



"If any Man Hear My Words, and Believe not, I Judge him not: for I Came not to Judge the World, but to Save the World."

VOLUME 9.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 4, 1894.

NUMBER 39.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
 PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
 No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
 Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, }
 CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, } EDITORS.
 A. F. BALLENGER, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

LAST week we said: Let not the people of these States, or of the United States, laugh at the absurd conception from which springs the "infallibility" of the pope of Rome until they are sure that they themselves are entirely clear of all such conception in their own practice, or in their consent even.

THIS word of advice is strictly appropriate, for the simple reason that in nearly all the States, and in the United States, there is established in its very essence the papal principle of infallibility: namely, that authority to act for the public in matters of religion and religious observances, is derived from *the seat* that is occupied by the officious official at the time of his officious action.

IN all the States of this Union, and in the Government of the United States there are officials—especially legislative and judiciary—who exercise prerogatives that are either usurped wholly, or else derived solely from *the official seat* which they occupy, and from nothing else under the sun. And the vast majority of the people consent to it without a word, while perhaps a majority of these justify it in their actions and in the practice of the officious officials.

IT is a fact too notorious to require any proof, that in the legislative and judicial proceedings of the government of the States and of the United States, laws are made, construed, and confirmed, and executed which establish religious dogmas and institutions and enforce them upon the people. For instance, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided for the people of the United States that "this is a religious people," and accordingly that "this is a Christian nation." And the Congress of the United States has decided for the people that the fourth commandment "means" that "the first day of the week,

commonly called Sunday," is the Sabbath, and have fixed that interpretation in the legislation of the nation to be enforced upon all the people. The same things, and other like things, have been done by the legislators and judges of all the States, except one or perhaps two. And not only do the vast majority of the people consent to it, but thousands upon thousands of the people justify it, while nearly the whole religious element of the nation—professed Protestants too—actually require it, and, indeed, so far as lies in their power, force it.

Now where did these men who happen for the time to be legislators or judges, get their right to do these things? How did they become possessed of the prerogative to interpret the Scriptures and decide religious questions for the people? No one will allow that any one of these persons merely as a man, simply as a private citizen, ever had, or ever could have had, any shadow of right to interpret the Bible or decide any religious question for any other man or citizen in any way, much less to decide it and fix it in an authoritative rule to be enforced upon all, or upon any man, in the State or nation. So certainly is this true that if any one of these men, when he was merely a man and a private citizen, had undertaken to do such a thing his action would have been swiftly resented as a piece of unbearable impertinence. Yet, lo! when he is an official he not only does this very thing, but it is expected by multitudes of the people that his action in this shall be accepted by all as valid, and be received as authoritative, and be respected and obeyed accordingly. Yesterday any such action would have been resented by everybody, while to-day it must needs be accepted and respected by everybody! But what wrought this so important a change in the condition and prerogatives of the man?

OH, yesterday he was but a man like all the rest of us, while to-day he is in official position. But what caused this change? How did he get into that official position?—It was all done simply by the votes of men like himself—his fellow-citizens. Yesterday he was as destitute as all the others of every shadow of such pre-

rogative, while to-day he is amply clothed with it: and all this because, as with the other pope, enough men as destitute of it as himself, voted for him to elect him to that office; or because he was appointed to the office by a man who was so elected. Yet even this is not the full statement of the case; because even when he is elected he does not possess it until he has been "sworn in" to the office, and even then he does not possess it in available form until he takes his seat in the legislative hall or on the judicial bench and acts officially *from that seat*. As a mere man or private citizen no one will allow that he has any shadow of right or authority to act for another in any question of religion or religious observance; when he is elected he does not have it till he is sworn in; and even when he is sworn in he does not have it until he acts from his official seat.

IT is therefore perfectly plain that all our legislators and judges get all the authority and prerogative that they exercise in matters of religion, precisely *where* and precisely *as* the pope of Rome gets his, namely, *from the seat* which they occupy when they speak with the authority that is to be heard by the whole people. For as no one of them as a man or a private citizen had any shadow of such authority, as no one who voted for any of them had any shadow of any such authority, it is impossible that any one of them could have derived this prerogative from anything that made him an official, except upon the principle from which the other pope derives his, namely, that like produces totally unlike, and out of nothing something comes. And as even when he has become an official by the votes of those who had no shadow of any such right or authority, this prerogative is not available until he occupies the official seat, it follows inevitably that it is *the seat* alone from which the legislator or the judge obtains all his right, all his authority, and all his prerogative, to speak or act in questions of religion or religious observances for all the people.

CONSEQUENTLY no legislator or judge who ever did, or who ever shall, act in the making or enforcing of a Sunday law, or any other law touching religion or reli-

gious observances or religious obligation of any kind, can ever consistently object to the claim of the infallibility of the pope of Rome, or laugh at the absurd conception of the source from which that infallibility comes to him, laughable as it undoubtedly is; because every such legislator and every such judge has in such action made the precise claim and has acted upon the very principle that the pope of Rome makes and acts upon in his "infallibility."

THE absurdity, and much more than this—the danger—of this evil principle was clearly seen by the men who made the Government of the United States, and was specially guarded against by them in the total separation of religion and the State and the absolute prohibition of any State official from touching in his official capacity any question of religion in any way. This is why they observed, and so pointedly, that "it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects which profess the Christian faith *without erecting a claim to infallibility* which would lead us back to the church of Rome." And this—

1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth "that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable, also, because what is here a right towards men is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society. Before any man can be considered a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the universe: and if a member of civil society who enters into any subordinate association must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority, *much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular civil society do it with a saving of his allegiance to the universal Sovereign.* We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance.

2. Because, if religion be exempt from the authority of society at large *still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body.* The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited. It is limited with regard to the co-ordinate departments: *more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents.* The preservation of a free government requires not merely that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power be invariably maintained, but more especially that neither of them be suffered to overlap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are tyrants. The people who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves *nor by any authority derived from them*, and are slaves.

And because they were "well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord of both body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his almighty power to do; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, *civil as well as ecclesiastical*, who being themselves but *fallible and uninspired men*, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and *infallible*, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath

established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world and through all time;" and "that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, is a dangerous fallacy which at once destroys all religious liberty."

