

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, Ltd.
(Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.,
Editor, Thomas Coffey, Ltd.,
Associate Editor—H. F. MacIntosh,
Manager—Robert M. Burns.
Address business letters to the Manager.
Advertisements for teachers, situations want
ad, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance
must accompany the order. Where Catholic
Record box address is required send 10 cents to
cover expense of postage upon replies.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be
inserted except in the usual condensed form.
Each insertion 25 cents.
The Catholic Record has been approved and
recommended by Archbishops Falcato and
Barnett, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada,
the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa,
and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Ham-
ilton, Peterborough and Ogdensburg, N. Y.,
and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
The following agents are authorized to
receive subscriptions and canvass for The
Catholic Record:
General Agents: M. J. Hagarty, Stephen V.
James, Vincent S. Cox, Miss Anne Sanders, Syd-
ney, B. C., 1000, 1410 Ave. West, Van-
couver, B. C.; S. J. Johnson, 210 Rochester St.,
Ottawa; Mr. Geo. E. Smith, 2333 Main St.,
Montreal; B. F. O'Leary, Lehigh, Sask.; Miss
Anne Hogan, 367 Langside Street, Winnipeg,
Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 1921

THE HOLY NAME SOCIETIES AND SEPARATE SCHOOLS

On Sunday, June 12th, in eleven different centres, the Catholic men of the Diocese of London made a magnificent public demonstration of faith in Jesus Christ and of reverence for His Holy Name.

After an absence of twenty years on diplomatic service for the United States Maurice Francis Egan was asked to write his impressions of the notable or noticeable changes that two decades had made in the habits and outlook of his fellow-countrymen at home. It is noteworthy that he placed in the forefront of the things that impressed him deeply the marked and remarkable decrease or entire absence of profanity in places and circumstances where it had been a matter of course, a commonplace twenty years ago. Whether or not this very gratifying revolution in habits of speech is due entirely to the activity of Holy Name Societies it may be difficult to determine; but that the enrollment of millions of men and boys not only pledged personally to reverence and purity in speech, but pledged also actively to discountenance and discourage profanity and obscenity, must have had a tremendous influence in bringing about the happy result. The indirect influence on the whole population of the public manifestation of their object and purpose it is impossible to measure. In every town and city of North America men in thousands and tens of thousands have had the courage to profess openly their profound reverence for that Holy Name than which there is none other whereby we may be saved. This was and is an impressive protest against the profane and the obscene in speech. And this was the primary object of Holy Name societies: to eradicate habits of speech that dishonour the Holy Name of Jesus or the great name of God; to banish from the conversation of Christian men the unclean, and everything that savours of the obscene.

That was and always will be a worthy object.

But, as His Lordship Bishop Fallon said at St. Thomas, it is no longer the sole object, no longer the chief purpose of the Holy Name societies. That object and purpose is no longer merely negative; it is the positive desire to honor the Person of Jesus Christ, to restore Him to his proper place in Christian society. For it is through the God-Man, Jesus Christ, and through Him alone, that society not less than the individual can find salvation.

We should be pleased beyond measure to give a summary of this address. For the Bishop, profoundly moved by the testimony to the Faith of that great concourse of Catholic men, discarded the notes of his prepared sermon and gave expression to the emotions that welled up from his heart, the ideas that surged through his mind, as he walked at the head of the parade. And speaking from the heart he spoke to the hearts of the multitude that filled the church and stood outside by the open doors and windows. It may be that at another time we shall be able to give our readers this sermon, though from its very nature it will be difficult to do so.

Almost everywhere Holy Name men have formed the commendable and eminently edifying habit of receiving Holy Communion in a body on certain Sundays. An admirable custom in many places is to have a Catholic, prominent or otherwise, address the men on some subject of Catholic interest on which he is well informed. It is only natural to

look to Catholics who have achieved a certain distinction for such addresses; but the main consideration is that the speaker be thoroughly informed of his subject, and that the subject be of genuine Catholic interest. In many places the subject of Catholic education has been thus treated with the greatest utility and profit.

There could hardly be a more appropriate subject for discussion and study amongst the Holy Name men. For Catholic education means just this: Jesus Christ in the schools.

Amongst Catholic fathers and mothers who have a realization of parental responsibility there is not one in ten thousand who does not thank God for Catholic schools where the atmosphere and influence of religion permeates the whole school life of the children; where the God-Man, Jesus Christ, is undisputedly and uncompromisingly "in His proper place."

