## MR. MEREDITH'S DILEMMA. Mr. Meredith to Archbishop Cleary.

London. Out, Dec. 27, 1889. LORD ARCHBISHOP-I have the hour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22ad instant (but only through the public newspapers), and were one content with a superficial reading of it, it would be difficult, in the mass of exhorts tion, instruction and fatherly admonition which it contains, and which reaches its climar when you stay for a moment the torrent of your eloquent invective to drop a sympathetic tear at the thought of the trigary I have done to my cause, to recognize the handiwork of the fiery eccles fastic who at the last Provincial general election swent Eastern Outario with his denunciations of the party I had the bonor to lead, and exhorting, vay, commanding, those of his Epiecopal flock to cast their ballots against it.

But it has been impossible for you to conceal entirely your true sentiments, or to hide the motive or object of your attack. to hide the monive or object of your analytic like, why do you speak of my Agnostic friends? Or why do you talk of the "ferocious bigots" of the Equal Rights Association, or falcely charge me with Association, or falcely charge me with desiring to oppress the Roman Catholic minority, or with seeking, by disgrace ful methods, to catch the votes of the unthinking populace, and it fluence religious passion egainst the Roman Catholic min-ority of Outario? For, mask it as you may, that is the charge which you insinu ate, though you do not appear openly to

I can appeal to a lifetime in this com munity for the enswer to the charge of intolerance and bigotry which you instau-ste against me and to the utterances of nearly twenty years of public life as my

efence against your calumnious charges. Tried by the same test, can you ask a verdict of acquittal on a like charge from your fellow citizens? I trow not. They do not, they capnot forget the cruel, the wanton attack which you publicly made upon the defenceless girls and young young women of Ontario, and that, too, that you might make a point against the public school system of this Province; nor can they forget the language which you thought fit to use towards your Protestant fellow ctitzers when you were addressing a body of Roman Catholic gentlemen con-nected with an association which had its

meeting not long ago in Kirgeton.
Then, toe, by what right de you speak of those who ere connected with the Equal Such language from a politician, in the heat of a political harangue, could hardly he pallisted; but what is to be said of its use by a high dignitary of a great Church, not spoken, but written in the seclusion of his study, and when he was penning a charge of intolerance and bigotry against a public man? Trink of such lauguage as applied to the recognized leader of the movement whose position in the Church to which he belongs is as high as that of Your Grace in your own, and whose every utterance, while he spoke with clearness against a piece of legislation which vast majority of his fellow-citizens, what ever view they may entertain of the constitutional question involved, join with him in condemning, was characterized by that broad liberality, generous toleration and true charity towards all men which should pervade the utterances not only of a Christian minister, but of

a Christian gentleman. Then, how do you justify your attempt to make me an oppressor of the Roman Catholic minority, if not in act, at least

I had thought that you concurred with me in deprecating the advice given to the Roman Catholic minority by the writer of the article in the Canadian Freeman to which you referred in your first letter; but as your last letter seems to leave that matter in doubt, the people of the Province, whom you are addressing by means of your own choosing, are entitled to know whether you do or do not approve it, and if no other good re-sults from my correspondence with you, much good will be done to have obtained definition of your view on that

subject. meet such a combination, as is suggested, involves the oppression of the minority. have rightly or wrongly interpreted the involves the oppression of the minority. Granting your premises, I deny your conclusion; and am astonished that, in the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the face of the declaration which I made from its antecedent and subsequent con the face of the fac as to the principles upon which I believed that the government of this Province should be conducted, you should

make such a charge.
In this Province the Roman Catholic minority has been treated not merely justly, but with generosity, and if, which I do not deny, prejudice exists in some quarters against the Roman Catholic, it is, in my judgment, due meinly to the policy of the Church, which forbids the youth of the country being educated together, and to a system of education which tends to separate from the rest of the community a body of its citizens by creed lines, as well as to the injudicious nd intemperate utterances of men on both sides, who do not know, or have forgotten, what civil and religious liberty

I have no quarrel with my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. I have nothing to do with their religious views or opin-ions, and cannot be drawn into a controversy as to the merits or demerits of the dogmas or practices of their Church.