SUCH are the noble and weighty words of Madison and Jefferson as they conducted the campaigns that established the principle of the total separation of Church and State in this country, and for the enlightenment of all countries. And these words clearly show that they well understood both the fallacy and the danger of the prerogative of "infallibility." They saw readily enough that all the authority that any man ever could have over another in matters of religion could only be by sheer usurpation, and contained in itself all the elements of the papacy, even to the extreme element of infallibility. And knowing both the fallacy and the tyranny of the principle, they exposed it as it deserved, and repudiated it, and, as they hoped, delivered the people of this nation from it forever, by fixing in the supreme law the absolute prohibition of the governmental power from ever touching any question of religion in any way. This they did that the people of this splendid nation—the last, the greatest, and the best—might be forever free from anybody here ever "erecting a claim to infallibility which would lead us back to the church of Rome."

LET no one jump to the conclusion that the foregoing argument applies with equal force against civil authority "because no legislator, or judge, or other civil official can exercise even civil authority until he has been duly installed in office and occupies his official place." For although it is true that no man can exercise the authority of legislator, or judge, or other civil office, *even after he has been elected*, until he has been duly installed in the office, and only then when he acts from the official seat or place; yet it is equally true that when he does so act, he exercises only the authority and prerogative that from the beginning were in himself as a man and a citizen, and that were also in all his fellow-men and fellow-citizens. All the legitimate authority that he exercises in office, except in the degree of it, was inherent in himself, and in all concerned, simply as men and citizens. Every person, *merely as a man in the world*, has within himself full right, authority, and prerogative to act, even to the use of force, to protect from violence the life, person, or property of himself or any of his fellow-men. For instance, any man who sees another setting fire to his property or the property of his neighbor, has full and inherent right, even to the application of force, to prevent that man from accomplishing his purpose. It is equally so in the event of any other threatened danger to the life, property, or person of himself or any other man.

WITHOUT organization, however, that is, without *government*, it would devolve upon each individual, of himself and for himself, to exercise this authority, and would lead to every man's hand being against his neighbor. Therefore, in order that this inherent right and authority of every man may be the better exercised in behalf of all, men enter into organization and establish an order of government for

this very purpose, and such an order of government as to them seems best calculated to accomplish this purpose. This is the origin and object of civil government.

THIS organization having been formed, each man is now a *citizen* as well as a man; and all this right, authority, and prerogative, that inhered in him as a *man*, still are inherent in him as a *citizen*—the only change that is undergone is in the *manner* of the exercise of these inherent qualities. That is to say: As the object of the organization that has been created is to relieve the individual from the *personal* exercise of this authority, the more fully to secure all in the unmolested enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, each one now *by vote* delegates to one of their number the exercise of his authority in this matter to be exercised by the chosen one as the representative of all. And he who is thus chosen acts with the duly delegated authority of all. And in all this he acts with no authority, neither does he exercise any prerogative, that he did not in himself possess before—*except in degree*. Whereas before the organization he must of necessity act for himself and from himself alone, *now* he acts for himself and for hundreds or thousands of others who, equally with himself, possessed this authority in himself; now he acts from the delegated authority of all these, who by vote have duly clothed him with the right and power to exercise for them the authority which inhered in them as individual men.

AND although when elected he cannot exercise this delegated authority until he has been duly installed in office, this is not because he derives any additional authority, prerogative, or characteristic, from the seat or official position itself; but because that, as his fellow-citizens have signified their confidence in him for the exercise of the authority which they have delegated to him, it is necessary and but proper that he should respond by submitting to the forms that have been established, and pledge himself to his fellow-citizens for the faithful exercise of the authority which they have delegated to him. The oath or affirmation of office, and whatever other ceremonies or pledges required in the installation in office of the elected one, are but the response of mutual obligation on his part to the delegation of authority on the part of the electors; and are not in any sense used with any idea that from these ceremonies or from the office itself he derives any additional dignity, authority, or prerogative whatever. So in no instance does any legislator, or judge, or other civil officer, acting in civil things, ever act with any authority or exercise any prerogative which he *in himself* did not possess, or that those who voted for him did not in themselves possess *before he was elected*; or which they did not have full right and power to delegate to him to be exercised in their behalf and for the better service of all concerned.

NOT so however is it in matters of religion. That pertains to man's duty or relationship to God. These come not from himself. They are laid upon him by the Lord; and are therefore incapable of being delegated, incapable of being exercised by any one in behalf of another. And as the exercise of these powers, the performance of these duties, and the fulfillment of these

relationships are incapable of being delegated, and so incapable of being exercised by any one in behalf of another; it absolutely follows that no legislator, or judge, or other official of any kind can ever have any authority in matters pertaining to religion in any way. Consequently any attempt to exercise any authority over, or for, another in matters of religion, springs from sheer usurpation. And if it be denied that it is sheer usurpation then the only conceivable source from which such authority or prerogative could be derived is the seat which said official occupies when he acts officially. And thus we are brought again to the absurd conception of the source from which "the infallibility of the pope" is derived.

AND the professed Protestant churches of the United States and of the world, in appealing to government, or allowing officials, without protest, to act in matters of religion; and the legislators and judges of the States, and of the United States, and of the world in acting in matters of religion, as they have done and as they continue to do, are in very principle and in actual practice committed to the identical conception of infallibility to which the papacy is committed in the dogma of the "infallibility of the pope." And this, too, without as much as the seeming justification that the papacy claims: for the papacy does claim that "blessed Peter" did occupy the official seat which the pope occupies when he speaks *ex cathedra*, and therefore "infallibly;" but no one can ever even claim that Peter ever occupied any seat that ever was or ever shall be occupied by any legislator or judge in any of the States or the United States—not even when they decided *ex cathedra* that "this is a Christian nation," or that "the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," is the Sabbath according to the "meaning" of the fourth commandment.