But it is one thing to love and esteem Catholic schools; it is another to understand their needs, to assert their rights, to set forth their claims intelligently and what is very important—intelligibly to our non-Catholic fellow citizens.

The fruits of such study and discussion in the Diocese of London were evidenced on the Sunday before last when at least ten thousand Catholic men in the various centres at their annual rally unanimously adopted a resolution setting forth Separate School rights and heartily endorsing the claims for justice and fair dealing from the Provincial Legislature.

We venture to say that were the assemblies exclusively non-Catholic and were they as fully seized of the disabilities under which we labor, that the same resolutions would be passed, if not unanimously, at least by overwhelming majorities.

For example: What non-Catholic would hold that the streets of Toronto or of London or of Ottawa or of Hamilton, or of any other city, belong exclusively to Protestants, Jews, agnostics and what not; but that Catholics have no share whatever in their ownership?

Can we think so meanly of any class of our fellow-citizens as to believe that they would advance so preposterous a claim?

Yet that, in practice, is precisely the present position.

Street-railways pay all their taxes to Public schools; not one cent to Catholic schools.

There is no such intolerance in Canada as would claim that Catholics own no part or lot in the great system of National Railways. The Member of Parliament who would exclude nearly forty per cent. of the Canadian people from ownership in the Canadian National Railways would be looked upon as insane.

Yet not one cent of the school tax from these railways, offices, terminals, etc., goes to Separate schools in Ontario; every dollar, every cent, so paid goes to the Public schools.

The Banking institutions which enjoy a monopoly of a very lucrative business, a monopoly granted by Parliament which represents not 60 per cent. but 100 per cent. of the people of Canada, are, as far as school tax is concerned, looked upon as Protestant institutions.

Were a Catholic to insist on a lower rate on passenger tickets or on freight from our railroads publicly or privately owned he would be in danger of being brought before an alienist to have his mental condition passed upon.

If the claim were made on behalf of the Catholics of Ontario to be relieved of their share of the \$70,000,000 deficit on our National Railway System it would hardly receive serious attention.

No, there is no distinction made when Catholics travel or pay freight rates; there is no distinction must be imposed by the tens of millions to make up deficits; then in the name of decency, of fair-play and justice let there be no distinction between Separate and Public schools in the distribution of the school tax from all public utilities.

That is one of the requests that Catholics are making with respect to Separate schools.

The daily newspapers headline the news that we are asking the Ontario Government for ASSISTANCE!!

We have not asked nor do we want one dollar or one cent of assistance.

We want what any self-respecting Protestant will concede is our due. Nothing more is asked; nothing less can fairly be offered or accepted.

CONGRATULATIONS

The Very Reverend Thomas O'Donnell has been reappointed by the Holy See for another term as President of the Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada. This is a signal mark of confidence, honestly earned by the conscientious and very successful administration of the affairs of this important Society during the trying period of the term just closed.

Just how onerous were the duties assumed by Father O'Donnell when he first took office as President of Extension is of course well known to many of the Society's best friends and warmest supporters. For reasons that it is unnecessary to dwell upon, the outlook of the great undertaking was dark, indeed many considered it hopeless. However it was decided that it was better to endeavor to revive the moribund society than to let it die and make a fresh start.

Father O'Donnell set quietly and patiently to work, restored shaken confidence, revived quenched enthusiasm, placed the affairs of the Society on a sound business basis, and ensured for it, under prudent management, a permanent place amongst the activities of the Catholic Church in Canada.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance and the usefulness of Catholic Church Extension in a country like Canada. "Why it is an empire you are building up in the West," exclaimed an eminent English Catholic on his return from a trip to the Pacific coast; and he spoke in sober truth, albeit with greater vision of the future than is always found amongst Canadian Catholics. More's the pity. Every Protestant Church has its counterpart of Extension in the Home Missions. The need for assistance to the newcomers to Canada is self-evident. They have everything to do; they have first of all to establish themselves, to make their homes, to put themselves in the way of gaining a livelihood for their families. If we meet these Catholic brethren of ours in the beginning of every settlement, if we help them when they are not yet able to help themselves to any great extent, then every mission formed now will be the nucleus of a future parish; the Church will strike its roots in the early settlements of the West, grow with its growth and become the great influence for the saving of souls and the upbuilding of sound Canadian citizenship that it ought to be.

