

# The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
SINGLE COPIES, 5 CENTS.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Editor.  
THOMAS COFFEY,  
Publisher and Proprietor.

Subscribers, JOHN KIRBY, JOHN NICH, and P. J. NEVEN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.  
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.

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.

London, Saturday, July 14, 1894.

## THE ANARCHISTS IN FRANCE.

The obsequies of M. Sadio Carnot, President of the French Republic, took place in the Pantheon of Paris on the 1st inst., a week after he had been struck down by the hand of the assassin, Santo Cesario, the Anarchist at Lyons. The body was deposited by the side of his grandfather, Lazare Carnot, known as "the Organizer of Victory."

The display was the most remarkable civic and military demonstration ever witnessed in France, and it should teach the promoters of disorder, the Anarchists, that the country will not bear patiently such wild vagaries and crimes as have been committed by them within the last few years.

It is comprehensible that in a country like Russia, or Turkey, where the will of the ruler is the sole law, and where the tyrant crushes as he will, the dagger of the assassin should be ready to avenge injuries inflicted, because there is no other resource by which one can deliver himself and his fellow-subjects from oppression. But it is hard to realize that in a country where the people themselves rule, and where the head of the Government is the direct choice of the people, there should be found any so dissatisfied with the form of Government as to declare their irreconcilable hatred against it. Yet this has been the case, not only in France, but even in America, where within a few years two presidents fell victims to the bullet of assassins, who were impelled by principles similar to, if not exactly the same as, those which influenced Santo.

The immense crowds which thronged the magnificent Rue Rivoli, and the island of the City on which stood the Paris of ancient days, are a testimony to the popular indignation against the grim conspirators who planned this murder, and brought their plans to a successful issue.

The Anarchists are evidently determined to keep themselves and their principles before the public; but the steps they are taking to effect this will certainly bring upon their heads measures as stern as those they are adopting towards the upholders of law and order.

There is not the least doubt that Santo Cesario would have been torn to pieces by the multitude if they had succeeded in laying hold of his person after the perpetration of his crime, and much as we disapprove of mob or lynch law, we cannot but say it would have served the miscreant right to have been dealt with by the multitude on the spot.

It is difficult to say whether the stupidity or the depravity of these Anarchists is the more to be wondered at. They talk of remedying the wrongs under which humanity suffers, and their mode of redressing those wrongs is to throw deadly bombs into the midst of peaceful citizens who have done no harm to them or to society, to injure and destroy the property of the nation, and to murder those officers of the nation who have been entrusted by the voice of the people with the duty of executing just laws, and of guarding the interests of the whole people.

The execution of Ravachol and Vaillant proves that France will not tolerate the wild theories of the Anarchists to be put into practical operation.

Ravachol and Vaillant have been apotheosized by the Anarchists as martyrs of their cause; and as Santo Cesario will also undoubtedly suffer a like penalty with these, there will be another added to form a triad of deities more shocking for its crimes than any of the most degraded forms of Paganism, however constituted.

All classes of the people of Paris, and of those from the country, young and old, rich and poor, flocked to attend the funeral of M. Carnot, and the crowd was such as was never before seen in Paris—which is saying a great deal, as Paris is well accustomed to demonstrations on a large scale.

It is a sign of the vigor of the party

of order that without any delay the Senate and Chamber of Deputies were able to elect a successor to President Carnot, and their choice, M. Cassimir-Perier, will undoubtedly command the respect of all France except the knot of Anarchists, who may perhaps still look for revenge. The murder of President Carnot was in revenge for the execution of Ravachol and Vaillant. There is no doubt that Santo Cesario will be dealt with as were these desperadoes; and perhaps there will still remain some who will seek for a further revenge, but the result must be a rooting out of the Anarchists, though perhaps before this result is reached there will yet be some more martyrs to the cause of order.

