

powers that be. Already the Lord Mayor (T. D. Sullivan) has seized on the ludicrousness of the situation, and one of his inimitable *jeux d'esprit* is being sung on all sides. The verses are thoroughly in the old ballad style, and are full of characteristic drollery. It is to the efforts of Castlereagh and his colleagues to defeat the Plan of Campaign we are indebted for the terms "garnishee" and "fi fa fum."

A TALE OF A GARNISHEE.

It was the Lord Lieutenant, whose name is Castlereagh, He sent to Thomas Sexton, and thus to him did say :
" You are our new High Sheriff, and now your time has come To execute a Garnishee, likewise a Fi-fa-fum."

Then up spoke Thomas Sexton, and says to Castlereagh :
" Of course the things you've mentioned I'll do without delay,
But first this simple question you'll have to answer me—
Pray tell me what's a Fi-fa-fum and what's a Garnishee? "

Then Castlereagh he placed two rolls of paper in his hand,
" Find out," says he, " one Will O'Brine, the plague of all the land.
We want the debt he owes the Crown ; we wish to strike him dumb ;
So serve him with this Garnishee, likewise this Fi-fa-fum."

Then off went Sheriff Sexton, a pleasant hour to spend
Upstairs in the Impyrial with his colleague and his friend,
They called for coffee and cigars, and laughed right merrily
While poring o'er the Fi-fa-fum, likewise the Garnishee.

" Behold my whole and sole estate," said cheery Will O'Brine ;
" So now take up your documents, and pen on each a line ;
On one write ' nullu bona,' on t'other, ' He won't come,'
And there you've filled your Garnishee, likewise your Fi-fa-fum."

Oh ! when unto the Castle Tom Sexton went next day,
'Twas something to behold the rage of Castlereagh.
He's not allowed to shave himself, or sharpened steel to see,
Since he got back his Fi-fa-fum, likewise his Garnishee.

For extreme cruelty, Lord de Freyne has well outstepped his brother lords and landlords during the present week—Christmas week, be it remembered. The facts are as follows : His lordship recently evicted a poor old widow, named Mary Mornsey—a bed-ridden, helpless creature, ninety years of age—together with her daughter Margaret, who is also in delicate health. Their patch of ground measures one acre and a-half. After the eviction, the old woman lay for a fortnight outside the door of her cabin, where she had been deposited by the bailiffs. The daughter made a shelter over her with some sticks and a quilt ; but when the snow came this poor daughter grew bold from the fear of her mother's death by exposure. She opened the door, and managed to get the sick woman laid on some straw on the clay floor. His Lordship was informed. The bailiff came to warn off these trespassers : the old woman pleaded piteously for leave to die inside the walls—even ventured to promise that she would not be long a trouble to Lord de Freyne, and that he might do what he liked with the place when she would be gone. His Lordship was inexorable. The two women were summoned to the Petty Sessions—the daughter only was able to attend. The law was vindicated, however, and the defendants were ordered to gaol in default of their paying a fine.

R. K.

THE SUBSTANCE OF TWO LECTURES DELIVERED BY REV. FATHER HURLEY, RANGIORA.

(Continued.)

FREETHINKERS and the moral revolutionists of this age will, notwithstanding all their boasting of liberty and progress, condemn Mormonism, Hindooism, and any other ism, the practice of which they cannot see their way to permit. They will tell you they do so because it is a violation of criminal law. Granted. But either that criminal law is just, or it is not. If it is not, then why does it exist? Why do not Freethinkers wipe it from the statute books and blot its memory from earth as soon as they can? If it is just, then it is evident there can exist a just law, which strikes at the conscience of individuals and forbids them the practice of what, on their own declaration, reason asserts to be their inalienable right. We will, perhaps, be told that to maintain society on its present basis it is necessary that criminal law should exist. And so it is, but then why boast of granting perfect freedom of worship and of conscience to man, when he may not dare to clash with State-authority? And why, in the face of this do the philanthropists of modern times, who are in many respects only dreamers of fanciful theories, reproach the Catholic Church because, when expediency dictated, she asked the State to protect herself and her laws from bigots and fanatics, who would if they could, destroy herself from earth and tear them from the hearts of her children? The Encyclical of 1864, states, say Freethinkers, that the State is to support the Church. And so it does state it, but in what sense? It explains itself when it tells us that the State should permit the Catholic Church to use her own laws, and that no one should be permitted by Government to wrest away her liberty with impunity. And is not this a fair demand of the Church and a just explanation of her position? But they seem to wish her to have no such liberty, and hence they are annoyed at her honest claims. Her claims, however, will remain and always be listened to by honourable and upright statesmen. Freethinkers try to hold up the Catholic Church and her principles as an object for the contempt of mankind because they say she would assail the conscience and that liberty which is each man's personal right. And what do they do? Take again that heartrending subject of Catholic education, to which we have so often adverted before. Catholics say they cannot in conscience and on the principles of their faith allow their children to avail themselves of the advantages of the secular system. They have protested, and shall continue to protest with all the earnestness of their souls, against it. Is their conscience much respected by those who boast