If we in older Canada fail in our duty to the late-comers in the West then the Church will have lost ground that it will take a century to regain.

Ours is a great responsibility; but our duty in the premises should be looked upon as a privilege. The Catholic Church Extension Society of Canada makes that plain duty easy. No Catholic worthy of the name will fail to contribute according to his means to a work so great and of such pressing importance.

We congratulate Catholic Church Extension and the Catholics of Canada on the fact that for another five years Father O'Donnell will have charge of this great work so essential to the welfare of the Church in Canada.

The zeal, the patience, the energy, the self-effacing devotion to the duties of his office which enabled the Reverend President to accomplish so much in the past five years, are the guarantee of even wider influence that lies before him.

Though we know that Father O'Donnell desired to retire—and because of that fact—we congratulate him on his acceptance of the office for another quinquennial, and we wish him the greatest possible measure of success in what is really a new phase of the work of Extension.

To every reader of THE CATHOLIC RECORD we commend warmly and unreservedly the Catholic Church Extension as a work of the greatest importance and urgency, one that affords each and every one of us the opportunity of exercising the great virtue of Christian charity in its noblest and most beautiful form.

DECIDING THE EMPIRE'S POLICIES

By THE OBSERVER

London, May 30.—Premier Hughes, of Australia, arriving at Toulon, France, en route to London, where he is to attend the conference of British premiers, said representatives of the dominions would meet for the first time at the conference to mould and formulate a foreign

policy for the empire which had hitherto been decided by Great Britain alone. Mr. Hughes thinks that the world welcomes the fact that the advice and counsel of the young and eminently democratic British peoples has been sought on matters wherein the peace of the universe largely depends. The Times remarks that Premier Hughes' favorable verdict on the meeting is not shared seemingly by many Canadians.

The Times is right, for once in its life. We are not so very enthusiastic in Canada about this Conference; nor are we very hopeful of having much to say about England's foreign policy. And it is England's foreign policy that Mr. Hughes is talking about, though he calls it "a foreign policy for the Empire."

Mr. Hughes, besides, is not very sure just how we of "the British dominions overseas," or, as the English love to call us, "the colonies," are to take part in making "a foreign policy for the Empire;" for he talks of our "advice and counsel."

Now, "advice and counsel" are very good in their way; but they are not the same thing as legislative or executive power. Evidently Mr. Hughes, when he had got as far as Toulon on his way to London, was not yet quite sure what he was going to do at London. Our guess is that he will give a good deal of "advice and counsel," and that most of the satisfaction he will get by so doing will consist in the pleasure of hearing himself talk and in seeing the English leaders listening to him politely. There seems to be no lack of advisers and counsellors of the name of Hughes. There is—or was—our own Sir Sam.

"Oh, that eye," wrote an enthusiastic English lady reporter, after she had interviewed Sir Sam. "That eye,—like a machine gun." Whereupon some cold blooded cynic was so hard-hearted as to remark: "It isn't Sam's eye that's like a machine gun, it's his mouth."

Sir Sam's namesake from Australia also has one of those mouths; and no doubt his hosts at London will give him full and ample opportunity to fire as many rounds from it on this occasion as he has been in the habit of firing whenever he has visited London. Just what effect his rapid fire "advice and counsel" will have on "a foreign policy for the Empire," is, however, another matter altogether. "Wait and see," as poor old Mr. Asquith used to say. My personal opinion is, we won't see much.

There is, of course, a wide field for "advice and counsel." There are fourteen or fifteen wars going on; in all of which a "foreign policy for the Empire" is more or less concerned. There are the remains of the Treaty of Versailles to be post-mortemed as preparatory to their decent interment. There is the Treaty of Sevres, to be "re-adjusted," not "revised," the diplomats assure us; only "re-adjusted."

There is the Silesian mess; with the task of convincing the Poles of the plebiscite area that the diplomats and the English bankers and manufacturers are not going to cheat them out of the fruits of their votes. There are all the points of divergence between England and France arising out of their different concerns in the future of Germany.

Yes, there is much to talk about; and it talk were all that was required, we Canadians would probably be as enthusiastic over the Conference of British Premiers as Mr. Hughes is. But, in Canada, we are not convinced that we are to have any effective voice or vote in all or any of these matters. The "foreign policy for the Empire" will be, in the future, as it has been in the past, made in London, by governments in whose making and unmaking Canadians and Australians have nothing whatever to say.

