

ARCHBISHOP CLEARY INTERVIEWED.

The Marty Defeat and Other Questions Touched by His Grace.

In a recent interview with Dr. Grant on the subject of the local elections the following passage occurred:

"To whom do you attribute the defeat in Kingston?"

"Entirely to Archbishop Cleary and to a number of silly Protestants who paid him the compliment of voting so as to spite him. When a man is willing to bite off his nose to spite his own face, or somebody else's face, one cannot have a very lofty opinion of his intelligence. Still, when a Roman Catholic archbishop announces that his policy is to form a solid vote—and that in doing so he is acting as the recognized agent of the whole hierarchy—you cannot wonder at another solid vote being created as the immediate result."

His Grace the Archbishop has replied to Dr. Grant in the form of an interview addressed to the Montreal Star, as follows:

"Have you seen Principal Grant's interview in the Star in reference to Hon. Mr. Harty's defeat in Kingston?"

"Yes, I secured a copy of it yesterday."

"Has your Grace anything to say in reply to Principal Grant's assertion that Mr. Harty's defeat is entirely attributable to you?"

"It is too good a joke for a Scotchman. I do not doubt, however, that the wily Principal expects it to be taken for serious truth by dull minds not energized by a sense of humour. Knowing, as everybody knows, that to his superlatively clever, and yet amazingly clumsy mismanagement of the Mowat-Harty cause is due the defeat in Kingston, he endeavors to shuffle the blame over to me by giving his candid opinion to the newspapers in the hope of their approbation. He knows that many of those journalists have good reason to be unfriendly to me. He has already asserted in his letter to Mr. Meredith that the agreement of the anti-Catholic section of the press is conclusive evidence of my being wrong. This is rather a mean way of acting. It is like taking a shabby advantage of our financial inability to maintain even one daily Catholic paper in the Province of Ontario for the defence of our rights against the no-Popery journals, whose name is legion. The reverend Principal lives on the breath of newspaper men. He would have us believe that they are the fountain of infallible truth. I hope to be pardoned for not subscribing to this dogma. I always take the newspapers for what they are worth severely."

"Principal Grant's process of self-exculpation is termed by Old Country folk 'saddling the wrong horse.' When detected in courts of justice it is regarded with special abhorrence and punished with severity."

"That the defeat of Hon. Mr. Harty is not in any way attributable to me is manifest in so much as I have had no hand, act, or part in the campaign or the election. I have not advised anyone to vote on the one side or the other. I have not spoken or written a word about politics unless the malicious misnomer 'political manifesto' be given to my pastoral instruction to my flock, wherein I exhorted them to hold fast to their religious duties despite the pronounced determination of Mr. Meredith to array all the forces of bigotry against them as 'the common enemy' of the country, and to snatch the little ones of the fold from the care of their parents and the Church. It is the Toronto Mail that invented this misnomer. The Toronto Star soon afterwards adopted it in contempt of the wavering voters that were hanging around the P. P. A. camp. Now Principal Grant whose manual

of prayers is the *Globe*, thinks it will help him out of his tight corner to chime in with these two journals and their satellites in the chorus of calumny. The fact of it is, these gentlemen don't believe the Catholic minority in Ontario are entitled to hold any opinion, or receive any fair consideration, but their voice must be rudely silenced, should they dare even to recite aloud the Apostles' Creed and the din of no-Popery warfare, in which their most precious liberties are immediately and directly at stake. The reason is, alas! that we have not any representation, not even a single Catholic paper in the daily press of the province."

