

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 181 and 480 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of St. John's Island."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LUCE, KISSIN, JOHN NICHOL, J. NEEVEY and M. C. O'DONNELL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

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

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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.

Articles must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, April 2, 1892.

"LIBERTY OR TYRANNY."

Some Ontario papers of all shades of politics are just now engaged in an endeavor to induce the Catholics of the Dominion to look on as contented and apathetic spectators while Mr. Dalton McCarthy is making his periodical attack on Separate schools, and the use of the French language in the North-West; a bill to abolish them being now before the House of Commons, introduced, of course, by the usual parent of all bills of the same import.

A recent article in the Globe explains that Mr. McCarthy's crusade conducted on these lines has been "marked by racial narrowness and religious animosities," and "his speeches have been marred by the venom of inherited prejudice," so that "he has consolidated the French into an inflexible unit against his personality rather than his cause, and under his hand the smoldering fires of ancient strifes have broken out afresh."

We are told that the North-West is an English and not a French Province. "The English, and not the French millions will people that vast land and determine the character of its laws and institutions;" and therefore "there is no need for French as an official language there," and "it would be a mistake to extend the Separate school system into these new Provinces."

We are expected to adopt these views, and in consideration of the marked change in the tone of Mr. McCarthy's speeches to contribute towards the development of a national sentiment by giving the settlers of the North-West the power to deal with the questions of dual language and education as they see fit.

The Mail, which, with or without Mr. McCarthy's collusion, has constituted itself the organ of that gentleman and his party, explains that "in Quebec and Ontario the French-Canadians and Roman Catholics generally have labored to secure and protect what, although termed their rights, are better described as their far-reaching privileges. Upper Canada," that journal continues, "prior to the Union, never would consent to the Separate School system. It was under the Legislative Union and through the votes of the French members, that the existing plan of education was engrafted upon our laws. While Confederation was contemplated, the occasion was seized in order to transform the statutory interests under which the separate schools were established into a constitutional provision. This acute movement succeeded, and now Ontario is bound as no Province ought to be bound."

Under the capacious heading of "Liberty or Tyranny" the Mail appeals to the Canadian public to follow Mr. McCarthy's lead in endeavoring to wipe out of our statute books the provisions which secure to North-Western and Manitoba minorities the rights, or privileges as the Mail prefers to call them, which were conferred on all denominations, when powers of self-government were given to the people by Dominion legislation. We are told further that the people of Manitoba and the North-West will not tolerate the restrictions which have been placed upon them, and that "it is highly dangerous to continue the system of today."

The question is, indeed, as represented by the Mail, one of "Liberty or Tyranny." But it has been the custom of that journal and the party which it represents to misapply these and other words of similar import, and it is scarcely necessary to say that it designates by the name Liberty the right of a Protestant majority to force upon a Catholic minority a system of education which the latter cannot conscientiously accept.

A majority is not always in the right; yet under a democratic form of government, such as we enjoy in Canada, it is quite true that the majority necessarily rules. We are not, however, an absolutely self-governing community, and though the Dominion of Canada has large powers of self-government, we are restricted in some matters by the supreme authority of the British Imperial Parliament. To this condition of affairs Canada must submit, as long as we remain subject to Great Britain, and we submit will-

ingly, and we shall continue to do so as long as we shall be satisfied to remain a colony.

But even if we formed an independent State the majority would have no right to impose upon us a system of education which does violence to parental rights and conscientious convictions any more than it would have the right to force conformity with a system of religion in which we do not believe. The attempt to do this is tyranny, not liberty, as the Mail represents.

The Provinces and the North-West Territory are in a position toward the Dominion somewhat similar to that of the Dominion toward Great Britain, and the existence of the Dominion depends upon the continuance of this state of affairs. It is a folly to tell us, therefore, that Manitoba and the North-West will not tolerate the supremacy of the Dominion Parliament in matters which are essential to the preservation of an equilibrium of interests of the people of the Dominion.

The education of the children is such a matter. The demands of Catholics for liberty to teach their children as conscience demands they should be taught is a reasonable one. It is a demand for liberty, and it is a tyranny for any majority to tell us that we shall not be allowed to do so.