This is the reason why The London Times cannot discover any enthusiasm in Canada in respect of the coming Conference.

THE K. OF C. TO ISSUE NATION'S HISTORY

To give to the country the most remarkable textbook of history ever written is the latest goal set for themselves by the Knights of Columbus in their historical convention just concluded at Chicago. The most famous authorities on American history are to be engaged in the work which is to be a complete history of the United States from Colonial times to the present day, "free from propaganda or personal interpretation" of any kind. Mr. John H. Reddie, supreme master of the fourth degree membership of the K. of C., who has been put in charge of this undertaking, offers the following preliminary explanation:

"Men of diverse racial extraction and religious denominations will be selected for this important work. No matter what the cost—and my estimate is that in time and labor materials our plan will run into an expenditure of from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000—the best historical brains of the country will be secured to write the nation's history from original sources."

"The experience of the Knights of Columbus throughout the country is that most textbooks of American history either are in important facts or contain unwarranted, un-American or contain unwarranted, un-American propaganda. Our aim is to give the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

A cycle of twenty-four pamphlets is to be prepared dealing with critical phases of our history. These are to be distributed in millions to all schools, colleges, legislatures and newspapers. They will later be gathered into a book with an ample bibliography appended.—America.

UNDER the heading "Historic Fakes dies in Penury," the daily papers print a despatch announcing the death in a London poor house of

the once celebrated Louis de Rougemont. Why he alone should be singled out among public entertainers for the opprobrious term of "faker" is not explained. That in the relation of his pretended adventures, he succeeded for a time in "fooling" both publisher and public is quite true, but then he does not stand alone in that respect, and would not seem to merit opprobrium any more than others who have indulged in the same pastime.

PHINEAS T. BARNUM, for example, is still known as the "great showman," although he confessedly "humbugged" the public. Indeed, his famous saying: "the public likes to be humbugged," has passed into current phraseology, and left no stigma on the man. And in view of the present-day maxim so widely acted upon by people who regard themselves as quite respectable, that in business and in other spheres of activity the great thing is "to get away with it," it seems rather unkind to separate poor Rougemont from the crowd, and "cast stones at him." If we may be pardoned a paradox, he was at least candid in his deceit, and laughed over the results of it, which is more than can be said of many another who not merely fooled, but robbed the public and "got away with it."

A PRESBYTERIAN scribe, writing in the Globe, waxed enthusiastic over an address of the Anglican Bishop of Ontario on the subject of religious instruction in the Public schools. The Bishop had said that frequent and systematic religious instruction is a necessary and essential part of any education, and the only foundation for moral and ethical training. The Globe contributor endorses this and further avers that the Bishop had "put his finger on a very vital and, it must be added, vulnerable spot" in the prevailing system of education. "Prevailing lack of discipline," he adds, "and present lawlessness are due to the lack of religious instruction in the Public schools."

It is something that thoughtful minds among Protestants are coming more and more to realize this truth, but in view of the prevailing state of belief among them, the way to solve the problem is not easily apparent. The Globe writer himself recognizes this when he says: "No one can teach religion who does not believe in it, and the question will be asked by many who heartily endorse the Bishop's contention as to how it is practicable to insure the appointment of teachers who have the necessary convictions for giving proper religious teaching. To state this problem is to enter upon a subject which many, perhaps most people in Canada, regard as insoluble." Therein lies the crux of the problem, and since faith, outside the Catholic Church, has become in our day a thing attenuated almost to disappearance little progress is likely to be made towards the much-to-be-desired solution.

THE following resolution passed at the Convention of the Middlesex and Lambton Association of Baptist Churches, held at London, Ontario, June 10th and 11th, 1920, embodies the teaching of the Baptist Church on this subject:

"That while we recognize the equality of the rights of all men under the law, nevertheless, realizing the sanctity of the marriage relationship, and the great danger to the welfare of our homes and nation involved in the weakening of the bonds which bind husband and wife, we would therefore view with alarm the passing of any law that would make the securing of divorce easier, or possible, save for the one cause laid down by our Lord Jesus Christ: (Italics ours.)"

