

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT 633 RICHMOND ST. LONDON, ONTARIO.

GENERAL AGENTS: Messrs. Donat Crowe and Luke King. OTTAWA AGENT: P. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.

Catholic Record.

London, Ont., May 25th, 1897.

THE MOBBIING OF WM. O'BRIEN.

ALL THE water in the bay cannot wash from Toronto the deep disgrace of Wednesday last. On that day the brave Wm. O'Brien, author of the Plan of Campaign, and editor of United Ireland, was brutally attacked by a maddened mob, who allowed their narrow prejudices to transform them for the moment into demons.

KINGSTON, the "Darry of Canada," played a very good second fiddle to the "Belfast of Canada." Here also the murder of Mr. O'Brien seems to have been deliberately planned and desperate efforts made to carry it into execution.

THE COWARDLY crowd in Kingston, when balked of their prey, set to work to destroy the Freeman office, and we believe succeeded well in the undertaking. We hope the proprietors, Messrs. Cicolari and Daly, two worthy, industrious young men, who have succeeded in establishing an admirable paper, will be soon able to resume their good work in the cause of Home Rule and fair play.

THE Orangemen of Toronto were perhaps not alone to blame for the Wellington street part of the reception accorded Mr. O'Brien. There exists in that city also, we believe, a society called the "Sons of England," made up largely of the descendants of Yankee skeddaddlers of revolutionary times.

THE RIOTERS and those whose interperate language was in a large measure the cause of the riot, were not actuated as much by a desire to champion Lord Lansdowne as to show opposition to Gladstone, Parnell, and the Home Rulers. Their hate of O'Brien is of long standing.

MAYOR HOWLAND, of Toronto, in the course of an address to the Governor-General, on his recent visit to that city, made reference to the fact that Toronto was a place where the Lord's Day was rigidly observed. We doubt not this is the case, at least outwardly, but for steady-going, quiet, concealed villany, Toronto would surpass almost any city in the American republic.

REFERRING to the speakers at the "loyal" meeting on Saturday the Globe says: "Two or three spoke with creditable moderation, the others played the part of firebrands. Canon Dumoulin showered abusive epithets upon Mr. O'Brien in a manner befitting a Billingsgate fishwife. The whole tendency of the speeches was to give the most violent part of the crowd an impression that to nail Mr. O'Brien's ears to the pump would be rather a fine demonstration of 'loyalty,' eminently calculated to please the Protestant clergy and the Mayor."

They deliberately put a match to a bundle of tow; and their eyes will now be turned to heaven in astonishment because it took fire.

THE CORONER's report thus refers to the parties who should be held to account for the disgraceful scenes enacted in Toronto: "The thinking people among those who have watched the evolution of the Toronto mob will naturally conclude that if it had not been for the meeting of the 'trooly loll,' held in the Queen's Park on Saturday last; if those peace loving dignitaries of the Church—Bishop Sullivan, Canon Dumoulin, Rev. John Potts, D. D., Rev. Mr. Milligan, and those pharisaical saints, Mayor Howland and 'Privy Councillor' Hugges—had been content to allow their free of super loyalty to their country and their God to burn a quiet flame, instead of bursting forth into a fierce conflagration at the somewhat tempting chance of having a fling at the Roman Catholics,—the editor of United Ireland would have come to Toronto, made his little speech, and gone away again, 'unhounded and ununsung'; and, comparatively speaking, that would have ended the matter. But no! These gentlemen—hoodlums, who, forsooth, pose as the leaders of Christian religion and Christian morality, couldn't help making manifest their close affinity to the brute creation. And, apparently they were successful, if the howling mob—the result of Saturday's meeting—will be accepted by its originators as an indication of success.

THE TORONTO Mail devotes half a dozen lines to an editorial review of the riot. The London Free Press is even more discreet than the Mail. Not an editorial line has yet appeared in that paper in denunciation of the fierce onslaught on the Dublin editor. As a rule we do not like to attribute motives, but in this case we cannot help remarking that both papers—especially the last named—fear they cannot afford to be very outspoken. The crowd by whom they live and move and have their being was largely to the fore in the cobble-stone throwing of Wednesday.