We may be told, and we are told, that this is a matter which ought to be left to the generosity of the local majority to settle, and that the local majorities in Manitoba and the North-West will do what is fair. But unfortunately for this view of the case, we have before us the example of the Manitoba Legislature to prove that this is asking the sheep to entrust itself to the tender mercy of the wolf. The Manitoba government is at this moment maintaining before the Privy Council of Great Britain its right practically to close the Catholic schools of that Province, in spite of Dominion law, and of the agreement made between the Dominion and the old settlers of the Province, before it was thrown open to the new settlers, who thus wish to inflict a gross injustice on those who were there before them.

But the Catholics are not the only portion of the people upon whom it is sought to inflict this injustice. The Church of England is equally a victim to the tyrannical action of the Manitoba Legislature, and in maintaining the rights of Catholic parents to freedom of education we are equally maintaining the rights of Protestants.

It is a habit with the opponents of our Separate schools to ignore the fact that Protestants are as much interested in their preservation as are Catholics. There is a purpose in thus representing the case. It is to rouse Protestants to sweep away the Catholic schools, under the impression that they will thus inflict a greater injury upon Catholics by so doing than upon their own co-religionists. But there are Protestant Separate schools even in Ontario, and in Quebec there are more than three times as many Protestant Separate schools as there are Catholic ones in Ontario; and the Protestants are just as desirous of retaining Separate schools where they exist as Catholics are.

The position of the Catholics is, therefore, to protect Catholic and Protestant rights equally against the insidious designs of promoters of Atheism who would be glad to see religious teaching entirely driven out of the schools. It is certainly the duty of the Dominion Parliament to prevent this intended attack upon religious education from being successful, and we hope to see Mr. McCarthy's motion voted down by a majority so substantial as to show that the rights of minorities are not to be sacrificed.

Mr. McCarthy's motion aims also at giving the people of the North-West the right to determine whether or not the laws shall be published, and the proceedings of the courts conducted in French and English, or in one language only. In itself, there would not be any wrong principle involved in giving to the people such a power, but it is a wrong that the new settlers should be allowed to violate an agreement which was made an express condition of their being allowed to settle in the country at all, and the Dominion Parliament should see to it that the agreement be carried out to the letter. But even independently of this agreement, the French-Canadians very properly resent any attack made upon their language as an attack upon their liberties, which were guaranteed to them as a condition of the cession of the country from France to England.

These are some of the reasons on account of which Mr. McCarthy's motion is an injustice, and it is evident that it is based upon the principle that promises are to be made to French-Canadians only to be broken.

THE HIERARCHY IN ENGLAND.

It is currently reported in England that it is the intention of the Holy Father to divide England into two ecclesiastical provinces, so that the important matters which arise in connection with the administration of the Church may be more efficiently attended to. Monsignore Stonor is now in England, having been sent thither on a mission by the Pope, and the rumor is that he is charged to ascertain from the Queen whether she would have any objection that the new Primates should be designated as Archbishops of York and Canterbury.

These were the titles held by the two Primates of England in Catholic times, but when Protestantism was

established the intruded Archbishops kept these titles, and their suffragans also retained the titles of the persecuted Catholic Bishops who were deprived of their Sees in the reign of Elizabeth.

The Pope's decree, of course, would be sufficient to entitle the new Primates to their Sees, and no Royal exequatur is necessary to make such a decree valid, but Pope Leo XIII. is of a most conciliatory disposition, and he desires, if possible, not to do anything which will bring the Church into conflict with the ruling powers, even in matters where their interference would be an unauthorized piece of impertinence.

It does not concern the Queen how the Pope may administer the affairs of the Church; nevertheless it will be remembered by many who are still living, that a great uproar was created among the fanatics of England when Pope Pius IX. re-instituted the English hierarchy, with Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster and Primate of England. This act of the Pope set forth in a strong light the absurdity of the oath taken by all Anglican Bishops and clergymen, and by those laymen who are appointed to high civil offices that "no foreign prince, potentate, or prelate, hath, or ought to have any jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal within this realm." This oath would deny spiritual jurisdiction to the Apostles themselves, if they were on earth; and as it is based on the theory that every nation should have an independent Church of its own, it implies that Christ Himself exceeded His powers when He commissioned His Apostles to teach all nations the gospel as He had revealed it to them.

