, of whom I find many here. I feel that I can leave you in their hands. They will give you the "chapter and verse." I rejoice to find one Catholic layman here whose ecclesiastical learning would bring honor to the Episcopate. I need not say that his name is not Pope, but Mr. Pope in due time will hear from him.

One word about Mr. Mucklestone's pamphlet. If, Mr. Pope, you are honest and sincere, why did you not meet his indictment? You have evaded him on every important point. On the question of Anglican Order, I refer you back to his pamphlet, which is straightforward, scholarly and to the point. Your answer is rambling nonsense. Had such a document come to me editorially it would have been sent back without the usual compliments accompanying rejected MSS.

I want to conclude with this statement in justice to laymen of the Roman Church. I have no feeling of ill-will toward them. My energies are devoted to upholding the Church of England, and destroying the efforts of those who are trying to take from it a glorious heritage. When these attacks cease, and religion not politics is shown to be the one great object of the leaders of the Church of Rome, I shall be through with controversy. HENRY MASON BAUM.

Ottawa, Jan. 17, 1894.

ALWAYS ON HAND.—Mr. Thomas H. Porter, Lower Ireland, P. Q., writes: "My son, 18 months old, had croup so bad that nothing gave him relief until a neighbor brought me some of Dr. THOMAS' ECLECTIC OIL, which I gave him, and in six hours he was cured. It is the best medicine I ever used, and I would not be without a bottle of it in my house."

When all other corn preparations fail, try Holloway's Corn Cure. No pain whatever, and no inconvenience in using it. Minard's Liniment for sale everywhere.

Mr. Joseph Hemmerich



Mr. Joseph Hemmerich

An old soldier, came out of the War greatly endeavored by Typhoid Fever, and after being in various hospitals the doctors discharged him as incurable with **Consumption**. He has been in poor health since, until he began to take

**Hood's Sarsaparilla** Immediately his cough grew hoarse, night sweats ceased, and he regained good general health. He cordially recommends Hood's Sarsaparilla, especially to comrades in the U. S. A.

HOOD'S PILLS cure Habitual Constipation by restoring peristaltic action of the alimentary canal.

THE HURON AND ERIE

Loan & Savings Company

ESTABLISHED 1864.

Subscribed Capital, - - - \$2,500,000

Paid up Capital, - - - 1,500,000

Reserve Fund, - - - 626,000

J. W. LITTLE, President

JOHN BEATTIE, Vice-President

DEPOSITS of \$1 and upwards received at highest current rates.

DEBENTURES issued, payable in Canada or in England. Executors and trustees are authorized by law to invest in the debentures of this company.

MONEY LOANED on mortgages of real estate.

MORTGAGES purchased.

G. A. SOMERVILLE, Manager.

London, Ont.

CANDLEMAS DAY.

Pure Beeswax Candles.

The manufacturers have, after 28 years experience, succeeded in producing a perfectly pure moulded Beeswax Candle which is evenness, finish and extraordinary burning qualities, defy competition. Guaranteed absolutely pure, being made from selected Beeswax, clear and unadulterated.

The Candles are symmetrical and burn with a bright, steady flame, while our Gramophone Candles cannot be excelled for beauty. Made in sizes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10. Neatly packed in 5 lb. paper boxes, and 10 lb. wooden boxes.

Moulded Beeswax Candles.

Second Quality.

Made in sizes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10 lb.

Wax Souches.

Unbleached.

Twelve to the lb. Fifteen to the lb.

Starbuck and Wax Candles.

Made of pure Stearic Wax only, and exceed all others in hardness, whiteness, beauty of finish and brilliancy of light.

Four to the lb.—13 inches long.

Six to the lb.—14 inches long.

Paraffine Wax Candles.

Six to the lb.—14 inches long.

Large Candles, 30 inches long.

Sanitary Oil.

Quality guaranteed.

Income for Churches.

Extra Fine Income. Income, 75 cents.

Artificial Chancel.

For Churches.

Great saving of time and trouble. This chancel is lighted at the four ends. It ignites so easily and never extinguishes unless completely smothered out of the air. Knap Glass Box containing 50 Tablets. Gas lighter, Floor, etc.

D. & J. SADLER & CO.

Catholic Publishers, Church Ornaments and Religious Articles.

1089 Notre Dame St. 123 Church St. MONTREAL. TORONTO.

JOHN FERGUSON & SONS,

The leading Undertakers and Embalmers. Open night and day.

Telephone—House, 373; Factory, 645.

WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY

—AND—

The Catholic Record for One Year

FOR \$4.00.

By special arrangement with the publishers, we are able to obtain a number of the above books, and propose to furnish a copy to each of our subscribers.

The dictionary is a necessity in every home, school and business house. It fills a vacancy, and furnishes knowledge which no one hundred other volumes of the choicest books could supply. Young and Old, Rich and Poor, and Ignorant and Learned, should have it within reach, and refer to its contents every day in the year.

Some have asked if this is really the Original Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, we are able to state that we have learned direct from the publishers the fact that this is the very work complete, on which about 40 of the best years of the author's life were so well employed in writing. It contains the entire vocabulary of about 100,000 words, including the correct spelling, derivation and definition of name, and is the regular standard size, containing about 300,000 square inches of printed surface, and is bound in cloth.

The whole library in itself. The regular selling price of Webster's Dictionary has here before been \$12.00.

No. 15—Dictionaries will be delivered free of all charge for carriage. All orders must be accompanied with the cash.

If the book is not entirely satisfactory to the purchaser it may be returned at our expense.

I am well pleased with Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. I find it most valuable work.

JOHN A. PAYNE, Chatham, Ont.

I am highly pleased with the Dictionary," writes Mr. Scott, of Lancaster, Ont.

Address, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, LONDON, ONT.

Margaret L. Shepherd

A COMPLETE ACCOUNT OF HER LIFE.

A single copy, 25c; fifty or over, 15c. Address, THOS. COPPEL, Catholic Record Office, London, Ont.

P.P.A.

An authentic copy of the Ritual of the P. P. A. will be sent to any address on receipt of 5c. in stamps. By down, 4c. By hundred, 3c. Address, THOS. COPPEL, Catholic Record, London, Ont.

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK

POPULAR

DERBY PLUG

Smoking Tobacco

be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.

REGISTERED TRADE MARK