IMPORTANT READING MATTER SELECTED FROM THIS WEEK'S NEWS FOR THE GUARDIAN'S SATURDAY SUBSCRIBERS

Proceedings In The Legislature

(Continued from Page Ten.)

that year was included all that was collectable of that $64,000, and still there remained $108,000. Now, the Leader of the Opposition knows we started out with a debt on our shoulders of $168,000 and ended at the close of the year with the debt reduced to $108,000. That is, we had paid off their deficit of $83,000 and liabilities of $85,000, to the extent I have mentioned, leaving $108,000. That was the situation on the 31st day of December, 1912. I think that is perfectly plain to anyone who wishes to be fair. This has continued from year to year. It is true that at the end of every year there are debts owing by the province and debts due to the province, which we call assets. We are more honest than the late Government. At the end of every fiscal year during their period, on the 30th September, the Provincial Auditor's report showed that during the year a certain amount of money had been received by the province and a certain amount of money had been paid out.—**AND THAT WAS ABSOLUTELY ALL IT SHOWED!** It did not show what the province owed, and no amount of questioning on our part while we were in opposition could elicit the information and place before the people of the province the exact situation. We demanded the statement year after year, and those who sat in the places we now occupy refused us the information, and it was not until we came into power that the province knew just where it stood. On the other hand, we have not only shown year after year what we have received and paid out, but we also show to the people of the province what we owe; so that today you can pick up the External Auditor's report and ascertain exactly to a cent how the province stands; and this is one of the circumstances that told in our favor when we had to go to the market for money. It helped us because, financial institutions said to us, "You have placed before us the precise situation of your province. Never before could we obtain such a statement. We never knew just what your province owed." It might be $100 or $100,000, and as a matter of fact, on the 2nd December, 1911, the amount due by this province and unpaid was some $85,000, and this had been going on year after year. I need not labor that point any further. It is not necessary; and I think I have made it plain that our system of book-keeping is the only proper one,—a system that readily commends itself to anyone who is accustomed to using figures. The last report from the external auditor shows that the debt of the province is $1,062,000 as against $1,072,000 on the 2nd of December, 1911,, or an improvement of $10,000; and the assets lying to the credit of the province amount to $52,000. This is the statement of a Bank manager, an independent outside man whose only concern is to give the correct figures. The financial critic of the Opposition says: If the debt is as high as it is, it is due to the Conservative Party of the Province. When we came to power a great many years ago we found that the debt of the province was $171,000, and besides that they had drawn $200,000 from Ottawa, making a total of $371,000. Now, I cannot see the analogy between drawing $200,000 from Ottawa and the debt of the province. However, he starts out with his debt of $371,000 and says there has been interest on that amount running ever since, so that in 1911 when they gave up power that debt of $371,000 would have amounted to $700,000, which the Conservatives are responsible for. That is what he says. Let us see how that works out. We, ourselves, found the debt at $1,072,000, and when in twenty-four years' time when we come to give up the reins of power in this province—and I have no dobut we shall remain in power so long—we were to leave a debt of $3,500,000, according to the Leader of the Opposition's argument we could turn round and say: "Why, that is all your fault. You left us a debt of a million dollars, and that compounded for twenty years has amounted to three and a half millions. It would be analagous to the case of the farmers' son who might be left a $10,000 farm with a small mortgage on it of $300 and, after he had kept it for a great many years, would be obliged to see the farm sold in order to pay off the mortgage, and accumulated interest, which would have amounted then to probably nearly the value of the land. Following the contention of the Leader of the Opposition, that farmer's son might very well say: It is all my father's fault. He left me the farm with a mortgage of $300 on it, and that mortgage, with compound interest added to it from year to year, has consumed the whole farm. That is the argument of the Leader of the Opposition, and I leave it to the House to estimate its value.