The Pope's authority, which is purely spiritual, cannot be restricted by any earthly government, and the oath of the Royal Supremacy is but a waste of words, and worse, for it amounts to a blasphemy.

The opposition to the establishment of the hierarchy was exhibited by many popular demonstrations, at which the effigies of the Bishops were burned; and even those of the Blessed Virgin and our Lord on the cross were dragged through the mire. A law was also passed, called "the Ecclesiastical Titles Act," by which it was forbidden under severe penalties of fine and imprisonment, to any one to assume a title expressing ecclesiastical jurisdiction, except under the authority of the civil law.

This act was ignored by the Bishops, and no attempt was made to enforce it, so that it was but a dead letter, a sword in its scabbard. Parliament since repealed the Act, as all parties were ashamed of it; and so great is the change which has occurred in public sentiment that no one was more honored in England by all classes than His Eminence Cardinal Manning.

We cannot say positively whether the current rumors regarding the proposed creation of two provinces be correct or not, but if it be the case that Leo XIII. intends to make such a change, we can readily understand that to avoid possible trouble he should enquire whether there would be any opposition to the erection of Catholic ecclesiastical provinces under their ancient titles. There would probably be some outbreak of fanaticism if this were done, but such outbreaks must be braved, as the necessities of the Church demand that its operations be extended.

THE HOME RULE MOVEMENT IN SCOTLAND AND IRELAND.

It is acknowledged that the American revolution, which took place a little more than a century ago, and which established the United States as an independent Republic, arose out of the refusal of the British Government then in power to grant any measure of Home Rule to the American colonies. The lesson taught to Great Britain was that even a distant colony cannot endure to be kept in leading strings; especially when it grows to have important special interests of its own.

It was this conviction which led to the granting of special constitutional government to Canada and the Australian provinces, and no one today doubts that if these Provinces are loyal to the British throne it is because self-government has been conceded to them all to the fullest extent. They would be at the present time as dissatisfied as were the American colonies a century ago if they were governed from Westminster; and it is not necessary to look far for the reason of this. Many years since Lord Salisbury himself laid down the principle that no legislature can perform its duties properly if it has to legislate for important communities whose interests

and requirements differ greatly from those of the people who have a decisive majority in the legislative body.

Such being Lord Salisbury's conviction, when he was in a position to state his views honestly and independently, it might reasonably have been expected that he would be now one of the most resolute advocates of Home Rule for Ireland; and we may infer that he would be such if he were honestly to declare his conviction; but this he prevented from doing through the exigencies of political partisanship. He is upheld by the Irish landlords; only on condition that he will place their interests before those of the people of Ireland in general, and it is at the price of principle that he secures their support.

There is a limit to the possibility of any one man mastering the details of legislation necessary for the good government of many nationalities of different interests, and it is no disparagement to Englishmen and Scotchmen to say that a Parliament in which they predominate cannot be expected to understand and legislate for the needs of Ireland. Hence it has happened that the British Parliament never could be brought to consider what Ireland requires to make her people prosperous. They had enough to do to consider the wants of their own people, and their dislike for the people of Ireland made them all the less ready to take into consideration at all any legislation which Irish members who were truly representative of the people of Ireland demanded at any time. Hence it was enough that any one who was truly a representative of the Irish people should introduce a measure into Parliament which would ameliorate the condition of the people, to have it voted down without any attention being paid to it.

This did not happen in the case of Scotland, for if measures were asked on behalf of Scotland they were for the most part practically left for the Scotch members to agree upon among themselves, and if they were acceptable to the Scotch majority they were passed without question. An Irish measure, on the contrary, could expect no favor, unless it emanated from the dominant minority, which always took care that the measures they asked for should be such as would enable them to grind the majority of the people by new acts of spoliation and oppression.

But even with the present state of affairs, it appears that the Scotch are not satisfied. A cable despatch states that the Liberal members of Parliament from Scotland have agreed upon the introduction of a bill for the creation of a Scotch Legislative body "to make laws and alter and repeal any law in Scotland, except those which relate to matters of Imperial administration, including the army and navy, postal and telegraph services, treaties of peace and war, customs and excise duties, matters of trade, navigation, coinage, copyright, patent rights, and succession to the crown or regency, and also the establishment and endowment of any religion, and the conferring of any privilege on account of religious belief, as well as the prohibition of any religion, or the free exercise thereof, or the imposing of any disability in consequence of religious belief."