I am ready to give to them every right which I erjoy, and I seek to take from them none that I claim for mysel but I am not willing that exceptional privileges should be granted to them, rotest against, and shall use my best endeavors to prevent their utilizing the party system for enabling them by means of the balance of power, which it is claimed they hold, to dictate their

terms to political parties. As to their separate schools I have nothing to add to what I have said, except to say that the principle on which they, in my judgment, rest is that their organization and support depend solely upon the voluntary action of the Roman Catholic citizen, and that the State has in their creation and for their conduct committed to its citizens, and not to the

judged, and not by unjust inferences which you, sgainst the whole spirit of it, profess to draw from my language. You have too long been accustomed.

when any question affecting or supposed to affect the Roman Catholic people of this Province was being raised, to see its public men, through fear of the cry which you are now seeking to raise against me, deferred from the efficient discharge of their duty; but I have the satisfaction of believing that whatever effect my declaration of principles may have on my party or myself—and it may be that your forecast of the result may prove correct (for I know the effect of the crusade you seek to preach)-those principles must ultimately receive the endorsation by their votes as they do now the convictions of the people of Ontario, because, as I believe, they have their foundation in the principles of eter-nal justice, and that without the recognition of them there can be no full develop ment of the principles of civil and religious liberty which have done so much for humanity, and for none more than for the Roman Catholic minority of the great Empire of which we form a not Insignificant part.

I have the honor to be

Your Grace's obedient servant,
W. R. MEREDITH.
The Most Reverend the Archbishe (elect) of the Diocese of Kingston, Kingston, Ont.

Archb'shop Cleary to Mr. Meredith. The Palace, Kingston,

Dec. 29th, 1889. To W. R Meredith, Esq , Q C. M. P.P. : DEAR SIR-Lest evening's mail brought me the Toronto journals containing s letter which purports to be your reply to mtre published on Tuesday morning, 24th iest., in the same papers. I confess to disappointment and some degree of curprise that after four days of preparation you have failed to produce a single argu-ment in reply to mine, and have found it necessary to substitute angry invective for reasoning, and to scamper off into the limitless regions of space, frothing and foaming with terrible agitation. I sincerely regret having been the innocent cocasion of your grevious mental dis-turbance. But you should remember that you have been the aggressor, and mine has been simply self-defence. Had you not thought fit to make a direct personal attack on me, when addressing the Liberal-Conservative Association in London, you would most certainly have passed without a word of comment on my part. I would have left you and your utterances to the politicians, and continued to attend to my ever pressing official business, probably without reading your speech. If, therefore, you feel burt, be candid enough to blame your self.
Although your letter sets no argument

before me for consideration, I take note of your eulogy of the Equal Rights Asso. clation, whose "feroclous bigotry," poured out in torrents of bubbling vitriel upon the platforms of all the cities and chief towns of the Province, is an unction of sweet odor to your soul as you stand in the centre of your grotesquely combined

allies just now.
I also note your reiterated demand on me to muzzle the press when it dares to disagree with your ideas. It may be that a your mental excitement you overlooked the roply given by me to this singular de-mend in my letter of date 221d inst. Wherefore let me repeat it here:

"Were I or any other prelate to exercise a rigid censorship of the press, such as you demand, on political tepics, or on any other than those directly bearing on faith and morals, although you would, as your letter intimates, appliand our action, many amongst your modern associates would, I am convinced, ring out their loudest denunciations against the Catholic Church, and proceed to vilify her from day to day, and from week to week, as the very type of despotism, the enemy of 'free thought' and 'modern civiliza-tion,' the citadel of 'obscurantism,' and all else that would depreciate her before But you say that my proposition to men. It nowise concerns me whether you s is suggested, have rightly or wrongly interpreted the text may be plausibly presented to the never been heard of by friend or 100; public in a sense whoily foreign to the mind of the writer. Wherefore, since I have no knowledge of the context preceding or following the short sentence you extracted from the Kingston paper, I am unable to form a prudent judgment as to its meaning. Neither does it as to its meaning. Neither does it appertain to my business in any way whatever. The conductors of the paper are, I presume, able and willing to give you due satisfaction."