"In placing the question of divorce before the 1920 Synod, the Anglican Bishop of Toronto said in part: 'May I say that for the branch of the Holy Catholic Apostolic church to which we belong, the question of her stand in opposition to divorce, save for the one cause allowed by her divine head, (italics ours) is plainly indicated by the legislation adopted in 1905. No clergyman within the jurisdiction of the Church of England in Canada shall solemnize a marriage between persons either of whom shall have been divorced from one who is living at the time.' Thus does she put herself on record as setting her face sternly against that which imperils the indissolubility of the marriage tie."

"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 cause for divorce should not be extended, divorce should be granted for the one 'scriptural cause' of adultery."

"The above quotations give the official teaching of the four leading Protestant denominations on the subject of Divorce. The reader will note that on this question there is unanimity among the Protestant sects. They, one and all, declare that Jesus Christ permitted divorce on the ground of adultery. They call this the 'scriptural cause.' This appeal here, as in everything else doctrinal, is to the Bible and the Bible only."

"Now the question arises—Does the Bible really teach that legitimate Christian Marriage can be dissolved for any cause? Did Jesus Christ make an exception in favor of the innocent party? In other words, is adultery a scriptural cause for divorce? Protestantism answers 'Yes!'"

"The purpose of this pamphlet is to examine the scriptural evidence

SOME LETTERS

FATHER MAHONEY RESENTS CHARGE OF INACCURACY AND ANIMUS

About a year ago the question of the establishment of Divorce Courts in the Province of Ontario was a much discussed subject throughout the Province. At the annual Synods, Conferences and Assemblies of the Protestant denominations the Divorce question was discussed from a doctrinal point of view. Catholics were astounded to see that Protestantism as a whole, officially taught that adultery was a cause for divorce admitted by Our Lord. It was called the "scriptural cause."

In July, 1920, a few weeks after the annual meetings of the Protestant sects, Rev. Father Mahoney of St. Peter's Seminary, London, wrote a pamphlet entitled "Marriage and Divorce" for the purpose of showing that there was no "scriptural cause" for divorce and that the official teaching of Protestantism was due to a misinterpretation of the New Testament passages bearing on the subject. In the introduction to the pamphlet he gave the doctrinal position of the four leading Protestant denominations taken from official sources as follows:

THE TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST CONCERNING DIVORCE

OFFICIAL TEACHING OF PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

"In the case of adultery after marriage (italics ours) it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce, and after the divorce to marry another as if the offending party were dead." (Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. xiv, Sec. v.)

OFFICIAL TEACHING OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

"The minister to whom application is made for the solemnization of marriage of any divorced person shall require the production of a copy of the decree and other proceedings of the party obtaining the divorce, and if satisfied that the divorce was obtained upon other than scriptural grounds, (italics ours) or, that in case of divorce on such grounds the divorced person desiring re-marriage was the guilty party, he shall refuse to solemnize the marriage." (Methodist Church Discipline, Par. iv, Sec. iii.)

OFFICIAL TEACHING OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH

"The following resolution passed at the Convention of the Middlesex and Lambton Association of Baptist Churches, held at London, Ontario, June 10th and 11th, 1920, embodies the teaching of the Baptist Church on this subject:

"That while we recognize the equality of the rights of all men under the law, nevertheless, realizing the sanctity of the marriage relationship, and the great danger to the welfare of our homes and nation involved in the weakening of the bonds which bind husband and wife, we would therefore view with alarm the passing of any law that would make the securing of divorce easier, or possible, save for the one cause laid down by our Lord Jesus Christ: (Italics ours.)"

OFFICIAL TEACHING OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

"In placing the question of divorce before the 1920 Synod, the Anglican Bishop of Toronto said in part:

"May I say that for the branch of the Holy Catholic Apostolic church to which we belong, the question of her stand in opposition to divorce, save for the one cause allowed by her divine head, (italics ours) is plainly indicated by the legislation adopted in 1905. No clergyman within the jurisdiction of the Church of England in Canada shall solemnize a marriage between persons either of whom shall have been divorced from one who is living at the time." Thus does she put herself on record as setting her face sternly against that which imperils the indissolubility of the marriage tie."

"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 cause for divorce should not be extended, divorce should be granted for the one 'scriptural cause' of adultery."

"The above quotations give the official teaching of the four leading Protestant denominations on the subject of Divorce. The reader will note that on this question there is unanimity among the Protestant sects. They, one and all, declare that Jesus Christ permitted divorce on the ground of adultery. They call this the 'scriptural cause.' This appeal here, as in everything else doctrinal, is to the Bible and the Bible only."