THE TORONTO Chief of Police has issued a letter which is intended to be a statement of facts in regard to the riot. This, however, it is not, but rather an attempt to whitewash all concerned. The editor of the Detroit Free Press thus refers to the Toronto Chief of Police: "The report of the Toronto Chief of Police concerning the attack on O'Brien in that city is 'one of the finest'—if we may borrow a police phrase—that the constabulary annals of the world have ever yielded. It is a thousand pities that it was not added to the literature of the language before Gilbert and Sullivan launched the 'Pirates of Penzance.' It would have given those artists points innumerable for the policeman's chorus in that operatic production—points which would have brought down the house far more effectively than any which the libretto actually written contains."

THE TORONTO Globe demands a strict investigation into the riot of last week, in order that the blame may be put on the right shoulders. It also demands that as many as possible of the rioters should be brought to trial. We doubt not our contemporary is perfectly honest in its desire to see justice administered and the majesty of the law vindicated. We venture the opinion, however, that nothing will be done. An attempt may be made to punish the ringleaders, and even some who took any part whatsoever in the disorder—arrests may be made and trials may take place—but no convictions will follow.

WHEN Mr. O'Brien was at Cape Niagara on Saturday, on his way to Niagara Falls, the following telegram was handed to him by an officer of the Kingston league from Rev. Dr. Cleary, Bishop of Kingston, from Prescott: "I thought the O'Brien meeting was fixed for to-night and had a letter prepared to be read at the meeting by you, commendatory of the insults and brutal violence offered Mr. O'Brien in Toronto. If Mr. O'Brien be in Kingston tell him this and express my profound regret and indignation at his ill treatment in Kingston."

IMMORAL ADVERTISEMENTS OF QUACK DOCTORS IN KINGSTON.

The "Limestone City" is exhibiting a true Christian spirit in expelling from its borders the itinerant quacks who diffuse obscene literature throughout Canada by means of advertisements in the papers and the flinging of pamphlets into the homes of virtuous citizens. In last week's issue we laid before our readers a sermon delivered the previous Sunday on this subject by His Lordship, the Bishop of Kingston. The whole city recoiled with applause the Bishop's sublime denunciation of the gang of Buffalo "Doctors" who poison innocent minds by their bawdy-house literature. To day we have the pleasure of publishing a brief summary of the debate in the Kingston City Council, resulting in an order to sustain the Bishop's teachings by force of law; also a letter from a distinguished Protestant physician endorsing most emphatically His Lordship's views. The example thus set by Kingston is well worthy of imitation in every city of the Dominion.

CLAIMS OF MODERN ANGLICANISM.

VI. THE KING'S SUPREMACY.—CONTINUED.

The Royal Supremacy forms so important an element of Anglicanism, that it cannot be passed over lightly. We have already seen how it worked in the case of Ann Boleyn. Let us now see the doctrines which were promulgated under its sanction.

The first doctrinal and moral decrees of the Church of England were promulgated in 1539. They were comprised in the six famous articles adopted by the privy council with the sanction of Henry VIII., "the Supreme Head of the Church," as now established by law. As compared with the belief now prevalent in the Church of England, these articles are a curiosity. They are as follows:

- 1. In the Eucharist, the body of Jesus Christ is truly present under the form, and not the substance of bread and wine.
2. The necessity of communion under the two species is not provable by scripture, and it is not necessary to salvation to believe therein, for the body and blood of Jesus Christ exist together under each species.
3. The law of God forbids the marriage of priests.
4. The law of God commands that vows of chastity be observed.
5. The use of private masses is founded upon scripture and ought to be preserved.
6. Auricular confession is both useful and necessary.

