



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

VOLUME 5.

NEW YORK, JUNE 5, 1890.

NUMBER 23.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

EDITOR, - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN,

W. H. McKEE.

THOSE who insist that some species of *religious* instruction shall be incorporated into our public-school system, may not intend the result; yet they are taking just the course most likely to destroy the system altogether, since they demand of it what it cannot consistently do. *Secular* instruction is the utmost limit to which the system can be reasonably extended.—*Independent.*

THE home and the church are the proper places for moral and religious training, not the State free schools. These schools are for secular training, to prepare for intelligent citizenship, heroic manhood, and for life work. The State educates for its own support and protection, not for the future of man or boy after death; not to make Christians, Jews, or Mormons, but to make good citizens, noble patriots, and wise men.—*Commercial Gazette, Baltimore, Maryland.*

"ALL crime against the State," says Rev. W. J. Coleman, "is an open sin against God." If this were true, it would follow that the State can require nothing wrong, and forbid nothing that is right. It would also follow that the three Hebrews who refused to fall down before the great image which Nebuchadnezzar set up, were guilty of sin; that Daniel sinned in praying to God when forbidden so to do by the king; and that the apostles and martyrs of Jesus also sinned when they chose to obey God rather than men. God has ordained civil government; he did this when he created men and placed them together in families and communities; and when governments confine them-

selves to their proper sphere it is sin to resist their authority; but when they enter the domain of morals and assume to rule in things pertaining to God, they put themselves in the place of God, and must be disobeyed by all who would remain loyal to God. It is this principle alone that justifies the martyrs; any other reduces them to the level of criminals who suffered justly, condemned alike by God and man.

The Bennett Law.

THE Bennett law of Wisconsin has excited much discussion not only in that State but throughout the country. This law was enacted last year, going into effect April 18, 1889. The object of the law is to compel all the children between the ages of seven and fourteen years, to learn the English language. Every such child is compelled to attend school where the teaching is in English, "not less than twelve weeks in each year" under penalty of a fine of "not less than three dollars nor more than twenty dollars" for each offense; "and failure for each week or portion of a week on the part of any person to comply with the provisions of this act shall constitute a distinct offense." Section 5 reads as follows:—

No school shall be regarded as a school under this act, unless there shall be taught therein, as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States History, in the English language.

This law has incurred the open and determined opposition of the whole Lutheran body in the State, assisted by that portion of the Roman Catholics who speak German or other foreign tongues. The Lutherans seem to be the leaders in the contest. Illinois has a similar law, only worse if anything, and the Bennett-law contest in Wisconsin has awakened a much more active opposition to the Illinois law. The cause is one in both States.

In several papers that have discussed this matter we have noticed a singular misapprehension of the question at issue,

and a misstatement of the reasons of the opposition.

1. The opposition is not to the public school in any sense. The Lutherans maintain the perfect right of the public school to exist; and willingly pay their proportion of the public-school taxes.

2. The opposition is not to the use, nor the teaching, of the English language in the public schools. The Lutherans cheerfully admit the right of the public school to teach the English language.

3. The opposition is not to the English language itself, nor to its use. The opponents of the Bennett law do not prohibit their children from either learning or speaking the English language. They know full well that their children will learn English. They know that in the nature of things they cannot live very long in this country without learning it. They teach it in their schools, and speak it, and write it, upon occasion.

BUT,

While admitting all this, they deny that the public school may teach religion, much less the religion which they believe; and they maintain their own exclusive right to teach their own religion to their own children, in their own schools, at their own expense, in their own native language, if they choose.

While maintaining the right of the public school to exist, they maintain likewise the right of the parochial school to exist.

While cheerfully paying their proportion of taxes in support of the public school, they maintain their right to pay what they please for the support of their own private school.

While they maintain the right of the State to use and to teach the English language in the State school, they maintain their own right to use and to teach the German, or any other language, in their own school.

While they cheerfully admit the right of the public to establish and maintain the public school, they deny the

right of the public to turn their private schools into public schools. For that, in one sentence, is what the Bennett law means, and the Illinois law also.

The Bennett law requires that every child between the ages of seven and fourteen years shall attend school such period of time, not less than twelve, nor more than twenty-four weeks, in each year, as "shall be fixed" "by the Board of Education, or Board of Directors of the city, town or district;" "and such Boards shall, at least ten days prior to the beginning of such periods publish the time or times of attendance."

The Illinois law requires that the children shall attend school "at least sixteen weeks," with a penalty of not less than one dollar, nor more than twenty dollars "for every neglect." "But if the person so neglecting, shall show to the satisfaction of the Board of Education or of Directors that such child has attended for a like period of time a private day school, approved by the Board of Education or Directors of the city, town, or district in which such child resides, etc., then such penalty shall not be incurred."

The only effect of these laws is to make every private school a public school. The use of the term "private school" in the sections quoted is a misnomer; because when the public fixes the time or times of attendance at the school, and fixes what shall be taught there and how; when what is done must be "to the satisfaction" of the public authorities, and must be "approved" by the public authorities, then such schools are no longer private in any proper or legal sense of the word.

Yet these laws do not openly propose the abolition of the private schools, they only mildly propose to confiscate them—to turn them into public schools at private expense. These two States generously grant the right of the churches to establish church schools; but when the schools are once established, then the States merely assert the authority to turn them into State schools at the churches' expense. The effect of these laws therefore is as clearly confiscation of property as need be. The State lays a public tax, collects it, and uses it under its own direction in the work of the public school. The people who hold church schools pay their proportion of the tax levied by the State. They pay all that the State asks. But besides this they as church members organize schools of their own in which to teach their own children the religion in which they believe, and whatever else they may choose; they use their own money to pay teachers, to build school-houses, etc. Then the State steps up and demands, "I must have all this too. These schools must be under *my* control; the teaching there must be to *my* satisfaction; in short they shall not be counted schools at all unless you teach there what *I* say shall be taught, and as *I* say it shall be taught. In other words,

and to be plain about it, you must spend your money and teach your children as I choose and as I direct."

