form? Does Your Lordship consider such language fair or just to me?

The stand of the Anglican co munion was given in the exact words of the Bishop of Toronto and in a summary of the action taken by the Synod of Huron.

In his charge to the Synod, the Bishop of Toronto states emphatically that the Church of England in Canada is opposed to divorce "save for the one cause allowed by her divine head." But the resolution of the Synod of Toronto reads thus :

That this Synod hereby records its recognition of the solemn duty of the Church to uphold the sanctity of the marriage tie and declares its fixed determination to protest against and oppose with all its power any attempt to extend or enlarge the grounds on which divorce may be

The Bishop's words to the Synod are therefore explanatory of the dos-trinal position of the Church implied, though not stated, in the resolution. The Syncd, while admitting adultery as a cause allowed by Christ, opposes any extension of the present grounds

which Your Lordship dignifies by the extremely misleading some other communions," I wrote

"The Anglican Synod of the Diocese of Huron, held at Brantford, Ontario, in the latter part of May, 1920, also put the Anglican teaching on record in a resolution to the effect that while the causes divorce should not be extended, divorce should be granted for the one 'scriptural cause' of adultery. The resolution of the Synod of

Huron reads as follows : That this Synod strongly protests against any extension of the grounds divorce by the Parliament of

You tell me that my statement was materially different from the text of the Synod's resolution." I answer: In my statement of the position of the four leading Protestant denominations, I was concerned only with their doctrinal stand. The purpose of my pamphlet, as stated on page 4, was to show that the "scriptural cause" admitted by all of them was not really justified by a proper exe-gesis of the Scriptural texts. My summary was not merely of the text of the resolution of the Synod of positio Huron but of the doctrinal of the Church as implied in the reso lution. The resolution, by itself, like the resolution of the Toronto synod, meant nothing doctrinally But when the resolution is consid s ed in conjunction with Your Lordship's charge to the Synod, my statement of the action of the Synod

of Huron is borne out absolutely. I append the following extracts of Your Lordship's charge to the 1920 Synod, and the debate of the Synod n the Divorce question, as reported in the daily press. As these press reports appeared in several papers in identical larguage and were never officially denied, I assume that they

are at least substantially correct.

(Free Press, Wednesday, May 12th, 1920.) "Bishop Williams stated that the only real cause for divorce sanctioned by the Church, was adultery, and saould divorce courts be established, that should be the only cause per mitted for securing separation Quebec would have to be incorpor ated in Dominion legislation regard less of the desires of the Church of Rome." (The Globe, May 12th, has the same report as above.

(Free Press, Wednesday, May 12th, 1920.) Divorce as a matter of provincial legislation, is approved by him (Bishop Williams) conditionally, in that no divorces should be granted

save as provided for by the Sermon on the Mount."

(In same report He then stated that for certain causes divorce should be made easier than it was at present, and that the provincial court was probably the bast remedy. He urged, however, that the causes for divorce should be limited strictly to the one cause that Christ said was sufficient ground."

(Advertiser, May 11th, 1920.)

given shall not be extended beyond what the teaching of Christ would But that is quite a different matter from extending the range of causes Divorce, for which diverse may be granted. Christian public is sufficiently alive to its immoral and its disinteextend causes for divorce, in my opinion, would be a calamity of the first magnitude."

(Free Press, Thursday, May 13th, 1920.)

Brantford, urged the Synod to ask the Government not to enlarge the causes for which diverse is granted "On the resumption of the debate Those now in force wers sufficient to

people. In conclusion I may say that I that a very grievous wrong has been pretext of done me in the most public manner possible. A public retractation is in all justice due me. I lock to Your Lordship to render the publication of this correspondence unnecessary. I beg to remain, My Lord,

Yours sincerely, A. P. MAHONEY.

The Bishop's Room Bishop Cronyn Hall. London, Canada, May 23, 1921. The Rev. E. P. Mahoney, St. Peter's Seminary, City.