Of these six Articles of religion, not one would be accepted by the Anglican Church of to-day. It is true, there is a party in the Church which would adopt some of them, and would set upon them if they dared, but even those who would agree with these articles in part would not accept them entirely. Moreover, if even the "extreme" High Church party were willing to receive these articles fully, it could not be said that they are the doctrines of the Church of England now. The High Church party are but a section, a minority, a hopeless minority in the Church, and the "Extremes" High Churchmen are still more decidedly a minority. In some dioceses they succeed once in a while in getting a catch vote somewhat in their favor, and thus sometimes a Bishop is elected more or less favorable to them, or probably it would be more correct to say, a Bishop who is not disposed to take part in their utter condemnation; but no one will be so dull as to interpret this as an ecclesiastical endorsement of their views. The most that they can usually obtain from their synods, even in the diocese where they are most powerful, is an abstention from positive condemnation. It, therefore, follows that the Church of England has positively changed her doctrines, and this most radically, in points of the greatest importance. The importance of these doctrines is manifest from the wording of the decrees above given. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth are declared to be of obligation. This is evinced by the statement that two of them are the laws of God, another, concerning private masses, is "founded upon scripture and ought to be preserved," while Auricular Confession is said to be not only useful, but "necessary." The first and second articles concern the very essence of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, or as Protestants usually call it, the Lord's Supper. The real presence of Christ therein, if true, requires that he should be adored, whereas if he be not present, it would be idolatry to adore the substance of mere bread and wine, such as the Protestant "Lord's Supper" is: an idolatry which only invincible ignorance could excuse from the guilt of grievous sin.

Of course we are aware that Anglicans will say, that at the time when these articles of religion were promulgated, the full light of Truth had not yet shone on the new Church-makers. Time was required, for them to develop their doctrines, and the Church of England was still in its infancy. This is, in fact, the defence usually made by Anglican

divines; but it will not avail to save them from the charge of gross inconsistency. Further, this single fact is sufficient to condemn utterly the whole Anglican theory. When these articles were constructed, the theory on which the Church of England was built was fully recognized. The palmary principle of Anglicanism is that the Sovereign is, by God's appointment, the Supreme judge in all Ecclesiastical causes, as we have shown in our third and fourth papers of this series; and it was in accordance with this principle that the above articles of Religion were promulgated. If they are false, therefore, the absurdity is to be attributed to the principle of which they are the result.

It is almost a work of supererogation to prove that the above doctrines are not now the doctrines of the English Church. Nevertheless, as we have precisely in view the refutation of the modern Anglican theories, one of the most prominent of which is the uninterrupted identity of the present Church with the Church of England as she existed from the earliest times, it is necessary to put this matter so clearly that there can be no doubt of the true state of the case.

Henry's first Article maintains Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, and further asserts that the substance of bread and wine is not therein. That is to say, the bread and wine have been changed into the body and blood of Christ. There is a change of substance, a transubstantiation. This is precisely the Catholic doctrine, and if it be true, Christ really present is to be adored. The 28th Article now used in the church says: "Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine, in the supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." True, the article afterwards states that "the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," but this only proves that the doctrine of the Church was purposely made vague, as Lord Maccuslay explains, in order to gain over as many adherents to the Church as possible, whether they were inclined to the Catholic or the Calvinistic belief on this subject. This confirms the utter absurdity of Anglicanism. It is in this which made Dryden say: "The literal sense is hard to fish and blood, but nonsense never could be understood."

It will be remarked that the 28th article, while condemning Transubstantiation, does not condemn Impanation or Consubstantiation, as held by Lutherans. It is therefore allowable to Anglicans to believe in the real presence, provided they admit that the substance of bread and wine remain in this sacrament along with Christ's Body and Blood. Thus, in the test oath, even, it is not required that the doctrine of the real presence be declared idolatrous, but only "Transubstantiation, as believed in the Church of Rome." Thus it is that the High Churchmen find in the Articles of Religion and in the liturgy sufficient warrant for their belief in the real presence. They, however, have publicly repudiated belief in Transubstantiation and notably so in a document addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury in January, 1867, and signed by the leaders of their party, including Dr. Pusey, Littledale, Mackenzie, etc. In fact there are sufficient grounds in the form of administering Communion to justify the most extreme High Churchism. One quotation out of many which might be made, will demonstrate this: "Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou didst vouchsafe to feed us... with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ."

The truth is, the doctrines of the Church were purposely clothed in such language that every one might be at liberty to twist them to suit his own opinions. One thing, however, is clear, that with all their ambiguity, they positively contradicted Henry's Articles. Henry's 2nd article, permitting communion in one species, is not merely repugnant, as a matter of discipline, but is declared to be contrary to Christ's ordinance, in Elizabeth's 30th Article: "Both parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be administered to all Christian men alike." Henry's 3rd and 4th articles forbidding the "marriage of priests," as contrary to God's law, is contradicted by Elizabeth's 28th Article: "Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."