That is precisely what these laws mean. The confiscation of the money and property however is a very small item, as compared with the usurpation of the place, and the authority of the parent and the Church. These laws are identical in effect, and almost identical in word, with a bill introduced in the New York Legislature, January 16, 1890, which the Union League Club unanimously denounced as "a dangerous and vicious bill," and "in the line of the most vicious class of legislation with which we are afflicted;" and which met the death it deserved, and which it is to be hoped is everlasting. Any private or church school that obeys these laws thereby consents to the State's assumption of authority to control the school, and dictate in its affairs. And if the State can say what any church or association of parents shall teach to their own children, and how it shall be taught, then there is no longer any such thing as parental or church authority to teach anything except at the direction and dictation of the State. The State has no more right to say what shall be taught in a private school, than a private individual has to say that his private views shall be taught in the public school. The State has not a particle more right to say what shall be taught in a church school, than a church has to say what shall be taught in the public school.

These are the grounds, and these the basic reasons, of the opposition to these laws in Wisconsin and Illinois. It is in defense of the American principle of the rights of the people, and of the Christian principle of religious liberty.

These compulsory school laws of Wisconsin and Illinois have not a scintilla of justice to rest upon. The principle is that of absolutism, the laws are but the assertion of it, and the defense of the laws is but the defense of it. We have read everything we could get hold of on the subject, from the laws themselves and Governor Hoard's speech, to whatever else we could find on either side of the question, and we have found the principle of the laws and the defense of them to be absolutism only; and in all that has been said in defense of them we have not yet found a single valid reason.

As we have shown, the laws logically assert the right of the State to say that neither the parent nor the Church shall teach anything to the children except at the direction and dictation of the State, and so argue that the State is absolute. All the advocates of the laws have not asserted openly and in plain terms that this is so, but some of them have. The words of one such we give. The *Chicago Tribune* of April 8, 1890, gives the words of Mr. William C. Goudy, a well-known lawyer and political leader, as follows:—

The State has the power over its citizens. *The State may even abolish the relations between parent*

and child, though as to the result of such an act I do not care to speak. The fact is that the law does interfere with the custody of children. Time and again children are taken away from both father and mother.

It is true enough that where parents maltreat a child, the State may, in fact it must, exercise its protective power in behalf of the child. Protection of the rights of the subject is what the State is for, and it must protect a child as well as a man. But it is only the assertion of the rightfulness of tyranny to argue from that the right of the State to abolish the relations between parent and child. It is a wicked spirit that turns the doing of a favor, into authority for an assertion of power—to make the exertion of a protective power in an exceptional case, the authority to assert a commanding or dictatorial power in all cases.

Further it is gravely argued that it is necessary to "the peace and safety of the State" that the State shall compel all the German and other children of foreign tongues to learn the English language. And it is *America* that says it. Well now, if all the people of Illinois and Wisconsin both should speak German, or Latin, or even Choctaw, we should like to know what calamity could threaten the peace and safety of either of the States from that source. Is every person necessarily a thief, or a murderer, or an outlaw who does not speak the English language? Is the peace or safety of States or communities never disturbed or threatened by people who speak English?

But if it is necessary to the peace and safety of the State that all the children of foreign tongues shall learn to read and write and speak English, why is it not necessary that the parents shall learn it also? Why jeopardize the peace and safety of the State all these years till all the parents die who do not speak English, and all the children learn to speak, read, and write English? Why is it not necessary, yea, much more necessary, that the parents be compelled to learn English as well as the children? Or is it a fact that the peace and safety of the State are endangered only by the *children*, and by such of them only as are between the ages of seven and fourteen years?

Besides, upon the theory of these laws that English can be learned only in school, not to compel the parents to use English is to continue the greatest possible hindrance to the children's learning to use it. So long as the parents are suffered to use German in the home, in the shop, in the field, everywhere, it will be almost an interminable task, successfully to get the children to learn it. Why then do not Wisconsin and Illinois go about this work in the right way? Why not adopt the plan that will positively assure speedy and certain, and permanent results? Why does not each of these States enact a law—doubtless Mr. Bennett for Wisconsin,

and *America* for Illinois, could easily frame the laws—declaring that after a certain time, say three or six months, everybody in the State shall use the English language exclusively, or else have his tongue cut out?

That will bring the result, and speedily, which these present laws aim to secure. We know it will, for it has been tried with perfect success. Some years ago a certain province of Turkey spoke another than the Turkish language. This was deemed not to be good for the State. Therefore a decree went forth that after a certain time whoever should speak any language but the Turkish should have his tongue cut out. And we have it from a person who was there that the thing worked splendidly. It is true some of the people lost their tongues, but what was that, in view of the immense result accomplished—the peace and safety of the State!

And just now, even in this present month, that most excellent ruler, that father of his country, the Czar of all the Russias, has issued an edict, abolishing the Finnish tongue and establishing the Russian only, in all the schools in Finland. We are not informed what penalties are attached to the law, but undoubtedly the mildness of temper that is characteristic of this model ruler will be expressed in penalties at the most no heavier than are those of these kindred laws in Wisconsin and Illinois.

The opponents of the Bennett law in Wisconsin and its counterpart in Illinois are in the right. It is the same old contest of justice against despotic power, of private rights against public wrongs, of the freedom of the individual against the despotism of the State. They are in the right, and we wish them unbounded success.

Will the people of these two splendid States come back to the place of enlightenment and American civilization? Will they redeem themselves from the reproach of Russian and Turkish despotism? We earnestly hope they will. A. T. J.

