MR. MEREDITH'S DILEMMA.

The Catholic Record. Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmon

Price of subscription—\$2,00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY.

REV. WILLIAM FIANNERY.
THOMAS COFFEY.
Publisher and Proprietor, TROMAS COFFEY.
MERSES, LUKE KING, CHEN NIGH and P. J. NEVEN Are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transactal other business for the DATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Alexandria, Glennevis and Lochtel.—Mr. Donaid A. McDonaid.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.
Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and ecommended by the Archbishops of St. Boulface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterbora, and leading Oatholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.
Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.
Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.
Persons writing for a change of address.

paper can be stopped.
Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat. Jan. 11th, 1890.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF KING-STON AND MR. MEREDITH.

In another column will be found the continuation of the correspondence between His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston and Mr. Meredith, The leader of the Opposition evidently feels that he has a bad cause to sustain, and consequently, after the manner of dishonest controversislists, he makes every effort possible to introduce into the debate other issues which have nothing to do with the matter really in dispute, hoping that in the confusion which necessarily srises when so many matters are brought before the public at once, they will fail to notice the completeness of his discomfiture.

The issue is a plain one. Did Mr. Meredith falsely assume that His Grace had advised the whole Catholic body to sions from one political party or the other? And assuming that His Grace gave such advice, did Mr. Meredith advise the Protestants to unite in oppress. to escape responsibility for his falsehood ing the Catholic minority?

No one who has read that gentleman's Opera House speech can fail to see that | wander over the whole range of matboth these things Mr. Meredith has done. | ters controverted between Catholics But is it a sufficient justification for and Protestants, he would have doing this to accuse the Archbishop of succeeded at least in arousing Proa deliberate insult to all who have been | testant prejudices against His Grace engaged in the so called Equal Rights and have avoided to some extent the egitation? The question is not how do His Grace and the Catholics regard colors as a calumniator and an inciter to these agitators. Though they try to bully us by their threats, we are not at all afraid to state our opinion of them. We are ready to acknowledge that many among them are honestly convinced that the Catholic religion is a menace to religious and civil liberty. No one will deny that Sir Walter Scott's Rav, Hannibal Mucklewrath was thoroughly in earnest in regarding "Popery and Prelacy" as alike dangerous to his ideas of civil and religious liberty, and deserving to be repressed by violent measures; and we do not deny the carnestness and zeal of Dr. Davidson, ex. Bishop Carman, Drs. Wild and Hunter, Major Bond, Dalton McCarthy and others who threaten us with a war of extermination. But while furnish them with this excuse. acknowledging that these men may have honest convictions on this subject, we feel ourselves under no obligation to cower under their threats In spite of Hannibal Mucklewrath's honesty, he was a "ferocious bigot;" and Thus the Woodstock Sentinel Review the horror express Meredith against the use of such a term, we cannot but look upon the Rev. Han. nibal's Canadian imitators as quite worthy of the same title. These people may as well know at first as last that the Catholics of Ontario are not in the humon of submitting to their threatened oppressive measures. We wish to live at peace with our Protestant fellow-citizens. We are submissive to the laws of our country. We are as anxious for the welfare and presperity of the country as are our Protestant neighbors : but if there is a faction in the country determined to inaugurate a persecution against us, let it be well understood that we are determined to resist it to the end We are confident, however, that the general Protestant sentiment of Ontario is not in favor of the policy of persecution which Mr. Meredith has formally adopted ; but, relying on the spirit of justice and fair play with which we believe the majority of Protestants are animated, and on our own firm purpose to maintain our rights, we have no fear for the result of the contest with which Mr. Meredith threatens us.

Mr. Meredith lays great stress upon the term "ferecious bigots" which His Grace applies to certain members of the Equal Rights Association, and he appeals to the prejudice of the Protestants of Ontario to resent the use of such expressions. Words like these must not be taken as meaning more than what their writer intended to convey by them. | bination." It can scarcely be denied that both fero. city and bigotry were displayed by a Toronto in June. This is all that His lie schools. If he is sincere we must

Grace means by the expression, and it with the 'ferocious bigots' that Mr. Meredith has formally allied himself. We do not think it too harsh a term to call "ferocious bigotry" such expressions as these from Mr. Meredith's Opera House speech :

"The thunderbolts of a great Church were discharged against me, and Roman Catholics from one end of the Province to the other were summoned to cast their votes against me."

