

The writer of the article in the Review says that this is "most emphatically what Catholic parents want by all means to avoid." Against this mingling of Roman Catholics and Protestants, several reasons are given. In the first place, it is stated that "they as Catholics, are a religious family, the only one enjoying the possession of the unadulterated truth." This is the usual strong exclusive stand taken by Romanists, and while one cannot help admiring to some extent the consistency of the position which they persistently claim, we at the same time are of opinion that this very exclusiveness weakens their chance of winning over those who are outside the pale of the Roman Church. It is all very well to say—"We are the elect of God—we are the only people;" but it must not be forgotten that those who differ from them in respect of this are not all illiterate, uncultured fools. It is quite possible to make out a good case for others, who do not see eye to eye with them. They speak as if no one outside the Roman pale had any knowledge of the History of the past; they speak of non-Romanists as having a religion "which is a mere matter of exterior observance founded upon imaginary history." Such a statement is ludicrous in the extreme. No unprejudiced man would ever dare to say that the Christian Church, which owes no allegiance to the Roman Pontiff, has not produced some of the ablest and most profound students of history that the world has ever known, and, as to the religion of non-Romanist Christians being a mere matter of outward observance; well, such an assertion is not worthy of notice. Thank God, the Roman Pontiff and the Roman hierarchy will not be the judges in the last great day. The Blessed Saviour whom they and we worship—He knows the hearts and thoughts of men;—we can leave ourselves without fear in his hands. It is a grief to many, who have a good deal of sympathy with Roman Catholics in the manly fight they are waging for separate schools, to read such expressions of mingled condescension and contempt as are given vent to in the Review, the only result they can have will be to alienate many who would have been their allies on this question. The one great point on which we do agree with them is this, that we do believe that the effect of being educated in a school where church principles and a sacramental system are taught clearly, definitely, regularly and daily, is to make better citizens and better Christians. We do not hesitate to say that church schools in the past have been the means of building up a better state of society than has been done by the public schools, which to all intents and purposes may be regarded as secular. Children educated in church schools not only get mental training, but spiritual training as well; religion in their case is not relegated to a lower place than the three R's, but is made the mainspring of action, and the basis of true education.

A LEGAL PELLET

Leo and John, A Parable.

The following skit from the Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette on the pope's recent allocution about Anglican orders is rather good and worth further printing: The pope's attitude towards us may be illustrated thus: A magnate called Leo has a neighbor called John, who possesses a fair estate, which he manages efficiently and well. On this estate Leo casts his longing eyes with a view to annex it, and he tells John how much better, it would be to transfer it to him for proper management. John declines on two grounds—(1) he has his title-deeds in his strong box, duly signed, sealed, and delivered, showing his right to possession; (2) he has practical proof in the flourishing condition of his property that it is much better under his care and keeping than under Leo's. He therefore declines the invitation. Whereupon Leo calls a committee of lawyers in his own employment and submits the case of John's title-deeds to them, John not being called before the committee or asked to send in his papers. In a short time the committee, in John's absence, decide that John's papers are "absolutely null and utterly void." Leo thereupon invites John to give up possession as he has no rights. John naturally declines to do so on the terms. He is then assured by Leo that not only are his title-deeds "absolutely null and utterly void," but that he only "supposes" he possesses "them and their effects where these are nowise to be found." John replies that he is not an imaginative person at all, that Bishop Butler, for whom he has a great respect and veneration, has declared "imagination to be a forward delusive faculty," and that he is not given that way. He adds that the possession of his title-deeds is not a fancy but a fact; and as regards the further assertion that the effects (of his title-deeds) "are nowise to be found," he cannot contradict the evidence of his senses, for the results of the management of his estate are writ too large to be brushed aside as delusive and non-existent. He therefore declines Leo's invitation to hand over everything to him on the ground of defective title and absence of result, as such theories of his case are directly in the teeth of simple, palpable fact and experience, and have a very suspicious flavor of personal aggrandizement on Leo's part.

CORRESPONDENCE

[The following communication comes to me from a thoughtful critic of men and things, and without in any way endorsing it, I give it as it came to the readers of the Western Churchman.—The Editor.]

It is hard to decide which is the greater fool: the agnostic who does not believe in any of the claims of our Christian churches, and does not think them worth the trouble of investigation, or the rigid denominationalist, whose aim is to gather all the Christian world into one church, and

whose belief is that all religious opinion and practice outside of his own church, is rank heresy, and obstructive to the real growth of Christianity.

The agnostic certainly has the advantage of saving himself a world of worry about his neighbors, and his creed, or rather absence of creed, while it cannot be reasoned into any theory but philosophical nihilism, is not tended to be a generator of religious persecution.

With the one and only church maniac matters are different. The salvation of his neighbors often costs him more anxiety and worry than his personal salvation; and, unfortunately for him, his ideas and theory have been productive of some of the worst periods of persecution, even to murder, that stain the pages of history.

Christianity, the healer of the soul, must, like healing for ailments of the body, be suited to the different temperaments of mankind, and the variety of churches organized under the banner of the humble prophet of Nazareth, simply supply the varied treatment necessary for these temperaments.

Take, for instance, the different characters of people in our own every day society. We have those capable of an implicit, almost blind faith, who have no desire to reason out the problems and enigmas of a complicated theology, but are prepared and glad to leave that work to spiritual guides, better informed than themselves; but who nevertheless will stand firm under the banner the follow, and without murmur die in the ranks. Such people will be most at home in the Roman Catholic church. Its claims of absolute obedience and unflinching reward in return, best suit the temperament of such people.

Then we have the individual with aesthetic leanings. He loves a beautiful liturgy, a rigid order in the ceremonies of his church, an acme of refined taste in every detail of service, and yet does not forget the spirit of the religion he clings to. Such an individual can find congenial surroundings in our Church of England, such as he will find nowhere else.

Again we have the naturally kind-hearted individual, whose generous impulses guide him much more than his cool judgment, who, in his fulness of heart could be bound down by no rigid code of decorum or order, but who will speak from that fulness of heart without seeking much guidance from his brain. It would be an unpardonable mistake to have that person outside of some of the branches of the Methodist church. There only can he feel at home.

Next let us view the theological hair splitter. The born metaphysician, to whom argument is the richest mental food. Who would not believe that five and five make ten, without putting the question to an arithmetical test. Whose heart is not without warmth and fervor, but it can act only as the brain dictates. Men and women of that stamp have gone cheerfully to the stake and gibbet to die, rather than forswear the creed their brains had reasoned out and their hearts accepted. There is no full scope for such people outside of the Presbyterian church, and the Confes-