

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum, United States & Europe—\$2.00

THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher

Advertisement for teaching, students wanted, etc.

When subscribers ask for their mail at the post office...

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Thomas Coffey

My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have read a reader of your paper...

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper...

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Thomas Coffey

turning over his omnipotence to a conquering army. Hence any party that champions compulsion and majority right will never find favor with the Church...

You say with evident satisfaction "but we do not consider ourselves unbound."

You say "our reason for maintaining that Local Option is a perfectly free question remains unanswered."

You do not deny that Local Option is prohibition. In fact you assert it, and you state "it is only an extension of the liquor law."

You seem to think that hotels improperly kept in that cater to no need properly dealt with unless by Local Option.

How did Toronto get rid of its forty undesirable hotels? It was not by Local Option. You must have heard of a by-law that, being submitted and passed by a municipality, can reduce the number of licenses.

Lastly, you say the license law is made up of prohibition. Prohibition on Sunday, prohibition between certain hours of the night. This is mere word play. I can hardly believe that you could confound restriction and regulation with prohibition, for they are poles apart.

I now retire from the discussion of this very live topic in the hope that some one abler and with more time at his disposal may say the last word on it.

It is a pleasure to us in this concluding article to find ourselves so much in accord with our revered critic. We are entirely agreed in matters of principle, not quite, but nearly so, on matters of fact, but there remains a diversity of opinion as to the application of some of the principles, and we fall to see some facts quite in the same light.

We meant the words quoted by Father Cline in opening his letter in their plain, obvious and natural sense. But Father Cline goes on to say: "You end your theological treatment of the subject thus: So much for what may be called the theological phase of the subject."

And then we went on, prescinding altogether from moral or theological considerations, to answer Father Voisin's question about our experience with Local Option in Ontario. But Father Cline would persist in mixing up theological and moral considerations with this part of the article, reminding us of instance, that experience was no test of morality, and that our theological standards were those of the Ecumenical Conference. That is why our friend wasted so much ammunition on positions which we never held.

It appears we are entirely agreed as to the undesirability of country hotels; now this is the whole distance we went in endorsing Local Option. The law is there. It is national, constitutional and moral. We should advise those who think "these hotels have no right to live" to take advantage of it. We did not say it was the only means; they might be abolished by the use of dynamite, but we prefer the legal method endorsed by Catholic practice, never condemned by Catholic authority and opposed to no principle of Catholic theology; unless, indeed, the authority of the free lances

of theology armed with the negative argument "Local Option has not been approved."

Happily, we are also in agreement as to Prohibition. Prohibition in the usual application of the word means the absolute suppression of alcoholic drinks, the prevention of their manufacture and sale except for medicinal purposes.

This is something that differs toto caelo from Local Option, which, though it may properly be called prohibition, cannot, with either truth or propriety, be called Prohibition in the ordinary acceptation of that term as defined above.

Here is where Father Cline differs from us, and, not keeping in mind the different senses of which the word is susceptible, accuses us of playing upon words. Local Option we conceded was prohibition, but of the self-same kind that necessarily makes up the very principle of the License Law which regulates the liquor traffic.

But as to Prohibition in the sense defined both by Father Cline and the RECORD, and which, for the sake of convenience, we shall call Total Prohibition, we are in absolute agreement. We are opposed to it for all the reasons put forth by Father Cline and for others as cogent. We are opposed to whether applied to Dominion or Province.

We differ, however, both as to the underlying principle of Local Option and as to its ultimate effect. We have not the remotest fear in the world that it will lead to total prohibition, the obscure Prohibition sheet quoted by Father Cline to the contrary notwithstanding; at any rate, it does not do our thinking for us.

This fear expressed sometimes by those for whom our friend is spokesman reminds us of the old story of the old maid who was found sobbing bitterly on the sea-shore. On being asked the cause of her trouble she replied: "I was thinking that if I got married and had a son and he should grow up and go to sea and get drowned—" here her emotions overcame her again. We believe that the chances were against the old maid getting married, or if married having a son, or having a son that he would grow up, go to sea and get drowned.

We consider the fears that Local Option will lead to total prohibition are still more groundless. At all events we shall cross that bridge when we come to it. We confess that we are not able to follow our critic, when he starts out with Edmond Burke, winds up with the Ruthenian married clergy, and concludes triumphantly that if we reason consistently we must be unsound on clerical celibacy or the celibate state, as compared with marriage. However, we hasten to assure him that we hold to the orthodox belief and practice with regard to celibacy.

