



Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 16, 1890.

NUMBER 41.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 48 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. MCKEE.

SAYS the *Christian Statesman* :—

The platform of the Prohibition party, in Pennsylvania, retains the familiar pregnant acknowledgment of Almighty God as the source of all power and authority in civil government.

It follows that should that party come into power it would attempt to define and to enforce the will of God, and herein lies the evil of such acknowledgment by parties and by governments.

Every individual should not only acknowledge, but should yield allegiance to God for himself, and should do all that he can, by persuasion, to induce others to do the same, but political parties should do nothing of the kind for they are organized for the express purpose of administering the government, and as government is force, for a political party to make such an acknowledgment as that quoted above, is simply to avow the purpose to force upon all the people their interpretation of the will of God. God has not committed such power to men.

A RECENT decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, holding that a barber who kept his shop open on Sunday violated the statutes prohibiting all labor on the Lord's Day except works of necessity and charity, provoked the following comment by the editor of the *Albany Times* :—

Why the Philadelphia judges should hold that it is Sabbath-breaking for a barber to shave a customer on Sunday, but not for the customer to shave himself,

is one of those queer things that none but Philadelphia lawyers could fathom. If the shaving be work and labor, why is it not equally work and labor if performed by an individual upon his own countenance? And again, if Sunday shaving be work and labor, what is putting on one's coat or one's clean shirt to be called? Is not the one as necessary to a decent appearance at church service as the other? Does not a decent respect for the house of worship require a man to appear in it with a clean face, as well as in a clean collar and polished shoes? And if the law will not allow the barber to shave his cheeks and chin, why does it permit his cook to prepare his dinner, his waitress to serve it up, and him to eat it? Where does Sunday work and labor begin, and where does it end?

They Agree on the Main Point.

WE have several times remarked that the only real difference between Romanists and Protestants on the educational question is, that the former want State aid in teaching Catholicism, while the latter want the State to pay for teaching Protestantism. We now propose to offer a little proof directly on this point.

The *Catholic Review*, published in this city, is certainly a representative Catholic paper. In its issue of August 30, appeared an article, entitled, "Why Should Not the State Pay for Religious Instruction?" in which strong ground was taken in favor of that very thing. The *Review* says :—

To make a man truly moral you must reach his conscience, and the conscience can be effectually reached only by the powerful motives and sanctions of religion which looks to the Author of conscience and recognizes the imperative obligation to obey Him. To bring those motives and sanctions to bear upon the life and conduct they must be enforced by definite, thorough and authoritative teaching of the doctrines and precepts of religion. . . . Banish God from your curriculum, or in any degree weaken the ligaments that bind the conscience to the throne of God, and by just so much you let loose the unbridled passions of men, and introduce knavery, insubordination and every evil work.

Now, if religion be so essential an element in the formation of good moral citizens, why should the Government be so unwilling to encourage it in its system of education of the rising generation? Why, evidently, the State ought to encourage it. It ought to hold out every inducement in its power and be willing to furnish every facility to the different religious bodies for making religion the foundation and informing spirit of their system of education.

There is no mistaking the meaning of this language. It is a plea for State aid to parochial schools, for no Catholic would admit for a moment that the State can or ought to teach religion; the State should, however, pay the Church for teaching it, is the Catholic theory.

And now let us turn to the Protestants and see what they say. In the *Christian Statesman*, of August 14, is an article, in which occurs this language :—

Beyond doubt the God of storms is angry. As a Nation we have forgotten him. . . . Him and his word we have ruled out largely from the sphere of Government. We have said, "We will not have this man to rule over us." This is the declaration of the fundamental law of our land, and the effects are to be seen in all the ramifications of our Government. The secular theory of Government is at the bottom of most of America's woes. The Bible is ignored. It cannot be taught in the schools where our youth, who are to manage governmental affairs, are trained. Many of these youth get no religious training at home or in any Sabbath school, therefore they grow up practically heathen; unless they absorb some religion or religious convictions by social contact with good people, they will know but little about Christianity.

The meaning of this is also unmistakable; it is that, as a Nation we ought to see to it that our youth receive religious instruction, and that that instruction should be imparted through the medium of the public schools. And herein is the difference, and the only difference on this question between very many Protestants and the whole body of Roman Catholics, namely, the Protestants want the Protestant Bible and Protestant religion taught in the public schools, while the Catholics want the State to give them a portion of the school funds in order that they may the more easily maintain their own schools in which to teach the Roman Catholic religion. In either event the State would

pay for the teaching of religion, and in effect become a partner of the Church in the business of giving religious instruction. It follows that when they reproach one another for endeavoring to secure some advantage by an alliance with the State, it is nothing more than the pot calling the kettle black. The moral of all this is that there is but one proper course for the State to pursue in the matter of education, namely, to provide facilities for giving not an irreligious, but a purely secular education to all children not otherwise provided for, and leaving to the Church and to the home the teaching of religion. To attempt any other system would be to belittle religion and destroy our common school system. C. P. B.

A Warning for the Clergy.

THE Municipal League is working hard to initiate the clergy as practical politicians, and it seems to be having very fair success in some quarters. The novelty of the business is not without its attractions for parsons who find their religious duties monotonous, and are glad of an opportunity to take a hand in political strategy.

The League is trying to enlist both Christian clergymen and Jewish rabbis; but the *Hebrew Standard* warns the teachers of its faith to be on their guard against the allurements of these banded politicians. "We confidently hope," it says, "that every Jewish minister will refuse participating in the affair." It thinks that the ministers should attend to their appointed functions, and be content to preach religious principles of conduct, instead of electioneering for a political party.

The advice is good. If the parsons can infuse the spirit of true religion into the community, there will be no need of getting up any so-called reform movement in politics. If every individual proceeds to reform himself, the government of the town is sure to be all right; and the purpose of religion is to bring about that individual reform. That is what the churches are for, and so far as they fail there, they fail in their spiritual mission. They cannot compensate for the failure by undertaking to begin at the other end and to teach men how to perform their secular duties. Their function is to purify men's hearts and regenerate their souls, and when that work is done, righteous conduct will follow, necessarily.

