

**The Catholic Record**  
Published Weekly at 436 Richmond Street,  
London, Ontario.  
REV. JOHN F. COFFEY, Editor.  
THOS. COFFEY, Publisher & Proprietor.

Ottawa Agency:  
P. J. COFFEY, Gen'l Agent, 74 George St.

RATES PER ANNUM.—One Copy, \$2.00;  
Three Copies, \$5.25; Five Copies, \$7.50; Ten  
Copies, \$12.50 Payable in every case in  
advance.

Advertising rates made known on appli-  
cation.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and  
recommended by the Bishops of Ottawa,  
Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Cath-  
olic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.  
All correspondence addressed to the Pub-  
lisher will receive prompt attention.  
Arrears must be paid in full before the  
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, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1884.

### THE MEMBER FOR ALGOMA.

During the last session of the Dominion Parliament, Mr. Dawson, M. P. for Algoma, addressed the House some observations on the subject of Indian schools. The hon. gentleman appeared very solicitous for Indian schools under Methodist and Church of England auspices, but had not a word for Catholic Indian schools. Mr. Dawson, we believe, occasionally, if not always, calls himself a Catholic. He votes and speaks as an enemy of Catholicity in Hansard.

Mr. DAWSON. I can say that the Mr. Wilson, who has been mentioned, is a very estimable man, and has done a great deal for the Indians at Sault Ste. Marie. He has collected a considerable fund in England and elsewhere, for maintaining his industrial schools at Sault Ste. Marie, for which there is a Government grant of \$1,800 a year. There is an industrial school for boys and another one for girls. They are working so satisfactorily and doing so much good that clergymen of other denominations—his school is in connection with the Church of England—have followed his example and have established industrial schools at Quémicon, where large numbers are attending them. The other day they sent, through me, from Quémicon, at the lower end of Manitoulin Island, some complaints and reports, which I sent to the Deputy-Head of the right hon. gentleman's Department; and I believe instructions were sent up to the local agents to inquire into the matter. They complained that the funds were entirely too little for the number of scholars who were attending. They showed a very large and close attendance, both at the girls' and boys' school. The children were making very great progress. There the Indians live near together in a sort of community; they raise a good deal of wheat, and are getting to be very comfortable on the Island of Manitoulin, and therefore they are able to keep their children at school. They had for two schools, with nearly 100 children in constant attendance, but \$1,200 a year. They had to board these children, and could not maintain themselves without foreign aid. They have missionaries collecting for them all over the civilized world, who get but very little; still they get enough to enable them to live. While on this subject, I would draw the attention of the Minister to another subject of great importance. There are schools authorized among the wild Indians at Nipigon and other places—I think five in all, and an appropriation of \$200 a year was made for each school. This sum, in a wild country like that, is too little to attract competent teachers, so that the Indians to this day are without schools, though they were quite willing to send their children to school. I sent in a representation the other day that \$50 a year should be added in each case to enable them to maintain their schools, and I hope the Department will see its way to make that small additional grant, more especially in view of the fact that there is a very large amount due to those Lake Superior and Lake Huron Indians, under the Robinson Treaty—I believe as much as \$300,000. Now, with such an enormous fund as that in prospect—enormous as compared with their position—it is much to be regretted that the rising generation should be without education; and I think a point might be stretched, and even a little additional sum given yearly to promote education. I may also say that the improvement within the last two years has been very marked among all the Indians of Algoma. They are showing a desire to have their children educated, above all things, and liquor has been kept from them in a great measure of late years, so that their condition is very materially improved. I am very sorry to say, however, there is one very marked exception to this rule, and that is the case of the Indians at Garden River. They are the poorest Indians in Algoma. The other Indians are comparatively rich; if they are not so, it is their own fault; for they can obtain plenty of work. But at Garden River the soil is poor, and during last fall they were compelled to live solely on turnips. These poor people cannot afford to keep up their schools, and they have a very devoted teacher among them, who, although very badly off himself, manages to teach a great many of them. His name is Rev. Mr. Willetts, and a little addition might be made to the sum paid him. He at present receives \$200, and an additional \$100 would enable him to keep body and soul together with less difficulty than at present.