Equally decisive is the condemnation of Henry's 5th Article, in Elizabeth's 31st, thus: "The sacrifices of masses were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

Auricular confession, commanded in Henry's 6th Article is not so plainly condemned by the Articles now in use. However, the 25th Article says that "Penance, &c., are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of

the Apostles, and partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures."

As Penance is not a "State of life," it is natural to infer that it is here condemned as "a corrupt following of the Apostles;" and Auricular Confession as part of the Sacrament of Penance, would thus be condemned also. With a strange inconsistency, the order of "Visitation of the sick" commands Auricular Confession: "Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it, after this sort."

Then follows the form of absolution to be used by "the Priest" in about the same words used by the Catholic priest, when giving Absolution! We have thus quoted sufficient to prove that the principles of Anglicanism lead to the most glaring contradictions. These principles are, therefore, absurd, for they can be no better nor more reasonable than their logical consequences.

To show that the Church, as constituted by Christ, cannot be guilty of inconsistency like this, we need not more than refer our readers here to a single passage of Sacred Scripture, wherein the Apostles are assured that it is obligatory on mankind to accept their doctrine, namely, St. Matt. x, 14-15. "And whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, as ye go forth out of that house or that city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city." Revised version.

Certainly Christ our Saviour, would not denounce such woes against unbelievers, if the doctrines taught were absurd like the Church of England's teachings, or subversive of the Supreme honor due to his heavenly Father.

EDITORIAL NOTES

WE ARE indebted to the Montreal Herald for a portion of the report of the proceedings connected with the celebration of the Golden Jubilee of Rev. Fathers Dowd and Toupin, at Montreal. The magnificent sermon of the Bishop of London, Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsh, was reported specially for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

A VILLAINOUS production was last week given by cable, purporting to be a strong pronouncement from the Irish College at Rome, against Parnell, Gladstone and Home Rule. It was likewise claimed that the Pope had approved of the document. The day after the appearance of this startling announcement there came the statement that the agent of the Associated Press in Rome, having instituted a searching inquiry regarding the matter, discovered that there was not a word of truth in the report. The London Chronicle first gave currency to the ridiculous canard, claiming that it had received advanced proofs of the brochure direct from the College. The London Tory papers have almost completely destroyed whatever little reputation they once possessed for reliability.

FATHER KELLER, the brave Youghal priest who has been undergoing imprisonment in Kilmalmainham jail for the past few months, has at last been released by order of the Court of Appeal. It will be remembered that he was imprisoned because he refused to testify regarding his knowledge of the Plan of Campaign. As he emerged from the prison he was driven to the Imperial Hotel in the Lord Mayor's carriage, in company with Archbishop Walsh and Timothy Harrington, M. P., followed by a large crowd of citizens. Father Keller addressed the crowd from the window of the hotel. He said he might have been in prison until doomsday before Justice Boyd would have released him. In reference to his treatment while in prison, he said that all the officials had shown him much respect. It is stated that the same objection that existed to Father Keller's imprisonment is applicable to the case of Father Ryan, and that proceedings for the release of the latter will be instituted at once.

THE TORONTO Mail of the 18th rushes to the rescue of Lord Lansdowne as an Irish landlord, and goes back to '48 to prove that even Lord Lansdowne's grandfather was a good and generous nobleman. "The Kerry of that day," it claims "was consoled. The potato famine had overwhelmed the swarming multitude; the poor rates exceeded the rental value of the soil; no one could pay rent; the country was stricken and bankrupt." We might here ask our Toronto friend if he means to convey the idea that the people planted nothing save the potato, and that the rot having set in the tenants had to starve if they could not emigrate. The whole truth seems to be carefully concealed. We know the state of affairs in Ireland, more particularly half a century ago, necessitated the disposal of almost everything raised on small farms to pay the rent. The potato and cornmeal were the only articles of food the people could afford to use. All the staple crops and luxuries went to the agent and the landlord. The potato crop failed in Kerry in '47 and '48. What is inscribed on the

tomestone at Point St. Charles concludes the sad chapter.

The following extract from the columns of our valued contemporary, the New York Freeman's Journal, hits heavily but not deservedly a New York German-Irish dollar weekly which has, by the million, been scattered all over Canada. There is a sort of heathen-Chinese complexion about the whole concern which is fully demonstrated by our friend of the Freeman's Journal as follows: "Vere lah O'Tools?" "He was up stairs boillin' dose Mother Noble's Blood Yash."