A great deal of Father Cline's arguments, and good forceful arguments they are, is based on the assumption that Local Option means compulsory total abstinence. This is a complete misconception; any prohibition cranks who believe this are amongst those from whom we dissociated ourselves at the outset. The majority of staunch local optionists are moderate drinkers, and make no apology for it.

In the township referred to in the first article, Local Option some years ago just failed to carry. Licenses were granted the next year as usual. That was the time when our friends in Toronto seemed a bit afraid of their own three-fifths clause, and for the next two years the licenses were refused. Then came another vote on the by-law, when it was carried with an overwhelming majority. Two years' experience without bar-rooms converted two hundred voters who had previously voted against Local Option. Experience does not always follow the lines of prejudice, sometimes it overcomes prejudice. Recently we came across something in our reading which struck us as serving to point a moral or adorn a tale.

A. M. Sullivan, in New Ireland, has an appreciative and discriminating sketch of the great Father Theobald Mathew the "Apostle of Temperance." Apart altogether from his bearing on Local Option the chapter is well worth reading, as indeed is the whole book, though a newer Ireland has arisen since it was written.

"I have said that the astonishing success of the temperance movement from 1838 to 1845 was largely the product of enthusiasm, and was certain to be followed by a reaction. Even if no unusual misfortune had befallen, some such retrocession would, in an affluent, have been suffered, but nothing that would have seriously impaired the reformation which Father Mathew had wrought.

"The circumstances under which the drink curse arose anew amongst the Irish people are painfully reproachful to our law-makers and administrators. There were scores, probably hundreds, of districts in Ireland from which drink-

shops had long totally disappeared; and had there been at this 'free soil' area, three-fourths of Father Mathew's work would have endured to the present hour. But what happened within my own experience and observation was this. When the Government relief works were set on foot all over the kingdom, close by every pay-office or depot there started into operation a meal store and a whiskey-shop; nay, lodged in the latter and made its headquarters." Only too well the wretched people knew what the freewater would do for them; it would bring them oblivion or excitement, in which the horror and despair around them would be forgotten for a while. In many a tale of shipwreck we read with wonder that at the last dread moment the crew braced the aprit casks and drank till delirium came. In Ireland the starving people seemed possessed by some similar infatuation when once more the fatal lure was set up before them.

In the track of the Government relief ships, and especially "licensees" by law, the drink-shops reappeared, and, to a large extent, reconquered what they had lost. Not wholly, however. There are thousands of men in Ireland to-day, who "took the pledge from Father Mathew," and hold by it still. There are cities and towns in which the flag has never been hauled down, and where his adherents are now as numerous as ever. To the movement of Father Mathew is owing, moreover, that public opinion in favor of temperance legislation, which Ireland has so notably and so steadily exhibited. The pure-souled and great-hearted Capuchin has not lived and labored in vain.

The italics in the above passage are ours. Thank God there is just such a statutory provision in the License Law of Ontario, in the clause giving to municipalities the right and privilege of ridding themselves of the drink shops when the sentiment of the people is overwhelmingly against their continuance. Indirect benefits, similar to those Mr. Sullivan indicates as resulting from the Father Mathew movement in Ireland, also follow the Local Option agitation in this province, as we pointed out in our first article.

In conclusion, we again thank Father Cline for opening up the discussion on our article. We should be very sorry to commit the CATHOLIC RECORD to one view of a controverted question, still we could not think of avoiding difficulty by maintaining a silence that would be cowardly. For this reason we gave Father Cline's able presentation of the other side of the question equal prominence with our editorial remarks, and now we feel that we have been absolutely impartial.

With regard to our remark about being unbound, the little figure of speech in which it was used, we are sure our friendly critic when he dons his war paint will see is susceptible of a very good-natured reading. We certainly did not imagine we were "on trial" and perhaps did not show sufficient deference to our judge. We should rather consider ourselves and Father Cline as two opposing advocates before a remarkably intelligent jury—the readers of the CATHOLIC RECORD. With them lies the verdict.