Mr. Meredith knows that this statement is false. The "Church" took no special part in the election of 1886, but the common sense of the Catholic body through the Province dictated to them to resent the no Popery policy on which the campaign was being conducted in that year. Mr. Meredith did not then. no-Popery policy; but, as his followers party were justly made responsible.

Still more "ferocious" than this is the bigotry displayed by Mr. Meredith when, on what is now acknowledged to be an unwarranted statement, that Archbishop Cleary had through the columns of the Kingston Freeman, called upon the Catholics to combine "to secure concessions as the price of their support to one of the parties or the other, that gentleman said :

"It is the duty of both parties to unite against what is a danger to the common-wealth."

As His Grace forcibly says : Mr. Meredith knew well "that there is no solid campact among the Catholics of Ontario" such as he described. This solid compact is simply an invention of the Toronto Mail, and Mr. Meredith adopted

wer to make pol itica capita among those with whom he knew a no-Porer; cry would have weight.

In the Archbishop's letters to Mr. Meredith, we admire the tact with which His Grace has kept the latter gentleman unite for the purpose of forcing conces to the subject at issue. We are all aware bow easy it is to excite prejudice in Ontario against a Catholic ecclesiastical dignitary, and Mr. Meredith thought by bringing up other issues. If he had only succeeded in inducing His Grace to humiliation of being exhibited in his true fanaticism. But His Grace saw from the outset Mr. Meredith's wiles, and refused to follow him through his tortuous course of empty abuse. Anti-Catholic journals like the Mail, the Oltawa Journal, etc., have very persistently called upon His Grace to repudiate the sentiments of the Canadian Freeman, under penalty of being held responsible for them. His Grace may calmly tell these journalists and Mr. Meredith that if he were to exercise that censorship of the press which they demand, many of those who are making the demand would loudly denounce such muzzling of the press as a despotism, and would make it a new excuse for vilifying the Catholic Church. His Grace very properly declines to

> It is the universal verdict of the press as far as they are not tied to Mr. Meredith's chariot wheels, that in the debate which has taken place Mr. Meredith has been completely demolished.

> 'The Archbishop replied that he had neither approved nor inspired such sen-timents; that he was in no way directly or indirectly responsible for the utter ances of the journal in question; and the editor of the journal makes a similar statement, This ought to satisfy any reasonable man, but Mr. Meredith, instead of withdrawing the imputation stead of windrawing the imputation against M r. Cleary. in sists upon His Grace giving his opinion of utterances with which he had nothing to do. Having made an utterly unwarranted use of the prelate's name for partisan purposes, he tries to shift the ground of dispute and to force him into a new controversy in the hope of excit ing Protestant prejudice against him." The Sentinel-Review adds:

"While Mr. Meredith is wasting his time in petty squabbles to excite race and religious hatred, Mr. Mowat is settl ing the difficult problems of the time and binding Canadians more closely to gether in patriotic endeavor toward national advancement."

The Globe also, though objecting to Monseigneur Cleary's reference to ferocious bigotry on the part of some Equal Righters, acknowledges that with the exception of this. Protestants in general would entirely approve of his last letter. The Globe adds, in its issue of 31 inst. :

"A shabbier evasion we never heard than the Opposition leader is guilty of in pretending (in his final letter) that he only meant people to understand that he only meant people to understand that Roman Catholics if they form a solid combination should be attacked as the common enemy. His imputation clearly was that they had formed such a com

Some are of opinion that Mr. Meredith was not sincere in asking his supporters very considerable number of those pre- to regard Catholics as "the common sent at the Equal Rights Convention in enemy," and in his opposition to Catho-

