

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 Archbishop (elect)
of the Diocese of Kingston.
London, December 27, 1889.

The Archbishop's Warm Rejoinder.

To. W. R. Meredith, Esq., Q.C., M.P.P.:

DEAR SIR,—Last evening's mail brought me the Toronto journals, containing a letter which purports to be your reply to mine, published on Tuesday morning, 24th inst., in the same papers. I confess to disappointment, and some degree of surprise, that after four days of preparation you have failed to produce a single argument 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 occasion of your grievous mental disturbance. 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 hurt, be candid enough to blame yourself.

Although your letter sets no argument before me for consideration, I take note of your eulogy of the Equal Rights Association, whose "ferocious bigotry," poured out in torrents of bubbling vitriol 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 in your mental excitement you overlooked the reply given by me to this singular demand in my letter of date 22nd 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 topics or on any other than those directly bearing on faith and morals, although you would, as your letter intimates, applaud 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 civilization,' the citadel of 'obscuration' and all else that would depreciate her before men. It nowise concerns me whether you have rightly or wrongly interpreted the naked sentence you have produced from the Kingston newspaper. You know, as well as I, that a sentence withdrawn from its antecedent and subsequent context may be plausibly presented to the public in a sense wholly foreign to the mind of the writer. Wherefore, since I have no knowledge of the context preceding or following this short sentence you extracted from the Kingston paper, I am unable to form a prudent judgment as to its meaning. Neither does it appertain to my business in any way whatever. The conductors of the newspaper 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 minority 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 oppress your 400,000 Catholic fellow-citizens in the Province of Ontario, 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 your modern allies that you are seriously of a 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 Ontario, guaranteed to them by the constitution, equally and in exactly the same terms as to the minority of the Province 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, unoffending people. The Catholic parent has as much right as you, sir, to educate his child for this life and for the next in the light and warmth of religion according to his faith. He does not ask you to pay for his child's education. He pays cheerfully out of his own pocket without legal compulsion, without encouragement from the State to do so, and despite the social discouragements and deceitful artifices of 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 education. This parental 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