themselves the liberators of mankind? Far from it; they are compelled, against every protest, against every belief, to pay dearly for what they can never approve nor even hope to enjoy. But they will tell you, and they have told you, that secular and religious education can be separated, and, therefore, they are doing no injustice to one portion of the community when they lock all religions outside the school. They want to bring up all the children to know and love each other, and to be citizens striving together for a common cause. It is a plausible argument, but it will not stand the test of severe criticism. Education, to be what society needs and what the Church understands by it, must necessarily be Christian. Religion must shed its light, and beautify and soften every phase and stage of it. Education is intended to soften the heart, smooth the asperities of nature, and polish manners, as well as sharpen the intellect. These effects are accomplished under the benign influence of religion. But in the secular system God and the truths of redemption are ignored. Its main tendency, therefore, is to foster intellectual pride. By giving too much head and no heart it helps very much to make man a demon. But how can secular and religious education be separated? Will a few half-hours in the week be thought sufficient for a knowledge of God and the truths of eternity, and shall six or eight hours a day be considered too little to devote to a knowledge of this world, and to what men now-a-days style modern progress? School opens for secular work at 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning. Most children in country districts have to come long distances. The bustle of school life and the strain of intellectual attention kept up, almost constantly, for six or eight hours, is a weary, jading work. It is especially so on youth. School hours over they have no desire except for relaxation from intellectual labour. They cannot be expected to sit down to listen to religious instructions with that freshness and vigour of mind with which their souls open in the morning to drink in secular knowledge. The secular master and the religious instructor are placed here at very unequal advantages. God and the world are receiving very different treatment. Children will not learn well when they have no desire to learn. They will perceive little beauty in religion when their minds are languid and their imaginations dulled. Nor will they manifest any relish for studying a subject which is learned under such painful circumstances. What value can they be expected to attach to that which the Government of the country relegates to those hours of life, when nature herself clamours for rest? The perception of a child is quick, beyond what most people are ready to believe. It will very well perceive if religion is considered of secondary importance. And what other conclusion can it come to? Religion is ignored during school hours; the names of Christ and His apostles, their lives, and sufferings, and death, are not in the school lessons, the heroes of antiquity and their deeds, the revolutionizers of modern society; the wars, and pestilences, and famines, that have devastated the world; the advances in commerce, and the changes in political arenas—all these are paraded, dressed in their most attractive garb, before the mind's eye of the young boy and young girl, but Christianity and its influence on society, and the lives of Christ and His saints, and the heroic fortitude of the martyrs, all these are locked in the lumber room of oblivion. Not religion must be the *alpha* and *omega* in Christian education. The superstructure of secular knowledge must be laid on the foundation of an unshaken faith. Men were not born to be mere citizens of an earthly kingdom; we have no lasting title here. Heaven is our goal, and whatever tends to draw us away from that, will prove a curse, not a blessing. And what guarantee have we that the morals of our children will not be tainted with the infidelity of atheistic masters? The young saplings cannot be raised and cultivated, and brought to full maturity beneath the shade of a decaying oak, without inhaling some of the noxious odours that are given out day by day. And who will say that many of the masters presiding in the State schools are not men of very decided irreligious ideas. If so is it not clearly in their power when commenting on a fact in history, or explaining a difficulty in chronology, or solving a problem in mathematics, in discussing a question in science, almost in a word, in explaining anything at all, to throw out a cant at religion that shall for ever remain fixed in the tenacious memory of the child? Can Catholics maintain a calm conscience while they voluntarily place their children in jeopardy of this nature? Can the Church, whose duty it is to point to Heaven as the primary end of education remain silent, while she sees the education and training of the little ones committed to her care by the Supreme Legislator, wrested entirely from her authority? But we know the ultimate end statesmen have in view in the establishment of this system. By introducing compulsory clauses they want to dispute with parents the right to educate their own children: this end accomplished they will see their way more clearly to deny this same right to the Church: again, this effect brought about, the State would exercise complete control in that department, where the destruction of Christianity appears most inevitable. We know what has been the result in countries where they have banished most of the religious Orders, closed all schools but their own, and compelled all denominations to attend them. The tide of infidelity has flown high, and morality has everywhere sunk beneath the advance of the iniquitous scheme. To make men love each other and be better citizens is a noble aim. No one more cordially approves it than the Church; that is part of her mission on earth. But how can this be accomplished without religion? God is love, and the essence of religion is also love. Our duties to man and the State are based upon our duties to God. To love Him is to love everything good, to hate all that is bad. Make men faithful to Him and you make them upholders of the State in everything great and honourable; make them traitors to God and you will never make them loyal to each other.

(Concluded in our next.)

Sister Mathilda of St. Francis' Hospital, La Crosse, was among those who took part in the recent examination of the State board of pharmacy, held in that city recently. She maintained a general average of 95 per cent., the highest that has ever been maintained by a candidate since the board began to hold examinations.