TREASON-FELONY

Many a time, up to less than a generation ago, noted characters in Irish history, including Daniel O'Connell himself, were sent to prison because they were engaged in a peaceful agitation for the restoration of Ireland's parliament. Words uttered which were not in any degree treasonable were deemed to be so by the authorities and speedy trial and confinement in Kilmainham goal was the result. Now-a-days, however, the law officers of the English Crown do not seem to be quite so active in the matter of smelting treason, otherwise Sir Edward Carson, K. C., member for Dublin University and Solicitor General for Ireland in the last Unionist government, would not be sitting in a cell in prison. It is another case of people becoming wrothy and indignant at the prospect of being compelled to deliver up special advantages accorded them in the old days for being distinctly un-English and pro-English. Sir Edward Carson and his co-laborers in the Unionist cause in Ireland are loyalists so long as it pays, but when it ceases to be profitable they will talk treason and threaten to do all sorts of things. When the time comes for action they will not be able to make a respectable cabbage garden escapade. Sir Edward has declared that "Ulster, for which he speaks, would under no circumstances accept Home Rule even if passed by the House of Commons, and intimated that if necessary he would lead an armed rebellion against it." These are valiant words, Sir Edward. So the Unionists, if they cannot have their own way, will become rebels and Sir Edward and his brother Orangemen will be prepared to fight against what he terms "the crime of the age." It is a curious spectacle. "The rebels of other days have become loyal to the British Crown and are prepared to shed their blood for its maintenance, and the loyalists from the teeth outwards would trample upon the Union Jack itself rather than see their fellow-countrymen happy and prosperous as in other parts of the United Kingdom and its colonies. Sir Edward Carson tells us that under present conditions Ireland is prospering

and we should "leave her alone." He attributes this to the Land Purchase Act which he and his party opposed tooth and nail. No doubt Ireland is prospering to some extent by the operation of the Land Act, but Home Rule is needed to bring that full measure of prosperity to Ireland which she deserves. Fifty years ago Ireland had 8,000,000 of people; to-day she has half that number. This is the condition of things brought about by Sir Edward Carson and his followers who formed the foreign garrison in Ireland. Ireland will not be "let alone." She must have her full measure of justice. The prospect of an uprising is really laughable. If the British Government were inclined to try the experiment they could recruit enough Home Rulers in Tipperary, Cork and Limerick to clean out the whole batch of anti-Irish Irishmen who have been for many generations but a curse to the country. They are men without a country and are like unto the sutlers who follow an army in time of war, hoping that hostilities may continue.

For twenty or thirty years it has been the custom of some gentlemen of the legal profession, when occasion calls them together in a body, to discuss the question of establishing Divorce Courts in those provinces of the Dominion in which they do not now exist. A couple of provinces at the time of confederation were permitted to retain these courts as they had already been established there before their entrance into the Dominion. It would be ungracious to impute selfish motives to those gentlemen who have advocated this new departure. Some papers have, however, gone that far. The Toronto Globe says "A Divorce Court might be more beneficial to the members of the law society than to the morals of Ontario." It also adds: "It is not yet certain that it is good for a community to make divorce cheap and easy." The London Free Press draws a striking contrast between the methods of obtaining divorce in the United States and in Ontario. It very truly says that while "in the United States the proceedings take place in an open court, with all the attendant publicity that the frequent sordid details receive in the public press, in Canada there is never more publicity to the proceedings before the Committee of the Senate than is contained in the official notice of divorce application and the bare announcement of the decision." Our contemporary also gives us a sound note when it declares that "there should be a stiffening rather than making easy the conditions under which a marriage shall be dissolved." In conversation with a non-Catholic gentleman the other day in regard to this question he made the remark that it was notable that lawyers who had a good practice were not on record as advocates of the establishment of divorce courts.

It has often been claimed that to obtain a separation of man and wife before the divorce committee of the Senate the outlay of a large sum of money, altogether beyond the means of the average citizen, is necessary. There is no foundation whatever for this claim. Applicants for a divorce before the Senate Committee are required to make a deposit of \$200. In addition a lawyer's fee and the expense of summoning witnesses have to be met. In cases, however, where the applicant is a poor man or poor woman, as the case may be, the \$200 deposit is refunded. Were a divorce court established in Toronto lawyers would have to be retained and the expense connected with the summoning of witnesses would have to be taken into account. It will thus be seen that the poor man, so far as money is concerned, would be in almost as bad a plight before a divorce court as before the Senate Committee. The only difference would be in the fact that witnesses would not have as large a bill for travelling expenses if there were a divorce court in each province.

To us it seems extraordinary that anyone having at heart the well-being of Canada, with the awful disclosures which the divorce courts in the United States reveal, should become the advocate of the introduction of like conditions in our Canadian nationhood. In the Republic the divorce courts are looked upon as institutions for the promotion of progressive polygamy. It is all very well to claim that such conditions would not prevail were we to have divorce courts in Canada, but as human nature is pretty much the same on both sides of the border, it would not be many years before our Canadian divorce courts would take rank with those prevailing in the States of the American Union. For our part we would like to see even the divorce committee of the Senate abolished. The proceedings before that body often reveal scandalous conditions. Separations are sought on the most trivial of excuses and quite frequently for the sole reason that the man or the woman tire of each other and wish to be free to marry again. Our non-Catholic fellow citizens have reason to be grateful to the Catholic Church for the stand it has taken in this mat-

ter. Were there no Catholic Quebec it is more than likely that long ago we would have had divorce courts, bringing us the same scandalous conditions which are now the shame of the great American Republic.