Nearly all the Meredith organs are silent as to the ignominious retreat of Mr. Meredith from the battle ground chosen by himself for a tilt with Archbishop Cleary. The Free Press, while publishing in large type the letters of Mr. Meredith, would not open its columns to Archbishop Cleary's elequent exposition of the open war declared by Mr. Meredith, in his London speech, against the Catholics of this Province, whom he designates as the "common enemy." Mr. Meredith accuses the Archbishop of resorting to a very vivid imagination for his facts. But the Archbishop quotes Mr. Meredith's own words in proof of his grounds for indignation quite so openly as he doss now, advocate of the latter's unjustifiable and ferocious onslaught on the whole did so in almost every constituency, the Catholic body of the people of this Province. It was not the Archbishop's vivid imegination that caused Mr. Meredith to say in his London speech: "Is there not great danger to the State in this solid compact of the minority? I say it is one of the greatest dangers to modern civilization, one o the greatest evils we have to contend with in parliamentary government." "Your aim in saying all this," said the Archbishop, "was to arouse the evil pas sions of the fanatics that hang around the skirts of the two political parties and to lash them into fury. Nor yet enough, abandoning yourself to uncontrollable fury you out-Heroded. Herod by your final call for vengeance upon uneffending citizens. Both parties should ca vou said, unite, unite, against the common enemy!' "Good God,' exclaims the Archbishop, "was it not the most shocking language that ever fell from the lips of a public man; a prac tised lawyer to boot, and a political leader of many years' standing!" There was no vivid imagination in this cutburst of Archiepiscopal indignation and horror that a man calling himself the friend of Catholics, and, God forbidding that he should give utterance to one word displeasing or discourteous to their Catholic fellow-citizens, should, in the next breath, stigmstize them as "the common enemy" against whom all parties should unite, and unite to crush them out of political or civic existence. The solid compact Catholic min ority did not exist outside of Mr. Meredith's vivid imagination, and one of the strong arguments of the Archbishop was his defying Mr. Meredith to give his reasons for supposing a solid compact where none such could be found. No meeting of Catholics had been held, no pastoral letter had been published, no authorita. tive pronouncement had been issued to warrant such a charge against the Cath olic body, whereas anti Jesuit conventions had been held, Evangelical conferences had assembled both in Montreal and Toronto, petitions had been signed, and carried to the foot of the throne, against what was styled Jesuitical endowments and Romish eggressions that never existed, except in the imaginations of the fanatics who simed at the disruption of the constitution and the breaking up of confederation into its to impress us with the conviction that its original fragments. All this was elo- introduction would be a benefit to our quently demonstrated in Archbishop Cleary's letters by most evident proof and unassailable argument; so that Mr. Meredith, who fancied he had an ordinary athlete to deal with, saw himself grappling with a giant, and cried out "enough," and, as the Globe puts it, "fairly certainly not in the hope of facreasing the runs away from Archbishop Cleary. E what possible reasoning," continues the Province that the Mail and other oppon-Globe, 'can anybody honestly allege that Archbishop Cleary shows lack of courage and candor in sticking to the point that Mr. Meredith, by denouncing Roman that it believes the adoption of the ballot Catholics as the 'common enemy,' tried to incite a political war against them? A shabbier evasion we never heard than the Opposition leader is guilty of in pretending that he only meant people to understand that Roman Catholics, if they formed a solid combination, should be attacked as the common enemy. His imputation was that they had formed such a combination, and now he wants to abandon this imputation by asking people not to understand him as asserting that the Roman Catholics should be treated as the common enemy," Archbishop Cleary has compelled the Opposi tion leader to est his own words, and to deny that he meant to advocate the abolition of Roman Catholic separate

> ton Speciator, and now he has been un horsed, and fairly tumbled down." COMPLIMENTARY.

able dismounting from the Protestant horse," continues the Globe. "He was kicked up on that horse by the Hamit-

schools, which he did in the plainest terms in the presence of nigh two

thousand people in London not two weeks since. There was never

so complete an overthrow of any

public man in so short a time as that of
Mr. W. Meredith by Archbishop Cleary,
As the Globe puts it: "He was knocked
out in the third round. What a laugh-

Ottawa, January 6th, 1890. Thos. Coffey, Esq , Catholic Record, London DEAR SIR—Enclosed please find my subscription for your very valuable paper. I have the honor to be, dear Sir, your

humble servant, + I. Thomas, Archbishop of Ottawa.

TIONS.