Reverend and Dear Sir :- Your letter of May 20th received and con tents noted. In reply, I shall confine myself to the original po which you raised, instead of following you into the side tracks.

(1) Yours was not the only pamphlet, published under the auspices of your Communion, which I received on the subject of Divorce In one, several pages at the end are devoted to controvert what "Protestants" are alleged to be saying about your Communion. Why insert such controversial stuff in a pamph let which was supposed to be issued for the sake of winning "Protestant" opinion against Divorce, unless there was some ulterior sim? (2) As regards your own pamph

let, what you call 'insistence on a common place of Catholic teaching, when inserted in a pamphlet intend ed for "Protestant" consumption, i In giving the action of the Synod exactly what I mean by animus. The Bible, and the Bible only, is the slogan of Protestantism, but strange to say "The Bible and the Bible only on this question, as on many others their own condemnation. reading that sentence, one can scarce ly fail to conclude that you, too, like the author of the pamphlet with propagandist appendix, are more anxious to score what seems to you a strong point against "Protestant ism" as such than to win Protestant opinion against Divorce. The re-mark is wholly unnecessary to your argument on Divorce. Why then was it inserted if not for propa-

gandist purposes ? To the same effect is your use of the term "Protestant Secte" when referring collectively to other Communions than your own, which you term always the "Catholic Church," forgetting or ignoring or denying the fact that some of us have just as good a title to be styled "Catholic" as your Communion and in our own judgment a little better title. again, why import such insinuations of inequality if the object was only, or even chiefly, to win supporters against Divorce? Is this also a little commonplace of Catholic teaching that slipped in inadvertently?

The foregoing are sufficient to show what I meant by a certain animus in the pamphlets. It makes no d fference whether it is conscious or unconscious, and I must insist on my right to interpret your words as they are written. If you say that no mind, that is another matter. I am prepared to accept your statement, but that does not remove the animus shown by the appendix in the other pamphlet to which I have referred.

(3) As regards my criticism that the position of some Communions might have been stated more accurately, very few words will suffice On page 4, you profess to give the official teaching of the Anglican Church and quote the action of the Synod of Huron as showing it. Apart from the question of whether resolution of a Diocesan Synod is the proper place to seek for the official teaching of the Anglican Communion as a whole, which, had you taken the trouble, you might have easily secured from recognized official documents, your statement about the action of the Synod of is an illustration of what I meant by inaccuracy, and I judge of your trustworthiness or the by him con say about the action of the one body of which I have personal knowledge. You state that the Synod of Huron "also put the Anglican teaching on record in a resolu-tion to the effect that while the causes for Divorce should not be extended, Divorce should be granted for one 'Scriptural cause' of

adultery." Now, in the sentence which I have underlined, by putting "Scriptural cause" within inverted comma's, you imply apparently that you are quoting those two words from the text, "Moreover the Christian public of while in the other words you are the Province ought to see to it that the causes for which divorces may be tion. As a matter of fact, the resolution. lution contairs absolutely no reference to Scripture. Nor does it say that Divorce should be granted for warrant. To extend the causes that Divorce should be granted for beyond the one which He allows is adultery. Nor does it claim to repre to open the flood-gates. It is right sent the teaching of the Anglican that relief in that case should be open to all equally, which is not the case simply express their own opinion. at present, because of the expense. Their exact words are: "We recognize only one cause as ground for Divorce, namely adultery." But while they recognize adultery as a ground for Divorce, they do not say that Divorce should be granted even grative effects as to make it impossi- for that. Whether they might, could or ble of adoption. I repeat, that to would have said it in certain circumstances, is another question. As a matter of fact they didn't say it and you have said that they did. The