You are pleased to say it is a "calumny" to impute to you the "intention" of oppressing the Catholic minor ity of Ontario, should you ever succeed in gaining power. This sounds very strange indeed. If there be calumny in the imputation, yourself is the author of it. No words could more clearly than yours express the intention, the design, the passionate determination to oppres your four hundred thousand Catholic

if ever you get the power to accomplish it. The most copious division of your London speech is devoted to the multiform assertion of your purpose and the repetition of the stale old sophisms by which you strive hard to assure you modern allies that you are seriou mind with them in regard to it, and that they and you are excusable in making war upon the educational rights of the minority of the Province of Ontario, guaranteed to them by the Constitution equally and in exactly the same terms as to the minority of the Pro-vince of Quebec. And this, you are pleased to say, does not mean "oppression." It is oppression of the worst kind.

It is oppression of the dearest religious and civil liberties of a loyal, honest, un-off-anding people. The Catholic parent has as much right as you, sir, to educate his child for this life and for the next in mitted to its citizens, and not to the hierarchy, the management and control of them. Upon no other ground and on no other view of their true position can the existence of them, in a free country, be excused, much less defended.

By the principles which I have laid down my party and myself must be its child for this fitte and for the next in the light and warmth of religion according on the light and warmth of religion according on the light and warmth of religion according on the last the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and warmth of religion according on the last in the light and instant and a

political agitators ever urging him to betray his own conscience and his child's temporal and eternal interests by the divorce of religion from youthful educa-

Tais paternal right has been accorded by the God of nature; it is inalienable; no parent can surrender it to you. It is ratified with supreme sanction by the Divine Lawgiver of the Christian religion, who chose to be a child and, for our exam ple, "to grow in wisdom and age and grace of the earthly parents assigned to Him by His Heavenly Father. It was held and exercised by Catholic parents throughout this Province before Confederation and before the British North America Act, and before God and men" under the tutelage North America Act, and was bravely maintained against enemies more powerful than you, and was finally ac-knowledged by Hon George Brown and the whole body of dissentients to be an indispensible condition of peece in Ontario, and was accordingly embodied in the Act of Confederation.

The peaceful possession and free exer-

cise of this parental right has hitherto been regarded as a sacred treasure, that makes our people feel more happy in Canada than they could hope to be in a neighboring country of brighter material prospects for themselves, but of darker surroundings for their children. Have you, sir, ever asked yourself why Annex ation, so highly favored by some of your modern associates, has never been counenanced by the Catholics of Ontario as a tenanced by the Catholics of Octario as a class? It has been my business to make the inquiry, and the primary argument against Annexation always adduced has been the advantage enjoyed by parents in this country for the religious rearing of their offspring. And you would destroy this strong bond of loyalty if you could, and rob your 400,000 Catholic fellow-citiz ins of this priceless civil right, and then coully turn to me and say you don't then coolly turn to me and say you don't consider it "oppression." My dear sir, the same forces that have gradually dragged you down to your present depths would draw you to co-operation n still more grievous acts of oppression whensoever the exigencies of your posi tion and the tyranny of your new masters would demand it of you. Religious per-secution once begun, no one can tell where it may stop. The lessons of his-tory on this subject are pregnant with warning. The enactors of the most infamous statutes in the penal code of the Tudors and Stuarts, that now bring a blush of shame to every Englishman's check, used to say, as you say to-day, that they did not mean oppression of their fellow-subjects, but only the en-forcement of equal rights and the rule of conformity. Tell us not, therefore, that you are any longer the liberal minded gentleman you formerly were; or that you are charitably disposed towards the law-abiding minority of this Province in your effort to despoil them of their religious and civil liberties; or that public justice or social peace or the good order of life among citizens, or all these together, constitute the principle and motive of your present crusade against the Catholics of Ontario. Lay your hand