The most hotly-contested election for separate school trustees which has ever taken place in Ontarlo, we believe, was that held in Toronto on New Year's day. The question of the ballot at separate school elections, and not the improvement of the schools under the existing law, was, strangely enough, the matter at issue between the contestants. We say strangely was the ballot made the fasue, for not a Catholic school section in the Province has declared itself, either by direct vote of the people, or through the school boards, to be in favor of introducing the bailit. It may, therefore, be fairly inferred that the Catholic people in the Province do not wish for a change of the law in this respect. Only in Toronto has there been any egitation on the subject at all. It cannot be disputed that there was on the school board of last year in that city a considerable number of members who were in favor of sending a petition to the Legis. lature to introduce the ballot, but as this was not the purpose for which they were elected, it cannot, by any stretch of imaginstion, be said that they represented the people in this. But the elections of New Year's day took distinctly the character of a declaration of the wishes of the Catholic electorate on this subject, and the result was the defeat of the ballot candidates in every instance.

In the city theze are thirteen wards. In seven there was no contest, the entiballot candidates being elected by accismation. Contests took place in six wards only-St. Stephen's, St. Matthew's, St. John's, St. Thomas', St. James' and St. Alban't-with the result that the opponents of the ballot received 631 votes, while its advocates received 179. The poil resulted as follows, the lowest figures being, in each case, those of the ballot candl-

dates : ST. STEPHEN'S WARD.

Against Ballot. For Haliot. Maj.

C Fianagan.........163 J. Keliy....... 37-126 ST. JOHN'S WARD. H F McIntosh 155 D P Cabill 63 - 92 Rev Father Gibbon.99 PCurran. ST. ALBAN'S WARD.
T McQuillan..... 24 T Rabelly.... 17-7 ST. MATTHEW'S WARD.

O Pape....... 46 G M Vincent.. 3-43 179 420

In St. Matthew's ward Mr. J. J. Cosgrove, who was also an anti-ballot candldate, polled 32 votes, making against the ballot 631 votes, and bringing up the majority to 452 sgainst the ballot.

We have no desire to stir up any acrimonious feelings in regard to the contest which has thus been decided, and we hope that whatever of bitterness there may have been will be now laid aside. We presume that those who were favor. able to the ballot honestly thought that its introduction would be beneficial to the schools, but we would beg of them to remember that the single fact that all those who have declared their uncompromising hostility to Catholic education have also declared thomselves in favor of the ballot in the separate school elections, is of itself a circumstance not calculated schools.

The Mail has made it one of its staple charges against Mr. Mowa's administration that this gentleman "refuses the ballot to the Catholic electors," who are supposed to be languishing for it. It is ents of Catholic education raise their voices in demanding the ballot for them. The Mail, especially, has openly declared would end in the destruction of the separate school system. While we do not believe in such prognostications they ought to make our people pause before asking for such a change in the law.

It ought to be remembered that the Ontario school laws so far discriminate between the separate and the public schools as to give the latter every possible advantage, and to leave the disadvantages to the saparate schools. Persons discontented with details in the management of the public schools have not it in their nowe to impede their almost automatic opera tion. With the separate schools the case is altogether different. All Protestant are made public school supporters, even though their children be sen to the separate schools, as is frequently the case, especially in the case of mixed marriages: but Catholics are expressly permitted to become public school supporters. As a consequence, whenever Catholics are disposed to follow their private planes, in preference to their conscientious convictions, they take their reverge by becoming public school supporters. This is not very frequently the case, but we have too often known it to occur. We have known it to occur when a child failed in the promotion examinations ; we have even known it to happen because there was a private grudge egalnet the ballot into the Catholic school are known to be earnest and zealous Sisters in charge of it,

necessarily oppose him, and, if not, we remain the good will increase the facilities of priests, who have earned the good will cannot trust him.

THE BALLOT AND THE cannot trust him.

THE BALLOT AND THE selections will increase the facilities of priests, who have earned the good will soreheads and cranks of every descriptions. tion to render the operations of the Catholic trustees more uncertain and | mind their own business, as the Rav. Mr. less efficient ; and this is why they are so spxlous for the ballot, whether Catholics like it or not. This will be, however, for Catholics a sufficient resson for declining their efficious interference in our school matters. Let it be borne in mind that the position of separate schools before the law is quite different from that of the public schools, and it will be understood that even if the ballot be desirable for the latter it does not follow that it would be so for the

former. We have seen only one reason advanced by supposed friends of Catholic education in favor of the ballot. It is that the Catholic electorate would, if it were adopted, be freeer from the it flaence of wish to destroy the influence of the clergy in school matters, and this reason nfust, therefore, have little weight with them. Beides, not a single instance has been adduced where the clergy have exercised other than a legitimate influence on the schools; and the absence of all sgitation on this subject outside of Toronto shows that the people are not laboring under the tyranny which our enemies pretend to have discovered. Now that Toronto has also spoken its mind so plainly, we trust we have heard the last of this false pretenca.