If Anarchists can be found who are ready to become martyrs in a bad cause, there are also many who will not hesitate to become martyrs, if it must be so, to the cause of their country and their duty; and if it is necessary that the contest between anarchy and order is to be fought out by assassinations on the one hand and legal executions on the other, there is no doubt where the victory will be. The cause of Law and Order will surely win, if Anarchy and Anarchists are to be violently rooted out in the struggle.

It is a good sign of the times that the obsequies of the late President were performed with all the rites of the Catholic Church.

The funeral cortege proceeded from the Palace of the Elysee to the cathedral of Notre Dame, where a most impressive scene was witnessed as the casket was taken from the funeral car. The troops presented arms, and Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris, with the clergy of the cathedral, met the procession at the door and escorted the corpse to the catafalque prepared to receive it. High Mass was then celebrated for the deceased, after which the Cardinal delivered an impressive funeral oration.

His Eminence attested that President Carnot was an upright man in public as well as private life, and added that "these simple words constitute a greater eulogy on him than long orations."

Anarchy is the result of irreligion. Those who profess to be Anarchists acknowledge no God; it is hard, therefore, to imagine any motive which could be strong enough to induce them to offer their lives in sacrifice for their principles; nevertheless, experience proves that some of them are ready to make this sacrifice. It is deplorable that men should be so infatuated; but it is some consolation to us at this side of the Atlantic to know that Anarchy has no foothold here.

Should Anarchists at any time make their appearance amongst us, they must be taught that there is no room for them or their principles in this country. This was the lesson taught to the Anarchists of Chicago in 1886, and notwithstanding that there was not long ago an Anarchist demonstration in New York, it was easily repressed without bloodshed, as the promoters of the demonstration soon discovered that they had to deal with a population which would not tolerate any nonsense from them.

## A TIMELY ENCYCLICAL FROM POPE LEO XIII.

It is announced that the contents of the encyclical letter which Pope Leo XIII. intends to issue as his political testament, have been made known. It is not certain, however, whether the details given are authentic. The following are said to be the principal points:

1. He declares that the Church will continue as heretofore to propagate the faith among unbelieving nations which do not know the true God; and he prays that God may send devoted missionaries to labor in the good work of converting them.

2. He expresses sorrow for the schisms and animosities which have separated so many civilized nations from the Catholic faith and expresses his hope that they may once more return to the one fold, a result which is to be gained only through the grace of God bending the wills of men.

3. He reminds the Eastern Churches that their forefathers of the Oriental Christians recognized the authority of the Roman Pontiff, and assures them that if they perfect the union which Christ originally established, the rights and privileges of the patriarchal Sees will be respected and confirmed. Prosperity and greatness will be the result, he says, of the return of these Churches to the unity of faith in communion with the See of Rome.

4. He reminds the Protestants that they have no certain rule of faith and

authority, and that as a consequence the most important Christian doctrines have been denied by many sects, and that many have fallen into materialism and actual unbelief.

4. He exhorts Catholics to remain steadfast to the faith and to submit to the guardianship of the Church, the only perfect society with a divine commission to teach the faith, and to make laws in regard to matters within its jurisdiction, without being subservient to any other authority; and yet without trenching upon the jurisdiction of any other authority.

5. The Freemasons are again condemned and the Catholics of France and Italy and other nations are exhorted to keep aloof from such associations, and, further, to do all in their power to cultivate peace and harmony, and to avoid the horrors of war.

6. He declares that the liberties of peoples can be made to accord with the powers of rulers under all the forms of government. Rulers must account to God for their stewardship; for the right to command and the duty of obedience proceed from God. He therefore exhorts rulers to foster religious union, that so the evils which perturbed the last century and plunged nations into Anarchy and blood may not be repeated now.

It is earnestly to be hoped that the efforts of the Holy Father to restore peace to the world may be crowned with success.

## A PERSISTENT POLICY-MAKER.

The Toronto Mail is quite a policy-maker for the parties in the Province of Ontario, but the policies it provides have hitherto not proved acceptable to the people for whom they have been intended.

But a few weeks ago our contemporary sagely announced that "at a former Provincial general election" it "outlined a platform for the people, the triumph of which it firmly believed would be also a decided victory for good government in Ontario."