Neither is it probable that the parsons will contribute anything toward the purification of politics where politics require to be purified. When they start out to apply the methods of politics in their churches and church convocations, we all know that the devil rejoices over the prospect of a rich harvest of wickedness. The sweetness and harmony of religious fellowship are transformed into the trickery and bitterness of battle. The clergy enlisted by this League are going into politics as

partisans of its particular ticket. Their congregations are divided, the great majority of them supporting the Democracy, against whom the League ticket is to be run. How, then, can there be peace and good will in the churches? Where will the pastors be after election, when the increased acrimony of the strife has left its results in heart-burning and disappointment, triumph and exultation? They will have to remain as political leaders, with such a remnant of partisan followers as they can retain, and their churches will be League churches, not Christian communions. The bond of union will be political, and not religious, agreement. The people who want religion only, will go elsewhere.

Therefore we are not surprised that the Hebrew paper warns the Jewish rabbis to keep out of the trap set for the ministers by this League of self-seeking politicians. They are sure to be harmed if they are caught in it, and will be able to extricate themselves only after having lost in both moral and religious power and influence. Failure as politicians may teach them a useful lesson, but the obstacles in the way of their spiritual prosperity will be greatly increased and multiplied because of it.

Yet many of them seem determined to find this out by actual experience.—*The Sun*.

Keep Church and State Separate.

THE St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* runs into the same way of error with several other papers on the subject of the Bennett law and the opposition to it. It makes the opponents of the law to be "the opponents of the English language," while they are nothing of the kind. They teach English in their schools; their children learn to speak English; they themselves learn it and use it on occasion. It is a total perversion of the question at issue to make the action of the opponents of the Bennett law to be against the English language or its use. The sole point at issue is whether the State shall assume control of the private schools and dictate what shall be taught there, or how it shall be taught.

Again the *Globe-Democrat* misstates the question when it says:—

In the matter of the regulation of the schools the people will not submit to dictation from any church or churches, however widely extended or powerful.

In this contest there is no attempt whatever on the part of either of the churches concerned to dictate to the State in any way in the matter of the regulation of the State schools. It is strictly and really a denial of the right of the State to dictate in the matter of their own, private schools. As the State would be right in resenting dictation from any church in the matter of the regulation of the State schools, so any church is right in resenting the dictation of the State in the regulation of the church schools. Such action on the part of the churches is only allegiance to the

principle of the absolute separation between Church and State. For, for any church to assume control of the State schools or dictate in any manner whatever what shall be taught there, or how, would be a union of Church and State; and it is none the less a union of Church and State when the State presumes to assume control of the church schools and dictate what shall be taught there, and how it shall be taught. Whoever pleads for the separation of Church and State indeed, will be an open straightforward opponent of the Bennett law, and everything like it. A. T. J.

Sunday-Law Arrogance.

IN the *Christian Union* of July 26, Dr. Lyman Abbott, the editor, says on the question of Sunday:—

The current notion that Christ and his apostles authoritatively substituted the first day of the week for the seventh is absolutely without any authority in the New Testament.

This statement is undoubtedly true, as any one may satisfy himself by carefully reading the New Testament. It is also the view held by other leading Protestant doctors, notably Dr. Schaff, and by other leading publications, for instance, the *Christian at Work*.

In the same paper from which we make the above quotation, in "Home Talks about the Word," Emily Huntington Miller on the subject of Christ, says:—

He taught by his example. He always kept holy the Sabbath day.

Now it is absolutely certain that Christ did not keep the first day of the week, but the seventh day according to the commandment, the day which all the Jews were observing. There was never any controversy about whether that day should be observed or not. The contention raised by the Pharisees against the Saviour was not whether that day should be kept, but *how* it should be kept. The day, therefore, which Christ kept holy was not the first day of the week; and, as he taught by his example, it is evident that there is no force whatever in his teaching by example in favor of the observance of the first day of the week.

This is the doctrine and this is the logic of these two quotations from the *Christian Union*. This is the truth as acknowledged by these two writers, and this journal. And being the truth, what basis is there in revelation, religion, or reason, for all these preachers and associations so urgently demanding the enactment of laws and the strict enforcement of the laws already in existence, to compel people to respect the first day of the week as the Lord's day, the Sabbath day, or the Christian Sabbath?

Such statements as these from those who believe in the observance of the first day of the week, plainly shows what THE SENTINEL has always insisted upon, viz.,

that the movement to secure the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws, is nothing more nor less than a scheme of ambitious preachers to secure control of the civil power to force upon people their own will for the will of God. Such a thing would be bad enough if it were truly the will of God which they sought to enforce; but when it is their own will that they intend to put in the place of the will of God, and compel people to obey it as the will of God, then it is infinitely worse. The scheme is nothing less than an effort to put themselves in the place of God, and so to erect here a living likeness to a power which did that same thing before; that is, the Papacy.

A. T. J.

Should the State Regulate Morals?

THIS is an important question, and one that every American citizen should understand, and be able to answer intelligently. In order to have a more correct understanding of the question it will be necessary to define the terms used.

"Morality is the relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule. . . . The conformity of an act to the divine law." The "divine law," is universally acknowledged as being "summarily contained in the Decalogue," written by the finger of God on the tables of stone. From this, it is plain that morality pertains solely to God, having reference to man's relation to his Maker. It must also be just as plain that, with these, civil governments or civil rulers can have nothing to do.

For civil governments were ordained to rule, not in the things of God, but in the things pertaining to civil matters—the relation of man to his fellow-man or to the government itself.

Civil government therefore can have no right to enforce or regulate acts of conformity or non-conformity of its subjects to the divine law. And an attempt, even of this kind, is only an attempt to regulate matters of conscience, and civil government can have nothing to do with conscience.

