

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., June 15th, 1889.

THE POPE'S TEMPORAL POWER.

A suggestive incident occurred in the German Reichstag on the 23rd inst., which proves that among Catholics on the Continent of Europe great confidence exists that the question of the Pope's independence will yet be settled in a manner satisfactory to the Catholics of the world. The President of the Reichstag read a telegram which had been received by Premier Crispien. The telegram was from the Italian Chamber of Deputies to the Premier, congratulating the latter on the cordial reception given to King Humbert in Berlin. Prince Bismarck forwarded the telegram to the Reichstag, together with a letter from himself, expressing a desire that the Reichstag should take some action thereon. The president proposed that the House express pleasure at the state of peace and security which arises out of the triple alliance. Baron Frankenstein, on behalf of the Centre, or Catholic party, concurred in the proposal, with the reservation that the vote shall not commit the Centre party on the question of the temporal power of the Pope.

There is no doubt that even in Italy there is growing a strong feeling in favor of the restoration of the Pope's temporal power.

The present Holy Father has been most conciliatory in his attitude towards the Italian Government, and it is positively stated that during the first ten years of his Pontificate he would have gladly agreed upon a *modus vivendi* if his independence in the Government of the Church had been assured, but from day to day it has become more plain that this independence will not be made sure until temporal power be restored to him.

The celebration of the Holy Father's Jubilee last year made manifest the unshaken loyalty of the Catholics of the whole world to the person and office of the Holy Father. This fact, so visible to the Freemasons and other enemies of the Holy See, angered them beyond all bounds of discretion. Signor Crispien is himself a Freemason, and an Atheist, and he made no attempt to conceal his indignation. The manifestations of the Jubilee were, in consequence, a signal for the enactment of new laws which made the position of the Pope more intolerable than ever. At every step the Pope's liberty of action has been interfered with, and at present the position of the Head of the Church, in the very city which is justly his domain, is fully as bad or worse than was the position of the Church in Germany under the Falk laws—now, happily, repealed or not enforced. This state of affairs is intolerable even to the Italians, for though the Government of Italy is now in the hands of Infidels, whether by conviction or in practice, the Italian people are at heart Catholics, and much as they may desire Italian unity, they do not wish to see the Church reduced to the condition of a slave to the State. They understand very well that the Church, to have its authority recognized throughout the world, must be above even the suspicion of being controlled in the promulgation of her decrees, by any State, however powerful, and this makes them as desirous as other nationalities to see her perfectly free in her self-government. The popularity of Signor Crispien has already waned under the infliction of an enormous debt upon the country, and his barbarous treatment of the Head of the Church increases his unpopularity.

The Pope's Allotment to the Sacred College of Cardinals a year ago manifested the desire of our Holy Father, Leo XIII., to see Italy prosperous, but he pointed out that to secure that prosperity Italy should repair the injustice it had done by destroying the dignity and independence of the Apostolic See; for the Papacy is a chief factor even of the worldly prosperity of Italy.

The Holy Father in all his anxiety to live at peace with the Italian Government has never yielded his claim to temporal independence. He has always felt and insisted upon the restoration of this right of which he has been unjustly deprived, but not for the sake of merely temporal distinction has this been insisted on, but for the preservation of the inalienable right of the Universal Church to govern herself, without interference from any Sovereign, however extensive or however limited may be his temporal domain. Cardinal Rampolla pointed out in his circular of June 23rd, 1887, that justice cannot reign in the world until restoration be made to the Holy See where justice has been violated; for the Pope's temporal sovereignty is the only one which is based upon "possession of twelve centuries, founded on the spontaneous assent of an unprotected people, on the gifts of pious princes, on an ever recurring claim, sanctioned by treaties, as being a sacred and inalienable patrimony of the Church, founded with the consent of all States and people which have ever regarded the temporal power of the Roman Pontiff as a necessary bulwark for the freedom of the Apostolic See for the unblinded propa-

gation of its teachings and the full exercise of its ministry against power and oppression of any kind."