There is another so-called "argument" used by the Opposition, a sample of their cherished stock-in-trade. They say that we have been getting $200,000 a year more than the Liberals got when they were in power. I will take the last four years the Liberals were in power. Their ordinary revenue for the following years was:

In 1908	$366,601.15
In 1909	375,374.45
In 1910	375,151.32
In 1911	374,797.82
An average revenue of	372,981.18

Our ordinary revenue has been, in the last four years:

In 1913	506,553.39
In 1914	525,555.19
In 1915	470,729.80
In 1916	482,534.51
An average of	496,345.22

The average difference for the four years is $123,000, not $200,000. What did we do with it?—they ask. I have a statement here which I have made up showing that we paid yearly on an average, during the last five years, for education in the province, $39,717 out of the ordinary revenue, more than in the last five years the Liberals were in power. That is, we have paid $40,000 a year on an average more than the Liberals paid during the last five years they were in power. We have expended on an average $50,000 a year in permanent public works. In those two items we have spent $90,000 a year of excess revenue. The balance can be easily accounted for. It has gone to good purpose and consists of small items which I will not go into. And another thing which we did was: We killed the average deficit of $45,000 a year which they had all except in one year. That is where more of the money went, and yet our friends of the Opposition accuse us of extravagance.

There is another matter I want to refer to, and that is this; The Leader of the Opposition made a charge that in the adjustment that took place in 1916 the assessors had worked by themselves, had not consulted together. I don't know what authority the Leader of the Opposition had for making such a statement,—that there was no co-operation among them and that therefore they could not have made a proper adjustment. This statement, like a great many more, is not founded on fact. The facts are that the adjustors did meet; that they did consult; that they started out their work on the borders of the Counties and worked together in order to get at the standard value of farms bordering on the counties. They met from time to time and compared notes, and when it is said in this House that such a thing did not happen, the statement is not founded on fact. I showed also that the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition that he knew one school district in his own district where the increase in taxes had amounted to some $400 was not correct. I have a statement in my hand showing that in the whole of the hon. gentleman's electoral district, comprising thirty-three school districts, the total increase was only $278, or an average of approximately $8.50 per school district, and there is not one single district in which the increase has been one-tenth of what the hon. gentleman claimed it was. What confidence can the public at large have in a man who would make such wild statements

I now come to the subject of the Increased Subsidy. This is a matter that is well known, and I do not think it needs to be dwelt on at any great length. The hon. gentleman started out with the assertion that the claim we made did not require very much research, that the statement had been prepared before and all that we had to do was to present it. He said that the statement had been prepared by others. Well, I am thinking that the hon. gentleman has been reading the journals of the years 1906 and 1907, and if he did look up those journals he will have found those claims very shortly set out there. The question is: Who made them up? Who was it that put them on the Journals of the House? Was it not the then Opposition? They prepared them and put them on the Journals of the House. It is true that the claims, as set out in the Journals there, made up the skeleton of the claim, but if the hon. gentleman has ever worked up a brief he knows it is not what goes in a brief that constitutes the work. He knows you have to look up a great number of cases and that perhaps of every dozen cases you look up only one applies, and he knows that a brief after all does not begin to represent the work that has been spent on it.

For two strenuous weeks we laboured at it. Besides the work that had been done in Prince Edward Island preparatory to going to Ottawa, we spent two weeks in the Library there, in the archives and in other places, looking over our ground, making sure of every point, and studying up the case, in order that when we went before the Privy Council any objections that might then be put up to us we would be ready to meet and overcome; and as a matter of fact, when we did go before the Privy Council every member of the Council raised objections of one kind or another which had to be answered, and I have no hesitation in saying that it was the thorough way in which the Premier of the province answered those objections that gave him the status he held before the Privy Council. (Applause.) I want to say in this connection that this province will never repay the Premier for the work that he then did and for many other benefits he obtained for the province. There was another case in which a brief was submitted, and that is where reference has been made to research in regard to the United States. That was the lands claim, and the strongest precedent we had in support of that claim was found in the United States after some research. The Leader of the Opposition said: "An amount of credit is due you, but there are others entitled to credit as well." Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree that there are other men in this province who are entitled to credit, and from the floor of this House they have obtained credit. Although they were politically opposed to us, we recognised what they had done for the province, and recognising, we gave them credit. I refer to Senators Yeo and Prowse. The Leader of the Opposition thinks we should also give credit to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In a moment I shall come to that point, but I will say now that whatever influence Sir Wilfrid Laurier had with his followers in the Senate was exercised against us rather than for us, and had it not been for the unremitting work of Senators Yeo and Prowse and their influence with their Liberal friends, the measure would have been defeated in the Senate at the instigation of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Perhaps the hon. member for the second district of Queen's will appreciate what I am about to read These are the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

