

cated, unsectarian religious instruction. No trouble is apprehended from Protestants. If the Catholics, whether reasonably or unreasonably, have any jealousy or distrust of such teaching, I should be disposed to hand over these departments, for the instruction of their children, to teachers of their own faith, under such arrangements as should insure an intelligent, systematic, and faithful performance of that duty. Such provisions are not uncommon in the continental countries of Europe. As the state, in its opinion, at least, would provide for the impartial performance of all its obligations by its own competent teachers, this permission to those dissatisfied, to do the work by their own instrumentalities, would not, of course, create any claim on the state for compensation.

I do not pretend that the irenical scheme of religious instruction which I have proposed will satisfy the leading ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church. It will make our schools better, but it will not take away their desire for schools of their own.

And what shall we say of these parochial schools? That the separation of our children into two distinct classes, divided by religious differences and almost identically so by social condition, is unfortunate, especially so for those who, in any event, have to fight the battle of life under natural disadvantages; but unfortunate also for the more favoured class, who need, for their own good and for the good of the state, to be brought into brotherly relations of sympathy and of insight with the others, I most strongly believe. But we must remember that, though the state has both the right and the duty of seeing that the obli-

gation of primary education is discharged by somebody, it has no right to determine by whom. The Catholic has the same right to his parochial school that the fastidious Protestant has to the ordinary private school or seminary. And, as a mere matter of policy, he must be a dull student of history or of human nature who does not know that any attempt of the state to use unfriendly legislation against the parochial school will arouse that spirit of religious partisanship which has ever proved stronger than laws or even arms. We must, therefore, frankly and heartily concede to the Catholics all we claim for ourselves, and seek to win and not to coerce.

I do not believe it wise to indulge in any panic upon this question, still less to introduce any shibboleth about it into party politics. If we are patient, I have faith that the American system of public education of the masses in common schools will triumph over the old-world theories of training by ecclesiastics. One thing is sure: the Roman Catholic layman in this country of the people must have a recognition not accorded him in Europe; and the style of Catholicism which will ultimately predominate will not be ultramontane. To the practical judgment of the Catholic masses must the determination of this question finally be left, and all that we can do is to maintain and increase the superiority of the common school. I, for one, do not believe that the American citizen, whatever his ancestry or his creed, will, in the long run, be inclined to pay for an inferior article when he can get a superior at the public expense.—*Robert C. Pitman, in The Forum.*

MILLIONS of spiritual creatures walk the earth
Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep.
—Milton.

FIELDS are full of eye and woods have ears;
For this the wise are ever on their guard;
For unforeseen, they say, is unprepared.
—Dryden.