It is true, in every sense of the word, that, "Sabbath desecration is to be deplored." But, as the Sabbath is an institution of heaven, and the command for the Sabbath is found in the moral law, and all moral questions pertain to God's government, the observance or non-observance of the Sabbath should be left to the individual conscience of every subject of civil government. And farther, if the above propositions are correct, the civil government has no right whatever, even to try to enforce a moral question, a question that pertains to man's relation to his Maker; and it must be clearly seen, that to attempt such a thing is exalting the civil government above God himself, for God never forces obedience from his creatures.

It will never do to say that this is a

temperance measure, for if a person who drinks, knows that he will be prohibited from getting it on any one day in seven, he will get enough on the day preceding, to supply his supposed needs.

Then, again, what may or may not be considered a desecration of the Sabbath, can only be decided by an appeal to divine law. And here, again, we are met with differences of opinion and interpretation. Thus again we see this must be left to the individual conscience, and not to civil authority, unless we adopt the principle that "might makes right," and then let questions of conscience be settled by majorities.

Lord Macaulay ironically says, that in matters of conscience "majorities are all right, when I'm in the majority; but all wrong when I'm in the minority."

To illustrate still farther, we will take the case of the infidel. Has he no rights? He has no convictions or scruples as to the Sabbath. Would it be right for the Christian, who might be in the majority, to compel him to observe a Christian institution? It would be all right and proper if it would be right for the infidel, who might be in the majority, to declare that there was no Sabbath, and compel Christians to labor on the Sabbath. But if one is wrong so is the other.

It must, therefore, be clear to all, that the only position for the civil government, or local authorities, is simply to protect every man in his rights; the Christian in keeping the Sabbath, and the infidel in not keeping it. If we should try to compel a man who is not a Christian, to act as do the Christians, we should only make a hypocrite of him who otherwise might be a good citizen, and thus he would become a dangerous man, and hence a dangerous citizen. Let us be consistent, and look at this question from the standpoint of the Golden Rule. "Therefore all things, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

H. F. PHELPS.

Keep Them Separate.

It seems to me clear that it is better to separate religious instruction from secular instruction, and to place it in a different school—a school connected with the church. . . . If the pupil leaves the secular school and repairs to the church for a religious lesson, the impression made upon him is much stronger than the same lesson given in the secular school in connection with secular lessons. Careful observers of the effects of the religious lessons placed on programmes of schools in Germany, and Austria, and other nations, tell us that where the secular studies are taught according to the true method the pupils are prone to hold in a sort of contempt the contents of their religious lessons. They are apt to bring their critical intellects to bear on dogmas and become skeptical of

religious truth altogether. It is well known that the people of Germany are much given to skepticism. Its educated class is famous for its "free-thinking," so-called. The French educated class, all of which was in its youth under parochial school influence, is atheistic.

All Protestant nations are agreed that there should be a separation of Church and State. The Catholic laity all over the world is nearly unanimous in the same opinion. I think that even the Catholic priesthood, at least in the United States, holds this view. The separation of Church and State implies the separation of Church and school. The Church and State are separated in the interest of the perfection of both. . . . The concession made in Savannah, Poughkeepsie, and a few other places, viz: a compromise which permits Catholic religious exercises before and after school in the school room, or which permits the teacher to wear the garb of some Catholic order—the garb of the sisters or the priesthood—militates against the public character of the school and cannot be conceded as a possible compromise.—*W. T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, in Independent.*

Strengthening the Hands of the Enemy.

THE *Truth Seeker*, of this city, occasionally says some very good and sensible things. Here is a sample:—

The State should not pay for religious instruction in the public schools, for the reason that it is not the State's business. Religion is a question for each person to decide for himself. The public schools are for the children of every one, and it could not be otherwise than a wrong inflicted upon some child to have religion taught therein—some Freethinker, some Protestant, some Catholic, some Jew. And for the State to provide schools for each sect would be impossible. It would ruin the people to pay the taxes to support them. There are some two hundred sects of Christians in the world, and the United States has samples of about all of them. Schools would have to be multiplied forty-fold. There is no feasible plan to educate children in public schools that will not work injustice except to make them strictly secular, and leave their religious education to their parents.

This is sound; but not so with this precious bit of baseless assertion from the same article:—

It seems to be necessary to continually remind the priests that morality has nothing to do with religion. Morality appeals to the experience of mankind. It cares nothing about faith, nothing about sacred books. Morality depends upon facts, something that can be seen, something known, the product of which can be estimated.

But morality has much to do with religion, and we doubt not that even the *Truth Seeker* admits it practically, even if it does not as a theory. We have known the *Truth Seeker* to remark upon the immorality of professed Christians as something not in accordance with their profession. Why, if morality has nothing to do with religion? The *Truth Seeker* certainly knows better.

But we quote again from the same article:—

The State should not teach religion for another reason. Religion is the enemy of the State, in that it diverts the attention of men from this world to another, and teaches them to sacrifice this world to that other. This weakens the ties that hold families and States together, and has a tendency to reduce society to anarchy.

The paper that uses such arguments (?) against the teaching of religion, is simply strengthening the hands of those who would make our public schools auxiliary to the Church. Every unprejudiced man knows that true Christianity is not "the enemy of the State." Both Christ and the apostles taught submission to rightful authority; and while Christianity teaches that a good hope of eternal life should be the first and great concern of every man, it also exhorts to diligence in business; and every infidel in the land knows that wherever you find a good Christian, one who is really worthy of the name, you find a good citizen, a good neighbor, and a good husband and father. Christianity guards the family, and cements family ties as nothing else can, and it is surprising that the *Truth Seeker* should deny it. The editor of that paper should read the twelfth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Romans, and learn what practical Bible Christianity is.

C. P. B.

The Divine Basis.

THE *Pearl of Days* says:—

An awakened moral conviction throughout the land must precede civil Sunday statutes, otherwise such legislation will be loose and below the divine standard.