It is quite true the Mail did propose four years ago that Sir Oliver Mowat should adopt the no Popery policy which it had advocated for some years; but the upshot of the matter is graphically described by the Mail itself as follows:

"This policy did not succeed."

But our contemporary is not easily discouraged, and while telling us of its past ill success, it does not hesitate to bring forward a new policy which it recommended, not indeed to Sir Oliver, but to a bantling largely of its own production, the P. P. A. of Ontario.

Alas! the same thing which our contemporary said of its policy four years ago is to be said of the one propounded just before the recent election: "this policy did not succeed either."

The P. P. A. has been brought to notice during the short period of its existence, especially by the Mail, and no method has been left untried by that journal which might possibly increase its membership so that its efforts to protect poor threatened Protestantism might be crowned with success.

So far did the Mail's solicitude for its bantling go, that it even provided a platform of twelve planks on which a coalition might be effected between Conservatives and the P. P. A., such that the united parties should march to victory with the Mail's principles emblazoned on their banner. Of the policy thus offered to the electorate the Mail said:

"Here is a policy which every man who has the interest of Ontario at heart will surely endorse."

It is curious to notice how our contemporary, from time to time, nay, almost daily, spoke with disapproval of the introduction of religious issues into the election. We agree with that journal that such issues should not have been raised; but let us ask who was it that raised them? Did not the Mail over and over again defend the P. P. A. as a society necessary for the protection of Protestants against "Roman Catholic aggression?" Yet there was no such aggression. The aggression was certainly on the part of those who laid it down as their primary principle in politics that no Catholic should be elected or appointed to any office in the gift of the people or of the Government, and who swear to keep Catholics out of all employment as far as they are able to effect this. Yet these aggressions upon the liberty of Catholics were advocated by the Mail with all its force. Further, the platform of the Mail contained these planks:

1. Religious equality before the law, the State to treat all religious communities alike, and to tolerate no undue ecclesiastical interference from any quarter.

We pass over plank 2.

3. Repeal of the coercive amendments to the school law. Every parent to have the right to choose of his own free will and without menace between the Public and Separate schools. The State to act no longer an informer for any Church.

4. The ballot to be given freely and honestly in all school elections.

There is not in the mere statement of these principles anything very objectionable or unjust, though regarding the last point, a compulsory ballot in all school elections, there is room for honest differences of opinion. We are not at all convinced that a compulsory ballot is absolutely necessary in school elections; and we have before now given it as our opinion that the ballot being the more expensive mode of election, it is not advisable to adopt it on all occasions, nor on any occasion, unless there be proof forthcoming that it is customary for some domineering power to interfere by positively coercing the electors, thus taking away from them the freedom of election which the laws intend they should enjoy.

We are well aware that this plank of the Mail's platform has a covert meaning which the words do not express. We are aware that this agitation for the ballot at school elections is not really meant for the Public schools at all. It is intended to convey the insulting insinuation that the Catholic school electors are coerced by the clergy at the Separate school elections.

There is not the slightest foundation for such an insinuation or assertion, and if there were, Catholics themselves would ask for the ballot for their protection. But it cannot be said that Catholics have done so, though we do not deny that the Mail's reiterated assertions that it is needed in order to secure the liberty of the Catholic electors, have induced a few Catholics to demand the ballot, that thus they might exhibit their readiness to fall in with the views of those Protestants of the Mail's stamp who wish to coerce and harass us at every step.

The vast majority of the Catholics of Ontario are fully aware that the agitation for the Separate school ballot was raised by enemies of Catholic schools, simply for the purpose of harassing them, and they are opposed to admitting the principle that so-called amendments to our school system should be forced on us by our enemies.

The other planks in the Mail's platform have equally another meaning which does not appear in their wording, but which is evident from the attacks made by that journal upon Catholics during the last nine or ten years.

Its pretence of being an advocate of "religious equality before the law" is a mere sham. For the last decade its aim has been to deprive Catholics of their rights as citizens, under pretence that they were aggressive when there was no aggression.

