

## ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

BISHOP PARET (Maryland) on Roman Catholic Schools in the U. S.

The following letter from Bishop Paret appeared in *The Churchman*, N. Y., of 29th March:—

In a charge recently delivered to the clergy of Maryland, after speaking of the demand of the Roman Church for Government support of its schools, I used these words: "Not content with the liberty of having their own schools, they have gone so far as to demand that they should be supported by the money of the Government. They have claimed that since they, in common with all other citizens, are taxed, and money raised by taxation is used to sustain the public schools, they, as not approving the public schools, should have part of the public money to sustain the religious schools which they do approve. And it is this demand of Government support for denominational schools which has roused, in many places, the popular indignation; and with ample reason.

"Under a claim of equality it would establish the most monstrous favoritism, and utterly subvert the grand principles of our National Constitution. And if the question concerning it were openly and fairly put, the answer of the nation against it would be overwhelming.

"But results are sometimes accomplished by indirectness. The proposal has been in several places made—and in some, I am sorry to say, inconsiderately accepted—that school buildings of the Roman Church, built by them in the immediate neighborhood of their churches, and managed by them long enough to gather their own people as the pupils, and provide them with their books, and familiarize the children with their ways of worship and speech, should be turned over (perhaps free of rent for a while) to be rated and treated as public schools, under the care and cost of the School Boards. And so schools essentially Roman, taught by sisters in their official garb, and visited by the Roman priest, are foisted upon the public charge."

And in the *New York Tribune* of March 4th appeared the following full illustration and proofs: "Chicago, March 3rd. (Special.)—A dispatch to *The Chicago Tribune* from St. Paul says—'In view of the fact that in several cities Catholic priests have recently ordered Catholic parents to send their children to parochial schools exclusively, an event occurred here yesterday afternoon which is remarkable, and may lead to a solution of the school question. The Catholics have lately finished a school building in St. John's parish, Dayton's Bluff. In that section of the city the public schools have been crowded all winter, and the Board of Education had been considering what was best to be done until spring, when a building could be erected. Father Fleming, pastor of the parish, learned of the dilemma, and staggered Superintendent Gilbert by offering the Catholic parish school to the city, only requiring that it pay the absolute and necessary running expenses. Father Fleming said the teachers now in the parish schools could be examined, and if they came up to the required standard they should be kept. During school hours the question of religion was to be scrupulously banished from the schoolroom.'

"The proposition was so manifestly fair, and the clergyman so evidently sincere, that the superintendent will report it favorably to the Board of Education."

Archbishop Ireland, speaking of the matter, said: "I have heard of Father Fleming's offer to the Board, and I think it will strike all right-thinking men as a most fair one. I think the plan is one in full harmony with American ideas, particularly with the truly

American principles of liberty of conscience. If the State authorities so wish, religion need not be taught during school hours. Catholic teachers could give religious instruction before school opens or after it closes, or before and after, as is done in England."

Surely it is important that these movements should be exposed and resisted.

WILLIAM PARET.

## HINDRANCES TO UNITY.

In these days when the Christian world is becoming weary of sectarianism, and Christ's true followers everywhere are longing and praying for the fulfilment of Christ's own prayer, that all His may be one, Satan, who knows well that divisions begin with censoriousness and end with infidelity, is most careful to sow the seeds of censoriousness in the gospel field whilst men sleep, or in other words are unobservant of His work.

Now censoriousness is very nearly akin to spiritual pride, and as Satan's main design is to separate those who ought to be very friends, for example—those who are baptized members of God's Catholic Church—we cannot behold without sore misgivings the bitter spirit of censoriousness which, in these days of desired unity, is so remarkably busy in the Christian world, and especially amongst the members of our own Church, which many Romanists and other Dissenters have admitted to be the nearest to the primitive pattern, with its historic episcopate, and freedom from modern accretions.

When we see, as lately in New York, that Baptists are now laying aside their exclusive claim to Christian baptism, so that they admit without reordination a minister ordained by the Congregationalists to the pastorate of one of their churches, whilst amongst us there are many who would jeopardise the sacred cause of unity for the sake of forcing even their brethren, if possible, to forsake our ancient Church unless they will consent to pronounce exactly as they do some shibboleth as to the rubrics of our Prayer-book, we fear that the charity of the disciples of Christ is sleeping, whilst Satan is busily sowing the seeds of separation in the ancient fold. Here we find a sad sign of illiberality.