The natural rules of construction upon which language is founded, and the inexorable necessity for a certain consecutiveness in mental action, make it well nigh impossible but that falsehood and misstatement should often bear unconscious and unintentional testimony to the truth.

It is so in this case. Before there is likely to be any legislation upon the Sunday question purely on a civil basis,—that is, before purely civil Sunday statutes will ever be passed, and the religious statutes upon Sunday observance be expurgated from the law books,—there must be "an awakened moral conviction throughout the land;" otherwise such legislation will certainly be below the "divine standard." But what would be the divine standard of "civil Sunday statutes"?

We have the divine standard of religious Sabbath statutes in Exodus 20:8, 9, 10: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." However, this law would not apply in any respect to Sunday, as the day mentioned in the divine statute quoted is the seventh day, and Sunday is the first day; it is manifest, therefore, that we must look elsewhere for the divine standard. No human court of law would accept the assertion in Exodus,

"The seventh day is the Sabbath," etc., as authority for a law on the statute book of any State, that "no servile labor shall be performed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday." Certainly not, the discrepancy is too patent. Such an assumption would be preposterous.

A careful search of the divine statute book from the first phrase, "In the beginning," at the opening of Genesis, to the "Amen," which closes the last chapter of Revelation, fails to produce a single precedent; Sunday must therefore stand solely upon its own worth as a secular day, with such extra dignity as human laws may have conferred upon it.

Finding no standard then by which human legislation may regulate itself as to the day in particular, it will be necessary to consider the other branch of the question, and ask what divine standard we are given by which to regulate civil Sunday legislation, as well as all other civil legislation? Upon this we have the authority of Christ himself in Luke 20:25; and Matt. 22:21, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." And again in another place, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The divine standard by which all human legislation must be governed is here given. The first principle laid down is that that which is God's is extra judicial, entirely, and cannot be trenched upon by civil regulations, either to be added to, detracted from, or in any way to be made a subject of adjudication.

Civil Sunday statutes, then, must be confined solely to such regulations of civil affairs, upon that day, as is acknowledged to be fit for the maintenance of good order and general civility upon the Fourth of July, and other legal holidays. For if it is a religious regulation it conflicts with the "divine standard," and if purely civil it must contain no religious element. All civil Sunday statutes must also be strictly impartial; there must be in them nothing whatever which might not be equally applicable to any other day; otherwise they will be found to conflict here and there with the standard, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

When will there be "throughout this land" such an awakening of "moral convictions" as will raise our civil statutes to the divine standard? And when will the law-makers, and those who appoint them, understand that the statutes of God are his, and that he has drawn an unalterable line of demarkation between them and the civil regulations which he has granted man the privilege and the ability of establishing for himself? If it were possible for that day ever to come, there would be found in it no "loose legislation" in which men would go outside their legislative sphere to enforce or interpret divine laws,

or under the title "Civil Sunday" to enforce a religious Sabbath. W. H. M.

Hits Them Too.

FREETHINKERS have discovered that they, as well as the Mormons, might easily be disfranchised under the Idaho test oath. Commenting upon that oath, and how it would affect seventh-day Christians should Idaho adopt a rigid Sunday law, the *Truth Seeker* says:—

It occurs to us also that the Freethinkers are in the same boat. It is true that infidels do not teach as a religious duty that labor on Sunday is particularly righteous, but they do teach that it is just as righteous as working on any day. This they do from a common-sense standpoint, which would come under the statutory description of "otherwise" than as a religious duty. Therefore, if Idaho shall by law define labor on Sunday as a crime, and disfranchise all who advise, teach, counsel, or encourage it, the Freethinkers of the State, and they are legion, will have to be hypocrites or be classed with Mormons and deprived of their voting rights.

So it is with a great many other things which are artificially made crimes by legislation. In some States, like New Jersey, for instance, speaking contumeliously of Christ is blasphemy, and blasphemy is a crime. Yet there are thousands of Freethinkers, particularly in the boundless West, who . . . do speak of Christ in just that manner. . . . But suppose Idaho should borrow New Jersey's blasphemy law. . . . And with a prohibitory law, beer-sellers would be disfranchised, and so would all anti-prohibitionists who advise resistance to the law. . . . The oath, therefore, very plainly goes too far. If it should be rigorously administered, the voters of Idaho would be diminished to an extremely small proportion of the population. Most people object to one or more of their State's statutes, and suppose Anarchists Tucker and Pentecost, who object to all laws, should move out to Idaho—why, two of the most intelligent and best citizens of the State couldn't get within miles of the polls.

It is indeed apparent that the Idaho test oath does, as we said a week or two ago, go too far. It ought to be abolished.

An Answer to Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts on the Sunday Amusement Question.

THERE is a class of men lecturing through the country at the present time, who unquestionably take unwarranted positions on the subject of the conduct of the people on Sunday, and what is proper Sunday observance; and they wish to force everybody to conform to their ideas. We use the term force in its most literal sense, that of physical compulsion. That these men have a perfect right to their ideas as to what is proper Sunday observance, and also by tongue and pen to labor to persuade men to endorse and adopt them, no one for a moment denies. But the doctrine of coercion which they advocate is radically wrong, and deserves to be frowned upon by every intelligent citizen and lover of civil and religious liberty. These men are trying to work the people, or one class of people, up to such a pitch of religious zeal that they will demand that their ideas on religion shall be enacted into law, and forced upon all classes,

irrespective of their religious convictions or non-convictions.

Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts is a prominent lecturer among this class of religio-political enthusiasts. He endeavors to prove that all amusements on Sunday should be prohibited by law, and claims that this can be done on a purely civil basis. The way he says it can be done is by asserting that Sunday amusements are not only sins against God, but "crimes against man." Now we submit that when an amusement on Saturday is acknowledged to be a harmless entertainment to mankind, it will be difficult, on a civil basis, to show that it is crime on Sunday. There is no law in logics or physics within the realms of civility by which this can be shown. Such a thing is impossible. It might as well be argued that the sun's rays shining on a certain day are detrimental to vegetation. Divest Sunday or any other day of its religious character, and the absurdity of the claim that harmless amusements, on that day, are crimes against men, will at once appear. Did not some regard Sunday religiously, no one would be heard decrying Sunday amusements. This is confirmed by the fact that none but the religious, or those catering to religious influences, are heard asking for laws to suppress them. This being so, Mr. Crafts's statement that these things are prohibited, or asked to be prohibited, "not because Sunday amusements are regarded by Christians as sinful," is certainly false. The truth told, this is just the reason the prohibition is asked.