"Vere lah O'Tools?" "He was up stairs boillin' dose Mother Noble's Blood Yash." "Vere lah O'Tools?" "He was up stairs boillin' dose Mother Noble's Blood Yash." "Vere lah O'Tools?" "He was up stairs boillin' dose Mother Noble's Blood Yash." "Vere lah O'Tools?" "He was up stairs boillin' dose Mother Noble's Blood Yash."

It is thought that both Gladstone and Parnell will cause such moderation to be used regarding opposition to the Coercion Bill that it will be allowed to pass at this session of Parliament. The measure will then become law. Thousands of witnesses will be imprisoned in accordance with the provisions of the bill for contempt of court in refusing to reply to the questions addressed to them by judges, magistrates and counsel, and when the prisons are full the Tory Government will be brought face to face with as big a failure as that of "Backshot" Forster. The Conservatives, owing to their evident inability to grapple with the situation, will become exceedingly unpopular in England and finally Lord Salisbury will be reduced to make overtures to the Irish party in the same manner as Gladstone was forced to do at the time of the Kilmainham treaty. A few months of the coercion policy will have the same effect on the Tories as it had on the Liberals in 1882, and will force Lord Salisbury to come to terms with the great Home Rule party. Home Rule is daily becoming more popular in England and the election of McArthur, a Home Ruler, for St. Anselm, in Cornwallis, is very significant. The bulk of the English people love fair play, and it is gradually dawning upon them that the Home Rule party in Parliament are not getting fair play.

THE POPE has written a letter to Archbishop Corrigan, wherein the Holy Father pronounces condemnation of the course of Dr. McElroy, and those who, like him, hold erroneous views regarding the rights of property. "It is indeed grateful to us," says the Pope, "that you have labored to crush, ere they sprang up, the vicious seeds of doctrines scattered under the pretext of helping the masses. Nor is it less to your praise that with long suffering and patience you have not ceased with watchful industry to calm proud spirits, although they have not refrained from slanders and reproaches against you and this Apostolic See. It is fitting then that you should be of good heart, and with unwavering firmness apply your strength to the work of the salvation of souls, and in defending the sanctity of faith and discipline. Nevertheless, led by Christian charity, you will leave nothing untried, that with paternal benevolence you may embrace those who are decaying by this new doctrine, if they return to wiser counsels."

HOW IT AFFECTS US.

Buffalo Times. With all due deference to statistics, we can have but a very incomplete idea of all the money sent from time to time to the cherished old homes in Ireland by the loving and hearts in America. Yet behold the enormous sums that even the statistics reveal! Up to 1867, for instance, more than \$125,000,000 were thus sent over the wave. If our readers would fully fathom this statement, let them picture twenty five rail cars filled with twenty dollar pieces, and they will have a tangible conception, so to speak, of this vast sum. How is this verified? Quite easily. Half a million of our gold makes a ton; and ten tons just fill a car. Five millions, therefore, to the car, would fill twenty-five cars. Be it observed that no account is taken here of the universally large sums sent to Ireland from the same private sources during the past twenty years—from 1867 to 1887. We may be sure, however, that those unrecorded remittances were many and generous in proportion to the want and suffering that appeared for aid. And yet the thought is maddening, that nearly the whole of these hard earned millions found lodgment in the coffers of rack-renting landlords, instead of the pockets of those for whose comfort they were sent. This was the golden age of Irish landlordism. There were no sneers then at "being supported by American money." But the rack-renting landlord's soul-dred has got his last American dollar in rent. For if the exiled children of Ireland henceforth send remittance home, it will surely be for purposes quite other than Lansdowne luxury or Tory tyranny.

Yesterday I plucked up some plants, and flung them on the dung-heap. I found them this morning blooming and smiling. Thus do beautiful souls flourish under humiliation.—Abbé Roz.

INDUCENT LITERATURE.

Kingston News, May 17. Before the council adjourned last night the mayor stated that his attention had been called to unclean literature that was being distributed in the city; consequently he consulted the city solicitor at once and decided to take steps to prevent the continuance of the distribution. He understood that the literature was unfit for the citizens to read.