These considerations will always have great weight with the Catholic nations of the world, and will make them regard the independence of the Apostolic See as a point to be secured in all their negotiations for preserving the balance of power amid European complications. If England, the United States, and Germany can find reason for a conference in Berlin to reconcile their different national interests in regard to little kingdoms of the West coast of Africa, why should not the Catholic powers feel a deep interest in the position of the Head of the Church, whose authority extends to the uttermost parts of the earth? They do feel this interest, and the subject of the Pope's temporal authority is from its nature an international, and not merely an Italian question. It is not very wonderful, therefore, that it should be the subject of consideration wherever Catholics exist, and that is everywhere. But when National Congresses of Catholics are called together, the consideration of the question of the Pope's temporal power becomes of paramount importance.

At the Madrid Catholic Congress a resolution was passed favorable to the appointment of the Pope as arbitrator for the settlement of disputes between nations. The resolution is as follows:

"In view of the tendency visible in modern Governments to submit their conflicts to arbitration, no better arbiter can be found than the Pope for settling disputes between nations, especially those professing the Catholic faith, to avert bloody wars and put an end to the present system of ruinous armaments."

In addition to this resolution, strong speeches were made by many prelates and others in favor of the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, and a resolution was passed that it ought to be restored. These proceedings of the Congress gave great offense to Signor Crispien, who thereupon wrote a note expostulating with Spain for allowing the Roman question to be discussed. The Spanish foreign Secretary, the Marquis Vega de Armijo, answered politely, but at the same time refused to interfere with the members of the Congress. He wrote to Signor Crispien:

"The Catholic Congress is a private assembly whose resolutions possess no official character; consequently, His Majesty's Government cannot hold itself in any way responsible for any resolutions that may have been arrived at in the course of these meetings."

The Queen Regent, however, did not heed what Signor Crispien might think about her conduct, and as she is a fervent Catholic she gave a solemn audience on the 28th ult. to all the prelates who were at the Congress. But not Spain alone has spoken in this matter. Similar resolutions were passed at Oporto, (or Portugal), at Vienna for Austria, and at Malines for Belgium. These frequent declarations of Catholic nations on a subject so dear to them cannot but bear fruit, and we may reasonably expect at an early date decisive measures which will result in the restoration to the Pope of that independence which is so much needed for the Head of the Church which teaches all nations.

The Emperor of Austria received from Signor Crispien an expostulation similar to that which was sent to the Spanish Government, but his reply was to a similar effect.

A FOE TO THE JESUITS.

The death is announced of Hermann Wagner, the framer of the Act of 4th July, 1872, by which the Jesuits were expelled from Germany. Wagner was, however, the tool of Bismarck in this matter. The Jesuits had done no injury, but they were successful teachers of religion and science, and as the Chancellor had made up his mind to persecute the Catholic Church, he naturally made his attack upon that order which was one of the strongest bulwarks of the Church. The first clause of the Act for the suppression of the Jesuits shows its tyrannical character. It was as follows:

The Order of the Society of Jesus, all Orders connected with it, and monastic institutions of a similar character are excluded from the territory of the German Empire. No settlements thereof may be established. Settlements existing at present must be dissolved within a period to be determined by the Federal Council, which period must not exceed six months.

By the 4th of January succeeding, the law was in full operation and the Jesuits were expelled, but within a year Herr Wagner was charged with jobbery of the worst description, and was convicted before the public of the most infamous penitential, which brought his political career to a close. It was in Germany as elsewhere, the enemies of the Jesuits were those whose characters were most blemished with corruption and infamy.

Mr. Gladstone, having been presented with a book on divorce written by Mr. J. A. Gemmill, an Ottawa lawyer, has addressed a reply to the author in which he says: "Reflection tends to conform me in the best basis for law is the indisputability of Christian marriage; that is to say, to have no such divorce or severance as allows re-marriage."

To invigorate both the body and the brain, use the reliable tonic, Milburn's Aromatic Quinine Wine.

QUEBEC AND ONTARIO SCHOOL LAWS.

Several times complaint has been made professedly on behalf of Protestants of Quebec that the school taxes of corporations in that Province are divided, not in proportion to the amount of stock owned by Protestants and Catholics, but in proportion to the Catholic and Protestant population. This complaint has been made by Sir W. Dawson, and the Mail of course has frequently urged it as a proof of the desire of the Catholic majority in Quebec to deal unfairly with Protestants.