Christians have the same rights in civil matters as other men; but they have no right whatever to force, by civil measures, their religious customs and ideas upon those who differ from them on religious questions. They may observe whatever day they please, and the Government protects them in the exercise of their rights, so long as they are civil. But they have no right, whether in the minority or majority, to institute measures whereby they can force all to conform to their religious ideas and practices. In other words, they have no right to deprive other men of their rights.

Sunday amusements will break up no churches if the church members stay away from them, which it is their undisputed privilege to do. And if any of the members persist in attending them, there certainly is no civil law prohibiting the other members from "churching" them. Neither are there any Russian laws in this country to prevent any church from preaching, praying, writing, talking, singing, and pleading against such things as "sins against God;" but they should remember that sins against God are not within the purview of civil government. If they will read their Bible they will find that God says, "Vengeance is mine, I will repay."

The sphere of the Church is moral suasion; but law in civil matters means compulsion. When men talk law they talk force; but the great commission of Christ to his disciples was not, "Go ye into all the world and force men to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," but to "teach them." The best way we know for Sunday observers to preserve that day as the Sabbath, is for them to keep it and teach others to keep it. And there is nothing to prevent them from doing this; but for them to try and preserve it by forcing others to keep it who do not believe in keeping it, at least as they do, is both un-American and un-Christian.—*W. A. Colcord, in Iowa State Register.*

The Bible in Our Public Schools.

THE following synopsis of a sermon preached at Freehold, N. J., by Rev. W. J. Gill, of Englishtown, is from the Freehold Transcript:—

"Let everybody read the Bible," said the speaker—"thoughtfully, prayerfully, earnestly—but not carelessly, presumptuously—perhaps even brazenly—in the school room or elsewhere. Do not secularize the sacred volume. Do not lay unworthy hands upon it, nor force it on the unwilling. Righteousness is not imparted by rule, arbitrarily. But 'the righteous shall inherit the earth.' Do not fear that our public schools will become godless. The Bible will be read and reverently taught in other ways and all appropriate places. It is the business of the religious world to see that it is,—of the Christian denomination to carry it into every consenting household, and popularize it in every wise and proper manner. The work is theirs and they will do it. They cannot delegate it to the secular, or the sinners, the godless or the alien. Nor should they seek to. Interpretation of the inspired word should be committed only to competent, I had almost said, to consecrated instructors. Cherishing it, and holding it in reverence themselves—interpenetrated and enthused by it, they will teach it in the love of it, and commend it to others because of the beneficent influence it has visibly exerted upon their own lives."

Mr. Gill premised by saying that he had something to say on what might be termed "*State Religion in our Public Schools.*"

"Bible reading," he said, "and prayers in our public schools are a relic of the old State religions. The Puritans of New England, have in the main, the honor of originating our common schools, and with them they established a State religion in these schools as well as in the church; and by extreme severity they enforced conformity so long as they could. The public finally refused to tolerate the Congregational Church as the State religion

supported by enforced taxation. The public school is a State institution and therefore its religion is a State religion, a State church. Its minister is the school teacher who is paid by the State for conducting certain specified religious exercises and devotions.

Now, it is a generally admitted principle in America that religion should be voluntary, and not imposed by the State, and the support of it enforced by penal legislation. That principle demands the extinction of State churches in our public schools. Religious exercises should not be enjoined on the teacher; for if enjoined they are to be paid for by taxation. Therefore let all laws requiring prayers and Bible reading as a religious exercise be repealed.

If we are to have a State religion in our public schools we shall always have the poorest religion in the largest quantity, for the religious body which has the lowest grade of spiritual life, and the most developed spirit and organization for political action and influence, will have its creatures and adherents most largely in these places, and receive the largest proportion of public money. Thus in proportion to their numbers the Catholics are now receiving from five to twenty times as much as the Protestants, all over this country; and they are annually increasing that proportion, and anticipate a coming time, not far off, when they shall have all; and nothing else is their aim and demand.

In practical meaning and force the Bible is a sectarian book. It is Protestant and anti-Papal. This the Papists have confessed by their hatred and fear of it, and by their steady and cruel persecutions of its readers, for more than a thousand years. Therefore it is not right to force them to hear it read in the public schools and to pay for the reading.

Besides, a growing number of these public school teachers of religion are Catholics, and to require them to read the Bible is a species of persecution; and they will read it in such a way and select such passages, as will make a burlesque of the whole affair.

The same may be said of all who have not a true spirit of devotion, and a loving reverence for the sacred book; and very many are lacking here, who are otherwise excellent teachers. They are not educated to be religious, but secular, teachers; and only as secular are they hired, or should be. It is their secular knowledge and ability which determine their grade and standing. And for a bad or irreligious man to be the leader of public worship, is not only absurd and offensive, but deleterious to religious life and feeling.

Next, consider also who it is that usually appoints these teachers—'ward politicians,' a phrase which has become a synonym for what is beneath even the average moral and spiritual worth. These

men are the directors of our State religion. They are, or they appoint, the trustees of our public schools, and so they appoint the ministers of our State church. How much will they be concerned for the religious qualifications of these ministers, and how well qualified are they to judge of fitness for such an office? Clearly the whole affair is absurd, as a method of fostering religion, and utterly contrary to the spirit of our free institutions. It is an anachronism which ought to be corrected."

An Unwarrantable Attempt.