"The only thing I was anxious to know to-day was, upon what ground my hon. friend is taking the very abnormal action he proposes. We are in this instance departing altogether from the practice that has been followed. I thought that in 1907 when we revised the subsidies of the provinces, and established a new scale of pay, **WE HAD PUT AN END TO THIS QUESTION.** Let me say to my hon. friend that he is turning over an important page in the history of the country **IF WE ARE TO REVERT TO THE CONDITION OF FORMER TIMES WHEN PROVINCES WERE COMING AGAIN AND AGAIN TO THE FEDERAL POWER AND ASKING FOR BETTER TERMS.** However, I will not insist upon this matter today. I would like to know where, in that speech, the Leader of the Opposition can find any consolation or justification for his statement that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is entitled to any credit ? Does the hon. member recall what happened in 1907 when at the time of the re-adjustment of Provincial subsidies, on the floor of the House, Sir Wilfrid was asked "If the provinces come back what will you do?" Does the hon. member recall the answer Sir Wilfrid made? **"THIS SETTLEMENT IS FINAL AND UNALTERABLE."** Those were his words.

Mr. BELL: That is not what he said:

HON. Mr. ARSENAULT: That is what he said when he was in power and controlled the purse strings. He said the settlement was final and unalterable, there could be no change, and it was useless to come back. Of course, when we went there the situation was changed. He was out of power, but still he could not refrain from the statement, more injurious than beneficial, that it was a strange precedent, that he thought when the subsidies of the province had been re-adjusted in 1907 the matter was ended. The occasion may arise in the future when we may have to deal further with the matter, and I can assure the hon. member that there will be nothing on record to the credit of either Sir Wilfrid or those representatives who went to Quebec at that time.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition also referred to the Department of Agriculture which he made the subject of extreme criticism. I am not going to interfere with the Department of my hon. friend the Commissioner of Agriculture. He is quite capable of looking after it, and I have no doubt if he has the occasion to speak he will take up the challenge thrown out by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition waxed eloquent and dealt at tedious length on the question of prohibition. Now, I had really thought that this year the Leader of the Opposition would have left that subject severely alone; but it seems to be one of the points that have an alluring attraction for him. I don't know whether it is because of familiarity with one Roderick Dhu of whom he spoke some days ago; but whatever the reason may be, he is on the warpath once again on that entrancing field, and even went so far as to read two letters written to the Jailor of Queen's County, with the intention, I have no doubt whatever, of misleading the people into the belief that those letters had reference to prohibition offenders who were incarcerated in the jail. Those two letters which he read have absolutely nothing to do with prohibition. One letter referred to a man with a family of young children. He had had some disagreement with his good wo-

HEAT FLASHES, DIZZY, NERVOUS

Mrs. Wynn Tells How Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound Helped Her During Change of Life.

Richmond, Va.—"After taking seven bottles of Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound I feel like a new woman. I always had a headache during the Change of Life and was also troubled with other bad feelings common at that time—dizzy spells, nervous feelings and heat flashes. Now I am in better health than I ever was and recommend your remedies to all my friends."—Mrs. LENA WYNN, 2812 E. O Street, Richmond, Va.

While Change of Life is a most critical period of a woman's existence, the annoying symptoms which accompany it may be controlled, and normal health restored by the timely use of Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound.

Such warning symptoms are a sense of suffocation, hot flashes, headaches, backaches, dread of impending evil, timidity, sounds in the ears, palpitation of the heart, sparks before the eyes, irregularities, constipation, variable appetite, weakness and inquietude, and dizziness.

For these abnormal conditions do not fail to take Lydia E. Pinkham's Vegetable Compound.