The member for Algoma is clearly of opinion that Catholic schools can take care of themselves. To him it is of no consequence how poor and inefficient they may be. His solicitude extends to Church of England and Methodist schools—and no further. What, we ask, do the good Catholics of Algoma think of their representative? He votes to incorporate Orangeism and is dumb on the question of aid to Catholic Indian schools. Let their watchword by all means be "Dawson must go."

### IRELAND'S DEVOTION TO THE FAITH.

The Right Rev. Mgr. Seton has, through the inexorable logic of figures, shown how truly and heroically devoted to the Catholic faith are the people of Ireland. Though robbed, after the Williamite wars, of all they possessed, they have not, since that dark period of their history, ceased to make the noblest sacrifices for religion. But specially since the relaxation of the penal laws have the Irish shown the depth of their love for the religion of their fathers.

Mgr. Seton puts it thus: "Since the Penal Laws have been relaxed in Ireland there have been spent there on churches \$5,250,000; on convents and monasteries, \$16,000,000; on colleges and seminaries, \$1,732,000; on asylums and hospitals, about \$800,000; and since the year 1838 Ireland has contributed \$326,000 to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. And that the old missionary spirit was strong as ever in Ireland, we know from the 400 priests sent out to foreign parts since the year 1842 by All Hallows College; and during the past sixty years, the united dioceses of Cashel and Emy have sent forth 143 priests, 33 monks, and 147 nuns; while 122 priests, 11 monks, and 87 nuns proceeded from the noble old diocese of Limerick. The Sisters of Mercy and the Nuns of the Presentation, both religious orders of Irish foundation, and whose establishment we owe exclusively to the zeal and charity of saintly Irish women, are now spread over all the English speaking countries of the world; and it is to the inexhaustible charity no less than to native energy of character and administrative ability of the late most pious Mother Margaret Hallahan, that is due the establishment, in England, after three centuries of extinction, of the noble order of Dominican Nuns."

Ireland's fidelity and devotedness to the truth make her very name illustrious. That fidelity and devotedness should, however, inspire us, not with overconfidence, but with a hearty desire to show ourselves worthy children of so noble a nation, worthy scions of so great and heroic a race. We must not close our eyes to the fact that thousands at least of our fellow-countrymen have lost the faith. That we may deserve to retain it, and that those who have lost it may again return to the true fold, should be our earnest and constant prayer.

### FRENCH AND SPANISH POPULATION.

The stand-still, or, rather, retrogressive feature in connection with French population has led an American writer into a comparison between the growth of France and Spain in that regard:

"It is curious," he says, "that while so much is said as to France's lack of population no one seems to be concerned about Spain's being far worse off in that respect. Spain is nearly as large as France and a country of wonderful natural resources; yet her population is not nearly half that of France. If France had a much larger population, would not she probably have a much larger number of paupers? At present she has no people officially recognized as such, as she has no 'poor law' in the English sense of the phrase."

It is, indeed, satisfactory to know that if the population of France is not rapidly increasing, there is no pauperism in the country. There is, however, reason to believe that France could, without danger of the intervening of pauperism, support a much greater population than she has to-day. As for Spain, its paucity of people is, we believe, due to long continued misgovernment and political troubles. A population so unsettled as that of the Spanish peninsula has been for fully a century has none of the conditions essential to rapid growth.

In a country where there are few, if any, manufactures, where foreign trade is paralyzed by the most absurd restrictions, where agriculture is discouraged by one of the worst systems of land tenure, there cannot be any healthy growth of population. With half a century of good government Spain would, we believe, double her population and again assume that commanding position in Europe for which her great resources and the genius of her people fit her.