Senator Blair's Educational Bill.

SENATOR BLAIR is attempting some very dangerous experiments, in the name of learning and religion. His Educational Bill is of doubtful utility, and of more than doubtful expediency. There is no evidence that education will be permanently benefited by putting the Federal Government in control of it, and aiding it for a fixed term of years out of the Federal treasury. The people should sustain popular education for its own sake. Our Government rests upon the intelligence of the masses, but it is a voluntary intelligence. The fitness of the people for self-government lies in their voluntary enlightenment. When they reach a point at which the Government has to force

them to fit themselves for self-government, there will be danger abroad that larger statesmanship than Blair's will have to deal with. His measure tends to reduce the spirit of self help amongst the people, to turn their faces toward Washington, and look to the Federal Government for that which they should do for themselves. In this sense the help he intends to give to popular education will hurt it more than it has ever been hurt before. Education is as much the personal concern of every American as is obedience to the laws which all have made. Pride in himself, in his citizenship, in his country, is the proper motive for supporting public schools and general culture, and for this Mr. Blair's aims will be a sorry substitute. —*San Francisco Alta.*

The Public-School Question.

THE common schools are our national idol. Like all idols this American tutelary genius exercises a peculiar spell over its votaries and has the faculty of stupefying and stultifying them *ad libitum*. A most glaring instance of over-zeal and folly in this noble cause is the recent legislation of Wisconsin and Illinois against the parochial schools which abound in those States.

These two States have an immense Lutheran population, which has come mostly from Germany and northern Europe. They are people of enlightened and earnest religious convictions, many of them having come here to enjoy, unhampered by statecraft and uncorrupted by rationalism, their pure, evangelical, Protestant faith. To inculcate this precious faith in their children is with them one of the primary functions of the Christian Church, a duty to which she cannot be derelict. Hence they maintain at great expense in every congregation, a parish school in which for the first hour of every day the children receive instruction in the Christian religion.

They have no hostility to our common schools. They laud them as one of the noblest products and supports of the State. They are perfectly willing to be taxed for their maintenance, although deriving little direct profit from them. They are accustomed to send such of their children as can prosecute a further course of study, to the higher grades of the public schools, where their primary training is found quite equal to that furnished by the public school. They have not in a single instance asked for a portion of the school fund. In cities where, by co-operation with the Romanists, they could easily have succeeded in getting exemption from school taxes, or securing a fair portion of the fund, they have repelled with scorn the proposal for united action, protesting that in this matter they had nothing in common with Roman Catholics. But while in the fullest accord with the American school system,

they recognize that it is purely and necessarily secular, that the all-important element of true education is absolutely excluded. Hence they propose to supplement State education with Christian education; and very properly this supplement comes first in order, since all admit that the earliest religious impressions become the deepest and most abiding. The hearts and minds of the children are filled with the knowledge of divine truth, and then the State may take charge of their further instruction.

All this, it must be acknowledged, is at once accordant with the purest patriotism, and the best type of Christianity. And so far, the State could have no possible pretext for breaking up these parish schools. But a pretext is offered on the score of language. Many of these people have not been long enough in this country to have acquired the English language. And some communities are so exclusively made up of Germans or Scandinavians that the vernacular which they brought with them to this country still prevails, and it is said that there are even natives who cannot read, write, or understand English. There is, again, no opposition to the use of English. Dear as is the mother tongue which embalms the hallowed traditions and associations of a people, the hymns and the prayers of their religion, these new comers are sufficiently intelligent to understand the significance of their American citizenship to their children—and that to contend with others in the race of life, they must master the language of the country. And whoever saw a young German or Scandinavian that was not eager to speak English, no matter how much amusement was caused by his broken efforts?

Whenever it is practicable, the parish schools teach some of the branches in English. In many of them it is the medium of instruction for half the day, and the children outside the school room speak almost exclusively English. Yet as large bodies of emigrants continue to arrive, forming new communities and churches, cases continue to arise where a suitable teacher who can use English as the medium of instruction cannot be found, or where the children are as yet so absolutely ignorant of English, that to use that language as the medium of instruction would be the height of absurdity. You might as well make Greek the vehicle of instruction in our primary schools.

Yet this is just what these political wiseacres say must be done—the elementary branches must be taught in English, whether the children can understand a word of it or not, whether the teacher is capable of using it, or whether he is not. The police are to drag the children out of the Christian schools, where there is no English taught, and force them into the schools of the State, even though they understand not a word that is uttered there.

If only an amendment had been added requiring these statesmen to do the teaching under these conditions for the first year, there would soon have followed a call for an extra session of the Legislature to abolish this crude and hasty measure.

The American people are as sensible and just as they are practical, and one may confidently predict that such enactments, when properly understood, will not have the sanction of a sober public opinion. Apart from the impossibility of instructing children through the vehicle of an unknown tongue, such an expedient is doomed to failure even as a means of making them English. The results may be seen in half the counties of Pennsylvania, where English has been the language of instruction for fifty years, and where persons can be found whose parents and grandparents were born in this country, and who are still unable to speak, write, or understand English. They attended the English schools, but not understanding what was taught they never learned English or anything else. Though not among our worst elements, could they have had the instruction of parish schools in their vernacular, they would be far more intelligent than they are.

If Americans could for a moment put themselves in the place of these pious foreigners, who by common consent constitute a most peaceable, intelligent and thrifty class, they must look upon this legislation as a wanton and cruel invasion of their sacred right to educate their offspring in the best manner possible under the abnormal and temporary conditions. No American community would submit for one hour to such an outrage.

Some of these Germans have probably fled from the intolerance of Russia, which forces the Russian tongue into the schools of the Baltic Provinces. Invited to this country as offering the fullest civil and religious liberty, how bitter must be the disappointment which finds here the same spirit, the same politics, the same heartless disregard of circumstances and of rights.