If there is any public retractation justify your accusation that I in Your Lordship's charge to the communion, for having, under the the Sancd of Haron in the communion. demand for a public respactation is meet the needs of a l right-thinking simply and ridiculously preposterous. have no desire to give this master needless publicity. However, I feel Communion, for having, under the that a very grievous wrong has been for having, under the combating Divorce, of the action taken by that body? andeavoured to work in some propaganda for its own ends, which had nothing to do with Divorce, and for having, in the endeavour, given a most incorrect account of the action of the Synod of Huron, and for its "He (Bishop Williams) then sta reprehensible conduct in the past, as that for certain causes divorce should certain underlying animus had been regards the indissolubility of mar. be made easier than it was at absent from them, if the statement the point too much. It has

statement "that Divorce should be

granted for the one 'Scriptural

cause'" is your own emendation of

riages, legally contracted in this pesent."-Free Press, May 121b, of the position of some other com- appearance of an admission of either attempts to evade the issue and to Believe me, yours faithfully, DAVID WILLIAMS

St. Peter's Seminary, London, Canada May, 26th, 1921. The Right Reverend D. Williams,

Bishop of Huron.

Bishop of Huron, City. My Lord :- I beg leave to acknowl edge receipt of your letter of May 23rd. In reply, I may say that the original points raised by me are of Micient importance to engage Your Lordship's undivided attention and there is not the least danger of my attempting to befog the issue.

(1) In both your letters you have referred to a pamphlet on Divorce, published under the auspices of the Catholic Church, which contains a propagandist appendix." I have no knowledge of such a pamphlet. And though I am soncerned only with a defence of my own pamphlat against I am anxious to let "which first your accusations, the pamphlet prompted your criticism as to animus." Would Your Lordship be prompted good enough to furnish me with a opy of the pamphlet or at least the names of the author and publishers?

(2) Let me say here that Your Lordship is altogether wrong in the assumption that my pamphlet was 'intended for 'Protestant' consump tion" or "to win 'Protestant' opinion against Divorce." It was written holly for the information of Catholics-to show that the much advertised "scriptural cause" of the Protestant sects did not exist ever on a critical examination of their own Authorized Version. tell you that 400 copies of my pamphlet went into the hands of Catholics for every single copy that reached Protestants you will see how

absurd your statement really is. I am fully aware of the fact that my pamphlet was mailed to Protest-ant ministers and the members of the Social Service Council of Canada during this present session of Parliament with a circular letter issued by the Catholic Unity League of Canada. The object was to start discussion and thereby awaken the people of this Province to the danger at their doors. The mailing of the pamphlet to Protestants was done some seven or eight months after its publication and distribution among Catholics, and was not even contem t the time I wrote the plated a namphlet.

The Catholic Church is as much opposed to compromise in matters doctrinal as was her Divine Founder. such intention was present to your Hence, in writing the pamphlet, I eaw no necessity to water down Catholic teaching on either of the poin's to which you have drawn my attention. I might add that my classification of the Anglican Com munion among the Protestant sects is as much a "commonplace of Cath. olic Teaching" as the other statement to which you took exception as indicating animus. Neither the one nor the other "slipped in inadvertently." Neither the one nor the other indicates animus in the author. Were I writing the pamphlet now would not change a word of it. report of the proceedings of the Lambeth conference and of the recent Synod over which you presided, only tends to confirm truth of both statements,-it confirmation were necessary.

very ludicrocs (3) In your attempt to justify your accusation that I had inaccurately stated the position of "some other commun ions," Your Lordship not only got into some very deep side tracks but deliberately side stepped the whole in dis issue. On this "original point" pamp point" raised by me, I make the following observations :

(9) On page 4 of my pamphlet I gave the official teaching of the Anglican Communion in the exact words of the Anglican Bishop of

(b) On page 4 of my pamphlet gave a summary of the action taken by the Synod of Huron; not merely of the resolution of the Synod, but of the doctrinal position of the Church implied in the resolution. In my last letter I gave extracts from the press reports of your own words to the Synod on this question. You seem to have overlooked that part of my letter. I assure you that it has to do with one of the "original points" to which Your Lordship promised to confine yourself in your reply. For the sake of emphasis I will repeat

Your Lordship's words:
"Bishop Williams stated that the only real cause for divorce sanctioned by the Church, was adultery. -Free Press and Globe, Wednezday, May 12th, 1920.

