

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland," THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

London, Saturday, June 16, 1894.

"A HUNGRY ADVENTURER."

All honour and praise to the intrepid and out-spoken Archbishop of Kingston! Aptly and deservedly did His Grace designate Mr. William Ralph Meredith "a hungry adventurer."

Truly, Mr. Meredith, you earned for yourself the name of "a hungry adventurer." Had you not been so insatiably greedy after place and power you would not, in all likelihood, have been betrayed into the fatal error you committed when you strayed away from the paths of moral rectitude and just principles to act as the tool of a clique of self-seeking bigots and the mouthpiece of rampant anti-Catholics.

may threaten their soul's salvation. It is known the world over that, next to their belief in all articles of faith, the Catholic Church enjoins upon parents the paramount necessity of giving to their children a moral and religious education.

The principle of Separate schools in Ontario has been long acknowledged and granted. The provisions, however, were meagre and grudgingly conceded by the Protestant majority in the old Parliament of United Canada.

Now, the right of the Catholic minority to Separate schools having been granted by Parliament and guaranteed by the Confederation Act, and this right, as already indicated, being founded on divine and natural law, is it not reasonable to expect that every man of good conscience and liberal mind, every lover of justice and fair dealing, would cheerfully lend his aid and influence to remedy the defects of the law and make it acceptable and beneficial to those whom it concerns?

In the light of this matter-of-fact and common sense view of the Separate school question, involving, as it does, the divine and natural law, parental conscience and rights, civil and religious liberty, may we not reasonably and fairly ask whether Mr. Meredith's specious objections to and appeals against "special privileges and concessions" to Catholics deserve any consideration?

of Quebec, which commands universal approval and admiration.

Again, we repeat, all praise and honor to the fearless Archbishop who has presented Mr. Meredith in his true colors to his people. The member for London is, in a very remote way, a true follower of the former Protestant Archbishop Whately, of Dublin, who devoted his life and his undoubted talents to the congenial work of endeavoring to rob the youth of Ireland of their faith through means of a godless school system.

AT THEIR OLD TRICKS.

There is good reason to believe that the English Tories are meditating a ruse against Home Rule somewhat similar to that attempted in 1887 when the London Times published its celebrated articles on "Parallelism and Crime," which were so thoroughly refuted by the bringing home of the forgeries to the source from which they had emanated, and which proved to the Times so costly a forgery.

MR. MEREDITH'S SCHOOL POLICY.

There are some Catholics, honest enough, as we believe, in their intentions, who are persuaded, or endeavor to persuade themselves, that Mr. Meredith and his party are not fanatically opposed to Catholic education, and that the legislation they propose will not be injurious to Catholics.

These Catholics have been Conservatives all their lives, and they are not willing now to cast a Reform vote, if they can only succeed in reconciling Conservatism with their consciences at the forthcoming election.

There are, no doubt, a very few nominal Catholics who are really opposed to Catholic education, and who would be glad to see the whole system of Separate schools swept away. With these it is useless to argue on this occasion, but those we have referred to do not belong to this class.

It would be too much to expect that all Protestants should agree that a Separate school system is desirable. The fact is that very few of them of either political party will admit this, and we do not ask or require that they should do so; but what we do ask is that they shall respect the religious convictions of Catholics, and leave us free to educate our children in the manner in which, as we believe, they ought to be educated.

The enemies of Catholic education generally maintain, at least when they

are discussing against fanaticism, that the State should have all the control over the education of children, should not only inspect the schools, but also dictate absolutely what books are to be used in them, and what the curriculum of studies should be, and that the State should, therefore, insist upon the exclusion of all religious teaching, inasmuch as it is not possible, even if it were desirable, that in this country the State should teach any religion in particular.

Here we join issue with our opponents. We do not deny the propriety of a system of education maintained by the State. The good results of a State-aided education are evident, and we fully agree that the State has a right and a duty to perform in taking care that the children should be educated; but this should be fulfilled without throwing any obstacle in the way of parents who desire to fulfil their duties also.