But the saddest aspect of these laws is the revelation they make of the godless spirit that rules the State. The beliefs and the morals of Christianity, we have heard times without number, are the palladium of our free institutions. Here now are evangelical churches providing a thorough Christian culture for their children, infusing into their minds the eternal principles of private and public virtue, and the State with iron hand breaks in the door and demands to know what is being taught in these schools. The answer is, "The doctrines of the gospel, and whatever besides will help to make good citizens." "In what language are you doing it?" "In the only language at our command." "OUT WITH THIS BUSINESS! This is an English country, and unless you teach English your school must stop."

And so we are going! Whither, O

whither, tell me where? We are fain to speak of this as a Christian country. We hear often that Christianity is the common law of the land. We are even now passing a bill in the national Legislature to enforce the observance of "the Christian Sabbath." To some well-meaning people only one thing is lacking to make this in form as it already is in fact a Christian Nation, and that is to write the name of Jesus Christ across the national Constitution.—*Prof. E. J. Wolf, in Christian at Work.*

Simple Tyranny.

THE public-school system, existing in the several States of the Union, is directly the creation of State authority, and is maintained and enforced by compulsory taxation. The object is to meet a great practical want in the way of popular education that otherwise would not be adequately met. There can be no doubt either as to the necessity or as to the wisdom of the system considered with reference to the end had in view. The question whether the education, thus provided for, shall be simply *secular*, or shall, in addition thereto, include some element or elements of *religious* teaching, is the vexed question that has for years been the bone of contention in our public-school system, and that now really constitutes its greatest peril.

We have never had but one opinion on this subject, and have given full expression thereto, as occasion has called for it. We do not believe it to be the legitimate province of any State, as such, to engage in any species of *religious* propagandism, whether in the public school or elsewhere. A State, in order to do this, must first have a State religion, and, of course, must authoritatively determine what it shall be, and what it shall embrace; and having proceeded thus far, it must then, in order to give the idea a practicable form, compel the people through a tax levy to pay the expense of teaching the religion, whether they believe in its truth or not. The mere statement of the idea ought to be sufficient to refute it with the American people.

An American State cannot consistently extend its public-school system, supported by general taxation, and regulated by law, beyond the purely *secular* field of education; and those who demand that it shall do more than this are making war upon the only system that comes within the province of the State. Our public-school system must be purely secular in its instruction, or be abandoned altogether, unless the people are prepared to have the State in its organic power become a religious propagandist.

We desire to preserve and perpetuate the system on the only basis that is practicable, and hence utterly dissent alike from those Catholics and those Protestants

who would use the public schools for religious purposes. Not a dollar of the public money should be thus expended. No man should be required by law to pay a solitary penny for religious propagandism. Such a requirement is simply tyranny.—*The Independent.*

Where the Difficulty Lies.

PROFESSOR BLAISDELL, of Beloit College, Wisconsin, in *The Christian Union* of May 8, criticises the decision of the Supreme Court of that State on the Bible in the schools. He raises the same cry as other enemies of the public school, that the public school is thus made godless, and says:—

There are multitudes of thoughtful people in Wisconsin who will say, If information about a Supreme Being, and addressed to the highest and most productive sentiments in the school training of my children is to be ruled out of our schools so that they become godless and morally colorless, we will have our parish schools.

Very well, such persons had better have their parish schools than to have the public school turned into a parish school. They had better teach their own children the religion which they want them to be taught, at their own expense, than to undertake to do it at other people's expense.

To talk about the public schools being thus made morally colorless is another piece of sophistry, because those very persons claim that the religion to be taught shall not be dogmatic, nor sectarian. It must be of such a kind as that all may receive it with equal favor. And to demand that in a community where there are many different views, and where every man is free to think for himself, is only to demand that the teaching shall be morally colorless. The objection that the public schools are made godless and morally colorless, is a fraud. There is not a particle of fairness in it, and those who make it must know it, because it is difficult to conceive how men who can write as intelligently as these, can be so dull as not to detect the sophistry of their own argument.

The Professor next objects to the decision because if it is sound, then the State cannot teach religion in its asylums, for the blind, the deaf and the insane. Then he begins to beg his question by appealing to the sympathies of the people for these unfortunates. But that is no objection to the decision. If the State has the right to teach religion in its asylums and in the penitentiaries, then it has a right to teach it in the public schools. If it is right to teach it in the public schools, it is right to teach it everywhere else. The trouble is that those who argue this way miss the whole point, and that is, that it is impossible for the State to teach religion. Before the State can teach religion, it has to have a religion to be taught. And as the Supreme Court of Ohio justly said:—

Properly speaking, there is no such thing as religion of the State. What we mean by that phrase is the religion of some individual or set of individuals taught or enforced by the State. The State can have no religious opinions, and if it undertakes to enforce the teaching of such opinions, they must be the opinions of some natural person or class of persons. If it embarks in this business, whose opinion shall it adopt?"

All that the State ever can do is to give a certain class of persons the power to force their views in religion upon others at the public expense. But the State had a good deal better let that be done at the expense of those who want to teach that doctrine. It is clear that the State cannot do it without at once making a distinction between its citizens and establishing a preference in religious things, which is only to establish a certain religion.

To the parent and the Church is committed by the Lord the task of teaching religion. It is the place and the duty of the Church to carry to the unfortunate the consolations of religion, and even to criminals the hope of being made righteous. But the Professor argues that especially in the asylums for the deaf and blind, "young children are gathered for four, six, eight, or ten years in the forming period of life." The idea is that these young children need careful training in religion and as the State has assumed charge of them, that therefore if they get such training, the State must give it. We are willing to admit that these young children, blind or deaf, should be taught religion and should be trained in righteousness, but, as it is only the parent and the Church to whom this work has ever been committed, it is they only who can do it. If the parents fail to do it, then it is the place of the Church to do it. If the Church fails to do it, then it goes undone because the State *cannot* do it.