A writer from Montreal revives this complaint in the columns of the Presbyterian Review of the 9th inst., viz., Rev. Professor Scrimger, M. A. The Professor says:

"According to this law, about one-fourth of these taxes go to the Protestant Commissioners, while it is believed that fully three-fourths of the stock of these companies are owned by Protestants. It is estimated that from eight to ten thousand dollars annually are thus lost to Protestant education in the city of Montreal alone."

The Professor says that the attention of the Government has been frequently called to this injustice, but that the Government have always refused to remedy it, and that a bill introduced during the last session of the Legislature at the instance of the Protestant Board of Commissioners to provide a remedy was opposed by the Government, and never went beyond the first reading.

This provision of the law in the Province of Quebec has often been made the basis of a charge of unfairness on the part of the Quebec Catholic majority, but not fairly, especially when those who complain are Ontario Protestants. In Ontario it is the universal cry among Protestants that the school law should assume that every taxpayer, whether Catholic or Protestant, is a supporter of the public schools, and that he be rated as a public school supporter, unless by a positive act he place himself on the roll of Catholic school supporters. The Ontario school laws recognize this as a first principle, and, as a consequence every Catholic who neglects to place himself on the roll of Catholic separate school supporters is taxed for the support of the public schools. The difficulty of moving a large community is well known, and this difficulty is much increased when the persons to be moved are required to give positive notice in writing that they desire to be placed in an exceptional position. The consequence of this is that in every school section of Ontario it frequently occurs that Catholics who really desire to be placed on the Catholic school roll, find themselves taxed for the support of public schools. It would partly, but only partly, counterbalance this injustice if Protestants could become separate school supporters, but this privilege is not given. Many cases have come within our personal observation where Protestants have desired to support Catholic separate schools, and where actually they send their children to the separate schools; sometimes it is because the public schools are at inconvenient distances from them. Sometimes because they consider the Catholic schools better; but whatever their motive may be, they are compelled to pay their tax to the public schools.

If it be so desirable to secure liberty to Catholics to have a choice of the schools which they will support, why should not the same liberty be accorded to Protestants? The answer to this question is easily given. With all the improvements which have been made to facilitate the operation of the Catholic separate school system, the Protestant majority in Ontario have not yet had the generosity to give to the Catholic minority a school system which can be as efficiently worked as the public school system. To make the treatment of Catholics fair, Catholics should be assumed to be supporters of the Catholic schools, in sections where such schools exist, unless they give notice that they wish to support the public schools; and Protestants whose children are admitted to Catholic schools should be allowed to place their names on the Catholic school roll. Ontario Protestants should grant these privileges to Catholics, before complaining of illiberality on the part of Quebec Catholics, who granted long ago to the Protestants of that Province a school law the like of which would at this moment be gratefully accepted by the Catholics of Ontario. The Quebec law may not be perfect, but it places the Protestants in a far better position than the Ontario law places Catholics.

But is there really an injustice done to Protestants in the matter of which Rev. Mr. Scrimger complains? A public school system cannot be defended, unless on the principle that the whole community is interested in the education of all the children in the community, either without distinction of wealth or poverty of the people; or if any distinction is to be made, it should be made in favor of the poor. If any special help is to be given, it should be extended to the poor. We think that this cannot be disputed. If, therefore, it be true that the Protestants of Quebec Province are so much wealthier than the Catholics, as the advocates of the proposed change pretend, there is no injustice in placing the Catholics and the Pro-

testants on equal footing, according to population, when the question concerns the appropriation of money raised by taxation. The law ought not to regard so much the difference of religion, as the difference of financial standing of those to whom aid is to be given, and the advantage should be given, in preference, to the poor.

But the Quebec law apportions the tax according to religion where religion is readily ascertained. The complainants must acknowledge that so far the Legislature showed a desire to deal equitably. It is only in regard to stock companies that the distribution is made according to population. Considering the difficulty of finding out the religion of stockholders, we should imagine this to be the very best way to make the distribution fair. It is certainly much fairer than the Ontario law, by which, in nearly every case, all the taxes of such companies are paid to the public schools, and there is no redress for Catholics except to get once in a while a smallittance from such taxes, after going about it with a great deal of trouble and in a roundabout way.

We have so far answered the objection of Mr. Scrimger, on the assumption that his statements as to the very superior wealth of the Quebec Protestants are correct. But we believe they are grossly exaggerated. He does not pretend that they are accurate. In any case the estimate ought not to be based on the condition of Montreal alone. It should be remembered that Montreal is but a small portion of the Province of Quebec, and if in Montreal the Protestants are so very wealthy, they are not so in all parts of the Province. Taken altogether we are inclined to think that the Protestants throughout the Province are about as fairly treated under the present law as they would be if it were changed to please those who complain of it.