Our school system is, of course, the pretext on which the Mail pretends that we are aggressive, but it is notorious that the Separate school system in no way interferes with the rights of Protestants to educate their children in their own way. It merely secures to Catholics the right of doing the same.

The third plank of the Mail's platform is, professedly, to secure the repeal of coercive amendments, and "to secure to every parent the right to choose of his own free will and without menace between the Public and Separate schools." Every one is aware that there are no such coercive amendments in the Separate school law, as the Mail is constantly harping on. At present every Catholic parent is quite free to support Public or Separate schools as he sees fit; and the Mail's assertion that he is coerced is nothing more nor less than a brazen misstatement of fact.

But here we may well ask, as the Mail is so extremely anxious to give Catholic parents the liberty of selection, why does it not contend for the same liberty of selection for Protestant parents?

We know of Catholic Separate schools which have been attended for years by the children of Protestants, by choice of the parents. Why does not the Mail agitate that Protestant parents who thus send their children to Catholic schools should be allowed to pay their taxes to the Separate School Board?

The secret of all this that the Mail's desire is for that equality of creeds which will place the creed of Catholics undermost.

The people of Ontario are not to be deluded by the false pretences of the Mail, and hence the obtruded platform of that journal has been rejected by them with scorn. But the Mail has as many policies in store as a cat

has lives, and when one is killed it brings out another from its exhaustless bag.

The P. P. A. has been relegated to obscurity by the electors of the Province, and it is useless any longer to propose a policy for that society to carry out, so since the election the Mail has constituted itself the policy maker of the Patrons of Industry. It says: "The Patrons hold the key"; and it advises them to "stand out and fight earnestly in the House from the very first day for every point they have advocated in the country," so that they may not be weakened and "ultimately destroyed."

It is not certain that the Patrons will consider it wise to adopt the policy recommended by a journal which has been so unfortunate in the policies it framed and advocated in the past. But the Mail, all the same, has a motive in view in giving the advice, and it has not the discretion to conceal its motive. It tells the Patrons that by following its advice "Sir Oliver must give up an immense amount of valuable patronage, or else he must be prepared for defeat"; and that "defeat would not necessarily pass the Government over to the Conservatives, who are not strong enough to rule even with the Patrons thrown in. It would rather mean a new election with the offices figuring as the issue of the hour."

The truth is, therefore, that the Mail has a dissolution of the Legislature already in view, before there is even thought of calling that body together for purposes of legislation! No doubt the hope entertained is that a new election might result even now in a partial success for P. P. Aism; but there is little likelihood that either the Patrons or Mr. Mowat will act upon the Mail's suggestion. In all probability there will be no new election for several years to come.

## THE MAIL'S "MISTAKES."

The editor of the Toronto Mail exhibits great soreness of spirit when he finds any of his contemporaries using strong language. He has taken the Brantford Expositor sharply to task for using such expressions as "falsehood" and "liar," when making reference to the Mail. In newspaper work an editor may often be mistaken; and when a contemporary finds such to be the case, it is commendable to use language customary amongst gentlemen. The editor of the Mail would not for the world use such a term as "liar" in his editorial work; and the dear, good man, with thoughts lifted heavenward, says that Christian charity prevents him replying to the Expositor in the language which that paper employed towards the Mail.

It happens, however, that in the Mail's explanation, which appeared in its issue of June 30, the editor has given the Expositor another opportunity for making use of forcible language. To cover up what we will for politeness sake call a mistake, the Mail has fallen into another one; and here is the proof: The Mail says that certain further demands in regard to Separate schools have been made by the Roman Catholics, and the Expositor contends that no such demand has ever been made by any one having authority to speak for the Roman Catholic Church. To prove its contention the Mail triumphantly replies: "Now look at the following from the Kingston Freeman, Archbishop 'Cleary's organ.'" (Here follow a quotation from the paper named.)