It was to be expected that the Mail would pretend that the result in Toronto was due to clerical intimidation. It says in Thursday's issue :

"The ratepayers who voted against the ballot yesterday were subjected to as complete a system of pressure and terror-ism as any Irish peasant ever was." And elsewhere in the same issue we

find the following : "The Roman Catholic taxpayer. . . .

wants the right to choose between separate and public schools, and he desires the ballot."

We wonder by what method of clairvoyance the Mail has discovered this "deire" of the Roman Catholic taxpayer, inasmuch as the indications are all the contrary way as far as they have come to ings; but it can be proved that Protestant public knowledge. It is needless to say Germany, Sweden, England and Scotland that the pressure and terrorism are all in | are far below the Catholic countries in rethe Mail's imagination, which is known to garding the secred character of the marbe very lively at timez.

It is worthy of remark that the Meil says after the school election that it "resulted just as was expected :" but just before the election it had a one sided "statement of the case" professedly by a in a recent number of the Forum, that leading Catholic layman, which was the 500,000 divorces which have been headed "Clergy versus Laity," as if the laity wers on one side and the clergy on the other in this dispute. The result is proof positive that the Mall was altogether midnformed in the matter, for it adopted elitorially the hypothetical layman's views. Of course, this layman proclaims that his views are those of the "progres elve element," and that the movement is gaining head way in various parts of the Province among Catholics. The state. ment is altogether gratultous. These efforts to divide the clergy from the latty have been tried before : and even the school law of 1863 was not gained until the laity showed unmistakably that they were one with the clergy in demanding that Act as a Work of justice.

TWO FANATICS.

We already in a late issue pointed out a long list of the felsehoods uttered by Mr. responsible, nor is the Catholic Church J. L. Hughes, the Public School Inspector responsible, for their disobedience to her of Toronto, in his lecture delivered in this precepts. But Mr. Hughes appears to ty on the 20th inst. The Rev. Mr. Porter. Baptist minister, introduced the lecturer as having come hither "In the interests of the public schools against Jesuit aggrestion;" and in the opening part of the lecture Mr. Hughes said: "I am going to prove to you that the Roman Catholic Church has issued its mandate against the public schools."

pabulum which he every Sunday deals out to his congregation under pretence that he is feeding them spiritually with the "Word of God." It grieves us that in this enlightened nineteenth century there should be found professing Christians who accept such nauseous stuff as the teaching of Him who is "the way, the truth and the life."

"Jesuit aggression" in Oatarlo, forsooth When and where has there been Jesult aggression in Outario above all the Provinces of this Dominion? In this Province there are just nineteen Jean'ts. Six are doing parish work in Guelph and thirteen are engaged in similar work in highly-favored public schools, the chil-Algems. The labors of the thirteen are in a great measure devoted to the spirit. ual care of the Huron Indiane, which tribe in the past made many martyrs among the Jesuits by putting them to death for Christ's sake. It is by teaching these poor Indians the way of salvation that the Jesuits make return obtained the highest number of marks for the ill-treatment which their brethren of any of the successful candidates from one of the school trustees. There is not received at their hands. Tals is all the the schools in Goderich or the towna doubt that the enemies of Catholic aggression of which the Jesuits have been spips in its immediate vicinity. This education foresee that the introduction of guilty. The six Jesuits who are in Guelph speaks volumes for the school and the

Protestant as well as Catholic. They Porter does not, and they have never been known to stir up ill will and excite discord between neighbors, as it seems to ba Mr. Porter's special mission to do. They have been guilty of no such aggressions as have been perpetrated by Rev. Mr. Porter and his colleagues, day after day and Sanday efter Sanday. Both Mr. Porter and Mr. Hughes are guilty of unadulterated falsebood in stating that it is the aim of the Catholic priesthood to destroy the public school system. Over and over again it has been stated by Bishons and priests, and by the Catholic press, that we have no objection whatsoever to the common school system, as far as its use by Protestants is concerned : morethe clergy. The Catholic body have no over, where Catholics are not numerous enough to support a Catholic school we are glai to see them make use of the facil. ities for education afforded in the public schools, provided there be no interference with their religious convictions. Catholics, therefore, do not desire to destroy the public school system ; but we istrepuously object against the obstacles by which fanatics like Mr. Porter and Mr. Hughes would prevent Catholic children from acquiring a religious education where we are both able and willing to bear the cost of imparting it.