The difficulty in this whole matter is that the Church in this and a good many other things, has proved recreant to her trust, and has deplorably failed to do the very work which belongs to her, which God has committed to her, and which the failure to do is a disgrace to her. And having done this, it is a poor plea for the Church to stand up and insist that the State shall teach religion to the children, and that the State shall not leave them godless when she herself, through the failure to teach them the religion of Christ has left them godless.

Next the Professor mentions the reform school and the penitentiary, and of the latter says:—

There is a penitentiary at Waupun, in the heart of our beautiful State, whither go up under sentence of these courts, and amid the deep solicitude of our people, five hundred vigorous young men annually to be recovered to citizenship, a problem concerning which the perhaps most successful and experienced criminal officer in America says, "I know of nothing which will solve the problem of penal discipline but the religion of Jesus Christ." This decision, if it means anything, hazards the banishment of the religion not only of Jesus Christ, but of any religion whatever from that prison.

To be sure it does, so far as any teaching by the State is concerned. But it does not preclude the Church from doing her work, that which is committed to her, of teaching these persons the religion of Christ. By the way, does Professor Blaisdell mean hereby to intimate that "any religion whatever" *should* be taught to anybody, but the religion of Jesus Christ? If so, what religion should it be? and how much would they be bettered?

But, aside from this, these people do not go to the penitentiary to be reformed; they are not sent there for that purpose. They are sent there in punishment for the crimes they have committed, and that their fellow citizens may be protected from their further depredations. It is a false theory—this mawkish sentimentalism—that the criminal is unfortunate, and that it is misfortune that overtakes him when he is convicted of his crime and sentenced to the penitentiary to pay the penalty. He is not unfortunate, he is bad. It is not misfortune, but *justice* that has overtaken him. It will not do to give the criminal to understand, as this theory does, that his conviction and the infliction of the penalty is a misfortune. It will not do for the State to undermine its own authority, destroy respect for its own laws, and put a premium upon crime, by counting justice a misfortune.

We admit that the religion of Jesus Christ will solve the problem, not only of penal discipline, but of parental and every other kind of discipline; but it is impossible for the State to apply it either in the penal institutions or anywhere else. Besides if the State is to apply this remedy in penal institutions, why shall the State not apply it outside? If the State is to teach the religion of Jesus Christ to people in the penitentiary to make them good while they are there, and to keep them out when they get out, why shall not the State teach that religion to the people before they get into the penitentiary, and in order that they may not get in there? And if the State shall do this, then what is there for the Church to do, and what is the Church for?

Thus, and so surely, does the State become a Church, and a Church the State, by every theory that would have the State undertake to the slightest extent the work of teaching religion. And every plea that the State shall do so is a confession that the Church either has no place in the world, or else has forgotten her place.

A. T. J.

THE American Sabbath Union Convention held a meeting in San Bernardino last week. The stock resolutions against Sunday newspapers were adopted. Sunday trains and Sunday mails were condemned of course. Those present were in earnest and meant what they said, but that doesn't help the matter any.—*The Citograph*.

The Sphere of Legislation.

LEGISLATION can deal only with the natural affairs of man. The laws of a land are restraining and compulsory, and can therefore not touch the free will of a man, to which true religion only, can come. No legal enactment can make a man honest; but if he is found guilty of stealing, it can punish him as a warning, and for a season remove him from all opportunities to steal. All legislation is for the protection of the people, to prevent the evil and unjust from molesting others in their just rights. Beyond this it has no power. All it can therefore do for religion, which is of every man's own free choice, is to prevent others from interfering with him in his worship and practices according to his own conscience; and to prevent zealots, who have not the Christian love of the neighbor, from molesting others.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL seems therefore to be right in opposing religious legislation. . . . All just laws are made for the protection of the people in all their just rights; of which religious liberty is the first; but no law can enforce, or even defend, any form of religion.—*Mount Joy, Pennsylvania, Herald*.

Sunday-Law Campaign in California.

WE have mentioned the political campaign which the Sunday-law advocates are carrying on to secure representatives pledged to enact Sunday laws. It is the same old trickery put in new dress. The following statement of *The Dial* gives a good view of the way they are doing it:—

The very beneficent Sunday-law devotees have mapped out an importunate campaign for the present season in California. Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts and Mrs. Bateham, both of national reputation in the line of Sunday fanaticism, have come from the East to assist poor California in the herculean task of extricating herself from Sunday desecration. In addition to this, the local co-adjutors, male and female, are training for a fight to the finish.

Dr. Thompson, the State satellite of the American Sabbath Union, a few weeks ago laid out the plan of operations before the pastors of San Diego, which, in brief, comprised the following programme: First, to labor to secure recognition by one or both of the great political parties by Sunday-law planks in their State platforms; second, failing to effect the point in this way, the next step will be to work upon individual candidates for the Legislature. Faithful friends of the measure in each district will interview the candidate of one party and if possible procure his private pledge to support a Sunday law. They can say to him, "Your party is not committed either way, you are at perfect liberty to do as you please; your position need not be known during the campaign;

just privately pledge yourself to us and we will throw our weight in the balance in your favor."

The point will be to assure the candidate that all the church people are united on this question, and will all vote for any one who is pledged to support a Sunday law. If he fail to see it in that light, he is to understand that he will be tabooed by the good people, and their support will be given to the other man. In this campaign everything political in the power of the sacred circle is to be bartered for a Sunday law.