REV. W. C. RIDDIFORD, BAPTIST

So long as a pulpit tople draws a large assemblage we may expect some of the ministers will continue to discuss the Ne Temere decree. Rev. W. C. Riddiford, pastor of Park St. Baptist Church, Peterboro, in a sermon recently delivered, gives us a crude and unfair statement of the case which keeps him in line with his brother Baptist preachers. He did not, however, confine himself strictly to a discussion of the decree, but launched out into other matters pertaining to the Catholic Church. "We can tolerate purgatory," said he, "even though we do not believe in it." If Mr. Riddiford were a member of the House of Commons he would often be called to order. As the text of his sermon was "Uniform Marriage Law," what has that got to do with purgatory? Well, if our dear good brother does not believe in purgatory there is nothing in the British North America Act or the revised statutes of Canada to prevent him going to the other place. We had intended devoting a little time to the Rev. Mr. Riddiford, but as he has made the announcement that Rev. Patrick Morgan, late of the Capuchin Fathers, — a person whose life work gives one an unlimited opportunity for the exercise of the charity of silence — is about to give a mission in his church, we touch our hat to him and say good-by. Before he leaves us, however, we desire to slip in his vest pocket the following editorial taken from the Toronto Mail and Empire of January 2:

"Much as it has been discussed, the chief feature of the 'Ne Temere' decree is misunderstood. The general idea seems to be that the decree forbids marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants. The decree does not forbid these marriages. It declares them to be no marriages if they are performed by a Protestant clergyman. If they are solemnized by a priest of the Roman Catholic Church they are recognized by that Church. The Roman Catholic hierarchy does not encourage marriages between members of its faith and non-Catholics; but for that matter Protestant clergymen do not encourage them either, experience having shown that the more husband and wife have in common the greater the chances are for a happy marriage. When religion is a vital matter to them, it is difficult to find a middle ground of compromise, and when there are children to be reared in one faith or the other, the problem becomes one of the most serious that any man and woman have to face. It does not become less serious because a priest has married them."

A NEW EXPEDIENT

The so-called Unionist party in England are beating about for new expedients to generate a wave of opposition to Home Rule. Mr. Bonar Law, the leader of the Conservative party in England, a Canadian unworthy the name, and who had been given his present position as a matter of compromise, is particularly active in the work of preventing Ireland from obtaining the same conditions which prevail in his native country. Had Mr. Bonar Law been to the fore in the thirties and forties in Canada he would have been amongst the Unionists of those days, who claimed that granting us responsible government would smash the British Empire. It had, however, the contrary effect and it will have the contrary effect in Ireland. A cable tells us that a persistent effort is being made by the opposition press to use the recent papal decree forbidding Roman Catholics from bringing priests into lay courts on pain of excommunication for disobedience as an argument against the Government's Home Rule proposals. What such an ecclesiastical regulation as this has to do with the granting of Home Rule to Ireland it would be difficult to perceive. A Catholic having a grievance against a priest brings him before a civil instead of an ecclesiastical court, therefore the people of Ireland are not to be trusted to deal with matters of trade and commerce. A family of three persons named Riley, presumably Irish, refuse to join a labor union in England. The union members on this account wished them dismissed, but their employers refused to grant their request. As a consequence hundreds of thousands of employees are on strike. Mr. Bonar Law should advance this as another reason why Home Rule should not be granted.

The Dublin Express and a few other organs of the anti-Irish faction are busily employed in misrepresenting the actual condition of things in Ireland. Bigotry and self interest may be taken as the prime reasons for their opposition. The Irish correspondents of the London papers, too, are dealing in yellow journalism and sending across the channel the most ridiculous and unfounded canards. An associated press despatch tells us that:

"The Dublin correspondent of the Pall Mall Gazette says the theory there is that the revival of the decree, which is an old one put in clearer form, is due to Cardinal Logne, the primate of Ireland, and Cardinal Bourne, of Westminster, who are said to be opposed to Home Rule and wish to kill it. The

correspondent admits, however, that this theory does not jibe with the facts, as Cardinal Logne has been preaching Home Rule for a lifetime. "The Dublin Express, a strong Protestant organ, which was the originator of the propaganda, is now being backed by other anti-Catholic newspapers, which are evidently making an effort to influence Englishmen and Scotchmen who favor Home Rule to change their views."