THE SENTINEL is not partisan in any sense, and, therefore, upon the reference to the Republicans in the following extract from the *Sun*, we have nothing to say. We print the item solely for the value of the point which it makes so clearly, without reference one way or the other to the Republicans, as such:—

"I think," said Governor Hoard in a speech delivered at Waukesha, the day after the Milwaukee election, "I see the interest of the American State hanging in the balance in the discussion, and I wish to see exhibited the patriotism that knows enough to defend the house in which it lives. This law may be imperfect, but what new law is not? It may require to be perfected, but we should stand by the right of the State to prescribe the secular education of the State." Unfortunately for Governor Hoard and the Republicans, the Bennett bill undertakes to prescribe what shall be taught in schools supported by religious bodies and private means, and not by public taxation. The position of the opponents of the Bennett bill is clearly defined by Mr. George Brumder, proprietor of the *Germania*, the organ of the German Lutheran Church. "It is not," he says, "because the Lutherans are adverse to the teaching of English in the Lutheran schools, that we oppose the law, but simply because the State attempts to dictate to us what we shall teach in our private schools."

The Republicans are raising the cry of the State against the Church, and they are taking the rather ticklish course of representing the opposition to the Bennett bill as the work of Catholics, Lutherans, and foreigners generally. In reality the opponents of the bill are fighting for the good and sound principle that the State shall mind its own business. They are not attacking the common schools. They are defending private and parochial schools, and they are resisting the unwarrantable attempt of the State to direct the instruction in institutions which it does not support."

HIM whom they would make King of this Nation by the manipulations of corrupt politicians, said, "My kingdom is not of this world."

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.



DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.
We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.
We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.
We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.
We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES.

48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;

225 A ST., N. E., WASHINGTON; 28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO.

C. ELDRIDGE, - - - - - President.
W. H. MCKEE, - - - - - Secretary.

Sunday and the World's Fair.

THE question of closing the World's Fair on Sunday is being agitated at the present time. It is insisted by a numerous and influential class of citizens that the Columbian Exposition to be held in Chicago in 1893, shall be closed to all the world on Sunday.

It is not the purpose of this leaflet to discuss whether the Fair shall or shall not be closed on Sunday, but to inquire what motive prompts the making of such a demand. On what ground is the demand that the Fair be closed on Sunday, based? Why not ask that it be closed on Monday? or why ask that it be closed on any day?

Sunday is regarded by a large majority of Christians as a religious day, and from these, and for religious reasons, comes the demand that the Fair be closed on Sunday. This is the reason the demand is made,—their religious views of the character of the day. The demand, then, is made by a class of religious people, from religious motives, and for religious ends. To their religious views they certainly have a right; but when it is insisted that the religious views of some, even though they be largely in the majority, shall be made a rule of action for all, another question at once arises,—

CAN A LAND OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ENFORCE RELIGIOUS VIEWS?

The World's Fair is not a religious concern. Others beside those who regard Sunday as a sacred day will visit it, and contribute to its support and success. Thousands may wish to attend it on Sunday who will not have an opportunity to do so on other days. Should the Fair be kept open, those who regard Sunday religiously need not visit it on that day. Their action in the matter would depend solely on their own choice. But to demand that the World's Fair shall be closed to all the world on Sunday, because some good people regard that day religiously, is unreasonable. What right have

those who regard the hours of Sunday as holy time, to dictate how or where those who do not so regard them shall or shall not spend their time? With all respect to religion, it must be said that when its devotees assume such an attitude, they are taking unwarrantable ground.

This demand is not made in the interests of the Fair, or of the Nation, but to secure national sanction to certain religious views. It is prompted by the same spirit which demands a national Sunday law, and an establishment by law of a national religion. But—

IS CIVIL GOVERNMENT THE PROPER CONSERVATOR OF RELIGION?

The object of civil government is not to make its citizens religious, but civil. Religion pertains to a man's obligations to God and his well-being in another world. Civil governments are instituted to protect men in their rights in this world. It is not the province of religion to run civil governments. The Church has never assumed control of the State without persecution quickly following in its train. Forgetting their high calling, religionists have sometimes made it their chief business to meddle with worldly affairs, and sought to place civil governments on a religious basis; but all such efforts have invariably proved disastrous, both to religion and the governments.

The success of Christianity does not depend upon the closing of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday. Christianity is a great deal larger than Columbia or the Exposition, and Sunday-keeping is not all there is to Christianity. Christians differ as to which day is the Sabbath, some claiming the first, and others the seventh day of the week, and it is not the province of the Government to say which is right.

Aside from divine revelation, the strongest argument any one can make in favor of the day he regards as sacred is for him to keep it. The consistent course for those churches to pursue which regard Sunday as sacred time, is for them to prohibit their members from attending the Fair on that day, and discipline those who do. This they may do, and this is as far as they can consistently go. The membership of a church is the extent of its jurisdiction. It is not the business of churches to demand of nations, States, or principalities, that everybody shall be required to conform to their ideas and customs in religious matters. Any attempt in this direction is but a step toward a union of Church and State.—*N. R. L. A. Leaflet.*

THE State is not an exhorter, or a persuader, or a debating club, but a positive law power for secular purposes; and hence, when it attempts to administer religion, it must of necessity give to it the law force, deciding what religion is true, and by what method it shall be promoted. There is no escape from this result, if we admit the principle from which it springs.—*Samuel T. Spear, D. D.*

HEALTH FOOD CRACKERS

HEALTH produces wealth; and good health can not be made of poor material. The agitation of this health question for some years in the past has created a demand for

HEALTHFUL FOODS,
in the manufacture of which we have for the past ten years been engaged. The demand having constantly increased, we have found it necessary to greatly increase our facilities by the addition of new and the latest improved machinery, etc. We are now well equipped, and prepared to fill all orders, and to extend our business into new fields. Our Foods and Crackers are made from the choicest grains and are strictly pure, justly entitling them to the name above given.