man and had been placed in confinement in the jail until such time as his temper would resume its normal state. His wife, after he had been in prison for some time, found it more than she could do to keep the family, and an arrangement was made and bonds were given for his good behaviour, and at the importunity of the wife and on the representations of her clergyman, the husband was liberated. The other case was under similar circumstances; but neither of them had anything whatever to do with prohibition. The Leader of the Opposition also dealt at some length on the happenings of a certain drug store in the western part of the province, and related all that was going on,—a great deal in his own imagination. But he did not tell us what went on in a certain law office in proximity to the said drug store on nomination day, 1915. On that day those living across the street observed a great stream of people going by one door into that law office and coming out by the back door; and in the place where the pocket of each individual was supposed to be, there was a significant protrusion. One man, it was stated went in on 17 different occasions, and on as many different occasions he came out arm in arm with Sir Roderick. A man from my district came to me and said: "I want two bottles of whiskey." I replied: "Well, I have no whiskey." His retort was: "If you don't give it to me I won't vote for you." I said: "All right; that is your own privilege. You can vote for whomsoever you please." He went off, seeing that there was no prospect of getting his order filled in the quarter he was applying to, but before going he levelled this Parthian shot at me: "If you don't give it to me I can get it from the other party;—and I know whom to vote for, don't fear." He did go, and he did get it,—and he got it from the same law office.

Mr. BELL: What is the name?

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us the other name.

HON Mr. ARSENAULT: It is well known. There is only one place in Summerside where such a thing happened. It is adjacent to the "certain drug store" of which the Leader of the Opposition spoke. Those who are acquainted with Summerside can tell the rest of the story.

Mr. BELL: That is pretty small politics.

HON. Mr. ARSENAULT: I admit it is small politics, but unfortunately we have fallen into very bad company. There is an old adage in French which says that when you are with the wolves you have to eat with the wolves, or, in plain English, "When in Rome, do as Rome does."

It is extremely regrettable that we should be under the necessity of following hon. members in this strain, but when we are confronted with tactics such as have been employed against us in this debate by some members of the Opposition, we must meet them on their own ground, distasteful though it is to us. In other words, to use another aphorism: You have to fight the devil with his own weapon.

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his odious personalities, introduced my name into a vindictive discussion on a certain article which appeared some time ago in the "Guardian." He and the hon. junior member for the First District of Prince, taunted me on that article and sought to define my attitude, as they professed to understand it, on the subject of the article in question; and the newspapers of the province have also referred to the matter. As a rule, Mr. Speaker, I pay little attention to what the papers say, and if the discussion of this matter had been confined to the newspapers I would deem it unnecessary to refer to it in the House. In view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters have endeavoured to place me in a false position, however, I think I owe it as a duty to myself and those of my race whom I represent in this House, irrespective of politics, to say a few words on the subject. In regard to Liberal newspaper comment regarding my attitude as to what the "Guardian" has said in reference to the Acadians, I cannot do better than quote from a recent article in "Le Moniteur Acadien," the organ of the Acadians for the last fifty years,—a paper which in all that time has defended the Acadians through good and evil, and which to-day stands high in their esteem. In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, knowing that perhaps you are more at home in English and perhaps in braw Gaelic, I shall not read the original as it appears in French, but shall read the translation of the article. This is what "Le Moniteur says:

"The Moniteur wishes to warn its compatriots against the appeals to prejudice which for sometime past appeared almost daily in the Transcript. These appeals to the lowest and meanest passion, are a gratuitous insult to the Acadian race, who we feel assured will not be deceived by the too transparent game of a newspaper, which in the past has and today continues to play a supremely odious role with the sole purpose of promoting the vile interests of a small political clique of whom it has constituted itself the mouth piece.

"Let us not be deceived; the senseless and ridiculous articles published by the Transcript are not inspired by love for the French race nor by a desire to strengthen (la bonne entente) the good will prevailing between the different races living in this Province, but they are the result of a deliberate plan to create discord and to endeavour to derive political advantage therefrom."