on your heart and you will feel it uumis takably it is the pulse of Despair re-sponding to the throb of Ambition. Your "intention" to oppress and, in fact, to ruthlessly crush the Catholic minority of this Province is still more forcibly proclaimed in that part of your address to the Liberal-Conservatives of London wherein you took unfair advan-tage of an ambiguous word written by some unknown person in a Kingston paper, and, after odicusly interpreting it in a sense suitable to your purpose, hastened to charge it with astounding recklessness of aspersion upon the en-tire Catholic population of Ontario, and to denounce them as a body worthy of universal execuation. Hear your own most awful language in reference to that fictivious charge: "Is there not great most awful language in reference to that fictitious charge: "Is there not great danger to the State in this solid compact of the minority?" "Danger to the State" has ever been the keynote of penal legislation. Whence the danger? From the "solid compact" of the minority. Now, sir, when you sought to in-fluence the already excited passions of your auditory by this unworthy appeal, you knew full well—avery resident in the country knew—that there is no has not been organized, or projected, or in the remotest way suggested in public or in secret. It has existence only in the brain of your patron and preceptor, the Toronto Mail, which has exceptated this, and many other more wicked theories, for its own purposes of malignity against the Catholic community, and has not been ashamed to repeal it hundreds of times in the last three years. From the editor of that journal you borrowed it, and to his purposes you have striven to apply Your aim was to arouse all the essions of the fenatics that hung around the skirts of the two great political parties, and, to lean them into fury, you . "Is there not great dang the State in this solid compact of the

in Parliamentary government." Nor yet enough. Abandoning yourself to uncontrollable fury, you "out-Heroded Herod" by your final call for vengeance upon uncflending citizens: "Both parties should cry, 'Unite, unite against a common enemy.'" Good God! was it not the most shocking language that ever fell from the lips of a public man practised lawyer to boot, and a political leader of many years' standing!

Now, Mr. Meredith, look me straight

in the face and say, did you not signify your "intention," should the power at any time be yours, to oppress the loyal, peaceful, industrious, religious Catholic minority? If they be the "common against whom both political parties have to fight for their very exist ence, what can possibly result but oppression, and, if needs be, extinction? If the Catholic minority be a langer 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

"Did the Hon, Mr. Marcier 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 influence 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 sgainst such petty politicians' barbarity. David, the royal sinner, felt no remorae of conscience over the murder of the brave and faithful officer whose bed he bad defiled, till the prophet of God ap pealed to the unextinguished spark of natural justice in his breast by a parable of inficately 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 least perturbed by your demunciations and threats of oppression. Witness their peaceful attitude, their absolute composure under such grave provocation. They rely on the protection of the God of righteonsness; on the atability of the Constitution and the fidelity of our most gracious Queen to the Royal Charter bearing her sign-manual and the Royal Seal; on the seages of insides and fair play and on the sence 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 pros-perity. Why, then, should the Catholics of Ontario be alarmed to-day? I remain, dear sir, yours very respect-

