

both political parties have to fight for their very existence, what can possibly result but oppression, and, if needs be, extinction? If the Catholic minority be a "great danger to the State," does it not become an instant and imperative duty of the State to protect itself by depressing and oppressing them through the agency of penal enactments and divers disabilities? I take the liberty of repeating here what I wrote in this reference to you a week ago:

"Did the Hon. Mr. Mercier or the leader of the Opposition in the Quebec Legislature attempt by any disgraceful method of this kind to catch the votes of the unthinking populace, and inflame religious passion against the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, your innate sense of justice and fair play would then, I trow, rise up in revolt against such petty politician's barbarity. David, the royal sinner, felt no remorse of conscience over the murder of the brave and faithful officer whose bed he had defiled, till the prophet of God appealed to the unextinguished spark of natural justice in his breast by a parable of infinitely less grievous injury done to one of his peasant subjects. Let Lower Canada be your parable."

In conclusion let me add that the loyal Catholic minority of Ontario are not in the least perturbed by your denunciations and threats of oppression. Witness their peaceful attitude, their absolute composure under such grave provocation. They rely on the protection of the God of righteousness; on the stability of the constitution and the finality of our most gracious Queen to the royal charter bearing her sign manual and the royal seal; on the sense of justice and fair play and Christian charity, and public honor, and social peace, that animates the great Protestant majority of the electorate of Ontario in laudable rivalry of the great Catholic majority of Quebec. Three years ago they gave the world a splendid proof of their possession of these virtues, which are the solid basis of national prosperity. Why then should the Catholics of Ontario be alarmed to-day?

I remain, dear sir, yours, very respectfully,

+ JAMES VINCENT CLEARY,
Archbishop (elect) of Kingston.
The Palace, Kingston, Sunday, 29th December, 1889.

Mr. Meredith Strikes Back Again.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ultimo. I do not think a discussion of the merits or demerits of my letter, as containing or not containing arguments relevant to the subject of our correspondence, would be of interest to the public, who must themselves judge as to that from

what is said, rather than from opinions expressed by either party to the controversy, and I do not, therefore, follow you in that discussion further than to suggest that where an accusation is made against a public man of intolerance and bigotry it is not irrelevant to inquire what manner of man his accuser is. My case on this point is unanswered, except where you go out of your way to repeat your opprobrious epithets towards those who are connected with the Equal Rights movement, and by the repetition of them show your desire to fasten the charge of ferocious bigotry upon the leader of the movement. I did not overlook the statement you quote from your letter of the 22nd ult., nor do I fail now to observe the disingenuous way in which you for the second time evade a direct answer to the question whether you approve or disapprove of the position taken in the quotation I made from the article in the *Canadian Freeman*. You must have a not very high estimate of the intelligence of your fellow-citizens when you speak of the request that you should give that answer as a "reiterated demand on 'you' to muzzle the press." Surely it were the part of a courageous, if not a candid, man that you should give the answer, but you dare not give it, because the only answer you could now give would convict you of making a foundationless charge against me. I say the only answer you could give, because I venture to think that even you dare not now endorse the position that both the political parties of this country are mere factions whose quarrels are to be utilized for the purpose of a compact minority (holding the balance of power between them), dictating its terms as the price of its support, and it was such a combination as that and not my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens that I denounced as the common enemy to be met by united action. This you know full well, and yet for the purpose of giving point to your attack you deliberately misstate my position. Fortunately the people of this province are too intelligent to be misled by these unworthy tactics, and they will only recoil on your own head. I do not hesitate to repeat that such a combination created and existing for such a purpose as I have spoken of, could not be tolerated in a free country, or to avow that wherever it is attempted party lines must be obliterated if necessary to meet it, not by oppressive measures, but by a stern resistance against aggression.

Equally foundationless (courtesy forbids my using a stronger adjective) is the charge that I advocated "making war upon the educational rights of the minority of the Province of Ontario, guaranteed to them by the constitution." It is impos-