The proposed new Legislature shall not have power to abrogate or derogate from any right to establish and maintain any denominational institution of education or charity, nor to effect prejudicially the right of any child to attend a school receiving public money, without attending the religious instruction of the school.

Bills passed by this Legislature are to be assented to by the Queen in the same manner as the Bills now passed by the Imperial Parliament, but they will not require the sanction of the Imperial Parliament nor of the House of Lords, nor of the Imperial Government; but should the question at any time arise whether any matter legislated on by it be within its powers, the judicial committee of the Privy Council shall adjudicate on the subject in dispute, and if it be decided that it is outside the local jurisdiction of the Scotch Parliament, the Queen's assent shall be withheld.

Many Conservatives as well as Liberals in England have promised to support this measure, and it is within the range of possibility that it will become law, even under the present Parliament, which is so averse to granting self-government to Ireland.

Scotchmen find that with all the good will which is manifested for them by the British Parliament, as at present constituted, Scotch affairs cannot be properly attended to except by Scotch legislators, who will have nothing else to do than to devote themselves to the consideration of what Scotland needs. Home Rule for Ireland is still more necessary, because Ireland is a more populous country, because it has been more neglected than Scotland in having suitable legislation, and because the character of the legislation required for it differs from that which for England more than does that which Scotland requires. Surely if Scotland has reason to be dissatisfied with the neglect of its interests manifested by a Parliament sitting at Westminster, Ireland has much greater cause for dissatisfaction; yet it would seem that even the present Tory Government is disposed to listen to the representations of the Scotch members, while they will give no heed to the demands of Irish members of Parliament, when the question of granting justice to Ire-

land is brought forward. The Irish Nationalists will undoubtedly assist the Scotch Liberals in obtaining Home Rule; but it does not appear that Home Rule will be granted to Ireland until a change of Government be brought about through a general election. The measure brought forward by Mr. Balfour under the name of a bill for Local Irish self-government falls far short of what Ireland requires; and it is certain that if it were to become law to-morrow it would not better the condition of Ireland in any respect. Ireland needs Home Rule as a reality, and no sham such as Mr. Balfour offers will satisfy the demand. Its failure is so complete that even the London Daily Telegraph, a Tory organ, thus disposes of its claims to be a measure which ought to satisfy Ireland:

"Those who would fain have supported the bill found nothing to say in its defence. We are bound to admit that the bill is, in no sense, a fulfilment of Government pledges. The safeguarding clauses are all open to more or less objection, and one at least is provocative of positive ridicule. The Government cannot deny that they have offered Ireland something signally inferior to that given the rest of the kingdom. If she deserves nothing better they were wrong in introducing the bill and they cannot escape the obvious dilemma in which they have placed themselves. It is now for the Government to consider whether or not it is better to drop than to try to amend it."

Surely it were better to drop it entirely. It is too hopelessly bad to be amended by botching, and nothing better than just such a bill could be expected from the Tory side of the House, which, through Lord Salisbury, has avowed its belief that Catholic Irishmen cannot be trusted to govern themselves. Irish Catholics need not look to such a Government for relief, but they have this consolation, that the handwriting is on the wall which foretells the early dissolution of the fossil Government.

A GOVERNMENTAL IMPOSSIBILITY.

Among the reasons given by some of our contemporaries why Mr. Dalton McCarthy's motion in Parliament having in view the abolition of French as an official language in the North-West and the shutting up of all Separate schools should be allowed to pass without opposition, we are told that he was not so violent in his speech in introducing the measure on the present occasion as he was two years ago when he introduced a similar bill.

We do not deny that he was somewhat less uncouth on the present occasion. He even tells us now that he does "not complain, nor does he know that anybody complained that the members of the Assembly should speak in both languages, or either language, or any language;" and, further, that "in the early days of the French Province, now the Province of Quebec, a claim was made (I do not think it was an unreasonable one) by the gentlemen elected to the Legislative Council to speak in their own tongue. Of course it would be impossible for them to speak in any other."

We cannot forget that Mr. McCarthy declared before that the use of French must be suppressed in the North-West, independently of the will of the people, because the French-Canadians are a conquered race, and must be treated accordingly, and that if ballots will not bring about this consummation bullets must be resorted to.

