

provided it were not clearly unconstitutional. As a matter of fact, however, it is only asking the national government to continue the policy which was begun even before the Constitution was adopted, and has been pursued down to the present time. The idea that education is a matter of merely local importance, and should therefore be remanded to the communities, is of comparatively recent growth. The founders of the government, the framers of the Constitution, the early Presidents and early Congresses, knew nothing of such a doctrine. There was in the act of 1787 a distinct recognition of the importance of popular education, and of the necessity of Federal action to secure the financial basis of a sound school system. The early Presidents favored the establishment of a national University. The early legislators considered it a part of the functions of the national government to secure, so far as the granting of aid would do it, the establishment of school systems in every new State. Our later Congresses, in addition to what former Congresses have done, have built up in Washington the nucleus of a grand University, and have undertaken to secure the establishment of special schools of agriculture in every State of the Union. Our forefathers granted such aid as they thought the necessity demanded, and did not let themselves be deterred by the cry that education was only of local interest, and that the national government had no power to assist in its maintenance.

"The conclusion of the whole matter may be summarized as follows:

1. Education is a matter of general and not merely local interests. It is fair, therefore, to call upon the most general form of government to assist in its support.

2. Under our system the local communities limited to direct taxation are unable to provide adequate educational facilities in addition to satisfying purely local necessities. The necessity of outside assistance is becoming more and more imperative.

3. The Federal government is amply able to assist in the support of education.

4. So far from being restrained by constitutional provisions, it would simply be following precedents already set, and continuing the policy begun even before the adoption of the Constitution."

### Separation of Church and State.

#### ROMAN CATHOLIC TACTICS.

*Take heed that ye be not deceived.*—Luke  
xxi: 8.

*My kingdom is not of this world.*—John  
xviii: 36.

What is known as the "Freedom of Worship Bill," which has been so persistently urged in the Legislature of the State of New York for several years and

which the advocates of are confident of ultimately carrying, has a deep interest and significance to every American citizen. Ostensibly the Bill simply aims to provide Roman Catholic worship and instruction to such of its inmates as are claimed by that church in the New York House of Refuge. The ultimate aim is to secure State recognition and patronage for the Romish church distinctively. They enjoy precisely the same privileges now as any Protestant sect. But they insist on the right to "instruct in their religion all Catholic inmates and celebrate Mass and such sacraments as are suitable to their age and condition in life." Denied this by the managers, they appeal to the Legislature to enforce their claim by what is adroitly named the "Freedom of Worship Bill." They demand this as a *right* under the Constitution. And every influence and means which the papal hierarchy and priesthood, directly and through political agents, can invoke to gain their purpose, will be put in requisition persistently while a shadow of hope remains.

This move is meant to be only the entering wedge. The next step will be to urge the claim already put forth for a share in the Public School money. And rest assured they will not cease their efforts until their parochial schools are recognized and fostered by the State. They do not conceal their purpose in this respect. In deference to their complaints, our public schools have already to a large extent been "secularized." But this avails nothing; in fact, puts another weapon into their hands.

"The moment the State, by Legislative act, takes official cognizance of the distinctive claims of any sect; the moment it admits, no matter how indirectly as a civil incident, the fact of religious differences of opinion, that moment the spirit of our fundamental law is violated, and we cannot escape the danger of Sectarian discrimination, preference, and consequent injustice, with the certainty that such distinction will also be applied to our public schools. Any classification whatever on religious grounds, by State authority, will inevitably lead to bitter and acrimonious sectarian controversies, to social disorder, and would seriously impend the peace of the community, and violate the quali-