Old abuses die hard. The advocates of vested wrongs are spending themselves unostentatiously to preserve their ill-gotten privileges. That Home Rule will come there can be no manner of doubt, for the men in the gap are made of sterling stuff. Their English confederates, too, are equal to the occasion and giving no aid. The schoolmaster has been abroad amongst the English masses. You cannot fool all the people all the time.

POLLUTING THE PRESS

Last week the gentleman having charge of the transmission of news in the Canadian Press Service in Winnipeg sent out a despatch containing some harrowing details bearing on the Ne Temere decree. It was represented that a Catholic man who was lying sick in a Catholic hospital in St. Boniface, was refused permission by the Mother Superior to see his "wife" for the reason that their marriage, one being a Catholic, the other a non-Catholic, was celebrated before a Protestant minister, and that therefore such a marriage was not legal in the eyes of the Church. The following article from the North-West Review, Winnipeg, puts a new light on the matter. It will be noted that the manager of the Canadian Press Service in Winnipeg did not follow up the first report by sending another despatch conveying the real facts of the case. All the newspapers of the East gave great prominence to this sensational story, but none up to date so far as we have seen have published the correct version. A Catholic Society of Winnipeg has very properly taken up the matter and a libel suit against the Winnipeg dailies may be the outcome. The following is the article from the North-West Review:

Two of our daily papers, the Telegram and the Tribune, of Winnipeg, recently published several columns of a would-be sensational character in which it was claimed that a certain woman by the name of Mrs. Brewer was unlawfully refused permission to visit her sick husband in the hospital. The stand taken by the nurse of St. Boniface Hospital was on the ground that the Mrs. Brewer who claimed to be the lawful wife of Mr. Brewer, the sick patient, was not what she claimed to be. The nurse had it on good authority that the said Mrs. Brewer was not married at all to Mr. Brewer but was simply unlawfully living with him as his wife and that moreover she was not of a good moral character. After several attempts to gain admittance to the hospital had been fruitlessly made Mrs. Brewer visited the office of these daily papers and complained bitterly on the stand taken by the authorities of St. Boniface Hospital. Immediately reporters were put on the case with the result that the matrimonial state of Mrs. Brewer was apparently proven to be absolutely legal. The marriage certificate of Mrs. Brewer was looked up, it was scrutinized and found satisfactory to them.

The above named newspaper stated that Mrs. Brewer's marriage was solemnized on October 10, 1904, by Rev. Dr. McMillan. Moreover, the records of the General Hospital show that the first Mrs. Brewer died on December 16, 1895.

So far, so good. But in their haste to make a case against St. Boniface Hospital and the Catholic Church, the reporters failed to notice that the Mrs. Brewer whose name appeared on the marriage register of Rev. Dr. McMillan was not the Mrs. Brewer who claimed to be the wife of Mr. Brewer. These are the real facts. Whilst Mrs. Brewer of the hospital case, was serving a sentence in the Brandon jail, her daughter contracted with Brewer the marriage which Rev. Dr. McMillan solemnized on the 5th of October, 1904. It can be seen at a glance how utterly impossible it was for Mrs. Brewer of the hospital case to be the legal wife of Brewer. The attempts of those who wish to bring the Ne Temere decree into the case are at once seen to be perfectly ridiculous. The Ne Temere had nothing whatever to do with it. The nurse of St. Boniface Hospital who refused to admit Mrs. Brewer to see her alleged husband was simply refusing admittance to a woman publicly known to be a questionable character, to say the least.

This goes to illustrate the customary action of some of our dailies. They take hold of the least pretext to drag the Catholic Church and her institutions in the mud. It is time that they realize Catholics will not tamely submit to such outrageous treatment.

Another feature of the occurrence was an interview with Rev. Father Comeau sent broadcast throughout the country. In regard to this interview the North-West Review speaks editorially as follows:

The Winnipeg Tribune of last Saturday contains what seems to us on the face of it a very strange production, purporting to be an interview with Rev. Father Comeau on the marriage controversy. Father Comeau the rev. gentleman is not used to speaking for publication. What may sound plausible enough in the intimacy of private conversation may take on a very different aspect when committed to ink and cold type. According to the above publication, Father Comeau supposes the case of a man who was married to a Protestant woman before a Protestant Minister subsequently to the promulgation of the Ne Temere decree. The conscience of this Catholic is afterwards smitten by

But there is as little likelihood of the Church favoring a surrender of the individual rights of her children to such a martial law as there is of the Creator