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOLS.

The Boston school reports show that in that city eighteen thousand whippings were administered in the primary public schools and boys' grammar schools during the year 1888. We are not of opinion that large bodies of children can be trained in the way they should go without making use of some corporal punishment, but certainly the showing of that city is greatly in excess of what might be expected amid a population which boasts so much of its high culture. Corporal punishment cannot be entirely dispensed with, but Boston seems to employ it to the extent of brutality. The parochial schools are not included in this estimate. In them, at least, brutality is not rampant. If the children attending the parochial schools were at the public schools, and received an equal share of the strap, the number of whippings would reach the handsome amount of 27,000 at least.

It is in the face of facts like these that we are solemnly assured that it is a crime against the children of the State to upbraidable to discuss in any way the management of the public schools. To attack Catholic school-bills now being discussed before the Massachusetts Legislature actually contains a clause inflicting severe penalties on any one who will try any argument maintain the superiority of a private school over any of the public schools, or to induce any one to send children to a private in preference to a public school.

The freedom of the United States consists chiefly in this, that its citizens may discuss public measures, but in their mad prepossession against Catholic education, the bigots of Boston, Haverhill, and other towns, desire to take away this liberty of discussion. The Bill, however, is not likely to pass. The fanaticism of its promoters is only to be equalled in Ontario, where an effort is being made to expel the French language from those public schools where there are children who know no language but French. This would be virtually an interdict on French children from being educated at all. It is hard to keep track of the shifts and twists to which bigotry will have recourse, but eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The Catholics of Massachusetts constitute about 40 per cent. of the population of the State, all other denominations amounting to 60 per cent. It is this close proportion which makes it so easy for fanatics to arouse hostility against Catholic education. Their desire is to prevent Catholic children from obtaining a solid religious education in their own parochial schools, yet in the public schools they insist upon impacting anti-Catholic teaching. It was upon this issue that the last school elections were fought in Boston, but though bigotry secured a success for the time being, the success will certainly be very temporary.

The following extract was published originally by the Rev. Charles C. Starbuck, of Andover, Mass., in 1882, in reference to an attempt then made to introduce into Rhode Island a law similar to that which is now attempted in Massachusetts. The views of the writer were then expressed by the newspaper organs of several Protestant denominations, including the Congregationalist and the Watchman.

The Rev. Mr. Starbuck reproduces this extract in the columns of the Portland Christian Mirror, as being applicable to the present dispute in Massachusetts. It shows that not all Protestants are animated with the insane desire of persecuting Catholics:

Our wild schemes, overthrowing our most cherished principles, for revenge on the Catholics, whenever they have proved refractory to our Protestant view of things, remind a dispassionate observer of nothing so much as the man in Hogarth's caricature of The Election, who is industriously sawing off the rival tavern sign at point between himself and the house. When we all come down in a common crash, we shall find out what we have been about. We may remember the monstrous bill introduced some years back into the Rhode Island Legislature, enacting sharp penalties against any one who should, in public or private, by instruction or advice, dissuade another from using the public schools. Had this passed (it was disgraced enough, both to Rhode Island and the Union, that it could possibly have been introduced) we should have had the commonwealth of Roger Williams branding it as a crime for any one to be of a political minority. For if once we curtail the right of every American, clergyman or layman or any association of citizens, ecclesiastical or civil, to criticize any and every measure of public policy, to any extent, and with any degree of sharpness they choose by the way of petition, argument, advice or dissuade, I do not know what non-descript we should become; but we certainly should no longer be Americans. We may then as well make thorough work of it at once and forbid the existence of a minority."

He adds, in reference to the present dispute:

"I little thought when I wrote this that I should live to see this same monstrous provision pending before the General Court of my own native Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Verily, as Ophelia says, 'we know what we are, but we know not what we shall be.' It is attested on the very best authority that the parochial schools of the State are highly efficient, so that there is no shadow of excuse for the attempted tyranny of the fanatics."

RELICS OF THE CROSS.

Toronto Globe.