As proof positive that the Mail is utterly unreliable when dealing with Catholic affairs, we quote the following extract from a letter written by Archbishop Cleary, dated Dec. 22, 1889, and addressed to Mr. W. R. Meredith. It will be remembered that the latter also held the distinguished Archbishop of Kingston responsible for the utterances of the Freeman. The correspondence between the Archbishop and Mr. Meredith appeared in the daily press at the time; and the editor of the Mail, who, judging by the copious supply of old time happenings which he continually gives us, must have a good memory, can hardly be held excused from falling into the error which Mr. Meredith committed. The Archbishop wrote:

"Know, therefore, that the Kingston newspaper referred to by you (the Freeman) 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."

## AN INTERVIEW.

We have much pleasure in reproducing this week the full text of an interview between His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston and a reporter of the Montreal Star. A representative of the same paper had previously asked the opinion of Principal Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston, touching the Ontario elections, and the defeat of Hon. Mr. Hart, of Kingston. The Principal, in a moment of weakness, we will charitably say, endeavored to transfer the responsibility of the defeat of the Minister of Public Works from his own shoulders to those of the distinguished prelate of Kingston. The Archbishop would not have it that way, however, and although the Principal is great at the pen, and well versed in the expediency of the professional politician, he has met a foe whose lucid arguments have completely demolished the untenable structure he has erected to justify his charges. Perhaps the strongest point in favor of the position of the Archbishop is to be found in the fact that, while Principal Grant is known to be a constant meddler in purely political contests, in fact assuming the role of a regular party man. The Archbishop, on the contrary, holds himself far above and outside the political arena, his life-work the faithful performance of his high and holy calling as guardian of the flock over whom he has been placed by the Vicar of Christ. When danger to the faith and well-being of his charge is threatened—when the politician steps out of his legitimate sphere and threatens to do aught that would dim the lustre of faith in the hearts of his flock—it matters not whether that politician emerges from the Grit or Tory or any other wig-wag—a valiant Prince of the Church will have to be encountered in the person of the distinguished Archbishop Cleary. We ask our readers to make a careful study of the interview, for therein wholesome truths are given in the clearest terms. It is time this no Popery nonsense was dropped in election campaigns and Catholics left free to exercise their franchise on purely political questions. That they are found almost a unit in opposition to the Meredith party is not their fault, but the fault of hungry politicians actuated by motives most unworthy.

## EDITORIAL NOTES.

A PERSON calling himself Rev. Amand Parent has been sojourning in London for some time. He comes from the Province of Quebec, and is said to be a missionary amongst the French-Canadians. In the Free Press report of a sermon delivered by him in the Askin street Methodist Church it is stated that "he charged the Church of Rome with having killed his wife and poisoned himself." He also said that "for years after he came to live with a Protestant family he was afraid to look into a bible lest the priest should discover it." It is really deplorable that our Protestant friends should tolerate such nonsense as this. These clerical tramps play on their credulity for the purpose of making a few dollars. We will merely say that priests frequently purchase bibles in our book-store for their own use and for the use of their people, and that our sale of bibles is larger than that of any other book. It is also a fact that very few Catholic houses are to be found that do not contain a copy of the sacred Scriptures. As to the "killing and poisoning" clause of the lecture, we will in charity suppose that the old gentleman is subject to fits of hallucination.

THE Anti-Lords Conference of the Liberal Convention which was recently held in Leeds reported resolutions to the effect that the power of the Lords to mutilate and reject measures passed by the House of Commons, and to defeat reforms is inconsistent with the right of the people to self-government, and ought to cease. The Government was called upon to prepare and introduce into parliament a measure by which the Lords' veto would no longer suffice to reject bills; but that when they should be so rejected a second passing of the bill by the Commons, with the royal assent, should suffice to make it become law.

THE Anglicans are again soliciting information from Rome concerning the validity of their orders, and requesting the Pope to appoint a commission of Cardinals to examine the Branch theory. This appears to us to be a needless waste of time and labor. Anglicanism, divided and sub-divided, receives scant recognition from thinking men. It was engendered by