

reference to an excerpt from a Kingston newspaper, which you most severely censured, "The words are used by a newspaper, but to some extent, I apprehend, by the gentleman who presides over the archiepiscopal see of Kingston."

I likewise take your word implicitly that you meant merely "to indicate your opinion that the newspaper in question, from its position and surroundings, might not unreasonably be taken to express the archbishop's sentiments upon the matter in hand;" which means, I take it, that you hazarded a conjecture, and no more.

Too frequently have the political agitators who are engaged in the present anti-Catholic crusade in Ontario given public utterance to that illogical and unjust and, pardon me if I add, illegal conjecture for the sake of creating odium against the hierarchy. The *Montreal Witness* and the *Ottawa Evening Journal* have recently committed the offence, with a view to bringing me, if they could, into direct antagonism with the newly founded University of Ottawa, its faculty and its patrons. I have not condescended to notice the insolence of those two journals, whose character is so well appreciated by my clerical and lay friends in Ottawa that contradiction of their injurious statements on Catholic subjects, more particularly on episcopal affairs, is deemed unnecessary. But when the same conjecture is delivered in solemn assembly by you, sir, whose reputation for personal integrity and high legal ability is undisputed, and whose masculine uprightness of heart, as your friends love to relate, used to find expression erstwhile in these noble words: "I would rather give up political life altogether than join in any agitation against my Catholic fellow-citizens." I feel bound to signify my respect for your sentiments, even when you err, and by correcting your mistakes prevent repetition.

Know, therefore, that the Kingston newspaper referred to by you has no more warrant than any other paper to express my sentiments. It was established independently of me and is conducted without control on my part, as its editorial pages rather frequently proclaim. I have no pecuniary interest in it; I don't know who its editor is; I have not seen a half dozen copies of it within the last six months. I know nothing of the editorial article stigmatized by you, except that a telegram received from Kingston yesterday in reply to my query as to its date, informed me that it appeared on the 25th of last September, whence you may judge of the forensic value of your proof of my responsibility drawn from the fact that the extracted sentence "has been permitted to remain before the public without at least

some effort on the archbishop's part to modify, if not to withdraw it."

Permit me to supply you with a rule for general guidance in matters of this kind. Whenever you see a letter from the archbishop or bishop at the head of a newspaper, especially if the diocesan seal be affixed, approving or recommending it to his flock as the organ of Catholicism in his diocese, or as a reliable exponent of Catholic thought and defender of Catholic rights, then, and then only, are you justified in holding him responsible for its teachings. On the other hand, were I or any other prelate to exercise a rigid censorship over 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 "obscurantism," 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. Perhaps you have heard of the unbelieving preacher who boasted of having read in the Bible that "there is no God"; and truly he was able to point to the assertion in Psalm 13. But he had omitted to quote the preceding clause of the verse which runs thus: "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God." Wherefore, since I have no knowledge of the context preceding or following the 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.

I may say to you, however, that I believe you have harmed yourself and your cause by the extravagance that pervades the whole course of your London speech—its looseness of assertion, its inconsequence of conclusions, its unrestrained license of denunciation. Yours was not a casual or extemporaneous address. It was, as it was expected to be, a manifesto of the policy of the political party who own your leadership in the House of Legislature and out of it. And yet you allowed party and passion to overmaster your legal mind to such a degree