There are in the plans for this campaign, although in the name of religion, the elements of the most deceptive political schemes ever brought to light in the State. This State movement is part and parcel of the game for a national Sunday law, which in turn is a link in the National Reform Constitutional Amendment plot; and their principal hope, all the way through, is based on the verdancy or the cupidity of politicians. They would loudly denounce the same principle of operations if brought to bear against their pet project. The line upon which the Sunday-law politicians are working, was laid out at a National Reform Convention, held in Pittsburg, in 1874, when Dr. Robert Audley Browne gave vent to the following sentiment:—

There is no more persistent man alive than the typical representative American office-seeker. Of that class, the most of those who have not yet found whether they are for Christ or not, or who are openly decrying this movement, are ready to be its firm friends as soon as they acquire wisdom to discern the signs of the times, and are assured of its speedy success. They may pull back now at the hind axle, or scotch the wheels of the car of progress; but when they see it move, they will quickly jump in to get front seats, and avow "they always thought it was a good thing." When our Master comes into his kingdom in our beloved land, they will be candidates for the foremost positions, and scramble with the mother of Zebedee's children for the right or left hand places in the kingdom.

This shows the character of the weapons they propose to use, and the programme proposed for the California campaign shows the deceptive manner in which the weapons are to be secured. Verily "the end justifies the means" from a Sunday-law standpoint. When a professedly Christian people begin to work in a secret manner with such candidates as can be secretly induced to barter principle for votes, it is time for honest people to look with suspicion upon the object sought by such means.

Not only is there deception proposed in regard to the manipulation of candidates, but there is equally as rank deception in regard to the character of the "Sabbath" which it is designed to bind upon the people of the State. The leaders of this movement have two propositions before the people: To the church people the very solemn plea is made that the sacred Sabbath is being desecrated by the ungodly use of the day; while to the general pub-

lic the call is for a merely "civil Sabbath," in order that the poor workingman may have a day of rest and recreation. The Oakland apostle of this religious-political movement, Rev. N. R. Johnston, even goes so far as to blandly plead for the saloon-keepers' opportunity to go to the picnic on Sunday: while on the other hand the wickedness of the Sunday picnic has been held up as the grand reason why we should have a Sunday law. In his call for a convention at San Jose on the twentieth and twenty-first of this month, he shows the *religious* character of the *civil* Sabbath that his party is working for in the following language:—

The great importance of the divine institution, the steady growth of opposition to it as a sacred day of rest, the alarming prevalence of Sabbath desecration, and the danger that a Continental Sunday may displace our true American Sabbath, all call for combined wisdom and united efforts to promote Sabbath sanctification, and to secure a righteous civil law in our State that will tend to prevent the contemptuous disregard of our sacred day of rest.

And all this in the face of the public representations, not only of Mr. Johnston himself, but of Mr. Crafts, Mr. Thompson, and the whole flock of prominent leaders, that all that is wanted is a civil day of rest, a legal holiday in the interests of overworked humanity. Let the people beware of wolves in sheep's clothing.

A Political Revolution in Wisconsin.

THE last Wisconsin Legislature, passed at its last session what is known as the BENNETT law, making education in Wisconsin compulsory, and enacting this provision beside:—

No school shall be regarded as a school under this act, unless there shall be taught therein as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic, and United States history in the English language.

Upon its face this provision might seem to be fair enough, but, closely considered, it is found to embody features replete with mischief. The State of Wisconsin contains a very large foreign-born population, chiefly German, Scandinavian, and Belgian. In many of its towns German is extensively spoken; in most of the private and parochial schools German is taught.

To make education compulsory, while denying to the schools where children of German parents are instructed a legal existence as schools, means substantially, their abolition; and if the State has the right to prescribe what language shall be taught in schools that are not maintained by the State, but supported and managed by private individuals, it must also have the right to prescribe and supervise all their other studies. Against such an invasion of private rights the citizens of Milwaukee have now protested with such vigor and effectiveness that the only thing

to be done with the Bennett law is to repeal it.

If the local authorities of New York were to direct that Latin or Greek should no longer be taught in any of our colleges; if they undertook to furnish the text books of history to be used in private schools and to interdict all others; if they assumed to interfere with the religious training of the young, either in parochial or Sunday schools, a strong expression of dissent would promptly follow. The State maintains its own schools, and there is no interference of any sort, sectarian or political, with their management; but the dictation of the State cannot be permitted any further than in the schools which it supports by taxation.

Penal laws for the obliteration of a language have been passed and cruelly enforced in Ireland and Poland, but they can have no place upon the statute books in this country. The people of Milwaukee gave their views upon the subject very decisively; and similar views, it is quite safe to say, are entertained by a majority of the voters of every populous community in the United States, where English is not exclusively spoken.—*The Sun*.

Remarkable Language.

THE Rev. Dr. Parkhurst used this very remarkable language in the course of a sermon last Sunday at the Madison Square Presbyterian Church:—

It is as much a Christian's duty to love his country as his God. To an American the Stars and Stripes ought to be as much of his actual religion as the Sermon on the Mount. It is as much the duty of a New York Christian to go to the polls on election day as for him to go to the Lord's table on communion day.

The command of Jesus is to love God with the whole heart, and your neighbor as yourself. Therefore, love for mankind as brethren is a Christian sentiment. But patriotism is a restriction of that sentiment to a man's own country.

Great as are the "Stars and Stripes," and glorious beyond measure, is a Christian preacher justified in calling them as much a part of religion as the Sermon on the Mount, in which is contained the very kernel and epitome of Christianity? They are for time; but does not Dr. Parkhurst believe that the words of Jesus are for eternity, for the endless ages, when the symbols of earthly power shall have passed into nothingness?

The duty of a Christian to go to the polls is a great and a high duty. He shares it with the Jew and the pagan; but were not the Madison Square Presbyterians a little startled to hear Dr. Parkhurst putting it on the same religious plane with the duty of partaking of the sacrament as distinctive of Christianity?