### PRESIDENTIAL PROBABILITIES.

As the time for the holding of the party conventions in the American republic draws nigh, the deepest interest is taken in the discussion of the chances of the various candidates for nomination. The two conventions will this year be held in Chicago, a city most favorably situated for the purpose.

In the republican ranks a lively controversy holds sway between the adherents of Messrs. Arthur and Blaine, while Messrs. Edmunds and Logan have not a few zealous friends pushing their respective claims. The N. Y. Sun publishes a statement showing the number of delegates already chosen to the Republican National Convention, with their reported preferences as to their candidate for President of the United States:

For Arthur—Alabama, 20; Arkansas, 14; Delaware, 1; Georgia, 24; Illinois, 6; Indiana, 6; Kansas, 2; Kentucky, 4; Louisiana, 16; Massachusetts, 12; Minnesota, 2; Mississippi, 17; Missouri, 9; Nebraska, 2; New York, 28; North Carolina, 12; Pennsylvania, 17; South Carolina, 18; Tennessee, 18; Virginia, 22; Wisconsin, 2; District of Columbia, 2. Total, 254.

For Blaine—Delaware, 5; Indiana, 7; Iowa, 2; Kansas, 6; Kentucky, 2; Maine, 8; Maryland, 12; Michigan, 16; Minnesota, 5; Mississippi, 11; Missouri, 11; New Jersey, 12; New York, 30; Ohio, 27; Pennsylvania, 43; Tennessee, 4; Wisconsin, 2; Arizona, 2; Dakota, 2. Total 197.

For Edmunds—Massachusetts, 12; Michigan, 6; Minnesota, 3; New Hampshire, 2; New York, 16; Tennessee, 1; Vermont, 4. Total, 44.

For Logan—Illinois, 38; Indiana, 7; Kansas, 2; Missouri, 7; Tennessee, 1. Total, 55.

For John Sherman—Indiana, 4; Ohio, 19. Total, 23.

For Joseph R. Hawley—Connecticut, 12.

For Gresham—Indiana, 6.

RECAPITULATION.	
Arthur.....	254
Blaine.....	197
Logan.....	55
Edmunds.....	44
Total.....	591
Yet to be heard from.....	229
Total.....	820
Necessary to a choice.....	411

It will from these figures be seen that President Arthur has developed a strength partially, it not wholly unexpected by the supporters of the other candidates. It must, however, be remarked that his main strength lies with the delegations from the South, which will not give a single electoral vote to the republican candidate, whoever he may be. The contest between Messrs. Arthur and Blaine may lead, as some what similar struggle lead four years ago, to the choice of a "dark horse." It is not, for this reason, safe to indulge in prediction. Amongst the democrats there is, it seems to us, a great deal of apathy. There does not appear to be any one man among them strong enough to command general support outside his own particular State. What that party requires is a candidate who can carry New York and a few of the doubtful Northern States. Where can they find him? This is the problem they must solve at their national convention. Thus far the chances for another republican administration are decidedly good.

### THE FRANCHISE BILL.

The prospects for the passage of the franchise Bill are now considered excellent. The division on the second reading gave the government one of the largest Parliamentary majorities obtained since the union. The vote standing—for the second reading 390, against 210. In the course of the debate Mr. John Bright delivered one of his most powerful harangues. His speech is a clear confession of English injustice towards Ireland. He strongly deprecated persistence in the policy of force hitherto adopted in regard of Ireland. Comparing the Irish elections of to-day with those of a few years ago he said:

"We know—hon. gentlemen opposite know—the whole house knows, or ought to know—that until recently legislation for Ireland was a farce. Whenever there was a county contest in Ireland there was a local civil war, and if you turn to the Blue Books, which give the evidence given before the Ballot Committee in 1869, you will see that the military officers in Ireland had to gather together soldiers here and there all over the country in order that the peace of the country might not be disturbed (hear, hear). I think, and the English people think, much change is due to the machinery of the ballot. Whatever other result has taken place the electors are much more tranquil than they were in past times. What was the reason for it? That the people discontented were as they had been for the last fifty years and before that, but as none of us are responsible for more than that period, I confine my observations to fifty years; and now in 1884 we have an hon. gentleman from Ireland, representing one of her chief cities, with great influence in the country, speaking of himself here as a foreigner almost (hear, hear from Irish members)—yes, but that is not a very enthusiastic cheer (laughter). But there are hon. gentlemen there who have not repudiated the statement that they were here as something like a rebel party" (a loud "hear, hear," from a member of the Irish party.)

Mr. Bright continued, making happy reference to a very suggestive historical reminiscence:

"I am coming to my argument on this question, and, therefore, I may be permitted to speak with a little freedom. Some of these gentlemen—the party, I suppose—are in league with persons in a distant foreign country who, as far as their stupid, malignant, wicked ideas will enable them to do it, are trying to make war on this country. Now, this is not a thing of to-day—it is a thing a hundred years old—for in this very house Lord North, in a speech on the American war, deplored the fact that some of the bitterest enemies of the English Crown were to be found among the Irish people who had emigrated to the American colonies. This is what I want to ask the house. I would ask my right hon. friend and anybody who has a doubt on the matter, whether it is worth while going on with Ireland upon the old lines. Is there anything in the political history of this country more completely a shameful failure than the government of Ireland, for it was as bad, or even worse, when a Parliament sat in Dublin? I ask them whether we are to go on upon the old lines, or whether we shall try some new ones? Now, I am for a new line. You may, if you like, give justice equally to all your people throughout the three Kingdoms, or you may act with injustice and contempt as far as regards five millions of people in Ireland. You may rule—your have ruled—for centuries in that country as if the people were for

ever to be a conquered people, or you may rule them as a portion of a great free nation. You may keep and rule Ireland by force. Force is the greatest remedy of the party opposite (oh, oh, coercion, withdrawal). You may if you like rule in Ireland by force—and there is nothing there you cannot do by force. You can put down all insurrection, all rebellion, and defy the efforts of those Irishmen who hate England, whether they are in Ireland or on the American continent; you have the power if you like to sustain and, in fact, if it may be, make more severe your absolute power over the government of the Irish people. I am speaking now of that power of which it was Mr. Dillon, I think, some three or four years ago, spoke in this house. He appeared, he said, to carry on a war; but he would have preferred another method of doing so had it been open to him. That was a candid statement. It is known by every sensible Irishman, and who among us does not know, that what Ireland gets from England is not because it is impossible to withhold it. They know this—England could be more cruel, if possible, than she has been; she has power enough to do anything she likes there; but depend upon it that it is not the wish of the English people (hear, hear). If there was ever a people in this world who had associations with another people and wished that people well it was the people of Great Britain (hear, hear). But, for my part, if ancient lines are to be worked upon and Ireland by no means to be tranquilized and united to this country, I can only wish, repeating a simile I have used before, that the island could be moved from her foundations in the deep and taken some thousand miles westward." (hear, hear)

We cannot, by any means, subscribe to all that Mr. Bright here states. The right hon. gentleman, we fear, greatly exaggerates the kindness of feeling entertained by Englishmen for Ireland. That kindness of feeling exists, we freely admit, amongst many Englishmen, but we have yet to see that the majority of Englishmen are actuated by such a feeling. We are sorry to have to place such a statement on record, but our reading of Irish history forces us to this unhappy conclusion.

Neither do we see much force in Mr. Bright's claim that England could be more cruel, more despotic and more absolute than she is at present. Her present policy is tantamount to one of explicit wholesale banishment of the Irish race from its own land, a policy than which extermination alone could be more cruel.