No divorces should be granted save as provided for by the Sermon on the Mount."—Free Press, Wednesday, May 12th, 1920. Divorce should be limited strictly

to the one cause that Christ said was sufficient ground."—Free Press, Wednesday, May 12th, 1920. Will you kindly say whether or time to draw your attention to the not you, yourself, misstated the anglican teaching in these state-

"It is right that in that cess relief should be open to all equally, which is not the case at present, because of the expanse."-Advertiser, May 11th

(d) The words "scriptural cause" in my summary of the action of the Synod of Huran did not imply that I was quoting from the text of the resolution. The four Protestant denominations admitted adultery as a "scriptural cause" for divorce. It was the common term used in the pulpit as well as in the press to indicate adultery. If you will read the next paragraph on page 4 of my pamphlet, you will find the same words in inverted commas. I was certainly not quoting the text of the

Synod's resolution there. You accused me of misetaling the position of "some other com munions." When I asked you it the Synod of Huron was "some other communions," you replied: statement about the action of the Synod of Huron is an illustration of what I meant by inaccuracy, and I judge of your trustworthiness or the reverse, as regards the rest by what of any such pamphlet.
you say about the action of the one ship very rudely and in ody of which I have personal knowl edge.'

Even were I guilty-which is not the case-of misstating the doctrinal position of the Synod of Huron, such a statement on your part would be, to say the least, unpardonable. this an example of the logical method at a judgment? One would expect to find the fundamentals of justice and fair-dealing in a man occupying

The truth of the matter is that yo made a statement which you cannot vindicate, and your attempt to dodge the issue has led you into another stalement less excusable than the

In your reply, kindly note that this is one of the "original points" raised

(f) You assure me that had taken the time, I might have easily secured the official teaching of the from recognized official documents. Would you be good enough to say what these documents are, and in what respect the Anglican teaching, as officially announced by the Bisho of Toronto and yourself, is at variance with the official teaching of the Church as a whole. This is a very interesting "side-track" into which have no objection to following Your Lordabip.

"In view of the foregoing." I still demand a public retractation. Even Bishops, in their Synodal Even Bishops, charges cannot afford to disregard the ordinary rules of justice; nor should they allow their Episcopa dignity to suffocate them request is made of them to make good their statements.

I beg to remain, My Lord, Yours sincerely A. P. MAHONEY.

The Bishon's Room. Bishop Cronyn Hall London, Canada, Jane 1st, 1921.

The Reverend A. P. Mahoney, St. Peter's Seminary, City. Reverend and Dear Sir :- Your letter of May 26th received. In reply

let me say : (1) I do not believe that you are so ignorant of the publications issued under the auspices of your Communion in this country that an outsider like myself can give you in formation about the pamphlet in question.

(2) One of the "original points" pamphlet, about the resolution of the Syncd of Huron. On page four, you state that the resolution "put the Anglican teaching on record." The resolution, according to contains the teaching of the Anglican Communion. That is why you quote Toronto. Will you kindly say whether or not the Bishop of Toronto misstated the Anglican teaching in the words which I quoted?

Communion. This is why you quote it, i. e., because it represents, according to you, the position of the Anglican Communion on Divorce. This identification of the Synod's resolution with the position of the Anglican Communion is made by you, in your pamphlet, not by me. Accepting, for argument's sake the importance which you thus assign to the Synod's resolution I have shown that your summary of the Synod's resolution is wholly inaccurate, to say the least; and, therefore, your representation of the position of the Anglican Communion is of necessity equally inaccurate. What I said or am reported to have said does not affect the resolution and is therefore entirely beside the mark.