Such language is very extraordinary. But Dr. Parkhurst, it must be remembered, is a Presbyterian of the agnostic variety.—*The Sun*.

**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.

**WATERMAN'S IDEAL
FOUNTAIN PEN.**

HAS THE MOST RELIABLE arrangement for feed-
ing the ink from the reservoir to the pen.

It has the same sure principle of operation
(capillary attraction) and simple construction (a
split) that have been used by the ordinary dip
pen for 5,000 years to carry the ink to the paper.

Remember it is a combination of the BEST ma-
terial, workmanship, and principle of operation.
Don't waste your time or shorten your life with
any other. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
Or OAKLAND, 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 at-
tached to any part of the clothing. A small invest-
ment will prevent the loss of a valuable pen or
pencil.

PRICES.

No. 1. Russia leather, for 2 pens . . . 10c.
No. 2. Russia leather for, 3 pens . . . 15c.

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

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING 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.

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

GOOD HEALTH

Is a popular health magazine, published at Battle
Creek, Mich., and conducted by

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Assisted by an able editorial staff.

It contains, each month, general articles on prac-
tical hygiene, and medical papers, besides a rich
variety of other matter, pithy and practical, on
popular questions, also representing the latest
scientific thought, in combination with Dr. Kellogg's
wide professional experience.

Established on Four Continents. No jour-
nal devoted to health or kindred topics has ever enjoyed
so great a popularity as this journal has earned by
its devotion to the interests of the people in the de-
velopment and popularization of knowledge on all
sanitary topics. It has been introduced into nearly
every part of the civilized world, and enjoys a large
circulation, not only in America, but in England,
upon the continent of Europe, in South Africa, and
in Australia. Among the

SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS

For 1890, the managers of this journal propose
during the year to devote considerable space to the
Exposure of Medical Frauds. They have,
therefore, established a chemical laboratory, in
charge of a competent chemist, for the purpose of
carrying on a series of thorough-going investiga-
tions, the results of which will be published in the
columns of this journal. Price, \$1.25 a Year.
Single numbers, 15 Cents. Send for specimen copy,
and terms to agents.

GOOD HEALTH PUB. CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

**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 frontis-
piece 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.

**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.

**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 accom-
panied 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.

CALIFORNIA TOURISTS

Should have a Copy of the Grand Book
"In the Heart of the Sierras."

It Pictures the World-renowned Yo Semite Va-
ley, the Big Tree Groves of California, the
Glaciers, Gold Mines, and Caverns of
this Wonderful Region. It is a

Complete Guide to the Yo Semite Valley,
Giving routes of travel, number of miles by rail
and stage; describes points of interest en route;
gives map of the Valley, and contains 160 Illus-
trations, 28 of which are Beautiful Full-
Page Artotypes, and which portray the
wonderful Cataracts, Mountains, and Precipices
with all the REALITY OF A PHOTOGRAPH. Bound
in five styles. Copy in cloth, embossed in jet and
gold, gold edges, sent postpaid where we have
no agent for \$3.50.

CHEAPER EDITION.

We have just issued a special TOURISTS' EDITION
of this book, containing all the matter of the
other edition, printed on thinner paper, without
artotypes, bound in flexible cloth covers. Copies
sent postpaid anywhere for \$1.50.

Address **PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,**
Or 43 Bond St., New York. **Oakland, Cal.**

FORTUNE!

**Florida Phosphate Facts Freely
Furnished.**

Knowing that very many people have errone-
ous ideas about Florida, her climate, resources,
etc., and wishing to add 100,000 new names to our
subscription list, we offer to send the *Florida
Home-Seeker* till 1891, for only 50 cents, to every-
one answering this advertisement. The *Home-
Seeker* tells the truth, and nothing but the truth
about Florida. Address,

FLORIDA HOME-SEEKER,
Apr. 24-3m GAINESVILLE, FLA.

ARGUMENTS

ON THE

Breckinridge Sunday Bill.

○ ○ ○ ○

Verbatim report of the speeches of Eld. J. O.
Corliss, of Washington, Alonzo T. Jones, of New
York, Editor *American Sentinel*, and Millard F.
Hobbs, District Master Workman of District
Assembly 66, Knights of Labor, together with a
brief submitted by Prof. W. H. McKee, Secretary
of the National Religious Liberty Association,

All Against the Breckinridge Sunday Bill.

An important and telling document against
all Sunday legislation, giving the basis of such
legislation, together with the object and price of
exemption clauses. Issued as No. 29 of the *Sen-
tinel Library*. Price 10 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
Or 43 Bond St., New York. **Oakland, Cal.**

ROMANISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

BY HON. WILLIAM JACKSON ARMSTRONG.

The above is the title of a recent issue
of the *Sentinel Library* which con-
tains a verbatim report of a powerful
lecture delivered by this well-known
speaker, in Oakland, California. Price,
4 cents. Address,

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

THE WEST SHORE RAILROAD

is one of the most popular routes for business and
pleasure travel, leading to and from New York
City, as well as being the most substantially built
and elegantly equipped double-track line, travers-
ing, as it does, the west shore of the historic and
world-famed Hudson River, and passing through
the beautiful Mohawk Valley.

By this route three express trains are run daily
in each direction, between New York, Albany,
Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, Niagara Falls,
Toronto, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and the
West.

The West Shore, in connection with the Fitch-
burg Railroad, is also the shortest line between
Boston and Chicago.

Palace sleeping-cars are attached to these trains,
and run through without change between the
points named.

Buffet smoking-cars, with revolving chairs, are
a special feature of the splendid service on the
West Shore.

Tickets via West Shore can be purchased at
ticket-offices of all connecting lines, and they are
sold, and baggage checked through to destination
from all stations of the West Shore Railroad.