Mr. Bright effectually disposes of the cry of alarm raised by the extreme Tories:

"I ask the house if there is not another and a better policy; and if England does prefer that better policy, will it not be more satisfactory to the people of this country that we should give full justice, and that they should have full confidence in that justice in regard to the question of representation? We have removed the grievance of an alien church in Ireland, we have given to the Irish cultivator a security he scarcely ever hoped for, a security as good, and I believe about as good, as the freehold which hon. members opposite wish they could induce him to buy. Well, if this is so, if we have done all this, what shall we do in regard to the franchise and the power of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament? The noble lord (Manners) pointed to the hon. member for Cork and spoke of the terrible things that would happen after a general election. I do not believe in these terrible things. The hon. member for Cork is not a fool (laughter). The member for Cork no doubt has wishes—honest, good wishes—differing from mine in some respects in regard to the country of which he is a native, but depend upon it they will not be worse whatever may be the representation of Ireland in this house. If any party in this house endeavored to do the thing the noble lord suspects and fears, depend upon it the English House of Commons, its vast majority of 550 members, representing Great Britain, would find out a way of meeting whatever difficulty may be interposed by any number of men, however ill-disposed, who come here from Ireland. What we desire in this bill, and what I am sure my right hon. friend desires in this bill, especially in regard to Ireland, is—no special sacrifice from England, but by a measure that may win the people from disorder, conspiracy, and rebellion, into a happy union with a free nation, in whose name and by whose authority we are assembled here. Any member is at liberty to say it is absolutely impossible, but I can say your plan is impossible, for it has been tried longer than the lifetime of any living man amongst us. So, therefore, at all risk try it if it is not possible to undo that which our forefathers have done, and see if Ireland will not be as tranquil as Wales or Scotland at this moment."

The right hon. gentleman takes strong ground against the proposed reduction of the number of Irish members in the Imperial Commons. His argument on this point is based on the terms of the Act of Union and deserves particular attention in this discussion. On no point is the right hon. gentleman more forcible than on this question of redistribution:

"But when you come," he says, "to restricting the rights of the Irish people, then I say you are bound—and there is nothing on earth can ever persuade me, unless I see it done, that Parliament, the Liberal party and the representatives of Great Britain, will restrict the rights of the Act of Union gave to the Irish representatives. The population of Ireland, though now reduced, is very near the same, rather more, perhaps, than when the number of members was originally fixed at 100. Some hon. members say the population is diminishing. It has been up to this time, but I am not quite sure it is to go on diminishing. I shall be disappointed in the result of the Land Act if it does not to some extent retain the men in that country and in this land. I

observe with great satisfaction that the hon. member for Cork is now appearing as the chairman of a company which is intended to buy estates and transfer them to tenants from the more thickly-populated parts of Ireland. I also see that he has obtained the support of three or four other members of this house, and what is more that he is acting under an Imperial Act of Parliament, and is obtaining money out of Imperial funds (hear, hear). It looks to me as if hon. members opposite were willing to unite themselves with Englishmen even on this side of the house. If that be so, I want to ask the house whether the statement of the right hon. gentleman, the head of her Majesty's Government, was an injudicious or an unwise statement? I am determined to stand by the Act of Union. Nothing shall persuade me to vote for less than this; but this I declare most solemnly, that I think the house would commit a most grievous injury, a most cruel affront, and a most cruel injustice to Ireland if they tampered with this Act of Parliament, which is called the Act of Union, and upon which the Irish people surely have a right impartially to rely. I have, I think, finished what I have to say, and I will conclude by merely one observation. There are two paths which are open to us—the union by force, and on the old lines, or the union with justice, and, notwithstanding what hon. members opposite may say, I believe within a short period prosperity and peace will come. The one path leads to disloyalty, discontent, conspiracy, anarchy. Our past conduct has led to all these calamities, and the line which I would point out to the house is a different one. I run all the risk of doing justice to Ireland (cheers), and I believe it is only by that and by confidence that you will overcome the disturbed state of feeling that has for some time unhappily existed in Ireland. Sir, this great measure of right which we are now discussing was explained a short time ago, and defended in a speech great as the subject with which you dealt (hear, hear). It has, I am convinced, the approval of the vast majority of our people. I trust and believe the house will give its hearty sanction to it, and that it may prove hereafter to be a new charter of freedom and of union of the three nations in whose name we sit here and for whose welfare we have the honour to labour" (cheers).