"Now the question arises—Does the Bible really teach that legitimate Christian Marriage can be dissolved for any cause? Did Jesus Christ make an exception in favor of the innocent party? In other words, is adultery a scriptural cause for divorce? Protestantism answers 'Yes!'"

"The purpose of this pamphlet is to examine the scriptural evidence

bearing on this subject in order that an answer may be given to the above question. The Bible is the last court of appeal for the Protestant. To the Bible we shall go. And, lest we be accused of unfairness or prejudice, the Protestant Authorized Version of the Bible will be used for all citations of scriptural texts."

At the 1921 Synod of Huron, His Lordship, Bishop Williams, made a public reference to the Pamphlet "Marriage and Divorce" and accused the author of writing it with animus and of giving an inaccurate statement of the position of "some other communions." The Bishop's charge to the Synod was published in the London Free Press of May 11th, and on May 12th Father Mahoney wrote to Bishop Williams asking him to prove or retract his accusations. A lengthy correspondence arose between them which resulted in the Bishop refusing to either prove or retract his charges.

In self-defence against the false accusations contained in the Bishop's charge to the 1921 Synod of Huron, Father Mahoney now publishes the entire correspondence. It is based upon the introduction to the pamphlet "Marriage and Divorce" as quoted above. The correspondence requires no further comment.

St. Peter's Seminary,
London, Canada,
May 12th, 1921.

The Right Reverend D. Williams,
Bishop of Huron, City.

My Lord:—In the report of your charge to the Synod of Huron as published in the Free Press of May 11th, I notice the following reference to my pamphlet, Marriage and Divorce:

"Perhaps the value of the pamphlets outside the communion itself would have been enhanced if a certain underlying animus had been absent from them, if the statement of the position of some other communions had been more accurate."

As the writer of the pamphlet, I am the only person competent to say in what spirit it was written. I emphatically deny any "underlying animus."

Moreover, I was not aware that I had inaccurately stated the position of other communions. Will Your Lordship be good enough to point out wherein these inaccuracies occur?

Of course I shall consider your reply public in view of your public reference to my pamphlet.

I am, My Lord,
Yours sincerely,
A. P. MAHONEY.

The Bishop's Room,
Bishop Cronyn Hall,
London, Canada, May 17th, 1921.

The Reverend E. P. Mahoney, St. Peter's Seminary, City.

Reverend and Dear Sir:—Your letter of May 12th received. In reply let me say:

(1) Yours was not the only pamphlet, published under the auspices of your Communion, which I received on the subject of Divorce, nor was it the one that first prompted my criticism as to animus. One has an appendix which is wholly devoted to propaganda for your Church and has nothing to do with Divorce.

(2) Even in your own pamphlet, the same animus is evident to non-Roman Catholics, especially page 14.

(3) Your statement of what the Synod of Huron passed in 1920 is materially different from the text of the Synod's resolution, so different that to call it inaccurate is to put it mildly.

(4) I have no objection to republishing this letter as public if you want to publish it, though I fail to see the necessity of it.

Believe me, yours faithfully,
DAVID HURON.

St. Peter's Seminary,
London, Canada,
May 20, 1921.

The Right Reverend D. Williams,
Bishop of Huron, City.

My Lord:—I am in receipt of your letter of the 17th inst.

While I accept Your Lordship's assurance that my pamphlet was not the one that first prompted your criticism as to animus, I draw your attention to the fact that in your charge to the Synod of Huron my pamphlet was singled out (1) by a quotation from the Foreword and (2) by the accusation that the position of "some other communions" had been inaccurately stated in it. As far as I know it is the only pamphlet on the Divorce question that gives the position of other denominations.

You Lordship professes to find an evidence of animus on page 14 of my pamphlet. Once again I submit that I am the only person competent to say in what spirit the pamphlet was written. Insistence on a commonplace of Catholic teaching, while it may sound rather unpleasant to call, "non-Roman Catholic" ears, is no proof of animus in the author.

But the charge with which I am most concerned is contained in the words, "if the statement of the position of some other communions had been more accurate." I asked Your Lordship to point out the inaccuracies. You answer that I misstated the position of the Synod of Huron. Is the Synod of Huron "some other communions?" Why the plural