Now, Sir, I may say further that the Acadians of this province do not wish to be patronised and they do not wish to be toadied to. They have so far hewed their way unassisted. They have risen from a small band of deported exiles, and by their indomitable courage and industry, their unflagging zeal, their thrift, and, above all, their grim and admirable tenacity of purpose, they have succeeded in again lifting their heads high among their fellow-citizens of the Maritime Provinces and commanding the respect of all. My position in this matter is too well known to require explanation. My duty as a member of the Government and as a Representative in this House has ever been, the interest and welfare of the Province in general; secondly the interest of my own constituents; and last but by no means least the interest of my Acadien compatriots. These various interests I shall always strive, as I have striven in the past, to protect and maintain; and I think I may claim with confidence, Sir, that I have not been remiss in the discharge of my duty in this respect. If the hon. junior member for the First District were in is seat—I regret that he is not—I would tell him some things I found when I became a member of the present Government. I found that many years ago there was an Acadien inspector of schools appointed for this province. His duty then was simply to visit the French schools once every year. These schools were also visited by the English inspector and the salary was fixed at $300. That inspector continued that work for many years. A man who can occupy that position in this province must have the ability of two ordinary men. He must have a thorough knowledge of French, and must also be intimately acquainted with English; therefore he has of necessity to be a man above the common. When I became a member of this House eight years ago I brought to the attention of the Leader of the Government the fact that this man could not live on the small salary of $300, that it was impossible. I pointed out that his work had increased and that he was doing work equal with the other inspectors and was therfore entitled to the same salary. My representation had some effect; his salary was increased to $350. That man was not a supporter of mine, but when I became a member of the present Government I laid his case before them, and to the credit of the Government and of my hon. friend, the senior member for the First District, the Government recognised the claim of this man and placed him on an equal footing with the other inspectors. (Applause.) I found another case in Prince of Wales College. There was a young man who had started in life the son of a poor farmer. He had received a common school education and had graduated at Prince of Wales College, taking his license as a second-class teacher. He had gone and taught school for a number of years as a second-class teacher, and gradually, by study and perseverence, succeeded in obtaining a first-class license. He was afterwards appointed to a position in Prince of Wales. Part of his duties at that institution was tuition of French. He was not satisfied but continued his studies; attended night school and succeeded in taking his B. A. degree. That man, although he had been teaching for several years and in the natural order of things would have been entitled to a yearly increase of $100 as other professors, when I came to look into things I found he had started at $600, and at that time, although recognised to be one of the best teachers in Prince of Wales College, was receiving only $700. I brought the case before the Government. This man's family had been Liberals, who were voters against my hon. friend from Tignish. You would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the natural thing my hon. friend would have done under the circumstances, would have been to say: "Well, his friends would not do anything for him. What right have we, then, to help a man whose family have opposed us?" But, no! My hon. friend took no such position. He allowed no party feeling or prejudice to weigh in the matter, and judged of the situation on its merits. He said: "If you think the man is equal to the position, then justice must be done." And justice was done. Now, I could go on to cite other cases, where, for instance, the Premier, knowing that there was a position in the Normal School for a young lady teacher, suggested to me that as there were not many positions held by Acadiens in the province I should have the right to name some person for the position in question. I made enquiries and found the best person available. That person was a young lady from my hon. friend's district.

I don't know whether the Acadian population in New Brunswick was against prohibition or for prohibition. I know it was a political issue in the province and some inflamatory speeches were made in the matter, and I know that English as well as French representatives were returned to oppose prohibition. It is not a matter of our concern, and if the "Guardian," said that one of the reasons why an apparent majority of the Acadians of New Brunswick population voted against the Government was because they were opposed to prohibition, the "Guardian" is right to the extent that it was a political issue in New Brunswick.

A few days ago I stated that I deprecated the agitation going on to have the boats retained between Charlottetown and Pictou and between Summerside and Point du Chene after the Car Ferry had been proved a success. It seemed that the doughty Knight of Prince County, Captain Joseph Read, has taken umbrage at my remarks and has written a lengthy letter which will appear in the "Farmer" tomorrow. I owe the advance copy to his courtesy and I wish to acknowledge it.

The gallant Captain keeps on reiterating throughout his letter. "Does Mr. Arsenault know? Well, there is one thing Mr. Arsenault does know, and that is that Capt. Joseph Read is at present moving heaven and earth in his attempt to secure the nomination for Prince County at the next Federal Election and this letter is only one move in his political game to that end. I understand that my colleagues from the Third of Prince (Mr. McLean) my friend the junior member for the first district of Prince (Mr. Gallant) and my friend from the second of Prince (Mr. Saunders) are also aspirants for the honour. The verbose Captain has obtained a "scoop" over them, and if my honorable friends want to be in the race for the nomination they certainly will have to check-mate the Captain. In fact I understand that the junior member for the second of Prince has had an **ultimatum** served on him that unless he opens up the flood gates of his well known slogan in denunciation of the government he cannot expect to get the delegates from his district and so I now warn the House and you, Mr. Speaker, that during the next few days this Assembly is threatened with the delivery of philippics by these gentlemen in condemnation of the Mathieson Government such as never before have awakened the echoes of these venerable halls.