Such are the main characteristics of Mr. Bright's speech—a speech which, on the whole, produced a very profound impression on the House and contributed not a little to the enlarging and strengthening of the government majority. We can hardly believe that the House of Lords will in the face of such a majority reject this bill. That chamber is, however, capable of a great deal in the way of stupid obstruction. The Tory leaders having openly espoused the cause of the Orange minority in Ireland, have expressed a determination to kill the measure. If their threat be carried out, we hope to see decisive action on the part of the government, and that action sustained by the voice and support of the English nation to which Mr. Bright attributes such feelings of kindness in regard of Ireland.



### ENCYCLICAL LETTER

OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD

LEO XIII.,

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE

POPE,

TO ALL THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATEs, ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD IN THE GRACE AND COMMUNION OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

When through the envy of the Devil the human race had miserably fallen away from God the Creator, the dispenser of all heavenly gifts, it divided itself into two separate and hostile camps, of which the one was perpetually for truth and virtue, and the other for everything that is antagonistic to truth and virtue. The one is the kingdom of God upon earth—that is, the true Church of Jesus Christ, of which the members, if they would belong to it in sincerity and in a manner availing for salvation, must serve God and His only Son with all their heart and will; the other is the kingdom of Satan, under whose power and dominion are those who, following his sad example, and that of our first parents, refuse to yield obedience to divine and eternal law; they set God aside in many things, and in many ways they actually oppose Him. St. Augustine has described these two kingdoms under the similitude of two States differing in the laws by which they are governed, and in their aims and objects, and has embraced in one pointed sentence the character of each. "Two loves have made two cities. The love of self," he says, "carried to forgetfulness of God, has been the cause of the earthly city, whilst the love of God, carried to forgetfulness of self, has been the cause of the heavenly city." I. All through the ages these cities have fought one with the other with many weapons, and in many forms of strife, though not always with the same fierceness, or the same energy. In our own time the enemies of God, aided and strengthened by the widely spread and firmly knit society of the Masons, seemed to have united to make a supreme effort. No longer concealing their objects, they boldly array themselves against the majesty of God, and openly strive for the ruin of the Church, in the hope that if possible they may rob the Christian peoples of the benefit won for them by our Saviour Jesus Christ.

We, bemoaning these evils, are often driven under the impulse of Our love to cry aloud to God: "For lo, thy enemies have made a noise, and they that hate thee have lifted up their head. They have taken up a malicious council against thy people, and have conspired against thy saints. They have said: Come and let us destroy them, so that they be not a nation." 2. In the presence of such a peril, and in the face of an attack upon Christianity at once so formidable and so persevering, it is Our duty to make the danger known, to point out the enemy, and, as far as possible, to make vain their schemes and plots, so that those whose eternal salvation is committed to Our care shall not perish everlastingly, and the kingdom of Jesus Christ, which it is ours to defend, may not only stand and remain unharmed, but everywhere spread over the earth by new conquests.

Our predecessors, the Roman pontiffs, steadily watchful for the well-being of the Christian people, recognized this deadly enemy for what it was, and what it aimed at, the moment it left the obscurity of a secret conspiracy to step into the light of day. Foreseeing the future, sounding a note of alarm, they put the princes and the people on their guard against the snares and the artifices intended to lead them astray. The first to denounce this danger was Clement XII. in the year 1738, 3 and his Constitution was confirmed and renewed by Benedict XIV. 4 Pius VII. 5 followed in the footsteps of these Pontiffs and Leo XII. 6 in his Apostolic Constitution, "Qua graviora," collecting the acts and decrees on this subject of the Popes who had gone before him, ratified and confirmed them for all time. Pius VIII. 7 Gregory XVI. 8, and on many occasions Pius IX. 9 have spoken in the same sense.