Ald. McIntyre—You are right. Ald. Thompson—Are these doctors licensed people? The Mayor—I don't know. Ald. McGuire said they had licenses, and that the head men employed Canadian graduates so as to get over the difficulty. O'herwise they would be liable to a fine of \$50.

Ald. Thompson said he thought the mayor's action commendable. Pamphlets were sent from door to door which were had enough to contaminate even aldermen. Ald. McIntyre—On your side of the house. Ald. McGuire—Speak for yourself.

Ald. Thompson said that on looking at Ald. McIntyre it reminded him that he had one of the symptoms—a bald head. (Laughter) It was time the authorities interfered in behalf of children. No citizen or alderman who had the interest of the city at heart should remain idle in the matter. Three of the pamphlets were shown on his door step and when he went home his children were reading them. Then again, the doctors of the city should be protected, the same as any other class of citizens who paid taxes. These foreign doctors who come here to come to this city and do business than to trade, without being taxed. In the lower provinces even commercial travellers are taxed.

Ald. C. Robinson—What about lawyers? Ald. Thompson—They are a harmless lot, but these doctors are not. Ald. Phelan said that the visiting "doctors" either employed Canadian graduates or broken down practitioners to do their work in Canada. He thought a stop should be put to the spread of unclean literature, which was put into every house. He saw some of the pamphlets at the school house door on Rideau street, which no doubt would fall into the hands of children. The doctor also said that one could hardly take up a paper now a days without being confronted with two columns of immoral reading.

Ald. McGuire said it might be well to have a by-law framed that would cover the matter. If such a thing could be done, it should be looked after at once. The mayor said he would look after the matter at once. Ald. Phelan—Can you prevent them from coming. Ald. Hobart—They could be taxed so heavily that it would not pay them to come.

An Order Has Been Issued.

Kingston Whig. To-day the police authorities notified J. Q. Willy, agent for Dr. Kergan, that the circulation of the physician's circulars must cease. James Agnew, city solicitor, sent the mayor the following memorandum: "With regard to the medical publications, which have been and are being periodically distributed in the city, and alleged to be immoral, the following appears to be the law governing the case: 'Such immodest and immoral publications as tend to corrupt the mind and to destroy the love of decency, morality and good order, are also offences at common law. Parties circulating publications of this kind under the above definition are liable to be indicted.'"

Bishop Cleary's Sermon. To the Editor of the Daily News: Sir—I read an extract from Bishop Cleary's last night's discourse, in the News of to-night, the sentiments of which seem to me to be opportune and wholesome. Both Catholic and Protestant alike should thank Bishop Cleary for his fearless presentation of the truth respecting the vile trash called medical literature which is periodically scattered amongst our population by men who style themselves "doctors," and who travel about from town to town for the purpose of making money out of those who are simple enough to be caught in their nets. While warning the parents and children of his own flock against the perusal of such demoralizing publications, his warning through the medium of the press, has reached thousands beyond his own people, and will, we trust, be an evangel for good wherever it may come. Bishop Cleary has spoken like a man of sound common sense and extensive education; and it is refreshing to find such an eminent man so ably defending the good, and the pure and the true in medical science at a time when the names of revered gentlemen without number are to be found appended to certificates attesting the value of almost every new cure introduced to the notice of the public. Most of these are chary about referring to these abuses because the public are so prone to impute motives of selfishness to them when they do so. Some of us, however, who feel that our desires for a more extensive practice have abated, and that we are not wholly dependent upon one of the most uncertain things on earth—namely, the daily routine of practice—for all livelihood, should join with Bishop Cleary in trying to give the laity just views of medical science; to convince them that their own country and their own city can afford them medical and surgical skill of superior quality, and that men who are really eminent in their profession have no need to travel about seeking patients, but can remain in their comfortable homes, and have patients in abundance coming to seek them. No medical man of any standing would stoop to advertise, for according to our *esprit de corps* this is beneath the dignity of a professional man; and if he descends to the lowness of traducing others and boasting of his own greatness. None of the great ones in our profession do any of these things, and hence those who do them are not great men. I, with Bishop Cleary, deprecate the moral perversion of what these pseudo eminent publications give us, for I have seen it in its most hideous forms and think it is full time that the strong arm of the law interfered for their suppression. Yours truly, THOMAS R. DUFFIN.

May 16, 1897.