Believe me, yours faithfully, DAVID WILLIAMS, Bishop of Huron.

St. Peter's Seminary, London, Canada June 6 h, 1921. The Right Reverend D. Williams, Bishop of Huron, City.

My Lord :- Your letter, dated June 1st, post-marked London, June 3rd, m., was received on June 4th. 8 p. m., was received on June 4 h.
I find it necessary for the fourth
time to draw your altention to the

Church on Divorce—and on Your Lordship's own admission—chiefly to

unions had been more accurate.
The "original points" then, are:

(1) that there is underlyin animus in my pamphlet and in another which you designate as the one with the "propagandist appen-

(2) that my statement of the doctrinal position of ns" is inaccurate.

reference to With original point," you failed to show any "animus" in my pamphlet. Your letter of May 23rd betrayed the fact that you had wrongly assumed that my pamphlet was written to be distributed among Protestants for propaganda purposes. My reply to that statement in my seems to have so far disconcerted you that you have dropped this original point" entirely in your letter of June 1st, without, howe apologizing for making such a groundless charge.

In regard to the other pamphlet with "propagandist appendix" I asked for information as to author and publisher. The request made in good faith as I do not know ship very rudely and in a manner ill becoming a gentleman refused to me the information. I repeat that I am not particularly concern with any but my own pamphlet. But your refusal to prove your statements regarding the pamphlet in question does not tend to heighten my opinion of your integrity and fair dealing. by which the Bishop of Huron arrives | In fact my suspicions of the contrary are aroused.

The second "original point" that I misstated the doctrinal position of "some other commu I gave the official teaching of four munions.

Did I misstate the doctrinal position of the Presbyterian communion? If so, prove it. Did I misstate the doctrinal position

of the Methodist communion? Did I misstate the doctrinal position of the Baptist communion? If so

prove it. Did I misstate the doctrinal position Anglican Communion as a whole of the Anglican communion? If so, You have side-stepped this issue

long enough. My patience with your quibbling is just a bit overtaxed. Either prove your charge or with-draw it as publicly as it was made. Up to date the only justification

you have offered for your accusation of inaccuracy in my statement of the position of "some other comis that I misstated the munions action taken by the Synod of Huron. Let me repeat : (s) The Synod of Huron is not

some other communions.' (b) The Synod of Huron is not the

Anglican communion.
(c) The Bishop of Toronto and you, in your official capacity as Bishop of Huron, stated the doctrinal position of the Anglican communion on the subject of Divorce. My statement of the Anglican position rests upon the words of two Bishops of that communion who are supposed be faithful guardians and expositors of Anglican teaching. it possible that I have over estimated the doctrinal value of an Anglican Bishop's pronouncement to his Synod on a matter of the Church's teach-

ing ? (d) My statement of the action of the Synod of Huron was not a quotation but merely a summary of the doctrinal stand of the Church implied in the resolution, and based upon your own words to the Synod. (e) Even if I had been guilty of inaccuracy of statement of the action of the Synod of Haron,-which I deny and which you have not been

Granting but not conceding that I did read into the resolution of the Synod of Huron more than the resolution actually implied, will you kindly show wherein the Anglican teaching is incorrectly stated? What is the official teaching of the Anglican Church on Divorce? Has Anglican Communion any doctrinal stand that can be called official or is it in a continual state of doctrinal flux? In your letter of May 23rd you referred me to "recognized official documents" for the official teaching of the Anglican Communion as a whole? What are

these "recognized official docu-ments?" Is the official teaching of the Anglican communion as a whole sufficiently elastic to include the official pronouncements of yourself and the Bishop of Toronto on the one hand, and that of the Bishop of Niagara and the opinions expressed by the author of the pamphlet munion. You did not do so.
Divorce" No. 38, issued by the In your charge to the 192 the Council for Social Service of the Church of England in Canada, on the other? Is there even a possibility of an Anglican holding heretical opinions on the doctrine of Divorce?