Captain Read makes the following statement: Mr. Arsenault says, 'Those who are now advocating that until the car ferry is in operation the boats be left on the Summerside-Point du Chene and the Georgetown-Pictou routes are rather injuring the province than benefitting it." I never made any such statement. I am not in the habit of revising or reading my own speeches. If I was so reported I was reported wrongly. What I did say was: **"AFTER** the car ferry began operations." I may say that in speaking this way I am giving my own opinion merely and not voicing the opinion of any member of the Government or the Government as a whole. I said I thought it was a short-sighted policy to advocate leaving on the boats between the Charlottetown-Pictou and Summerside-Point du Chene routes after the car ferry went into operation. I said further that when it was decided to accept the car ferry as a solution of the winter navigation problem we had not in contemplation the subsidies of boats to perform the service, and I pointed out that the widening of the gauge was not part of the Confederation contract. Captain Read takes issue with me on that point, but I think that anyone who reads the British North America Act will agree with me that the widening of the gauge of the railway was not contemplated by that contract. I have reason to know that the feeling is gaining ground in Ottawa that we are a hard people to satisfy, that we hardly know what we want. No sooner had one part of the province asked for one thing, than another part wants something altogether different. We believe in asking, and we have not been remiss in that respect. We have received the car ferry and promise of widening of the gauge of the railway. We have had an increased subsidy. We have had a four-core cable laid between the Capes and a two-core cable laid at the eastern end of the Island; a large vote for re-building the land telegraph lines, and a great many other things we have had. Our representation was about to be cut down to three, and we have succeeded in retaining it for all time at four. Captain Read has himself stated that the Car Ferry would increase the value of every acre of land in this province and would increase the traffic immensely,—and now, what do we want? It seems we want the Dominion Government to operate three boats. I say the danger lies in this: that we may go just a little too far. There is a war on now and money is none too plentiful, and there is a possibility that, by importuning the Government too much, they may say: We were ready to do many things for you that we were not obliged to do, but as you seem incapable of satisfaction and want too much, we will give you just a little less than we promised. That is the danger. I have the assurance from one in authority that until the car ferry has been proved a success and gives us the fullest measure of transportation facilities the boats will remain on the other routes. This I think should satisfy any reasonable person. I am not here pleading the cause of the

(Continued on Page Sixteen.)

"We never have coffee at our house, because I can't make good coffee".

Have you ever started right —with Chase & Sanborn's "SEAL BRAND" COFFEE?

In ½, 1 and 2 pound tins. Whole—ground—pulverized—also fine ground for Percolators. Never sold in bulk. 185

CHASE & SANBORN, MONTREAL.

KEEP LIVER ACTIVE AND BOWELS CLEAN WITH "CASCARETS"

Best when bilious, sick, headachy, constipated, or for bad breath or sour stomach.

Be cheerful! Clean up inside tonight and feel fine. Take Cascarets to liven your liver and clean the bowels and stop headaches, a bad cold, biliousness, offensive breath, coated tongue, sallowness, sour stomach and gases. To-night take Cascarets and enjoy the nicest, gentlest liver and bowel cleansing you ever experienced. Wake up feeling grand—Everybody's doing it. Cascarets best laxative for children also.

For Run-Down People Vinol Creates Strength

Weak, run-down, nervous men and women need Vinol because it contains the most famous reconstructive tonics in an agreeable and easily digested form:—Beef and Cod Liver Peptones, Iron and Manganese Peptonates, Glycerophosphates, etc.

Vinol

Full Formula on Every Bottle

Is always sold with a definite guarantee to return the purchaser's money if it fails to give satisfaction. Very few bottles are returned.

E. A. FOSTER, DRUGGIST, CHARLOTTETOWN,

Vinol is sold in Montague by H. J. Mabon

Also the best druggist in all Prince Edward Island towns.

Why?

Why are Davis cigars never raw, harsh, bitter or peppery?

Why?

Perfection "Perfection"
Actual Size as illustrated
3-for-25c.

Perfection "Straights" 3-for-25c.

Because

for over 70 years the house of Davis has been making good cigars. In that time it has discovered and acquired many trade secrets of blending, curing and maturing tobacco.

156

"Perfection" Cigars are made by Davis' SOLD AT **3-for-25c.**