

disclaimer of any participation in the recent electioneering tactics of the *Freeman* was, after a fortnight's detention, returned to me, with a note, as deficient in candour as it was barren of gratitude. The substance of the communication, thus suppressed, is all that I will trouble you with, in order that you may fully understand the turpitude of this conduct. It was entitled, "*A short Address to the Readers of the Toronto Freeman*," and would have filled a column and a half, perhaps, of that Journal. It contained just six paragraphs. The *first* briefly alluded to my well known public interest in the *Freeman*; the *second* referred to the policy of *conciliation* towards the reform party of which I had been an advocate in the House of Assembly, and the *Freeman* one of the organs in the Press; the *third* deprecated in mild but explicit language the sudden desertion of that policy, without sufficient public cause *shown*, on the immediate eve of the late general election; the *fourth* and *fifth* illustrated the folly and danger of fickleness and disregard of principle in political crises; and the *sixth* expressed my personal gratitude to those communities of our friends such as Lanark, Victoria, Haldimand and Perth, which honourably adhered to the conciliation policy of the last four years, and to prominent individuals who had preserved the same consistent course. This was the whole sum and substance of the communication which Mr. Moylan refused to permit me to publish over my own name, through the medium of those types of which, but for my friends and myself, he never would have been the master.

"The personal wrong, however, is but a small part of the far greater public wrong done by the *Freeman's* perversion. That paper was not a private chattel, of which the gentleman in charge could say: "I have a right to do as I like with my own." It was founded and sustained chiefly by the contributions of Catholic electors in Upper and Lower Canada. It had a representative character and a representative responsibility. The Toronto Conference, immediately preceding the Banquet of the 29th of September, 1859, composed of locally influential men, Reeves, Councillors, Aldermen, Presidents of Societies, and Chairmen of numerous Meetings, had given it that character, in a series of resolutions, explicit and unequivocal. That Conference was held more than twelve months after the Brown-Dorion crisis of July, 1858, and no new facts have since been publicly elicited, so far as I know, which would justify a total abandonment of the understanding then entered into—an understanding cordially accepted by the Editor (to use his own words at the subsequent Banquet), "for weal and for woe,"—words which for more than a year afterwards, up to the very day of the late general election—were never once attempted to be explained away, still less withdrawn or retracted, or denied, as they now are.

"If there *are* good and sufficient *public reasons* for such a sum-