(g) I take the liberty of quoting the following choics bit from your last laster: "What I said or am reported to have said does not effect the resolution and is therefore entirely beside the mark."

Anglican communion a Synod may go on record in a resolution that does not take into consideration the official teaching of the Church as expanded by the Risham? Do you have given you ample opportunity to prove or retract your charges. You refuse to do either. expounded by the Bishop? Do you mean to say that the Synod of Huron has no regard for purity of doctrine?

Am I to infer that the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the state of th of the action taken by this body?

(c) You object to my statement—
"Divorce should be granted for theone 'scriptural cause' of adultery." My use of the word should is based upon your own statement to the Synod:
"He (Bishop Williame) then stated "He (Bishop Williame) then stated would have been enhanced if a "Your Lordship, I would not str your own comments. The correspondence between us, together with my own comments. The correspondence between us, together your ability of the synod of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the Bishop of Huron in his official charge to the World Mark I shall proceed at once to publish the entire correspondence between us, together with my own comments. The correspondence will reveal your shifty "vox et praeterea nihil?" If I w Your Lordship, I would not str

weakness or incompetence. I beg to remain, My Lord, Yours sincerely,

The Bishop's Room Bishop Cronyn Hall, London, Can., June 9th, 1921. The Rev. A. P. Mahoney, St. Peter's Seminary, City.

Reverend and Dear Sir :- Your letter of June 6th received. I do not not see any value in prolonging the correspondence be-tween us. As Sydney Smith once remarked when he saw two persons disputing with each other on oppos ite sides of the street: "They will never agree because they stand on different premises." So is the case with us. My criticism, in the Synod, have fully substantiated in my letters to you. I refuse to digress to

other matters. Believe me, yours faithfully. DAVID WILLIAMS Bishop of Huron.

St. Peter's Seminary, London, Canada June 11th, 1921. The Right Reverend D. Williams, Bishop of Huron, City.

My Lord :- Your letter of June 9th received. In reply let me say : (1) On May 12th, I wrote asking you to prove or retract the accusations made against me in your

charge to the 1921 Synod. Since then you have written four letters in which you have utterly failed to make good your charges. On the contrary, you have side-stepped the whole issue Regarding your first accuss tion of "animus" in my pamphlet, you defined what you meant by

animus in your letter of May 23rd. 'What you call 'insistence on commonplace of Catholic teaching when inserted in a pamphlet intended Protestant consumption exactly what I mean by animus.

I answered in my 26th, that my pamphlet was not written for "Protestant consumption" but for distribution among Catholics : that its circulation among Protest ants was not even thought of at the time it was written; that hundred copies went into the hands of Catholics for every one that reached Protestants. On your own declaration of what you meant by animus," your accusation is shown to be groundless.

(3) In your first two letters you assured me that my pamphlet was not the one you had chiefly in mind in your statement as to You furnished me with a fund of information concerning another pamphlet on Divorce, published under the auspices of the Catholic

Church. "Several pages at the end devoted to controvert what ' Protestants' are supposed to be saying about your communion." (Your letter of May 23rd.)

Why insert such controversial stuff in a pamphlet which was supposed to be issued for the sake of winning Protestant' opinion against divorce unless there was an ulterior aim ?" Your letter of May 23rd). It had a "propagandist appendix."

Your letter of May 23rd.) Apimus shown by the appendix in the other pamphlet to which I have referred." (Your letter

of May 23rd.) The only information which you did not give concerning the pamphlet in question was the information which I requested, viz, title, author and publishers. I asked twice for this

specific information. On both occasions you refused to give it.
Why did you refuse? Were it not discourteons. I would be say that I strongly suspect the non-existence of this pamphlet. You had nothing to loss in giving me this information. The fact that you not would lead one to believe that you could not.

The fact remains that you have offered no proof for your statement that the "animus" in this un-named pamphlet justified your accusation.