His words are not now so needlessly violent, but the spirit of hostility towards French-Canadians which he before openly avowed is merely concealed in his present motion under a form of sweet words. The pill is gilded, but it is as bitter as ever. We all know its meaning, and though the Protestants in Parliament by far outnumber the Catholics, we have every confidence that the spirit of fair-play which animates them will prevent them from perpetrating the domineering act of injustice which is contemplated in Mr. McCarthy's bill.

Mr. McCarthy himself may think that by an exhibition of bigotry he will make his seat secure in North Simcoe for many years to come. Even if this were the case he would only succeed at most in making himself the leader of a contemptible faction in the House of Commons. It is still more likely that he will find himself there as isolated as his prototype Whalley was in the British Parliament. Others have made themselves "governmental impossibilities" in the Canadian House of Commons, before Mr. McCarthy, by following a course very similar to that which he has chosen to pursue. But we have confidence, from our knowledge of his constituency, that even though he has managed to hoodwink the electors twice by appealing to their fanaticism, such an appeal will not be permanently successful. Sooner or later the electors of North Simcoe must discover that Canada is not to be ruled by a clique of bigots, and when they make this discovery,

which we believe will be soon, Mr. McCarthy will be thrown aside as a piece of useless lumber.

The bigots of Mr. McCarthy's stamp seem to be of opinion that Catholics are in Canada on tolerance. They need to be taught that we are here with all the rights of British subjects, and that we will not hesitate to maintain our equality and exercise our influence in the councils of the country, without fear of Mr. McCarthy or his faction; and the result will be, not the driving of Catholics out of Canada, but the political demise of Mr. McCarthy and his followers.

THE NATURAL CONSEQUENCE.

Much has been said of the facilities for divorce which are offered in many of the United States and of the great social evils which follow therefrom and threaten the ruin of society. These evils arise, of course, from the laxity with which the marriage tie must be regarded when marriage ceases to be held as a sacred bond which cannot be dissolved, and they are the inevitable consequence of the Protestant view of marriage whereby it is treated merely as a civil contract.

The case of the wife-murdering Williams, who has been arrested in Melbourne, Australia, shows the existence of a danger of another kind which is equally the result of Protestant practice in regard to marriage. This danger comes from the facility with which marriages may be contracted. A magistrate is always to be found who will very readily unite as husband and wife any man and woman who apply to him; or if he be a person who is to read the marriage service, he regards himself as a civil official for this purpose, and not as the dispenser of a sacred rite. He has no special reason for making particular enquiries into the antecedents of such applicants for marriage as present themselves before him, and any person unknown, however bad his character, will be married without difficulty.

Williams' chief occupation in life seems to have been to contract marriage with unsuspecting girls, that he might afterwards murder, or at least desert them.

On the 9th of last August, a gardener at Liverpool, England, saw the woman who was then supposed to be Williams' wife, and next day heard the screaming of children. He paid no attention to the occurrence, as he supposed that some of the children had been hurt; but he observed that he never saw either the woman or the children afterwards, and it was not till Williams was arrested at Melbourne, Australia, for the murder of a young woman, Miss Mather, whom he had married there, that the bodies of his former wife and four children, ranging from one to twelve years of age, were found in his house at Liverpool, where Williams was known by the name Denig.

It has been discovered that while his wife who was murdered at Liverpool was living, this villain was arrested at Hull and convicted of forgery, for which crime he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment.

On his discharge he married a young woman at Hull, whom he afterwards deserted, returning to his real wife. Under the assumed name, Harry Lawson, he married a Miss Matheson at Beverley in 1890, whom he also deserted, and it has been discovered that he had also married a young woman at Birkenhead previously to his imprisonment at Hull. It is believed that other murders besides those which have been already traced to Williams were perpetrated by him, and it is now thought that he is the unknown Jack the Ripper whose many atrocious crimes in Whitechapel District of London created so much consternation and horror. It is said that the description given of the man who was several times seen in company with the unfortunate Whitechapel victims, tallies perfectly with the appearance of Williams, as the people of Liverpool knew him.