"Had the Rev. Principal of Queen's University received an early education in ethical philosophy, or in pastoral theology, he would not be unacquainted with the great, broad, adamant principle that governs the morality of all human acts from which follow both good and bad results. It is this: If any person, in fulfilment of the duties of his office or state of life, performs an act in itself good or indifferent, from which result two effects, one good, the other bad; and if the good effect alone is intended by his action as its proper and effective cause; whilst the other effect, being bad, is no wise intended by the agent and is derived from the good action, not directly, as from its efficient cause, but indirectly and by virtue of the malice or folly of another person taking occasion from the good act to bring about an evil result—in such case the natural and divine law, and all human laws, ecclesiastical and civil, and all courts of justice in the world, insist that the evil result is not imputable to the person who performed the good action in the legitimate exercise of his duty or rights, even though he had foreseen (and I did not foresee) that the malice of other persons would give the good action (such as my pastoral instruction) a twist, and direct it to the production of evil results. Hence, the learned Principal must see that he did me a wrong, condemned by all laws, in imputing the Kingston mishap to me. Let him saddle the right horse now."

"I will here add a statement that involves an additional argument. On the occasion of Mr. Meredith's delivery of his no-Popery plan of campaign in 1886, and again in December, 1889, I addressed to my people, and through them to all the Catholics of Ontario, similar instructions and exhortations for the confirmation of their faith and their steadiness in Christian duty, after the manner of military commanders addressing their soldiers on the morning of battle with the enemies of their country. The anti-Christian journals bestowed upon me plentifully the praise of their vituperation; but when the Liberal candidate was defeated each time in Kingston, no one, not even Principal Grant, ventured to say that the result was attributable entirely or in a part to Archbishop Cleary. The warfare against Christian education was the same, and issued from the same source, my defence of action was the same; the evil result, to wit, the defeat of the Grit candidate, was the same; how is it attributable to me now, if not attributable to me in 1886 or 1890? Did some agency interpose in 1894 to bring about the evil result? There was plainly more of educated reason and common sense in discerning the relations between cause and effect, or else there was less of another and more selfish element at work in the recesses of the Sybil's Cave in those years than at present."

To whom, then, does your Grace attribute Mr. Harty's defeat?"

"To Principal Grant, entirely," replied the Archbishop. "He is a politician, if anything. In his interview with the Star he upbraids me with 'singular political incapacity' for having, as he malignantly pretends to think, done what he knows right well

I did not do, but what he, in sequence to the slanders of the Mail, and for the sake of escaping the blame of his own folly, tries to make the no-Popery gentry believe I did. If I were a politician like him, which God forbid! I feel confident I would not have blundered as he did, to the ruin of the cause he had set his heart upon. See how stupidly he acted! In the first place, he is not a divinely appointed pastor of souls, charged with the direction of Christ's flock in faith and fidelity to Christian duty, and commanded by the Pastor of Pastors to instruct and exhort them in all seasons especially in the day of diffusion of irreligious principles and polished impiety, and seductive articles in the daily press and campaign sheets; and moreover, emphatically admonished that on the approach of the wolf he must not fly, but must go forward to meet the invader of the fold, regardless of his own safety, of his ease and peace and worldly interest, and of all things whatsoever of this earth, even of life itself, for the protection of those entrusted to his care. In the next place, Mr. Meredith's programme of desperate attack upon the schools of Christian education, which was the main and in truth the sole substantial issue in the campaign, did not officially demand any very active exercise of the Rev. Principal's zeal. Indeed, it is well known that he has no sympathy whatever with us in our maintenance of Separate Schools, and in fact, Mr. Meredith, when speaking in the Toronto Pavilion a couple of weeks ago, gave as his reason for dealing tenderly with Principal Grant this gentleman's approval of his (Mr. Meredith's) aggressive policy on the Catholic school question. In the third place Queen's University, which legitimately demands Principal Grant's advocacy of all its rights and interests, was not, so far as the public could see, in any way concerned in the issues of the general election. The Rev. Principal, therefore, had no visible interest, no reason that any man could recognize for rushing to the front the moment the campaign began, and displaying an inordinate and preternatural zeal in the contest on behalf of Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat."