(4) Your second charge was that I misstated the position of "some other communions." The only explana-tion you offered was that I had misstated the position of the Synod of Huron. Granting, but not conceding that I did, the Anglican position is still correctly stated in the exact words of the Bishop of Toronto. My summary of the action taken by the Synod of Huron is based upon your vour own words and agrees with the state-ment of the position of the Church made by the Bishop of Toronto. asked you in three letters to point out any inaccuracy in my statement of the teaching of the Anglican com-

In your charge to the 1921 Synod you used the plural "some other communions." You have no explanation to offer for the accusation against me contained in these words. Your second charge, then, remains like the first, upproved

Notwithstanding all this, you have the effrontery to tell me in your last letter that you "do not see any value in prolonging the correspond. ence between us" as your "criticism Has it come to this, that in the in the Synod" has been "fully sub-

respondence will reveal your shifty

I am, My Lord, Yours sincerely

A. P. MAHONEY.

IRISH RELIEF FUND

Previously acknowledged ... A Friend.

THE SACRED HEART AND CHINA BY REV. J. M. FRASER, CHINA MISSION COLLEGE, ALMONTE

Let "China for the Sacred Heart be our constant prayer during June. Think of our two young missionaries, Fathers Sammon and Carey, in far-off Kwei-chow. How those of St. Paul are their journeys. Like him they travel through the highways and the byways. Strange faces watch them in the streets, and men wonder who they are. Some may smile at their simplicityhalf way round the world to tell an ancient people that now after four thousand years they must give up their household gods and adore the One and Only True Creator; that their temples and priests and pago das are only superstitions; that their ancestor worship is devilish; that Confucius was a mere man, but that

Christ is the Son of the living God. Then, as a fitting and practical tribute to the Sacred Heart in the month dedicated to His honor send an offering towards the completion of the Sacred Heart League Burse for the education of missionaries for China. Surely the future mission aries who owe their ordination to this Burse will deem it their duty to spread the love of the Sacred Heart among their converts in China.

QUEEN OF APOSTLES BURSE Previously acknowledged 12 020 80 A Friend, Fairfield, P.E.I.

ST. ANTHONY'S BURSE Previously acknowledged... \$1,185 20 IMMACULATE CONCEPTION BURSE Previously acknowledged... \$2 489 48 COMPORTER OF THE AFFLICTED BURSE Previously acknowledged \$870 50 ST. JOSHPH, PATRON OF CHIMA, BURSE

Previously acknowledged ... \$1,955 44 BLBSSED SACRAMENT BURSE Previously acknowledged,..... \$321 05

ST. FRANCIS TAVIER BURRE Praviously acknowledged..... \$280 80 HOLY NAME OF JESUS BURSE

Pravicualy acknowledged... \$229 00 HOLY SOULS BURSE Pasviously acknowledged... \$1,029 75 Child of Mary ...

Thanksgiving, Hazel Hill, LITTLE FLOWIN BURN Previously acknowledged.. 1624 84 A Friend, Sherbrooke, Que

C. T., Renfrew SACRED HEART LEAGUE BURSE Previously acknowledged... \$1,546 32 Richard Fleming, Bay de

Verde. A Friend, Canso, N. S.. 5 00 E. A. McGrath, Fresno, Cal. 2 00 B. M. & E

THAT SOFT ROSY, VELVETY COMPLEXION **Blemishes Removed Quickly**



ion treatm

| W | rill give you full details by return mail. |
|----------|--|
| | - FREE COUPON |
| ten man | PEARL LA SAGE, Reg. Dept. 504 Box 289, Station B, Montreal. |
| T. C. C. | I am a reader of this paper and am entitled to know full details of the separational, harmless scientific method for giving mercelous beauty to the complexion. There is no obligation whatsoever of my part for this information. |
| | Name |
| 1 | Street |
| 1 | City |