To the Editor.—In a controversy quite recently waged not a hundred miles from here, one of the contestants found himself obliged to the necessity of ridiculing certain phases of the other's belief. In the course of a lengthy denunciation of Catholic veneration of relics he committed himself to a statement which concerns not Catholics alone, but all who wear the Christian name. He declares: "I almost every chapel in Europe, and also in many in Canada, may be found pieces of the true cross on which our Lord was crucified. If these were all collected no doubt they would form a pile enough to construct one of the largest buildings in Canada."

As a Catholic, I protest against any man who dares to insinuate that a religion would dare to so insult a Christian as the language of the above paragraph betrays. Only the more ignorant infidel would urge this objection against the authenticity of the existing relics of the Holy Cross. Will you allow me to repeat to the Christian minister, who dares to utter such a reply, that it may be pure waste of time to give him, but whose force even infidels have owned. In the "Antiquary" of June, 1887, may be found the following:

"M. R. B. de Flury has made a list of all the relics of the Cross in Europe and Asia of which he can find any record, and the sum amounts to 3,941,975 cubic millimetres—a very small part, indeed, of what would be required to make a cross." It is estimated that 3,941,975 cubic millimetres are equal in English measure to 0.139,217 of a cubic foot or to 240,567 cubic inches, which represents a piece of wood fifteen inches long and four inches square on the end (4 x 4 x 15), of which the learned editor of The Antiquary might well say:

"A very small part of what would be required to make a cross."

I intended commenting on the deplorable ignorance of the gentleman who made the horrible assertion quoted at the head of this letter; but, as it has occurred to me that he may not have known he was ignorant, I refrain, and conclude with an expression of my admiration for his fine audacity in making the assertion at this time of day, an audacity worthy the best of the infidel encyclopaedists of the Voltairian era.

THE GILMORE CONCERTS.

Referring to the concert on May 31st the Albany Argus says: "The concert given last night by the Gilmore artists was a perfect triumph and a scene of the wildest enthusiasm from beginning to end. The glorious 'Niagara' overture was played to perfection, the wonderful body of clarionets giving the most formidable passages without flaw. Another remarkable feature of the concert was the playing of Liszt's twelfth Rhogation Rhapsody, which seemed to gain rather than lose by its transfer from the piano to the band. Certainly Gilmore has no rival. However, if the band had failed to put in an appearance there was a company of singers sufficient to satisfy the most exacting musician present. Their marvellously beautiful voices rang out in the immense building with a clearness, richness and brilliancy that was truly electrifying." Such eulogies as this are sufficient evidence of the high regard in which the donors on June 27th, and those who have not secured seats had better do so at once as the plans are very rapidly filling.

The Mighty Dollar.

Is long distanced by a 10 cent bottle of Nerveine, the newest and best pain remedy. It cures colds, cramps, colic, pain in the head, sciatica, warts in the chest; in fact it is equally efficacious as an external and internal remedy. Try a 10 cent bottle of the great pain remedy, Nerveine. Sold by all druggists. Large bottles only 25 cents. Try a sample bottle of Nerveine, only 10 cents. Take no substitute.

Mrs. Celeste Conn Syracuse, N. Y., writes: "For years I could not eat many kinds of food without producing a burning, excruciating pain in my stomach. I took Barometer's Pills according to directions under the head of 'Dyspepsia or Indigestion.' One box entirely cured me. I can now eat anything I choose, without distressing me in the least." These Pills do not cause pain or griping, and should be used when a cathartic is required. Milard's Liniment Cures Burns, etc.



KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

OFFICE OF CHARLES A. SYDNER.

CLYDEMAN DAY AND TRUSTING BIRD HOUSE.

ELMWOOD, ILL., NOV. 20, 1888.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I have always purchased your Kendall's Spavin Cure by the half dozen bottles, and I would like to see it in larger quantity. I think it is the best I have ever used. I have used it in my stables for three years.

Yours truly, CHAS. A. SYDNER.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.

KENDALL'S SPAVIN CURE.

Dr. R. J. Kendall, Co.

Dear Sir: I desire to give you testimonial of my good opinion of your Kendall's Spavin Cure. I have used it for Lameness, Self-Joint, and Spavin, and I have found it a sure cure. I cordially recommend it to all horsemen.

Yours truly, A. H. GIBNEY.

Manager Troy Laundry Stables.