So the professed Protestants of the United States and of the world, and the legislators and judges of the States, the United States, and of the world, who presume to act officially and governmentally in matters of religion, will have to clear their skirts of the smirch of "infallibility" before they can ever consistently indulge any smiles at the absurdity of the claim of "the infallibility of the Roman pontiff." All these will have to abdicate the exercise of the prerogative of infallibility themselves, before any of them shall ever be able consistently to criticize or reject the exercise of it by another, even though that other be the pope of Rome. In short, all these will have to cease to be popes themselves before they can consistently object against the pope of Rome.

THE basis of the papal claim as derived from "blessed Peter" will be examined next week.

The Taxation of Church Property.

THE young people who visit Toronto will be interested to know that the Jarvis Street Church refused to accept exemption of its fine church property from taxation. This is a practical emphasis of the position to which our Baptist views of the proper separation of Church and State must sooner or later lead us as a denomination. Undoubtedly, the taxation of all

church properties would, at first, work hardships to the smaller churches, but the inconvenience of doing right can never be a reason for our staying on the wrong side of a great principle. We shall never fight Romanism with hands quite free until we as Protestants, one and all, refuse thus to receive State aid for religious purposes in any form, and exemption from taxation is really State aid in a veiled form.—*Baptist Young People's Union.*

A Persecuting Baptist.

THE *Alabama Baptist*, of August 9, attempts to justify the persecution of W. B. Capps, who is now serving a sentence of nine months in the county jail at Dresden, Weakley County, Tenn., for plowing in his field on Sunday, by the following argument:—

The law does not compel him to violate his convictions by working on Saturday, neither should he violate the law and the convictions of the people by working on their holy day. If Mr. Capps cannot have the law changed to suit his religious views, he ought to go where there is no such law.

The *Baptist Examiner*, of September 13th, says, in replying to like "arguments" which appeared in the *Baptist and Reflector*, of Nashville, Tenn: "It would have been easy, by similar arguments, for those who persecuted Baptists in the past, to have justified their conduct and policy." How true! and why can't the *Alabama Baptist* see it? Its arguments are similar to the arguments of John Cotton, in his justification of the persecution of Elder Holmes. And to show the similarity we will put the words of the *Alabama Baptist* editor, with slight changes into the mouth of the persecutor of Baptists.

The law does not compel him (Obadiah Holmes) to violate his convictions by being sprinkled himself, neither should he violate the law and the convictions of the people by baptizing by immersion. If Mr. Holmes cannot get the law changed to suit his religious views, he ought to go where there is no such law.

John Cotton and his associates, in the persecution of Baptists, thought Baptists "ought to go where there is no such law," and the Baptists refusing to go were whipped, imprisoned, and banished, and now the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* thinks the same of Seventh-day Adventists; and since he thinks they "ought to go," and they think like Baptists of Massachusetts that they ought to stay, it follows that the John Cotton, of the *Alabama Baptist*, is in favor of banishing Seventh-day Adventists in 1894 as the John Cotton, of Massachusetts was in favor of banishing Baptists in 1651.

Although the *Baptist Examiner* says it is easy to show that the cases of the persecutors are similar, the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* thinks it is easy to show that the case is different. And now hear him try it:—

This case is different from those in which patriots and Christians, especially Baptists, have felt called upon to resist laws that were evidently unjust, and which were intended to be restrictive and proscriptive of one party or creed and in favor of another. This Tennessee statute, like those of other States, restrains those who indorse it as well as those who do not.

This attempted defense of the Tennessee persecutions is the old threadbare excuse of the persecutor. "When we were persecuted we were 'patriots and Christians,' but you 'violate the law' and are therefore lawless and unchristian." This was the way the Puritans of colonial days talked about the Baptists. Thomas Shepard, of Charlestown, in a sermon entitled

"Eye Salve," told the governor and magistrates of Massachusetts that "Anabaptists [a nickname for Baptists] have ever been looked at by the godly leaders of this people as a scab," and the president of Harvard College said, "such a rough thing as a New England Anabaptist is not to be handled over tenderly."

But, now, all this is changed. Baptists no longer suffer imprisonment, whipping, and banishment. From a small minority they have grown powerful, until in some localities they have a controlling influence. And, now, forgetting their own sufferings, once and again the persecuted become the persecutors, and thereby furnish another proof of the correctness of the statement of the report of the committee on Sunday mails, communicated to the House of Representatives, March 4th and 5th, 1830, that "every religious sect, however meek in its origin, commenced the work of persecution as soon as it acquired political power."

If the Tennessee Sunday law is not both "restrictive and proscriptive of one party or creed and in favor of another," then the Massachusetts law requiring all Baptists to attend the established church was neither. It restricts Seventh-day Adventists to five days' work instead of six, and therefore attempts to make them pay a tax of 16½ per cent. more than is assessed on other citizens. It is proscriptive, since in the language of the *Alabama Baptist*, the State of Tennessee, "by statute law," "recognized the Christian Sabbath [Sunday the first day] as God's holy day," as against the commandment of God which requires the observance of the seventh day, and which Seventh-day Adventists choose to obey rather than the commandment of the State. The State has come out in favor of the "party or creed," which teaches that the first day is the Sabbath, and thereby proscribes the party which teaches that the seventh day is the Sabbath. The statement that "this Tennessee statute, like those of other States, restrains those who indorse it as well as those who do not," is a childish excuse. When the Baptist ministers—John Clark, Obadiah Holmes and John Crandall—were forcibly taken to church in compliance with the law compelling all to attend the State church, it was not persecution, according to the *Alabama Baptist*, since it restrained those who indorsed it as well as those who did not. According to this modern expounder of Baptist principles of religious liberty, all John Cotton needed to say to these Baptist ministers when they protested, was, "Oh, this law restrains me from remaining away from church the same as it does you. It restrains those who indorse it as well as those who do not."