fully,

+ James Vincent Cleary, Archbishop (elect) of Kingston. Mr. Meredith to Archbishop Cleary. 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 accusa tion is made against a public man of it tolerance and bigoiry, it is not irrelevant to inquire what manner of man his accuser is. My case on this point is unwith 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 22ad ult., nor do I fail now to observe the disin genuous way in which you for the second time evade a direct answer to the ques tion 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 righ 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 muz zle the press." Surely it were the part of a courageous, if not a candid men that 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, bedare not now endorse the position that both the political parties of this country are more factions whose quarrels are to be utilised 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 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 esitate to repeat that such a combina. tion, created and existing for such a purpose as I have spoken of, could not be tolerated in a free country, or to arow that whenever it is attempted party lines must be obliterated, if neces sary, to meet it, not by oppressive measures, but 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, guaran teed to them by the Constitution." It is impossible for you, in the face of what I have said and written on that subject, successfully to mislead even yourself, much less the people of Ontario and I leave the matter, therefore minority? I say it is ene of the dangers with this single observation, that to modern civilization, one of the nothing, in my judgment, is more likely greatest evils we have to contend with to bring about an agitation for such con stitutional changes as may be necessary to permit the abolition of separate schools than the extraordinary preten ions put forward by the Hierarchy in certain places with regard to their right to control them and the intemperate utterances of such too zealous champi as Your Grace has proved yourself so

> Depend upon it, those whose caus ou champion will not thank you for the spersion you put on their country and their loyalty to it, when you suggest that, though their material interests would be served by annexation to the neighboring Republic, they are restrained from advecating Annexation by a consideration of the advantages with regard to separate schools which they enjoy in Canada They have, I doubt not, a higher opinion of their country thhan Your Grace seems to entertain, and they will not, I ven ture to think, thank you for the sugges tion that the continuance of their alle-giance to it depends upon their retaining the rights they now enjoy with regard to education. Be assured, too, that covert threat to the majority in Ontario, which the statements to which I have adverted contain, will not deter them

from pursuing that course which they believe to be best calculated to advance

their country's interest.

I now part from Your Grace, congratulating myself on the absolute justice of the principles which I advocate, which stands confessed when you are unable to attack me for any position which I have actually taken and are compelled to resor to a very vivid imagination for you facts, and, having called it to your sid, to a most copious vocabulary for the denunciation of the image you have set up.

have the honor to be, Your Grace's obedient servant, W. R MEREDITH.
The Most Reverend the Archbishop elect of the Diocese of Kingston, Kingston London, Jan. 2, 1890.

Archbishop Cleary to Mr. Meredith.

The Palace, Kingston, Sunday, 5th January, 1890. To Wm R. Meredith, Esq., Q.C., M.P. P.: DEAR SIR-I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter pub-ished in Friday's issue of the Empire. Whilst I experience no small share of satisfaction at your prudent resolve to lay down your arms, I do not forego my right, as complainant against you in the court of public opinion, to "sum up" the case before I allow you to part from me

My complaint was that you had "pub licly attributed to me the authorship of a sentence extracted by you from a King-ston newspaper, which you were pleased to interpret to your suditors as revealing a "great danger to the State," "one of the dangers of modern civilization," "one of the greatest evils we have to contend with evils we have to contend with in Parliamentary Government," and "against which both parties should cry, "Unite, unite against a common enemy." My Lord Archishop—I have the boar to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ultimo. I do not think a discussion of the merits or demerit of my letters, as containing or not containing arguments relevant to the subject of our correspondence, would be of interest to the public, who must themselves indee as to that you did not impute the authorship of the sentence to me, inasmuch as the Empire's report was "verbally" incorrect in making you appear to say "The words are used by a newspaper, but, to some extent, I apprehend, by the gentleman who presides over the Archiepiscopal who must themselves indee as to that the containing arguments relevant to the subject of the public, who must themselves indee as to that the containing arguments relevant to the subject of the public, who must themselves indee as to the action of the sentence to me, inasmuch as the extensive process of the sentence to me, inasmuch as the extensive process. See of Kingston." I honorably accepted your assurance; and, on your further explanation that you had merely hazarded a conjecture as to my responsibility in the matter, I allowed your im putation to stand as "conjecture and no more." Accordingly I challenged you to justify your public utterance of this "conjecture," declaring it illogical, unjust and illegal. You made no defence answered, except where you go out of your way to repeat your opprobrious statement and argument, you abandoned epithets towards those who are connected your original charge altogether, never your original charge altogether, never referring to it in any of your subsequent etters, and thus you have virtually pleaded guilty to an indefensible and unjustifiable attack upon me before my fellow citizens throughout the Province Pardon me, sir, if I venture to say that according to the laws of bonor you are bound to make me an adequate apology.
In your first letter to me (dated Dec.