For further information regarding West Shore
Railroad address
H. B. JAGOE, C. E. LAMBERT,
Gen. East'n Pass. Agt., Gen. Pass. Agt.,
363 BROADWAY, 5 VANDERBILT AVE.,
NEW YORK. NEW YORK.



NEW YORK, JUNE 5, 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.

THE German Emperor makes "Sunday rest" the phase of the industrial question, which claims "the foremost attention." It will not be long before the Sunday-law question becomes not only a national but an international one.

THE Woman's Christian Temperance Union takes to itself much credit for securing the Illinois Compulsory Education law. They are entitled to all the credit that attaches to such a statute. The law is entirely worthy of its source

THE *Christian Union* says that "Few intelligent Christians believe that the earthly body has any resurrection." Such "intelligence" as that is the most serious kind of ignorance. Such wisdom as that is of that kind which by wisdom knows not God, at the last. The earthly body of Jesus Christ had a resurrection, and so must every one have who will ever be where he is.

A CONTRIBUTOR to the *Western Wave*, of South Dakota, states that in some of the public schools in Grant County in that State "the Roman Catholic catechism is being taught." Those who know of it ought to have it stopped. The Roman Catholics of South Dakota have no more right to use their catechism in the public school, than the Protestants of Wisconsin have to use the King James version of the Bible in the public school.

IN defense of the Bennett law, Governor Hoard cites the fact that some persons who could not understand English had been seduced into signing what they supposed were contracts to sell patent rights or something of that sort, while in fact they had signed promissory notes for large amounts of money, or perhaps mortgages on their farms. Well, we have known that to be done all over the land, to people who could not understand any language but English. If the Governor's argument means anything, it means that people who can speak, read, and write English are thereby made safe from being deceived or swindled. That is giving rather more virtue to the English language than it had ever yet been known to display. But perhaps the idea is in-

tended to be conveyed that the Bennett law gives to the English language this virtue. If so then the argument has at least one merit, it is the only real point that has yet been made in favor of that law.

THE Hon. J. M. Palmer, late United States minister to Spain, adopted in Spain, and brought home with him, a Spanish boy. As the Spanish nurse who had engaged to come was hindered at the last moment, Mr. Palmer waited in this city until another could come from Spain; because, he says, he desires that conversation with the child shall be wholly in Spanish, and that his instruction shall be in that language also. It is a good thing that Mr. Palmer lives in Michigan, instead of Wisconsin or Illinois. Otherwise, he might soon find himself undergoing prosecution for not giving the child instruction in English, and for not causing the child to forget the Spanish language as soon as possible.

SUNDAY evening, May 11, Rev. Theo. Clifton, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, delivered a lecture on "What Protestants May Learn from Catholics," in which he said:—

They [the Catholics] must give to support their work. They dare not do otherwise for fear the priest will send them to hell. When I have gone to a millionaire to get a few hundred dollars for the support of our cause, and have been refused, I have sometimes wished for the power of the priest to say to him, "Give me a hundred thousand dollars or here you go."

That is just about the size of it. That is a very fair illustration of what Protestant preachers learn from Roman Catholic priests, and of how they learn it. The trouble is, they are learning too much from this source. Woe to the people when these men get the power to practice what they are learning. Mr. Clifton is a Congregationalist.

THE Canadian Supreme Court has just decided that in the works of Victor Hugo there is nothing immoral, even though they may be condemned by the Roman Catholic Church. The case grew out of the refusal of certain Catholic booksellers of Montreal to fulfill a contract which they had made to supply a customer with Hugo's works, on the ground that as Catholics they could not sell works condemned by the church. The court very properly held that the Congregation of the Index, or any other congregation, could not make laws annulling the legal contracts between its own members and outside parties. The *Catholic Review* of this city complains that this is simply a Protestant decision and that it places the booksellers in a dilemma: they must "commit a grievous sin by dealing in prohibited books, or they lose heavily by breaking their contract." This, the *Review* thinks, "only illustrates a plain but much-obscured fact, that Church and State cannot ignore each other, even

if they would." It is evident that the editor of the *Catholic Review* would like to see "the Church" clothed with power to revoke civil contracts just as she used to do in the palmy days of the Inquisition. The bookseller was not obliged to make that contract; but having voluntarily entered into such a contract it was only justice that he should fulfill it. Let Roman Catholics make no such contracts, and they will have no such difficulties. No decree of any church can impair the obligation of contracts.

MANITOBA has adopted a law by which it is proposed that from the first day of May and forward, the schools shall be public schools, and so conducted as to be without offense to Catholic or Protestant; in short, unsectarian. Accordingly instructions were given as follows:—

On the first of May the Catholic school board will cease to exist and the Protestant school board will become the public school board of the city. The members of the Protestant school board will continue in the office of public school trustees for the remainder of their respective terms. After the first of May all moneys due to the Catholic school board on the levy of 1890 will belong and be payable to the public school board.

This is to say, that the public schools of Manitoba shall henceforth be *Protestant* public schools, and that they shall be unsectarian *Protestant* schools. This is the same kind of public schools that those people in this country want, who are clamoring for the teaching of religion in the public schools.

SOME time ago we mentioned the pamphlet "Bible Principles and the Union of Church and State," issued by the London branch of the Pacific Press. We had then received only a sample copy. We are glad to announce that we have the pamphlet now in stock and can fill orders promptly. Aside from the Bible principles, which are universal, there is much in this pamphlet that is of interest to the people of the United States in its excellent showing of some of the workings of Church and State when legally, or rather illegally, joined. In the presence of the workings of the National Reform Association and its allies this book makes good reading for Americans. We shall present extracts from time to time in THE SENTINEL; but everybody should have the pamphlet. Send in your orders. Price, forty cents.

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 toward 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, each, 75c.

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 Bond Street, New York.