Now, we expect that the *Baptist Examiner*, of this city, and other consistent Baptists, will write to the *Alabama Baptist*, as did the brethren of the Puritans in England, and protest against the persecuted turning persecutor, and it is probable that the *Alabama Baptist* will want to reply. We therefore print a part of the letter written by John Cotton, which the *Alabama Baptist* can use in full with a few changes in names:—

One of them, Obadiah Holmes, being an excommunicate person himself, out of a church in Plymouth patent, came into this jurisdiction, and took upon him to baptize, which I think himself will not say he was compelled here to perform. And he was not ignorant that the rebaptizing of an elder person, and that by a private person out of office and under excommunication, are all of them manifest contestations against

the order and government of our churches, established, we know, by God's law, and he knoweth by the laws of the country. And we conceive we may safely appeal to the ingenuity of your own judgment, whether it would be tolerated in any civil state, for a stranger to come and practise contrary to the known principles of the church estate? As for his whipping, it was more voluntarily chosen by him than inflicted on him. His censure by the court was to have paid, as I know, thirty pounds, or else to be whipt; his fine was offered to be paid by friends for him freely; but he chose rather to be whipt; in which case, if his sufferings of stripes was any worship of God at all, surely it could be accounted no better than will worship. The other, Mr. Clarke, was wiser in that point, and his offense was less, so was his fine less, and himself, as I hear, was contented to have it paid for him, whereupon he was released. The imprisonment of either of them was no detriment. I believe they fared neither of them better at home; and I am sure Holmes had not been so well clad for years before.

But be pleased to consider this point a little further: You think to compel men in matter of worship is to make them sin, according to Rom. 14: 23. If the worship be lawful in itself, the magistrate compelling to come to it, compelleth him not to sin, but the sin is in his will that needs to be compelled to a Christian duty. Josiah compelled all Israel, or, which is all one, made to serve the Lord their God. 2 Chron. 34: 33. Yet his act herein was not blamed, but recorded among his virtuous actions. For a governor to suffer any within his gates to profane the Sabbath, is a sin against the fourth commandment, both in the private householder and in the magistrate; and if he requires them to present themselves before the Lord, the magistrate sinneth not, nor doth the subject sin so great a sin as if he did refrain to come. But you say it doth but make men hypocrites, to compel men to conform the outward man for fear of punishment. If it did so, yet better be hypocrites than profane persons. Hypocrites give God part of his due, the outward man; but the profane person giveth God neither outward nor inward man.

And now we wish that the editor of the *Alabama Baptist* would not use this letter at all, or any of his own similar arguments, but that he would see the error of his way, repent and do works meet for repentance.

The Catholic Church and Religious Liberty.

THE Roman Catholic Church professes to be, and always to have been, the champion of civil and religious liberty. But this profession is as disingenuous as is the advice of Satolli to the people of this country, to "go forward bearing in one hand the book of Christian truth—the Bible—and in the other hand the Constitution of the United States." It has recently been shown in these columns, that, shorn of its verbiage, this means only, Go forward bearing in one hand the Catholic Bible, as interpreted by "the church," and in the other, the Constitution of the United States, likewise interpreted by "the church."

It is the same when Rome talks of *religious liberty*. Cardinal Gibbons says: "A man enjoys religious liberty when he enjoys the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God. Every act infringing on his freedom of conscience is justly styled religious intolerance. This religious liberty is the true right of every man, because it corresponds with a most certain duty which God has put upon him."—*Faith of Our Fathers*, page 264.

It will be observed that the cardinal says: "This religious liberty is the true right of every man." What religious liberty?—Why, "the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a right conscience," to be sure. And who is to determine what is a "right conscience"?—The Roman Catholic Church, of course. And it is "*this religious lib-*

erty" which "is the true right of every man," according to Cardinal Gibbons.

That this is the real meaning of the cardinal's words is evident from the following, on page 268 of his book previously quoted:—

The church is indeed intolerant in this sense, that she can never confound truth with error; nor can she admit that any man is conscientiously free to reject the truth when its claims are convincingly brought home to the mind.

On page 85 of the same work the cardinal says:—

The church has authority from God to teach regarding faith and morals; and in her teaching she is preserved from error by the special guidance of the Holy Ghost.

And again, on page 88, we read:—

Not only does our Lord empower his apostles to preach the gospel, but he commands, and under the most severe penalties, those to whom they preach to listen and obey. . . . We see on the one hand that the apostles and their successors have received full powers to announce the gospel; and on the other, that their hearers are obliged to listen with docility, and to obey not merely by an external compliance, but also by internal assent of the intellect.

All this must be taken into consideration in weighing the cardinal's definition of religious liberty. Here are the legitimate and ever necessary deductions from the quotations made from his book:—

1. The Catholic Church has full authority to teach faith and morals.
2. That which she teaches must be received.
3. No man is conscientiously free to reject that which the Roman Catholic Church teaches.
4. A man enjoys religious liberty when he enjoys the free right to worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience.
5. No man who does reject the teaching of the Catholic Church can have a right conscience.

Which is only saying that a man enjoys religious liberty when he enjoys the free right to meekly accept the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church, and does so accept them; but not otherwise.

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward religious liberty is further defined by the cardinal on pages 268 and 269, thus:—

Many Protestants seem to be very much disturbed by some such argument as this: Catholics are very ready now to proclaim freedom of conscience, because they are in the minority. When they once succeed in getting the upper hand in numbers and power, they will destroy this freedom, because their faith teaches them to tolerate no doctrine other than the Catholic. It is, then, a matter of absolute necessity for us that they should never be allowed to get this advantage.

Now, in all this, there is a great mistake, which comes from not knowing the Catholic doctrine in its fullness. I shall not lay it down myself, lest it seem to have been gotten up for the occasion. I shall quote the great theologian Becanus, who taught the doctrine of the schools of Catholic theology at the time when the struggle was hottest between Catholicity and Protestantism. He says that religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it. The ruler may even enter into a compact in order to secure to his subjects this freedom in religious matters; and when once a compact is made, it must absolutely be observed in every point, just as every other lawful and honest contract. This is the true Catholic teaching on this point, according to Becanus and all Catholic theologians. So that if Catholics should gain the majority in a community where freedom of conscience is already secured to all by law, their very religion obliges them to respect the rights thus acquired by their fellow-citizens. What danger can there be, then, for Protestants, if Catholics should be in the majority here? Their apprehensions are the result of vain fears, which no honest mind ought any longer to harbor.