"His startling interview with the *Globe*, in which his fulsome adulation of the Premier and his insulting references to the leader of the Opposition and his party, 'ignorant, prejudiced, and hungry followers,' he designates them in his affectionate letter to Mr. Meredith, and his connection of them by implication with public robbery and 'the nation of thieves,' his grandiloquent appeal also to the patriotism of Canadians, that should not, could not, afford to dismiss Mr. Mowat, were all jumbled together in hysterical fashion, fell upon the public ear like a thunder storm from a clear sky. 'Twas the great 'I am' who spoke, you know! There was nothing to call for all this, no warfare against the Rev. Principal or any interest pertaining to him. Why, then, this excessive heat of passion and violence of mind and language? It was simply unaccountable, and men asked each other what it all meant. Hon. Mr. Harty's religion did not certainly explain the mystery. Dr. Grant's equally earnest talk and activity in the city of Kingston kept alive the question from day to day. 'What's at the bottom of it?' Suspicion of selfish motives was awakened. By degrees it developed into belief, and took the shape of accusation in the press, till finally the cartoon representing the Rev. Principal with both arms extended over Sir Oliver's shoulders, taking heavy fistfuls of gold from the provincial money-chest, told what was believed by many to be the true solution of Dr. Grant's mysterious zeal for the cause of Mowat and Harty. In reciting the facts, I do not signify my approval or belief of those suspicions and allegations, but merely point to the 'singular political incapacity'

of the professional politician who tried success in a severely contested election by provoking—I should say forcing—his watchful opponents to solve an apparently insoluble enigma, by discrediting himself and his cause, and engendering a dread in the minds of the various Protestant denominations that Presbyterian endowments were bargained for, and Presbyterian ascendancy was aimed at, and a 'Family Compact' sought to be established between the Presbyterian Premier and the Presbyterian organ of his Government and the Presbyterian Principal of the Presbyterian University. This is the hobgoblin that frightened Protestants in hundreds from the Grant-Mowat-Harty cause at the polls, where they were free to kill off what they believed, rightly or wrongly, to be a conspiracy against their independence and the equality of all denominations in the State. Of course, they were not so foolish as to tell the reverend Principal and his friends their real reason for voting adversely. That would bring a hornet's nest about their ears. Dr. Grant says that some 'silly Protestants' told him that they 'voted so as to spite' the Archbishop of Kingston. That may possibly be true in 1894, as in former times when the issue of the election was determined by hostility to the Catholic religion. But it was meant for an excuse, and we must remember that it was easier for those 'silly Protestants' to allege that acceptable excuse than the unacceptable and real one. At all events the action of a few 'silly Protestants' could have no more influence on the result of the election this year than similar action of the same or other 'silly Protestants' in former elections. Let the truth be acknowledged honestly; it was not the few 'silly' people who did the mischief. It was the hundreds of voters from all religious denominations, minus one, in Kingston, who, through a very natural dislike for Principal Grant's self-inflated autocracy, the dread of Presbyterian ascendancy and of a Presbyterian family compact in the centre of the province, resolved on spoiling what they fancied to be the simple minded Principal's game. This is the true and obvious explanation of the loss of the election."

"Do I understand your Grace to say that you exercised no influence on the election at all?"

"None whatever," was the reply. "I have not spoken or written a word in favour on either side. I have not advised anyone to vote this way or that. I myself did not vote, having been at the Springs for the benefit of my health on the 26th ultimo. True, I have been consulted in Kingston as to what should be done in the trying circumstances of the case, and my answer has been 'consult your conscience in the presence of God and act in accordance with it.' This has been my sole answer to such interrogations. I don't travel outside the sphere of conscience, nor dictate or counsel how any man should exercise the suffrage. In this reference I deem it proper to mention a fact which may convey a lesson of wisdom to many, and may not be wholly unworthy of the attention of Sir Oliver Mowat and his Cabinet, as well as of others. In a certain constituency within my archdiocese the Mowat candidate, who had been elected in 1890 chiefly by favour of the Catholics, who believed him to be the less bad of the two candidates in the field, was opposed this time by a respectable Conservative Protestant, who holds the confidence of all who know him. The Catholics were puzzled how to act on 26th June, and became divided in opinion. I was consulted by the friends of both parties. I declined to express any preference, and left the choice to each one's conscience. The result is that the Catholics voted for the Conservative Protestant, and the worthless Grit has been relegated to private life."