Yet, to change the figure, how careful is the infernal Anglor to hide his hook with a tempting bait! This bait is false liberality,—a giving away that which is not ours to give.

Irreverence is one of the besetting sins of a waning faith, and a sure accompaniment of growing infidelity. In "Salvationism" or Boothism, we see frightful irreverence, bordering on and often mixed with blasphemy, condoning impurity of life in those who blatantly claim that they are pure and sure to be admitted to the Beatific Vision. We see them ignoring Christ's two Sacraments, Baptism and the Holy Communion, and substituting therefor admission "under the flag," coupled with the sounding brass and the tinkling cymbal. Here we see irreverence rejecting the gratifying and feeding Sacraments of Christ as "empty forms."

Censoriousness is nearly akin to self-righteousness. Men are easily tempted to flout at ancient Christian forms, whilst insisting on the superiority of forms of their own devising,—showing their liberality by giving away what does not belong to them. And false liberality is very popular in our day. Those who, amongst ourselves, are least anxious to preserve and make reverent use of the Holy Communion, are always the most ready to carp at "forms" ordered by Holy Scripture and the rubrics of our Prayer-book.

We are led into this train of thought, by a paragraph in one of our Church of England periodicals of a recent date, published in western

Canada, on the subject of prayer. In these days, when we find sectarian bodies not kneeling or even standing in public prayer or praise, but sitting—(a position never known either in the ancient Jewish or the primitive Christian Church), our brother, a Churchman, we suppose, thus expresses the feelings of his soul to his brethren:

"The first duty of the worshipper is personal prayer. It is not necessary that he should kneel to pray. Even the bowed head may be a poor substitute for the bowed and waiting heart. All forms fail; nothing but the personal outreaching of the mind and heart after God will meet the deep want."

This strong assumption that the outward form of devotion and humility is a dangerous thing, and liable to be suspected of not being accompanied by the "personal outreaching of the mind and heart," is—to say the least—not unlikely to be accepted as a *solatium* by those whom we too often see loling or even half lying in their pews, whilst others are humbly kneeling at prayer, or standing whilst the praises of God are sung in His holy temple. Who are the most likely to believe in God's immediate presence in public worship,—those who "worship and fall down and kneel before the Lord our Maker," or those who sit, or lazily recline, in the Divine Presence, whilst with self-satisfaction they suspect of insincerity and mere formalism their brethren who assume the more reverent attitude?

What would have been thought in aftertimes of the three wise men from the east, if instead of kneeling in the presence of the Holy Child in the stable at Bethlehem, they had seated themselves perhaps on a log at hand?

What would we have thought of their wisdom if instead of kneeling when offering their gifts, they had—like too many in our day—presented them, whilst sitting, by the hands of others?

Whatever men may think, Satan well knows that true religion has its foundation in humility, and God is the author of forms in religion, without which its spirituality may soon evaporate amid the deadly miasma of infidelity—*Church Work*

## IF WE BELIEVE TOGETHER, WHY NOT WORSHIP TOGETHER?

The proof that the difference between Christians are at least as grave as those which caused St. Paul so much grief among the first Christians is this, that they prevent our worshipping together. Those who disputed in St. Paul's time did not set up separate places of worship.

The first dissenters who broke off from the Church of England did so because they mistakenly thought themselves bound in conscience so to do.

If it be the case that we are no longer divided by serious differences of belief, why do we not worship together? Why do Nonconformists still separate themselves? Why do they not come back?

It may be said—"We all hold the same faith, but not all in quite the same way. People see the same thing with different eyes. Why then should there not be different Christian bodies working side by side? They preach the same Jesus. They need not interfere with each other's work. They need not be rivals except in the work of bringing souls to Christ. Those who slip through the net of one denomination may be caught by another. It is not like different religions. Let every man please himself, so that all tastes may be suited."

This is not, however, the "striving together for the Faith of the Gospel," which St. Paul commands. Nor is it "walking by the same rule." Nor is it being "perfectly joined together."

At the first meeting of the Melbourne Parliament in St. Patrick's Hall, a proposal to open the session with prayer was negatived on the