This is not a disavowal of the right of the Catholic Church to coerce people in matters of faith and morals, but is rather an assertion of the right. "*Religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the State or to the community to repress it.*" Exactly! and

who is to judge when it will do more harm to repress "religious liberty"? Who, indeed, but "the church!" And hence it follows that the much-vaunted Roman Catholic "religious liberty" is only a limited degree of religious toleration, depending entirely on that policy by which the prophet declared of that power of which the papacy is the legitimate successor: "Through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand." Surely Rome is well called "the mystery of iniquity."

Religious Appropriations.

[Speech of Hon. William S. Linton, of Michigan, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, June 7, 1894. The House being in committee of the whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (H. R. 6913) making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes, Mr. Linton said:—]

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is high time to call a halt in the expenditure of the nation's money either directly or indirectly toward any sectarian school, or to enrich the coffers of any religious society at the expense of many others, and we should here and now, by striking out portions of the pending bill and placing safeguards around the remainder, discontinue such perilous and unconstitutional appropriations.

Our public school system, "the bulwark of this country," non-sectarian and non-partisan, and the embodiment of the best educational thought of this enlightened century, should be the boon of the nation's wards that compose the remnant of the unfortunate Indian race, and they should not be forced hereafter to attend, as they have been for centuries, without material advancement, that class of schools where Indians always remain Indians, and which to-day keeps the great bulk of the population in poverty-stricken Italy (where it is said 63 per cent. of the people cannot even read and write), Mexico, and similar countries from rising up out of the slough of ignorance and superstition in which they are engulfed.

I do not intend, sir, to attack any religious denomination as such, but the subjoined table showing one church alone to have received during the past eight years \$2,366,416, while all others combined, fifteen in number, received during the same period only about one-half that amount, proves conclusively that it pays to maintain here, on a prominent street, at the nation's capital, a bureau of Indian missions that has all the appearance of a huge lobby for advancing their interests.

As stated by a senator from New England, they have been on the ground here for years pushing Catholic schools upon the Government as earnestly as was in their power, and largely to that influence is attributed their great increase, which has come to be for their church three-fifths of all the appropriations; and if this bill passes the proportion will be much larger. They are active still, foisting upon the people of this country schools that do not belong to the civilization of to-day.

For more than a century the Mission Indians have been under Jesuit control, education, and influence, and to-day are as incapable of self-support as citizens of our country, as babes. They are reliant more than ever upon those from whom they receive their instructions. They go in temporal matters as they do in their

spiritual, where they are advised to go by their superiors. They plant where they tell them to plant, and sow when they tell them to sow.

The founders of the Republic builded better than they knew when they demanded the separation of Church and State, and little did they imagine that Congress would ever pass a bill such as the one under consideration to-day, or that appropriations would ever be made as shown by this table and information taken from Government reports, and which I submit for printing in the *Record* as a portion of my remarks:—

Denominations.	1866.	1867.	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.	Total.
ROMAN CATHOLIC *	\$118,348	\$104,635	\$221,169	\$347,672	\$386,937	\$363,349	\$394,756	\$309,535	\$2,306,416	
Presbyterian	32,995	37,910	38,500	41,295	47,650	44,850	44,310	29,040	315,080	
Congregational	16,121	26,696	26,696	29,310	28,450	27,271	29,146	23,730	208,819	
Methodist	5,400	10,410	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	63,000	
Episcopal	1,860	1,860	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	3,600	27,000	
Friends	1,860	27,845	14,460	28,388	23,288	24,742	23,220	10,650	107,130	
Mennonite	1,860	3,240	2,500	8,128	4,375	4,375	4,375	4,375	33,500	
Unitarian	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	11,820	
Lutheran	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	11,820	
Methodist - Missions	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	11,820	
Missions - Hampton Institute	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400	267,200	
Hampton Institute	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040	160,320	
Total	228,350	383,214	375,264	592,905	562,640	570,218	611,570	525,881	3,767,951	

Amount set apart for religious bodies for Indian education for each fiscal year, 1866 to 1893.

* In addition to this immense sum, their school at Devil's Lake was in a Government building, and when the training school was established at Fort Totten the Sisters' school was made a part of the Government school, and the Sisters retained as teachers under Government pay.

The sentiment of the American people is aroused against this unholy and unconstitutional union of Church and State shown by these figures, and bowing to this sentiment, if for no other reason, were I high in authority in any of the ecclesiastical bodies referred to that still asked for Government moneys, I would say that if my church wished to retain the good will and respect of Americans we could not afford to take a subsidy from the public treasury, and would have none of it. Several leading denominations have already taken this course, and I desire to have read the resolutions they have adopted upon the subject. The clerk read as follows:—

By the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Omaha, Nebr., May, 1892.

WHEREAS the appropriation of public funds for sectarian purposes by the national Government is not only wrong in principle, but in violation of both the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States: Therefore

Resolved, That this General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church requests the missionary societies working under its sanction or control to decline either to petition for or to receive from the national Government any moneys for educational work among the Indians.

By the General Board of Managers of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Resolved, That the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church cordially ap-

proves the action of the General Conference, requesting all benevolent societies of our church neither to appeal for nor accept from the national Government any moneys for Indian schools, not only because of its loyalty to the highest legislative and judicial body of the church, but because of its belief in the American principle of the absolute separation of Church and State.

(This was the only organization connected with the Methodist Episcopal Church receiving national money for Indian education. It no longer receives appropriations.)

By the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Portland, Oregon, May, 1892.

Resolved, I. That in the judgment of this assembly all public moneys expended upon the education of the Indians ought to be expended exclusively by Government officers upon Government schools.

Resolved, II. That in the judgment of this assembly the practice of appropriating public money for the support of sectarian schools among the Indians, as is now done in contract schools, ought at once to cease.

Resolved, III. That this assembly heartily approves of all proper efforts to secure the constitutional prohibition of all appropriations of public money to sectarian schools, either by the State or by the General Government.

(Rev. Dr. William C. Roberts, secretary of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church, the organization conducting for that denomination its school work among the Indians, writes under date of December 15, 1893: "We have contracts until July, 1894, when the Government understands that we give up all connection with it.")