It is undoubtedly the duty of parents to educate their children in their religious obligations, and the system which would prevent them from doing this is radically wrong; and it is in this respect that the course which Mr. Meredith proposes to follow is unjust.

The Hon. G. W. Ross and the Protestant members of the administration are not favorable to the existence of Catholic schools; but they recognize that Catholic schools exist, and that they are guaranteed by the terms under which the Confederation of the Provinces was brought about. They are willing, since this is the case, to make the Catholic schools of the Province as efficient as possible; and as the school law of 1863 did not in every respect give Catholic schools perfect equality in comparison with the Public schools, some slight changes were made which rendered the Separate school law more effective.

Another injustice was that while the Public school taxes were collected by the municipality, at the expense of all the rate-payers, Protestant and Catholic, the Catholic school taxes had to be collected by the Separate School Boards, at the expense of the Catholic rate-payers. This inequality was also corrected.

It was recognized and admitted by both political parties that as the law stood, it was unjust under these respects, and the measures by which these grievances were removed were passed in the Legislature with little or no opposition. The Conservative party was at that time not opposed to equal justice, and so the remedial measures became part of the Catholic school law.

There was also some doubt, as the law stood at first, in case of a difference of religion, between landlord and tenant, whether the tax should be paid to the Public or Separate school.

An amendment was passed making this matter clear. As the tenant, by the payment of rent, undoubtedly is the actual payer of the school-taxes, the most just method was to hand the tax over to the school of which he was a supporter, and the school law was adjusted so that this should be the case.

Here is precisely the matter on which the present elections turn, as far as education is concerned. Mr. Meredith has made the discovery that the amendments have facilitated the operation of Separate schools, and, yielding to the demands of fanaticism, he has proclaimed it to be the principal plank of his platform to repeal all these amendments, in order to hamper the Separate schools, and thus, if possible, kill them off by petty annoyances. A meaner policy, to be the policy of a great party, can scarcely be conceived.

Mr. Meredith and the Toronto Mail are very fond of repeating that they

are unjustly accused of fanaticism, because they express their opinions openly against Catholic education. It is a fact, however, that they are in league together to deprive us of rights which we hold most dear, and the Catholic who would assist them in their plans would be a traitor to himself, his family and his religion.

That there may be no doubt of Mr. Meredith's intentions we append here his words as uttered in London Opera House in the opening speech of the campaign. He said:

"The existence of Separate schools is a matter which was settled upon a certain basis in the Constitution of the Dominion, and which could not be changed either by the Local or Dominion House. That much he admitted, but he considered that the Separate schools which had been given to the Roman Catholics by the British North America Act should not be increased in any way, or any greater facilities given for the establishment of Separate schools."

He proposes, therefore, to repeal the amendments which have made the Separate schools work more easily. His policy is hostile to us, at the same time that it is unjust, and he has no right to expect that we will help him with our ballots to carry it out.

HOME RULE FUND.

The collection taken up in St. Thomas last Sunday amounted to \$75. Many were prevented from contributing towards the fund by the non-arrival of the M. C. R. pay car, which was expected on Friday, the 8th. It is probable that \$50 additional shall be handed in on next Sunday. The names of contributors are:

- The society of the A. O. H., \$11; Rev. Dr. Flannery, \$10; J. H. Coyne, Esq., \$4; Timothy Hickey (M. C. R.), \$5; D. J. Donohue, Esq., \$5. Contributors of \$2 each: S. B. Pocock, Thomas Duffy (M. C. R.), James Egan, Michael Heenan, (M. C. R.), James Brady, (Westminster). Of \$1 each: Thomas Kelly, M. Screenan, Chas. Arlin, John Clarke, W. P. Reynolds, Ed. Reath, John Amyott (M. C. R.), Daniel Baker, Corn. Maxwell, James Moylan, Jeremiah Loran, W. Reath, Patrick Butler, Thos. Lowry (M. C. R.), John Fitzgerald, Michael Waddie, Patrick McManus (sr.), Mrs. Relis, Mr. J. Relis, Mathew Dowd, J. J. Murphy and Mrs. Donnelly. Those who gave fifty cents each are: Mr. Jan Barry, Mrs. Jenkins, Daniel McDonnell, Jas. O'Brien (farmer), Jas. Moylan, Thos. Doherty, Daniel Barrett, Tim. Kelly, Mrs. J. Ryan, Mrs. Corbett, Patrick McManus (jr.), Thos. Bassford, Michael Casey, John McMillen, Miss Ryan, Martin Donnelly, John King (H. M. C.), Joseph Doyle, John Maginn, M. McAndrew (M. C. R.), Daniel Coughlin, John Coughlin, John T. Coughlin and George Carr. Those who gave twenty-five cents: Patrick Ryan, Mrs. Ronan, Mrs. Vahey, Patrick Hanley, Mrs. Moffat, C. J. Arlein, John O'Rourke, James Waddie, Misses Higgins, Rose McCaffrey, Mary Masterson and Lizzie McDermott, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. J. Boughner, Mrs. T. McManus, Mrs. McMullen, Mrs. Moriarty, James McManus, James Smith, Mrs. Bryer, F. Cassidy, Mrs. B. Harvey, Mrs. Taylor, W. J. Hayes, Mr. Miller, Francis Frank, Matt. Bryce, James Ryan, Mary McGowan, Miss Redmond, Wm. Redmond, John B. Coughlin, Nap. McNabb, John Wimmer, Alice Coleman, Charles Butler and James McManus.

Some there are who refuse to contribute because there is division among the Irish Nationalists. "Let them present a united front," they say, "and we shall help to the best of our means." Others, called extremists, refuse to give aid because they have no confidence in any English party. To the first we would say: Division in their ranks is a cause of weakness, and therefore do they require more help than if united. The great majority represent the Irish people. Let the minority—nine in all—submit, as minorities submit in all countries. But because one ambitious man has just now a following of eight partizans, must Ireland be abandoned when she has crossed the Red Sea and is in sight of the Promised Land? Why should all Ireland be punished for the sake of two or three irreconcilables? Does that country or nationality exist in the whole world that has not its divisions? How are we in Canada? Is the whole world going to frown upon us, or treat us with scorn, because we have amongst us Grits and Tories, P. P. A.'s and P. P. I.'s, etc. How are they in the neighboring republic? How are they in France, in Italy, in England itself? Are not divisions found in every nation and in every party into which politicians are divided up? But, forsooth, Ireland must be an exceptional nationality. Because her politicians are divided we will refuse all aid and sympathy. Because the great majority of Ireland's representatives have a few soreheads barking at their heels and doing the work of the enemy we shall lend no helping hand in this momentous hour when liberty is about to dawn upon her, or leave her to pine in gloom for another century.

The extremists have no confidence in any English party. The Liberals who promise solemnly and publicly to grant Ireland her freedom are no more deserving of confidence than the Salisburys and Balfours who promise a renewal of coercion. How can such a proposition be maintained? Is it

possible we can have no more faith in Gladstone, who dreams but of Home Rule for Ireland, and who has made it acceptable to the English people, than in Salisbury, who ridicules all such pretensions and declares openly that nothing will pacify Ireland but the gag, the landlord and the plank bed? Lord Rosebery and Hon. John Morley and the whole Liberal Cabinet, the Spencers, the Ripons and Harcourts, are all openly and heartily in favor of Home Rule for Ireland. By sustaining them in power we sustain the only Englishmen that ever made Ireland's happiness and freedom the object of English legislation and the key-note to the stability and endurance of the British Empire.

DR. BARNARDO.

The name of this man has been made notorious in consequence of his having been prosecuted, several times, in the London law courts, and before the highest court in the Empire, for kidnapping Catholic children and spiriting them away to Canada and elsewhere, out of reach of their parents or guardians. He is a heartless and inveterate bigot. This kidnapping business is practiced, now and again, to replenish his coffers. Each trial costs him about £3,000, but he receives, in return, from Protestants of the extreme Evangelical and anti-Catholic type, £10,000 and upwards, in every case. He is a shrewd man in money matters and does not scruple much how he "turns an honest penny."