19) you claimed that I should have censured the newspaper from which you had extracted the sentence to which you were pleased to attach a most odious meaning, and in each of your subsequent rejoinders you have insisted that I am bound "to approve or disapprove" that sentence, as interpreted by you. Your patron and inspirer, the Toronto Mail, and all the small antiyou should give the answer, but you dare | Catholic local sheets that take their one each morning from its editor, pined in full chorus with your demand. Ye seem to have had a previous sgreement about say the only answer you could give, be-cause I venture to think that even you you would be that it is not the practice amongst gentlemen to answer nent questions, more especially if they have been captiously contrived. But I prefer to deal with you as a lawyer. Having had the advantage of thirty years' study of law, and ten years practice in the judicial application of i's principles and methods, I take exquisite pleasure in probing your legal mind and analyz ing its operations. Suppose you were re-tained as Queen's Counsel in a case, the issue of which depended on your establishing the responsibility of one man for a libel written by another, would you are mine.) Could a politician speak issue of which depended on your estabunworthy tactics, and they will only to prove definitely three points, viz of the Press. And you further add the recoil on your own head. I do not let, that the written document in question bound to "approve or disapprove." to prove definitely three points, viz : tion was a libel in the sense imputed:
2nd, that defendant was privy to the
writing or publishing of it: and 3rd, that
although he did not co-operate he was
bound by his effice or contract to prevent
such publication or order its retraction.
You dare not ask a verdict from the
jury without plain proof of all and each
of these three points. Should you do
so, the presiding judge would undoubtedly call you to order in the middle of
vour speech, or he would point out to
What appears in an assumption mothing in
your letters that has surprised me more,
as in judicious, impolitic and thoughtless writing, than this appeal to
hierarchical authority for restriction
of the press in this most free country.
No newspaper asks for my "approval.
The limits of my spiritual jurisdiction are
eas well known to the lalty as to myself.
What appears in a newspaper daes not libel in the sense imputed your speech, or he would point out to the jury how widely you had deflected from the lines of common law and common sense, and would direct them to give their verdict unbesitatingly against you. Let us apply this to your case against me. You persist in claiming that I should, in virtue of my episco pal jurisdiction, approve or disapprove the sentence of some unknown writer in a local newspaper which you have thought fit to interpret as revealing a "zolid compact of the minority grievously injurious to the State," "to modern civilization," etc., etc, and if I decline to submit to your unwarranted dictation, I must incur, you say, the responsibility and all the heinous guilt you nave conjured up in support of your war-fare against the Catbolic minority as the

> above stated, being conspicuously nonexistent in your argument. For I have put in evidence that, 1st, I have no knowledge whether the naked sentence withdrawn by you from its antecedent and subsequent context, is fairly chargeable with the odious interpretation you have thought it your inerest to put upon it; and you have not, despite my reinterated challenge, offered even a simulacrum of proof, or alleged any reason whatsoever in support of your fanciful interpretation: that, 2nd,

"common enemy." In presence of all the dignified judges and learned lawyers in the land, I respectfully submit that your cause is lost, it is treely beaten, all

three essential conditions of proof, as

at your meeting in London three months after date, I had not seen it or heard any-thing about it. This statement remains on the record undisputed. 3rd, that my episcopal office does not extend to censorship of the press on political topics or any other, save those which bear directly on faith and morals; and that condemnation or approval of your pet sentence does not appertain to my business in any way whatever. Against this my allegation as to the extent of my duty, you have not demurred even by a whisper. Let me now ask you, in the hearing of your fel-low-lawyers of Ostario, whether or not I am bound to accept your interpretation of that isolated sentence, and publicly to condemn it in order to save myself from ocial vesponsiblity and all your fancied guiltiness in regard of it? Don't part from me, if you please, till you settle this question. The public will await your answer with more than ordinary curiority.
I might indeed have formulated a

