

I now enter my protest against the admission to your paper this evening, under a pretence of reviewing my adversary's book, of a partisan criticism of the controversy, two columns in length, from a Roman Catholic special pleader, who has not the manliness to write over his own name, but signs himself "Philaethes," in which the main questions are re-opened, new matter introduced and actually defence made for the low, scurrilous style of my opponent's writing. I must ask you now to show cause why one of my friends should not be allowed to deliver his criticism upon the book, over the name "Veritas" or the English equivalent to "Philaethes," "Lover of Truth?"

I do not complain of your own notice of the reprint (Tuesday, January 27, 1891) when acknowledging its presentation to you by its author, but it seems to me most unfair, after what you have said, to re-open your columns, and that to anonymous partisan writers, as you have done to-night.

I remain, yours very truly,

JOHN M. DAVENPORT,

January 30, 1891.

Priest of the Church of St. John Baptist.

[Rev. John M. Davenport had the closing word in the discussion, and the discussion closed with his letters. Mr. Quigley did not consider the space offered sufficient to make such reply as he thought he needed to make, and he did not avail himself of it. The two letters of Mr. Quigley, to which Rev. Mr. Davenport refers—if there were two—were no more a part of the "subject" than is this letter which we now cheerfully publish for Mr. Davenport, despite its rasping and ungenerous tone. We do not feel called upon to plead to any indictment of Mr. Davenport's framing. The *GLOBE* had a perfect right to publish anything it pleased in the way of a review of Mr. Quigley's book, as it would of any other book, just as it would of one of Mr. Davenport's if he had published his side of the controversy. One word more. Rev. Mr. Davenport recklessly assumes to know and states without any scruple whatever that the review published in the *GLOBE* was written by a Roman Catholic. He could not have had the slightest information on which to base this statement. The *GLOBE* does not say who does or who does not write what it publishes. It departs from that rule on the present occasion to say that the review was written by a well read scholar in the denomination to which Rev. Mr. Davenport himself belongs.]

---

*The St. John Daily Sun.*

More than three years ago Rev. Dr. Kingdon, coadjutor-bishop of Fredericton, delivered a lecture in St. John on "Misprints."

The subject was apparently innocent, and little likely to excite controversy, especially a religious controversy. Yet it did lead to a lengthy discussion, which was not the less spirited because it was long. The disputants were Rev. John M. Davenport, priest of the Mission church in this city, who has a high reputation for scholarship, especially in the field of patristic literature, and generally in