> Mr. Hughes maintains that the religious education imparted by the Catholic Caurch does not contribute to make the children moral. He maintains that illegit. imate births and murders are more frequent in Rome than in London, and be gives some figures to bear him out in this. On what authority are these figures based? He says "on a Catholic Almanac published at Turin." There is no such Catholic Almanac as he pretends, and the figures which he gives are evidently nonsensical. He says there are in Rome 3 160 illegitimate births for every 1,215 legitimate. These figures are absolutely false, though we do acknowledge that there are many children of the Church who are not faithful to her sacred teachrisge tie, and in regard for human life, in spite of the fact that some of these Catholic countries have been dominated by auti-Catholic government,

Have we not been told by Mr. Phelps. granted during twenty years in the United States are almost entirely confined to the Protestant white population? And is it not notorious that the Mormon population of Utah and other States of the West, whose anti-social immoralities have given and are still giving such trouble to the United States Government, is recruited almost exclusively from the Protestant populations of the United States, Sweden, Denmark and Germany? Mr. Hughes thinks proper to allude to

the sad murder of Dr. Cronin in Calcago, and he says "the men who murder are not Protestant Irishmen but Roman Catholic Irishmen." We are sorry to say that there is strong reason to believe that Dr. Cronin's marderers were men who ought to be Catholics and who ought to have profited by the good lessons of Christian meekness inculcated on them in former years by the Church. We cannot be forget, conveniently, that the Chicago Anarchists who wantonly killed the policemen of Chicago at the Haymarket were exclusively Protestants-and men who were reared on Protestant principles. The policemen who were killed on that occasion, while maintaining law and order, were nearly all Irish Catholics. He for-gets that both in Toronto and in the township of Arthur Irleh Catholics were The ignorance displayed by Rev. Mr.
Porter in his statement is so gross that it scarcely needs a word in refutation. But both the malice and ignorance of his utterances are simply specimens of the openly advocated, and that the murderous papalum which he can also be a stacks made upon Mr. Wr. O'Prince to the murder of Catholics was papalum which he can also be a stacks made upon Mr. Wr. O'Prince to possible the murder of the murder openly advocated, and that the murderous attacks made upon Mr. Wm. O'Brien and more recently on His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto were the immediate consequence of such teaching.

Once for all, we hold that Catholic parents have an inalienable right to impart Catholic education to their children, and this right it is our purpose to maintain.

Another proof of the superior training imparted in our separate schools has come to hand this week; and we might here mention that this is not an isolated case. In almost every instance where the pupils of Catholic schools are placed in competition with those from the dren of the former are able to hold their own, and oftentimes take the highest honors. In Sister Benedicta's division of the Goderich separate school four pupils were successful in passing their entrance examination to the high school, and one of them, Annie Curtin.

may, that is the charge which you insinu ate, though you do not appear openly to I can appeal to a lifetime in this com I can appeal to a litetime in this community for the enswer to the charge of intolerance and bigotry which you instantiate the analytic tendence of nearly twenty years of public life as my defence against your calumnious charges.

Tried by the same test, can you ask a verdict of acquittal on a like charge from that, it is the attention of the public life and the attention of the public life.

passion against the Roman Catholic min-ority of Outsrio? For, mask it as you

verdict of acquittal on a like charge from your fellow-citizens? I trow not. They do not, they cannot forget the crael, the wanton attack which you publicly made you he upon the defenceless girls and young ment i women of Ontario, and that, too, that you might make a point against the public school system of this Province; nor can they forget the language which you thought fit to use towards your Protestant fellow citizens when you were addressing a body of Roman Catholic gentlemen contact of the province of the contact of the province of th nected with an association which had its that y

nected with an association which had its meeting not long ago in Kirgeton.

