

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, was 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 audiences 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 to commercial 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 I, but his countrymen generally, can afford to forgive him even 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 endeavoring to counteract its influence when it came to your knowledge, at least by warning your 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 action.

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 everyone 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 certain, at least, of the hierarchy upon his rights as a citizen and as a man. The agitation which has begun (unless it be put down) will continue to grow and spread until it shall be recognized from sea to sea, throughout this great Dominion; that while the fullest liberty of conscience shall be accorded to all religious bodies, and to every man, the State shall know and recognize no church as different from or above the other, and that in all his obligations, duties and relations to the State, the citizen's action is not subject to control by or dictation from either priest or presbyter, bishop or pope, or any other ecclesiastic authority whatever—for such a consummation I devoutly wish. Your Grace believes it your duty to oppose its accomplishment. I have no quarrel with you for so doing, but let the weapons which you use be those of honorable warfare, not unfair efforts to misrepresent your opponents, in order that you may lead those with whom a good bishop must necessarily have great influence to believe those opponents to be their enemies,