Barnardo is a Cork Irishman, using, of course, an Italian name. His title to style himself "Dr." is founded on a few months' medical studentship.

We copy the following from Truth—Labouchere's paper—of May 3rd. "Labby" knows Barnardo. He says:

The following circular has just been issued by Dr. Barnardo. It is avowedly an appeal to the very lowest form of sectarian bigotry, and it will, I should hope, evoke nothing but disgust from those who have any claim to be called either charitable persons or Christians. In the leaflet enclosed in his circular, Dr. Barnardo explains somewhat more coherently that "certain Roman Catholics have come forward with a firm offer of £7,000" for some freehold land adjoining the Home referred to, and the gist of it all is that he must have £7,000 in a fortnight in order to secure the land for his own purposes:

A DARK CLOUD INDEED! April 19, 1894. Dear Sir,—In the enclosed envelope you will find an extract entitled "A Romish Plot," from a number of Night and Day just going to press. A perusal of it will enable you to form some conception of the alarm into which I am plunged by the facts therein set forth. Since that article was written, however, the position has suddenly assumed an acute phase; and when I tell you, in confidence, that the institution referred to is none other than the girls' Village Home, Ilford, Essex, upon which we have already spent in the past twenty-three years £90,000—to which quite lately a Children's Home has been added by one generous donor, at a cost of £7,800—and wherein there are now sheltered nearly 1000 little girls—the gravity of the crisis threatened by the establishment on part of the land we have hitherto occupied of a Roman Catholic convent and convent school will, I am sure, be realized by all who have, out of love to Christ, helped forward this work for Him for so many years. There is not an hour now to be lost if this evil is to be averted: I have already been compelled to take a most presumptuous step, so as to save from being lost to us for ever a small part of the property, which was just being surrendered to my rivals. The greater portion still remains awaiting the decision which can only be announced after hearing from you and other friends of the work. I pray God to help us in this emergency; and I remember that He is the God of the valleys as well as of the hills: Our eyes look up unto Him, while we beseech Him to move the hearts of His servants to come speedily to our relief. Any aid contributed towards the purchase should be effected by cheque, as for the redemption of the land at Ilford. Awaiting your early response, I am, your faithful but unfeeling fellow-laborer among the children. THOMAS BARNARDO. 18 to 26, Stepney Causeway, London, E.

I venture to suggest to this truculent philanthropist that it might assist his supplications to the Almighty if he would remember not merely that "He is the God of the valleys as well as the hills," but also that He is the God of the Roman Catholic as well as the Protestant. It might also prove of advantage to Dr. Barnardo if he would remember the same fact in his appeals to his fellow-men. As it is, I should hope that there is very little chance of his getting the money he asks for.

Not content with exhorting Protestants to send him cash for this purpose, Dr. Barnardo does not hesitate, it seems, to insult Catholics by posting his circulars to them. Several of them write to me on the subject, as do also Jews, English Churchmen, and many persons who have been favored in the same way, but who have no notion of supporting a crusade against the Pope of Rome. From the fact of these appeals being addressed to them, I take it that these ladies and gentlemen have in former times contributed to Dr. Barnardo's work, supposing it to be one in which all religious sects might gladly unite. They now perceive their error, and will, I trust, act accordingly.

Since the foregoing remarks were written, a more serious aspect has been placed upon Dr. Barnardo's circular by the statement, published in the current number of the Tablet, that no Catholic body has any designs whatever upon the plot of land referred to. This seems highly probable, for, while this belligerent Protestant is so overcome at the prospect of living next door to Roman Catholics, it is not easy to see any reason, outside his excited imagination, why they should be anxious to live next door to him. As Dr. Barnardo opened the attack, it now behoves him either to substantiate his