When the nature and the character of the Masonic body had been made apparent by unmistakable signs, by the knowledge of its principles, by the publication of its rules and rites and ceremonies—and to these was often added the testimony of the initiated themselves—the Holy See condemned and publicly proclaimed the Masonic sect as contrary to right and justice, and not less baneful to Christianity than to the State. At the same time, under pain of penalties which the Church is accustomed to reserve for serious offenders, the Holy See forbade any one to join the association. Irritated by this condemnation, and thinking to escape the force of it, or—partly by disregarding it, partly by the use of calumny—to weaken its effect, the members of the sect accused the Popes who had decreed it of having passed a sentence that was unjust or of having exceeded the bounds of equity. In this way they sought to escape the authority and the weight of the Apostolic Constitutions of Clement XII. and Benedict XIV., and in the same way those of Pius VII. and Pius IX. But there were always some even in the ranks of the Masons, who, unwilling witnesses as they were, confessed that the teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church being accepted, the action of her Pontiffs was amply justified. And many princes and chief magistrates have so far agreed with the action of the Popes, that they have made it their business either to denounce the sect to the Holy See itself, or else by their own laws to brand it as noxious, as has been the case in Holland, Austria, Switzerland, Bavaria, Savoy, and other parts of Italy.

But what is of most importance is the fact that the result proved the wisdom of Our predecessors. For their far-seeing and paternal efforts had not always or in all places the desired effect; and that, too, either through the deceit and craft of men who were engaged in that conspiracy, or through the thoughtless carelessness of the rest, whose duty it was specially to attend to their admonitions. Hence, in a century and a half, the sect of Masons had made great strides in public opinion; and by boldness or slyness intruding themselves into all ranks of the commonwealth, already began to be so great that they seemed almost to rule the State. From this rapid and threatening progress there resulted, in fact, those deadly evils against the Church, the authority of rulers, and the public weal, which Our predecessors long before saw. For matters have got to this; that for the future there is cause to fear—not indeed for the Church, whose foundation is far too secure that human power should shake it—but for those States in which the sect of which we are speaking is rife, or others of a similar kind, who lend themselves to it as its co-operators and satellites.

For these reasons, as soon as We received the charge of ruling the Church, We clearly saw that it was Our duty to resist to the utmost so great an evil with the weight of Our authority. And, indeed, as opportunity from time to time offered, We attacked the chief doctrines of the sect in which the greatest moral evil seemed to be found. Thus in an Encyclical Letter, "Quod Apostolici munus," We endeavoured to reute the most monstrous features of the Socialists and Communists; and in another Letter, "Arcanum," We laboured to defend and explain the real genuine idea of domestic society, whose fountain-head is matrimony; and besides the above Letters, in another entitled *intimum*, We set forth the idea of political society according to Christian principles as bound up most admirably with the very nature of things, and with the welfare of both peoples and princes. But now, following the example set by Our predecessors, We have determined to direct Our mind pointedly against the Masonic sect itself, its entire teaching, aims, ways of thinking and acting, in order that its pernicious power may be more and more brought to light, and may thereby avail to stop the spread of so terrible a plague.

Now there are various sects of men which, though in name, rites, form, and origin they differ, yet when in sameness of aim and likeness of first principles they are bound together, really thereby agree with the Masonic sect, which forms for all a common centre, whence all proceed and to which all return. Though they just now seem very much to have cast off the garb of secrecy, and hold their meetings before the eyes of the world, and even have their own daily press, when We look however, into the matter We find that they still retain all