It is certain, from what we have stated, that Williams has killed two and deserted three wives within an incredibly short period; and the clergyman or magistrates who so easily marry unknown persons are surely very culpable for their careless methods of procedure. These numerous villainies would not have been possible if marriages were not contracted only under the conditions instituted by the Catholic Church for the purpose of preventing just such enormities.

Williams' crimes are not a whit worse than those of Henry the Eighth, to which they bear a striking resemblance, and it is no wonder that they should be one of the results of a system which King Henry established for the express purpose of giving him free scope to indulge his evil passions.

WAR CLOUDS.

The Behring Sea dispute between Great Britain and the United States, which has been going on for years, has, within the last few months, assumed a very threatening aspect, which may possibly result in a war.

The Government of the United States, in order to protect its claims to the right to seize in the open sea during the summer months the seal fisheries, has sent a fleet of British vessels equipped with the latest machinery, and work are from Canada.

The point in dispute considered by arbitration of the two Governments, is a narrow strait, known as the Behring Sea, which deep sea fishing vessels from both Governments frequent. Lord Salisbury refuses to allow the United States to fish in the Behring Sea, which he holds as a sacred bond which cannot be dissolved, and they are the inevitable consequence of the Protestant view of marriage whereby it is treated merely as a civil contract.

The case of the wife-murdering Williams, who has been arrested in Melbourne, Australia, shows the existence of a danger of another kind which is equally the result of Protestant practice in regard to marriage. This danger comes from the facility with which marriages may be contracted. A magistrate is always to be found who will very readily unite as husband and wife any man and woman who apply to him; or if he be a person who is to read the marriage service, he regards himself as a civil official for this purpose, and not as the dispenser of a sacred rite. He has no special reason for making particular enquiries into the antecedents of such applicants for marriage as present themselves before him, and any person unknown, however bad his character, will be married without difficulty.

Williams' chief occupation in life seems to have been to contract marriage with unsuspecting girls, that he might afterwards murder, or at least desert them.

On the 9th of last August, a gardener at Liverpool, England, saw the woman who was then supposed to be Williams' wife, and next day heard the screaming of children. He paid no attention to the occurrence, as he supposed that some of the children had been hurt; but he observed that he never saw either the woman or the children afterwards, and it was not till Williams was arrested at Melbourne, Australia, for the murder of a young woman, Miss Mather, whom he had married there, that the bodies of his former wife and four children, ranging from one to twelve years of age, were found in his house at Liverpool, where Williams was known by the name Denig.

It has been discovered that while his wife who was murdered at Liverpool was living, this villain was arrested at Hull and convicted of forgery, for which crime he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment.

On his discharge he married a young woman at Hull, whom he afterwards deserted, returning to his real wife. Under the assumed name, Harry Lawson, he married a Miss Matheson at Beverley in 1890, whom he also deserted, and it has been discovered that he had also married a young woman at Birkenhead previously to his imprisonment at Hull. It is believed that other murders besides those which have been already traced to Williams were perpetrated by him, and it is now thought that he is the unknown Jack the Ripper whose many atrocious crimes in Whitechapel District of London created so much consternation and horror. It is said that the description given of the man who was several times seen in company with the unfortunate Whitechapel victims, tallies perfectly with the appearance of Williams, as the people of Liverpool knew him.

It is certain, from what we have stated, that Williams has killed two and deserted three wives within an incredibly short period; and the clergyman or magistrates who so easily marry unknown persons are surely very culpable for their careless methods of procedure. These numerous villainies would not have been possible if marriages were not contracted only under the conditions instituted by the Catholic Church for the purpose of preventing just such enormities.

Williams' crimes are not a whit worse than those of Henry the Eighth, to which they bear a striking resemblance, and it is no wonder that they should be one of the results of a system which King Henry established for the express purpose of giving him free scope to indulge his evil passions.

A BOOMERANG.

As an engine of our Popery cry in politics, it is as much damaged as much employed in the United States who bring it into vogue. There is a Captain Prentiss living at Pennsylvania, who, besides receiving \$2,500 a year as an army pension, received \$1,000 out of the Government under the policy under General Grant's occupation of the schools of the States were conducted on the tizing the Catholic in attendance at their school was distinctive school; and though in the United States (Catholic) fairly with all religious none an advantage was the boast of Capt had Protestantized Indian children who the sphere of his in Superintendent.