SAMPLE PACKAGES
Of assorted Health Food Crackers sent post-paid on receipt of fifty cents. Write for descriptive circular and price list to

Battle Creek Bakery Co.,
168 WEST MAIN ST.,
Battle Creek, Mich.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism, is outlined in the prophecies of Holy Scriptures with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

PAPER COVERS, 25 CENTS.
CLOTH COVERS, 60 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address,
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.,
Or, LOS ANGELES CHURCHMAN, 35 California
Bank Building, Los Angeles, Cal.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

Neat, cheap, serviceable. They perfectly secure pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it cannot fall out when stooping. Can be easily and safely attached to any part of the clothing. A small investment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1	Russia leather, for 2 pens	10c.
No. 2	" " " " " "	15c.
No. 3	" " metal back, 2 pens,	15c.
No. 4	" " " " " "	20c.
No. 5	Sealskin, for 2 pens,	15c.
No. 6	" " " " " "	25c.
No. 7	Russia Leather, for 4 pens	25c.
No. 8	Sealskin, " " " "	40c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH,"
"COPYGRAPH."

Or any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is used, are the

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil, Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

REDDING INK CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

TEN LECTURES ON NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and **SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES**, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

GOOD FOR ALL TIME!

THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS THE ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS, AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL, WHICH MR. JONES PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, DECEMBER 13, 1888.

Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING."

And Mr. Jones' comments make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments. As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is based on Scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the

Sunday-Law Movement of the Fourth Century,
AND THE
Sunday-Law Movement of the Nineteenth Century.

The Methods Used in Securing Indorsements to the Petition for the Blair Bill, and the Workings of Such Sunday Laws as are Proposed for the United States.

The Work Contains 192 Pages and will be Sent Post-paid on Receipt of 25c.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to Your Friends!

Address all Orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

NEW EDITIONS

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN

By A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain, and Forcible.

THIS IMPORTANT WORK SHOWS CLEARLY THE RELATION THAT SHOULD EXIST BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE AT THE PRESENT TIME, AS PROVEN BY THE BIBLE AND HISTORY OF THE PAST TWENTY-FIVE CENTURIES.

CHAP. I outlines vividly the relation that existed between "Christianity and the Roman Empire."
CHAP. II distinguishes between "What is due to God and what to Cæsar."
CHAP. III shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are ordained.
CHAP. IV ably discusses "The Religious Attack upon the United States Constitution, and Those Who Are Making it."
CHAP. V unmasks "Religious Legislation," calling special attention to the Blair Sunday Bill now pending in Congress.
CHAP. VI is devoted to the "Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and its Parallel in the Nineteenth."
CHAP. VII shows The Workings of Sunday Laws when they are enforced.
These chapters, with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States which are printed in Appendices C and D, make this treatise INDISPENSABLE TO EVERY LOVER OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

Is a Pamphlet of 182 Large Octavo Pages, in English, Price 25 Cents; and in German, 228 Pages, Price, 35 Cents.

MILLIONS OF COPIES

Should be Placed in the Hands of Thinking People at once. It Clearly Defines what Position American Citizens should Sustain Toward the Effort now on Foot to Secure Religious Legislation. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK,

OR OAKLAND, CAL.

DO YOU USE A FOUNTAIN PEN?

Then you need the **COMBINED INK BOTTLE AND PEN FILLER**, consisting of a bottle holding ink sufficient to fill a pen 8 or 10 times, with a Patent Rubber Cork and Filler, all inclosed in a neat wooden case with a screw top, making the safest, most complete, compact, and convenient article for the use of traveling men and others now extant. Weighs when filled with ink less than three ounces.

Imitation Rose-wood case, 25c.
Real Box-wood, " 50c.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price.

Address,
PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication

Devoted to the defense of

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

And the Preservation of the

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

AS IT IS.

TERMS, 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

The following numbers are now ready, and will be sent to any address post-paid on receipt of price:—

- No. 1 *The National Reformed Constitution.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 2 *Religious Liberty.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 3 *Evils of Religious Legislation.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 4 *The Blair Sunday Rest Bill.* Price, 7 cents.
- No. 5 *The Blair Educational Amendment.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 6 *Purity of National Religion.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 7 *National Reform and Rights of Conscience.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 8 *The American Papacy.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 9 *The Salem Witchcraft.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 10 *National Reform is Church and State.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 11 *What Think Ye of Christ?* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 12 *Bold and Base Avowal.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 13 *The National Reform Movement an Absurdity.* Price, 2 cents.
- No. 14 *The Republic of Israel.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 15 *National Reformed Presbyterianism.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 16 *A Lutheran View of the National Reform Movement.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 17 *Religion and the Public Schools.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 18 *The National Sunday Law.* Price, 25 cents.
- No. 19 *Rev. W. F. Crafts Against the Editors of The American Sentinel.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 20 *Romanism and Civil Liberty.* Price, 4 cents.
- No. 21 *Why We Oppose Religious Legislation.* Price, 3 cents.
- No. 22 *The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 23 *A Civil Sunday Holiday.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 24 *Blair's Sunday Rest Bill and Joint Resolution, introduced December 9, 1888. (Exact copies, with notes).* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 25 *Civil Government and the Decalogue.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 26 *National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 28 *A Religious Political Movement.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 29 *Arguments on the Breckinridge Sunday Bill. The Object and Price of Exemption Clauses.* Price, 10 cents.
- No. 30 *A Civil Sabbath. What It Amounts to.* Price, 1 cent.
- No. 31 *Union of Church and State. What Constitutes Such a Union? Price, 1c.*

Address:
Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
OAKLAND, CAL.

Or, **Atlantic Tract Society,**
48 BOND STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.



NEW YORK, OCTOBER 16, 1890.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

REFERRING to the Lutheran declaration that the "underlying principle of the Bennett law is needless interference with parental rights and liberty of conscience," *America* says:—

The best refutation of this false charge is to be found in the fact that, although the law has been in force nearly two years, there has not been a single prosecution under its provisions.