By the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, Allegheny, Pa., May 31, 1892.

Resolved, That we protest against all Government appropriations for the denominational Indian schools and for other sectarian purposes as unconstitutional, and petition Congress to refuse all applications for such appropriations.

(This denomination has not received Government appropriations.)

By the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, sitting as the Board of Missions, Baltimore, Md., Oct. 19, 1892.

Resolved, That in the judgment of this board subsidies from the Treasury of the United States in aid of Indian education ought neither to be sought nor to be accepted by this church, and that the board of managers be, and hereby is, requested to act from this time forth in accordance with this judgment.

By the Board of Managers, Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, December 13, 1892.

Resolved, That in view of the action taken by the Board of Missions at its triennial meeting, and which was as follows:—

Resolved, That the general secretary be instructed respectfully to advise the United States Government that this board, while gratefully sensible of the past coöperation of the Government in its missionary work, finds itself unable, consistently with its convictions as to the incompetency of the Government to make appropriations for religious, ecclesiastical, or denominational purpose, to accept such appropriations in the future.

(Rev. Mr. Wm. S. Langford, General Secretary of "The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church," the organization conducting for that denomination its school work among the Indians, writes under date of December 30, 1893, "All contracts which this society has had for educational purposes with the United States Government have terminated and none will be renewed.")

By the American Missionary Association (Congregational), in annual session at Hartford, Conn., October 27, 1892.

WHEREAS the system known as "Contract Schools," in connection with Indian work, is open to very serious abuse; and

WHEREAS Government schools have now reached a position as to equipment, methods, and general efficiency, where the common school education among the

Indians may be safely and wisely intrusted to them; therefore

Resolved, First, that public money expended upon the education of Indians ought to be expended exclusively by Government officers upon Government schools.

Resolved, Second, that the practice of appropriating public money for the support of sectarian schools among the Indians ought henceforth to cease.

Resolved, Third, that it is wise for the American Missionary Association to decline to seek or accept any subsidy from the Government, and that henceforth this society act in conformity with this purpose.

(In the contract book of the Department of Indian Affairs there appears the following entry: "August 14, 1893, F. L. Riggs declined to renew the contract for the Oahe School, because the American Missionary Association had decided not to receive Government aid." This severs all connection of the Congregational Church with national appropriations.)

All of the foregoing bodies, together with the Baptist and Methodist Protestant churches, have also approved the following form of

XVITH AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

"No State shall pass any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or use its property or credit, or any money raised by taxation, or authorize either to be used, for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding, by appropriation, payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any church, religious denomination or religious society, or any institution, society, or undertaking, which is wholly, or in part, under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

MR. LINTON. Thus it will be seen that four great denominations that have heretofore been beneficiaries of a system foreign to the principles of our Government, viz., the Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Congregationalists, representing with adherents, a population of 14,750,000, now refuse to receive further grants of public money collected from the whole people, and they are joined by the important Baptist denomination that has never accepted, but always refused,* this public money for their missionary work: and I know other church societies are now protesting against this great wrong, while that great mass of our population not officially connected with any church, numbering at a low estimate 30,000,000, are outspoken and decidedly in earnest in their denunciation of this outrageous fraud that has been for years perpetrated upon the American people. I ask the members of the House to do away with this abomination under our Government, and you will do much toward eliminating religious controversy from political questions.

Some members will argue that the church can carry on these schools more cheaply than the Government. Those who consider this an argument are foes to the common-school system, and in favor of parochial schools instead, as the same reasoning would apply there also. Such argument is a confession that our citizens generally are incompetent to economically perform this duty, and I for one am not in favor of making any such admission, believing as I do that the average American citizen, no matter what his sect or creed may be, is as competent to carry on this work as any.

The bill before us makes specific appro-

*This is a mistake. For the facts as officially stated, see page 302 of last week's SENTINEL.—EDITORS.

riations for only a few parochial schools that appear upon the surface, beginning on page 51 with St. Boniface's School, in California, and the Holy Family School, in Montana, *et al*; but the "milk of the coconut" is found in the statement with which I have been furnished from the office of Indian Affairs, and I wish to say right here in this connection, that when I first asked for this information relative to denominational schools, my clerk was informed by the assistant commissioner, who I am told is a zealous member of the church which has its headquarters upon the Tiber, that it could not be supplied.

I of course was astonished to receive this message indicating that the bureau was in ignorance of the facts, or that the request of a member of Congress for information had been refused by a department, but upon sending a second time for a reply in writing to my letter, I received the following remarkable statement that I wish read and printed as abbreviated in the *Record* as a portion of my remarks, showing the number and class of schools under the office of Indian Affairs, and to which the people of this country have been contributing millions of dollars.

Now, that a large majority of ecclesiastical bodies, realizing the wrong, have severed the bond of Church and State, we should take action here to-day that will prevent subsidizing the schools of Mother DeChantal, Gerhard Terhorst, Pius Boehm, Balthasar Feusi, S. J. Sister Kunigunda, Rev. Aloysius M. Folchi, and others whose euphonious names have not been heretofore called to the attention of American people. I ask the clerk to read this statement. The clerk read as follows:—

Contract schools, giving the total amounts required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894.

School, location, and contractor.—Catholic.