Then, toe, by what right de you speak of those who are connected with the Equal Rights movement as feroclous bigots? Such language from a politician, in the heat of a political harangue, could hardly be pallisted; but what is to be said of its use by a high diguitary of a great Caurch, not spoken, but written in the seclusion of his study, and when he was remning a discipled. of his study, and when he was penning a charge of intolerence and bigotry sgainst a public man? Trink of such language as applied to the recognized leader of the movement whose position in the Church Alth to which he belongs is as high as that of | b fore Your Grace in your own, and whose every utterance, while he spoke with clearness against a piece of legislation which a vast majority of his fellow-citizens, what the pl ever view they may entertain of the towns constitutional question involved, jin sweet with him in condemning, was character- | the cer ized by that broad liberality, generous allies j men which should pervade the utterances me to not only of a Christian minister, but of disagre

a Caristian gentleman. in you Then, how do you justify your attempt the re to make me an oppressor of the Roman | mand Catholic minority, if not in act, at least | Where

in intention?

I had thought that you concurred with exercime in deprecating the advice given to press, the Roman Catholic minority by the topics writer of the article in the Canadian direct freeman to which you referred in your first letter; but ss your last letter seems to leave that matter in doubt, the people of the Province, whom you are addressed am of ing by means of your own choosing, are ing by means of your own choosing, are denut entitled to know whether you do or do not approve it, and if no other good results from my correspondence with you, much good will be done to have obtained of 'from the provided in the p definition of your view on that tion,'

But you say that my proposition to men. meet such a combination, as is suggested, have involves the oppression of the minority. Granting your premises, I deny your conclusion; and am astonished that, in the face of the declaration which I made as to the principles upon which I betata lieved that the government of this Province should be conducted, you should

make such a charge.

In this Province the Roman Catholic cedin minority has been treated not merely justly, but with generosity, and if, which I am I do not deny, prejudice exists in some quarters against the Roman Catholic, it is, in my judgment, due meinly to the policy of the Church, which forbids the youth of the country being educated together, and to a system of education which tends to sense from the rest of the country being the property of th which tends to separate from the rest of the community a body of its citizens by creed lines, as well as to the injudicious and intemperate utterances of men on both sides, who do not know, or have forgotten, what civil and religious liberty

I have no quarrel with my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. I have nothing to do with their religious views or opin-ions, and cannot be drawn into a controversy as to the merits or demerits of the

versy as to the ments or dements of the dogmas or practices of their Church.

I am ready to give to them every right which I enjoy, and I seek to take from them none that I claim for myself, but I am not willing that exceptional privileges should be granted to them, d I protest against, and shall use my best endeavors to prevent their utilizing the party system for enabling them by means of the balance of power, which it is claimed they hold, to dictate their guar

terms to political parties.

As to their separate schools I have nothing to add to what I have sold, except to say that the principle on which they, in my judgment, rest is that their slon organization and support depend solely upon the voluntary action of the Roman Catholic citizen, and that the State has in their creation and for their conduct committed to its citizens, and not to the hierarchy, the management and control the of them. Upon no other ground and on no other view of their true position can for the existence of them, in a tree country, be excused, much less defended.

be excused, much less defended.

By the principles which I have laid the down my party and myself must be disc

Mr. Meredith to Archbishop Cleary. You You MY LORD ARCHMSHOP—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 22ad instant (but only through the public newspipers), and were one content with a superficial reading of it, it would be difficult. In the mess of experts would be difficult, in the mess of exhorts against tion, instruction and fatherly admonition which it contains, and which reaches its climax when you stay for a moment the effect r

drop a sympathetic tear at the thought of the tripry I have done to my cause, to recognize the handiwork of the fiery eccles issue who at the last Provincial general princip election awapt Eustern Optatio with his endorse denunciations of the party I had the honor now the following the followi conceal entirely your true sentiments, or ment o Else, why do you speak of my Agnostic for hus friends? Or why do you talk of the "ferocious bigote" of the Equal Rights Association, or falcely charge me with desiring to oppress the Roman Catholic I ba minority, or with seeking, by disgrace ful methods, to catch the votes of the unthinking populace, and it fluence religious

(ele Kip Archb'

disappe

publi