Indeed, simply because a law is not enforced it is a just and humane law! It must be then that the Tennessee Sunday law was a perfectly righteous statute, till R. M. King was arrested and fined under it, simply to gratify the intolerance of his bigoted neighbors. Strange logic, that!

THE "Metropolitan Church and Choir Directory," for 1890, gives the number of churches in New York and Brooklyn as 759. This is an item of importance, as well as interest, when it is considered that effort is now being made to show the strength of the churches as a factor in local politics in the city of New York. How long is it possible for the Church to exert itself in politics in New York City, without becoming a full-rigged political machine? Have the political bosses in the past shown themselves too highminded to steal the livery of the Church to serve their master the devil, and Mammon, in? Certainly this is what they will do the very hour these noble-purposed, but mistaken gentlemen succeed in making the Church a political power.

THE *Christian Statesman*, of August 7, has the following, which is interesting, especially in view of some of the so-called arguments in favor of compulsory Sabbath keeping:—

A well informed authority says that Columbia College, New York, is largely carried on for the benefit of the Jews. They take five times as many prizes, in proportion to their numbers, as other classes; and in the annex to Columbia College, seventy per cent. of the pupils are Jewesses. The Jews control journalism in Germany, and are very largely influential in journalism all over the world.

This ought, certainly, to disprove the claim so confidently made in justification of Sunday laws, namely, that a regular day of rest is a physical necessity, and that in order for a portion of the community to take the necessary rest all must rest. The Jews do not rest habitually on Sunday, and it must be confessed that but

few of them observe with any degree of strictness any other day; yet it is a fact that in point of both mental and physical vigor they excel. This fact, coupled with like facts concerning the Japanese, a people who keep no rest day, ought to effectually dispose of the fiction that a regular weekly rest is a *physical* necessity.

WE find the following in an exchange, credited "*Voice*;" we doubt if it is from the paper of that name published in this city, but it may be:—

For our part we want to see less useless and hopeless tinkering with the Federal Constitution, and more of an effort to secure a government in conformity with the spirit of that still grand document. The changes the people of America most need are not changes in the Constitution. That is about the only thing left in our Government to be proud of.

We, too, believe that our Constitution is as nearly perfect as it can be made, certainly much more nearly so than it would be if amended according to the programme of the various and numerous Constitution tinkers. Let it remain as it is; and obey it as it is.

It has been proved by actual demonstration in Boston, that Sunday opening of their Museum of Fine Arts is appreciated by the general public. A writer in the *Independent*, of this city, says:—

The Boston Museum gives free admission to visitors two days in the week, Saturdays and Sundays. On Saturdays the average number of visitors last year was 776. The Museum is open on Sunday afternoons from one till five, at hours not conflicting with church services. The average number of Sunday admissions last year was 1,317.

The admissions for four hours Sunday afternoons, were almost double that of the ten hours of Saturdays,—though both are free days.

If the museums are designed to be instructors of the people, why not give laboring men and women the benefit of them without at the same time requiring them to make a financial sacrifice, which they must do if they go upon working days?

PRESIDENT WOODRUFF, on September 24, published a manifesto denying that plural marriages were still solemnized in Utah, and saying:—

Inasmuch as laws have been enacted by Congress forbidding plural marriages, which laws have been pronounced constitutional by the court of last resort, I do hereby declare my intention to submit to those laws and use all my influence with the members of the church, over which I preside, to have them do likewise. There is nothing in my teaching to the church or in those of my associates during the time specified, which can reasonably be construed to inculcate or encourage polygamy, and when any elder of the church has used language which appeared to convey such teaching he has been promptly reprov'd; and I now publicly declare that my advice to the Latter-Day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land.

On the 6th inst., the Mormon Conference, in session in Salt Lake, resolved by a unanimous vote to sustain President Wood-

ruff in his action in abolishing polygamy. Not a dissenting voice was heard in the entire assembly of 10,000 persons.

Many will still doubt the sincerity of the Mormons in thus renouncing polygamy, and the Government will doubtless still keep them under surveillance for some time to come, or until they bring forth in this respect "fruits meet for repentance;" but so long as the Mormons abstain from plural marriages the Government cannot properly treat them differently from other religionists. Polygamy is rightfully prohibited by civil law, but aside from the practice of polygamy, the Mormons have just the same rights as the Catholics and the National Reformers, whom they resemble in their ideas of Church and State.

THE September *Arena* has an article from Thomas P. Gorman, in which, enumerating the grave problems which confront Canadian statesmen, the writer says:—

Then as to the separate school question, the Legislature of Manitoba has passed an act abolishing the existing school system in that province,—which is similar to that of Ontario,—and substituting therefor a public school system such as prevails in the American States. Although the British North American Act, the Constitution of the country, expressly declares that provincial legislatures have not the right to deprive the Protestant minority in Quebec, or the Roman Catholic minorities in other provinces, of any rights or privileges, with respect to education, which they enjoyed at the time of the union; the Manitoba Legislature, backed no doubt by popular opinion in the province, has undertaken to do something which the Constitution declares it shall not do. Not only does the British North American Act prohibit the local legislature from interfering with the separate school system, but it expressly declares that, in the event of that legislature failing to provide the money and machinery necessary for the carrying out of such a system, then the federal Parliament shall intervene and supply whatever is wanting. Then a new party has been formed in Ontario for the purpose of securing for that province full control of educational matters in that province, including the right of abolishing the separate school system.

Thus it appears that the mistaken zeal which leads men, calling themselves Protestants, to violate charters for the sake of gaining advantage not only in politics, but in religious propaganda, is not confined to the United States.

ANY one who can give any information concerning the whereabouts of John N. Fearon, who was in Colorado when last heard from (ten years ago), will be *duly rewarded* for his trouble by addressing his mother, Sarah B. Fearon, 409 E. Main Street, Lock Haven, Pa.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

The defense of American Institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights both civil and religious.

It will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending towards a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

SINGLE COPY, PER YEAR, POST-PAID, \$1.00.

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, 75c.

To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid. 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.