Avoca Boarding, Minnesota, Mother de Chantal.....	\$ 3,780
Baraga Boarding, Michigan, Gerhard Terhorst.....	5,400
Bayfield Boarding, Wisconsin, Casimir Vogt.....	3,750
Bayfield Day, Wisconsin, Casimir Vogt.....	900
Bernalillo Boarding, New Mexico, Sister Margaret Mary.....	7,500
Colville Agency, Washington:	
Colville Boarding, Joseph M. Caraura.....	7,020
Cœur d'Alene Boarding, Charles Mackin.....	7,560
Crow Creek Reservation Boarding, Pius Boehm.....	10,260
St. Xavier Boarding, Crow Reservation, Montana, Leopold Van Corp.....	11,340
St. Mary's Boarding, Devils Lake Reservation, Sister Genevieve.....	14,040
St. Paul's Boarding, Fort Belknap Reservation, Montana, Balthasar Feusi, S. J.....	16,200
Graceville Boarding, Minnesota, Mother Cecelia.....	5,400
Harbor Springs Boarding, Michigan, Norbert Wilhelm.....	10,260
St. Joseph's Boarding, Green Bay Agency, Wisconsin, Orlan Derenthal.....	14,040
La Pointe Agency, Wisconsin:	
Red Cliff Day, Casimir Vogt.....	900
Bad River Day, Sister Kunigunda.....	600
Lac Court d'Oreilles Day, Sister M. Tabiola Oswald.....	1,200
St. Mary's Boarding, Sister Kunigunda.....	5,400
Morris Boarding, Minnesota, Mother Mary Joseph Lynch.....	9,720
North Yakima Boarding, Washington, Aloysius M. Folchi.....	5,400
Osage Agency, Oklahoma (paid from Osage money):	
St. Louis Boarding, Sister M. Acquinate.....	6,250
St. John's Boarding, Sister Mary Paul.....	6,000
Holy R. sary Boarding, Pine Ridge Agency South Dakota, P. Florentin Dignann.....	18,900
Pueblo Agency, New Mexico:	
Acoma Day, Placidas Louis Chapelle.....	750
Isleta Day, Placidas Louis Chapelle.....	900
Laguna Day, Placidas Louis Chapelle.....	750
Jamez Day, Placidas Louis Chapelle.....	750
San Juan Day, Placidas Louis Chapelle.....	660
Santo Domingo Day, Placidas Louis Chapelle.....	750
Taos Day, Placidas Louis Chapelle.....	600
St. Francis Boarding, Rosebud Reservation, South Dakota, John Jutz, S. J. (paid from Sioux money).....	10,260
San Diego Boarding, California, Anthony D. Ubach.....	11,875
St. Benedict's Boarding, Sac and Fox Agency, Oklahoma, Thomas Duperon.....	5,400
St. Peter's Boarding, Montana, James Rebmann.....	19,440
St. Catherine's Boarding, Santa Fe, N. Mex., Placidas, Louis Chapelle.....	12,500
St. Stephen's Boarding, Shoshone Reservation, Wyoming, Philbert Turnell.....	8,100
St. Labre's Boarding, Tongue River Reservation, Montana, A. Van der Velden.....	4,320
Tulalip Boarding, Tulalip Agency, Washington, Peter J. Dubbel.....	10,800
St. Benedict's Orphan, White Earth Agency, Minnesota, Aloysius Hermanutz.....	9,720
Red Lake Boarding, White Earth Agency, Minnesota, Thomas Borgerding.....	4,320
California:	
Eoplant Day, Mendocino County, Gregory Knepper.....	600
Pinole Day, Mendocino Co., Gregory Knepper.....	600
St. Turibius Day, Lake County, James Nolte.....	600
Ukiah Day, Mendocino Co., Gregory Knepper.....	600
Total.....	\$276,115

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS SPECIALLY APPROPRIATED FOR BY CONGRESSES

St. Boniface's Boarding, Banning, Cal., Joseph A. Stephan.....	\$12,500
Holy Family Boarding, Blackfeet Agency, Montana, Peter C. Bongis.....	12,500
St. Paul's Boarding, Clontarf, Minn., Anatole Oster.....	15,000
St. John's Boarding, Collegeville, Minn., Bernard Lokenkar.....	7,500
St. Benedict's Academy, St. Joseph, Minn., Bernard Lokenkar.....	7,500
St. Ignatius Mission, Boarding, Flathead Agency, Montana, J. B. Rene.....	45,000
St. Joseph's Normal School, Rensselaer, Ind., B. Florian Hahn.....	8,330
Kate Drexel Boarding, Umatilla Agency, Oregon, Joseph Chianale.....	6,000
Total.....	114,330

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Total.....	9,580
------------	-------

LIST OF ADDITIONAL CONTRACT SCHOOLS.

White's Indian Manual Labor Institute, Wabash, Ind., Oliver H. Bales.....	\$10,020
Lincoln Institution, Philadelphia, Pa., Lincoln Institution by William M. Hugg.....	33,400
Hampton Institute, Hampton Va., Hampton Institute by Hallis B. Frissell.....	20,040
Hope Boarding, Springfield, S. Dak., Walter James Wicks.....	4,860
Episcopal Mission Boarding, Shoshone Agency, Wyoming, John Roberts.....	2,160
Tuscon Boarding, Tuscon, Arizona, Howard Billman.....	25,000
Omaha Mission Boarding, Nebraska, Wyllys K. Morris.....	4,860
Sisseton Reservation, Goodwill Mission, South Dakota, G. S. Baskewill.....	6,430
Ramona Boarding, Santa Fe, N. Mex., Elmore Chase.....	8,125
Plum Creek Boarding, Leslie, S. Dak., Thomas L. Riggs.....	2,700
Point Iroquois Day, Bay Mills, Mich., William Edgar Brown.....	900
Wittenberg Boarding, Wittenberg, Wisconsin, Axel Jacobson.....	15,120
Mennonite Mission Boarding, Halstead Kansas, Christian Krehbiel.....	3,750
Crow Reservation Boarding, Montana, Alfred Manchester.....	5,004
Greenville Boarding, Plumas County, Cal., Amos G. Swan (for six months).....	1,800
Greenville Day, Plumas County, Cal., Amos G. Swan (for four months).....	240

After reading the above long list of sectarian beneficiaries at the hands of the Government, do you wonder that the system has caused a well-known writer to say:—

We have reached a critical and crucial period in the history of our Republic, so far as the integrity and very existence of our free public school system, the safe relation of ecclesiasticism to our Government, and essential separation of Church and State are concerned.

We are aware that this statement will be declared, by three classes, as sounding an alarm without cause; namely, the egotistic ignorant, the cowardly compromising, and the time-serving politician—the three worst foes of civil and religious liberty. But these are times when it becomes thoughtful citizens who have some knowledge of history, and who understand the situation in these history-making days, to be candid and wise, steady and courageous, and to stand together on the tenable ground of impregnable principle, which recognizes the equal rights of all and repudiates special privileges to any.

