

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 *permitted to remain before the public without, at least, some effort on your part to modify, if not to withdraw it.* (The italics are mine.) Could a politician speak or write more distinctly in favor of Episcopal interference with the liberty of the press? And you further say that I am bound to "approve or disapprove." In fact, sir, there has been nothing in your letters which has surprised me more as injudicious, impolite and thoughtless writing, than this appeal to hierarchical authority for the restriction of the press in this most free country. No newspaper asks for my "approval" before publication, no editor has ever consulted me or solicited my approval. The limits of my spiritual jurisdiction are as well known to the laity as to myself. What appears in a newspaper does not require my permission to "remain before the public." It may remain till doomsday if it awaits my "*permission to remain,*" or the remotest interference on my part "*to modify, if not to withdraw it,*" unless, perchance, it be directly antagonistic to faith or morals.

Sir, will you kindly grant me permission to 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 the case between you and me in the court of public opinion. Meanwhile I wish you a happy new year, and have the honor to be,

Yours very respectfully,

JAMES VINCENT CLEARY,  
Archbishop of Kingston.

LONDON, Ont., Jan. 11, 1890.

To the Most Reverend, the Archbishop (elect) of the Diocese of Kingston, Kingston, Ont.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP: When I last had the honor of addressing you I supposed, as I still think, that the matters in controversy between us had been so fully discussed that an intelligent public was in a position to pronounce judgment upon them, and that it would be but trespassing upon its indulgence to multiply words in further discussion, but your latest letter leads me to re-consider my decision and, at the risk of wearying my audience, to make one more effort to bring within the reach of your Grace's apprehension what has long since been apparent to your fellow citizens.

It scarcely needed your statement that you had for a period of ten years occupied a judicial position to call attention to the eminently judicial character of Your Grace's mind and utterances, for have we not seen it exemplified in the calm and impartial judgment which you passed upon the Protestant girls and young women of the province in which you live? Was is not apparent in the opinions which you so recently expressed in Kingston in regard to your Protestant fellow-citizens, and has it not been demonstrated by your utterance with regard to Principal Caven and the thousands of other "ferocious bigots" connected with the Equal Rights movement, to say nothing of the judgment you were pleased to pronounce upon the humble individual who is now addressing you?

I must not, however, overlook the quality of humanity which Your Grace so illustrates, by your correspondence and especially in that portion of it which deals with the disadvantages under which you labor in having no newspaper to champion your cause, Surely so eminent a logician, so distinguished a rhetorician, so candid a jurist, so excellent a judge and so pre-eminent an ecclesiastic requires no such adverbious aid as the assistance of a newspaper, but without being deemed impertinent may I ask Your Grace if you are not, in so lamenting, a little unfair to that once great organ of public opinion, *The Globe*, for has is not donned your livery, defended your position and chosen you for its patron, while you delegate me to the lowly position of retainer of my "patron, *The Mail*"?

Pardon this digression and let me now invite your attention to what are the real issues between us.

In my speech at London I quoted from a Roman Catholic journal, published in the city in which you live, which addresses itself especially to those of your flock and which gave to them

and to the Roman Catholic electors of the province advice as to the action which they should take—based upon the following statement:

"Holding, as we do, the balance of power between the factions we are, if only true to ourselves and to the crisis about to come upon us, independent of either and can dictate the terms upon which one or other shall receive our support."

This statement, I said, I believed to represent your views. Upon this you addressed to me your first letter and in reply to it I accepted what I thought was the plain inference from it—your repudiation of the sentiments of the quotation—and not only did I do that publicly, but I promised in my future addresses to remove the impression which my remarks might have produced by telling my audience that those sentiments were not Your Grace's and that you joined with me in condemning them. Had you no other object in view than to call upon me to put right any erroneous impression that my remarks might have created with regard to your sentiments, the correspondence might have ended there, but this was not your object as became apparent when you followed up your first letter with another assailing me violently for having made an attack upon the Roman Catholics and having declared for a policy of oppression of them—charges the falsity of which was so evident that they hardly required from me the answer and denial which I gave.

Now the whole point of the matter so far as the quotation and my attributing to you its sentiments is concerned is: Was I right in attributing those sentiments to you?

Your refusal to repudiate them and your evasion of making answer to my question as to whether you do or do not approve of them, I am bound to say, justifies me in returning to my original view that these sentiments coincide with your own views. You ask why you should any more repudiate the utterances in question than I should those of Mr. Solomon White on the subject of annexation. I pass by your assumption that Mr. White is an advocate of annexation, with the single observation that I have it from Mr. White himself that he never did advocate annexation to the United States, but only declared his preference for political union, and gave his reasons for so doing, but even if he did what you charge him with I am not ashamed to acknowledge him my friend, and to say that in view of his patriotic stand upon the Riel question, not only do I, but his countrymen generally, can afford to forgive him that vagary, were he chargeable with it.

But the cases are not parallel, I venture to point out, for two reasons at least:

(1) You claim and assert most rigorously, I am told, your control of those who are of your flock in the domain of faith and morals, and I judge from some archiepiscopal utterances, which you are doubtless familiar with, that the boundaries of that domain are of a somewhat elastic and shifting character. Now I assert that the principle of the quotation is distinctly immoral, and hence it follows, either that disapproving it you were remiss in the performance of your duties as you proclaim them in not endeavouring to counteract the influence when it came to your knowledge, at least, by warning you flock against it, or you approve of it. You may accept whichever dilemma you choose, and you cannot escape on the pretence that the quotation and the article from which it is taken dealt solely with a political matter, for the fact is not so. On the other hand, I have no control, and do not pretend to exercise any, over Mr. White's utterances, nor did he assume to speak for my party or to offer it any advice or to direct its actions.

(2) Those who know Your Grace, would certainly, judging by their past experience of you, not be able at once to say in reference to the quotation, "Those sentiments are not the sentiments of the Archbishop of Kingston," but the contrary; while every one who knows me would not be required to be told that I did not approve of annexation sentiments or that I was loyal to my native land.

But the whole purpose of your attack is transparent. You see my platform affords standing ground for Protestant and Roman Catholic alike; that my principles aim not at curtailing the rights of the Roman Catholic citizen or infringing his liberty of conscience. but that the effect of the adoption of them would be assisting him in resisting the aggression of