

absurd! It is a mere sham and subterfuge, a substitution of the hierarchy's will for the people's conscience; and even this is only regarded by the sympathetic conscience of the Government when the suffering consciences of ten or more householders are brought to bear upon it! Where there are but five, more or less, households of them, the poor consciences, although of the same material as the others, must, martyr-like suffer on under the anti-religious and heretical impositions of the public schools! But to show such partiality in favor of some Catholic families to the exclusion of others, must be a great grief to the tender consciences of those still unprovided for, and a "grievance" requiring another "remedy" that even Mr. Tupper and company, I presume, will scarcely be equal to. To equalize the thing, however, I would suggest the all-round remedy referred to by Mr. Laurier in his last "great speech" before the House, as reported in the Globe from which we quote. Speaking of the remedy for this "grievance" of one and all of the minority in Manitoba alike, he said: "The remedy of the minority under a free government is to agitate and endeavor to bring over the majority to their way of thinking." This would leave the whole question to be settled by the provincial majority. He further said: "It must be accepted as a truism that under popular government the majority must rule." It is to be hoped that Mr. Laurier's future course may be consistent with these utterances; and if so there will be no "remedial bill" forced upon an unwilling "majority" with his consent. We shall await developments and see. I have my doubts about him—he is a Catholic. And what Catholics are taught to be, whether they attain to such perfection of morals or not, may be gathered from the following: "Are vassals and servants, and others freed from any private obligation due to a heretic, and from keeping faith with him? *Answer*—Yes. All are so by the clear disposal of the law,"—Decret. tit. 7, de Her, vi. p. 205. "Faith given to heretics is not to be kept." Simanca, a Spanish doctor, De Cath. Inst. "These things being established," says the distinguished Roman authority, St. Ignori, "it is a common and certain opinion among all divines, that it is lawful to use equivocation in common conversation, and to confirm it with an oath." Mor. Theo. ii, 118. "If a confessor is asked the truth known to him by confession, he ought to answer that he does not know it, and, if necessary, confirm the same by an oath." Den's Theol., De Pecc. "May a person who turns bankrupt, with a good conscience, keep back as much of his personal estate as may be necessary to maintain his family in a respectable way—ne indecore vivat? I hold, with Lessius, that he may, even though he may have acquired his wealth unjustly, and by notorious crimes; only in such a case he is not at liberty to retain so large an amount as he otherwise might."—Escobar, in his Moral Theology. I don't wonder much that this "moral theology," with the priests at its back, captured such a man as the notorious Holmes! Such morality must have been rare bait for him, and no wonder that he was so easily hooked by it. His past morals, moreover, had been so correspondent with this Romish teaching, that he must have been a rare prize to those who captured him!—Wonder how much he paid for "absolution" for his "unjustly acquired" but innocently retained "wealth?" Wonder also why the U. S. judicial authorities would allow such a man to dispose of "his"