more easy, and perbaps more interest-ing case for your legal decision. Sup-pose the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the Legislative Assembly had identified himself, his party and his political programme, with Mr. Sol White, ex M. P. P. and had publicly signified absolute unity of sentiment with that learned gentleman by taking him around circuit of the Province as his lieutenent and alter ego to be the choice speaker and trustworthy exponent of the views of the party of Opposition on every platform in the cities and towns of Oniario during the electoral campaige of 1886. When the aforesaid Mr. Sol White struck out straight for Annexation and delivered to the world his manifesto against British connexion. ms mannesso against british connexion, was or was not the Leader of Her Msjesty's Loyal Opposition bound to purge himself and his many coloured party from the suspicion of complicity by an early and unambiguous pronounce ment of dissperoval? I expatiate upon the above-mentioned three essential conditions of proof of complicity in their bearing on this very serious case -- especially serious in respect of a Conservative Leader. I believe, Sir, you have been "consulted" on this particular case ere now. Would you kindly favor the public with the legal opinion you have given as to the Conservative Leader's responsibility? Has he been so 'disingenuous' as to evade a direct answer? And, if so, why so? Do, Sir, speak out this time. Before quiting this division of my argument, I seel bound to notice the passage in your last letter wherein you charge me with underrating the "intelligence of my fellow citizens," whea I spoke of your insistence on my official condemnation of a political article in a newspaper as a "demand to muzzle the press" in favor of your policy. Hear me. It is solely to the intelligence and public spirit of my fellow citizens of Oatario I have een appealing throughout this controversy which your wanton aggression has forced upon me. I have no Party to sustain me; no daily press to huzza for me and vilify my antagonist; no adviser to take counsel with or to aid me by suggestion; I have nothing on earth to rely upon except the inherent rightscueness of my people's cause, and the honest intelligence of the Protestant majority, whose attention to my feeble utterances I have been compelled to crave, not for my sake, but for the sake of justice and fair-play towards their peaceful fellow-citizens constituting the minority, who are denounced as a "common enemy" of Canadism society, and threatened with religious and civil disabilities. Now, sir, let the honest in-telligence of the people of Oatario judge between you and me on this last point, as on all the rest. Here are the terms of your demand on me : "One would hardly have thought that

so important a statement would have appeared in it (the newspaper) without your approval, or if it had appeared without that approval, would have been per-mitted to remain before the public without not think it all-important (the question of conspiracy or agency being excluded) Episcopal interference with the liberty of the Press. And you further add that In fact, Sir, there has been nothing it What appears in a newspaper does not require my "permission to remain before the public." It may remain till Doom's Day, if it awaits "my permission to re-main," or the remotest interference on my part "to modify, if not to withdraw it," unless perchance it be directly antagmistic to faith or morals.

Sir, will you kindly grant me permission o halt here. Official business of paramount importance demands my instant attention for a few days. I promise to return as soon as possible to my review of between you and me in the court copinion. Meanwhile I wish you of public opinion. a "Happy New Year," and have the hon to be, Yours very respectfully,

+ JAMES VINCENT CLEARY, Archbishop of Kingston.

MR MAYOR CLARK has been re-elected to the Mayoralty of Toronto for a third term. His opponent was Alderman Mc-Millan. Mr. Clarke received 10,326 votes, and Mr. McMillan 8 422. Mayor Clarke's majority was therefore 1,904. The ex-Alderman's personal fitness for the position is undeniable, but it would seem that the support of the Mail was fatal to his prospects. In addition to this, the whole power of the Equal Rights Association was exerted in his favor, but the people of Toronto are not satisfied to be de ated by this faction.

It is reported from Baltimore that I have not been privy to the wriging or publishing of the sentence brought up by you; that I don't know who wrote it; and that, prior to your production of it. United States.