

series of tortures before his execution and exit from the world, and thus be made to suffer in kind something of the pain and torment that he wickedly and diabolically inflicted on his victims. It would also be a warning to others, and would operate as a deterrent. Wicked and conscienceless infidels, such as Ingersoll and his followers, may exclaim against this; but by so doing they simply show their degenerate sympathy with crime and the principles and powers of darkness. The newspaper sympathy, also, which we see sometimes expressed in connection with the prolonged suffering of executed murderers is simply weak and mawkish sentimentalism. They should transfer and confine their sympathy to the suffering victims who were cruelly ushered, prepared or unprepared, without a moment's warning into eternity.

To trace the crime to lunacy, when lust, jealousy, revenge, money, or other criminal motive, was the propelling cause of the murder, and where the criminal can give a rational account of his proceedings and doings, is simply absurd; and wherever and by whomsoever so adjudged but exemplifies the misconceptions and weakness, or something worse, of poor erring humanity. The murderer that is sane enough to procure a knife or a gun, and follow his intended victim with it, is sane enough to know what he is about to do; and that being to kill, he should invariably be hung for it. He doesn't follow a horse or an ox as his intended victim, nor does he attempt to thrust his knife into a stone wall, or fire his gun at the sun or moon, or administer poison to a flower or a gate post; if he did he might be adjudged mad in doing it. But the fact that he is sane enough to choose a human being for his victim, should, I think, be adjudged evidence that he had sanity enough to deserve hanging for it. Lunatic in some respects or not, having shed man's blood he should pay the penalty with his own life, and thus be made to follow his victim to the Supreme Court for final decision and sentence.

But to return to the consideration of the Catholic "conscience;" whenever and wherever possible, these tender consciences, expressive of the hierarchy's will, should be respected no doubt; and the more so, since that which is most obnoxious to them, and which stings them the most, is the reading of the Divine Word! Yes, this hierarchically trained, anti-Bible conscience should be respected, no doubt; but it should be so respected as to be politely bowed out of both the Provincial and Dominion courts of appeal. I am under the impression, however, that whichever party gets into power this so-called "grievance" will be settled by legislation in some way in favor, as usual, of the Catholics. And if so, farewell to Manitoba's future as a united prosperous people. There will then probably be, and should be, a bone of contention between the two Governments and between the two sections of the people until it finally merge into an agreement for a national institution worthy of a unitedly intelligent people and a prospectively great nation.

Aside from Rome's bigotry and blindness, coupled with her ever existing treasonable designs, rightly and intelligently considered, it is, as we have said, no "grievance" to the Catholics to be without Separate Schools. It can be considered a grievance only in this sense (the view taken of it, I presume, by the Privy Council): Mother, to quiet the fretful child, says, "You shall have