The enemy have said: "We will wait a little in hiding, and the spasm will soon pass off, and then we will come out in the open again." Is it not time that the occasional spasm should change to a normal and healthful permanence of purpose and action?

Mr. Chairman, I am not an alarmist, but the annals of earth are replete with tales of danger, trouble, and war, caused by religious rivalry, zeal, and hate, when Church and State are in any way connected, and it matters not in how slight degree. Already we are told of riots taking place, and that blood has been shed at elections in some of our cities, and we hear the murmurs of discontent, of dissatisfaction with and denunciation of the methods employed in this bill. Will you not take warning from the past by heeding the protests of great religious denominations; by heeding the resolutions passed by many, many civic organizations; by heeding the demands of almost the entire population of our country, declaring that this nefarious system of paying mil-

lions of the people's money to priestly agents of sectarian institutions must immediately cease. So long as you continue this system so long will the religious agitation now sweeping over the country continue.

Some may claim that I am bringing religion into politics, but far, far from it. I am trying to divorce the two in order that we may have no more of the combination; neither have I opposed this bill because one aggressive church whose ruling power is in a foreign land gets the lion's share of the spoils (as one of the largest beneficiaries to lose, I believe in amount received in case of the defeat of sectarian appropriations, is the Society of Friends, a sect for which I have the greatest respect, and to which a majority of my own people belong, and have since they landed in Penn's time, two centuries ago), but I oppose it, believing honestly that its whole principle is radically and everlastingly wrong in America.

Significant Paragraphs.

[We publish under this heading paragraphs more or less significant, without either approval or dissent, and without comment. The careful observer of the signs of the times will readily discern the pertinent facts and opinions, and will know how to turn them to account in the great controversy between truth and error.]

Some People Can Work on Sunday if They Want To.

THREE carpenters, O. F. Noble, of 20 Holyoke Street, Frank Schoonard, of 67 Minton Street, and H. A. Cook, of 57 Walton Avenue, repaired a little photograph gallery on wheels, Sunday, and were arrested for violating the Sunday labor law. But the policeman who made the arrest did not know that the men were Seventh-day Adventists. He was astonished when they "gave him the laugh," and he called it impudence. On Monday morning Prosecutor Fiedler got down his law book and began to look for information. He found that persons who conscientiously held the seventh day as a day of worship could not be prosecuted for working on the first day. Then the cases were *nolled*. The policeman turned a sickly smile on the prosecutor and went down the stairs whistling "Every Day'll Be Sunday By and By."—*Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Sept. 17.*

Divine Punishment.

"I LIKE your paper very much. I would like to ask you if the Scripture does not warrant us in the belief that the present fearful drought and failure of crops is not due to the desecration of the Sabbath? For all through this country there will more gather to watch baseball players on the Sabbath than attend church."

In reply: Sometimes we can see the connection between the sin and God's punishment of it. When we see the apple hanging on the tree we can say that it has grown on the tree. But sometimes we cannot see the connection between a particular sin and a special display of God's anger against sin; and then we cannot assert that the visitation is the result of the one sin alone.

Sabbath desecration leads to political corruption, through the daily papers which are the teachers and leaders of the people. We first teach the reporters and editors that God commands rest: and then as a body politic we afford them protection and aid in publishing, distributing and

selling Sunday papers. Thus we teach the teachers of the people that money is more important than the Decalogue. Our political and social debasement is the direct punishment of Sabbath desecration, and this political corruption brings in hosts of other sins. For one or more of these God sends the drought.

We ought to do one of two things: either repudiate the fourth commandment or stop the Sunday mails and baseball.

Perhaps if the preachers put more Christian patriotism into their sermons their congregations would be larger.

"Ye shall keep my Sabbaths and reverence my sanctuary; I am the Lord. If ye walk in my statutes and keep my commandments and do them; then will I give you rain in due season." This text from Leviticus, 26th chapter, seems to especially connect Sabbath-keeping and reverencing God's sanctuaries with seasonable showers.—*Christian Patriot, (Morristown, Tenn.), Sept. 15.*

To Combat the A. P. A.

HAVERHILL, Mass., Sept. 25.—The Patriotic Catholic American is the name of a new organization which, its founders believe will counteract the influence of the A. P. A. in this section of the country. The organization has just been formed, and it is claimed that there are twelve branches already.—*New York Sun, Sept. 26, 1894.*

Crispi and Canossa.

HOWEVER it may fare with her oppressors, the Church can afford to wait for justice, because she has all time at her disposal. If Premier Crispi has not actually arrived at Canossa, he is well on his way thither. His policy of warfare on religion and morality—against which honest Protestants themselves have protested—have created the dangers which now threaten his country, and from which only the Church can save her. Having done his best to make anarchists, he would now raise the cross between himself and his creatures.

This is the meaning of his call the other day at Naples for a union of forces against anarchism, under a banner inscribed, "For God, our King, and our Country."

But the Church must have freedom of action that she exert to the full her beneficent influence in the crisis through which the Italian government is passing; and that implies papal independence.

With the papal question unsettled, Rome remains the weak point of the Italian kingdom. Is Crispi beginning to see the necessity of sacrificing ill-gotten possession to secure true Italian unity?—*The Pilot (Catholic), Sept. 22.*

Seven Lodges Suspended for Sunday Meetings.

READING, Sept. 24.—A special meeting of the Grand Trustees of the Grand Lodge of Elks of the United States was held here this afternoon to consider the disagreements and discussions in the order. When the order was founded it consisted chiefly of theatrical men and those who found it convenient to meet on Sunday. Finally the Sunday meetings were severely criticised, but there were a number of lodges which refused to change the day of meeting.

To-night Grand Exalted Ruler Friday issued a proclamation suspending the following lodges, which are the only ones to disobey the circular of June 1894, commanding the discontinuance of Sunday meetings: New York, No. 1; Philadelphia,

No. 2; Baltimore, No. 7; Boston, No. 10; Washington, No. 15; Denver, Colo., No. 17, and Norfolk, Va., No. 38.

The suspended lodges are forbidden to hold any further meetings or to transact business as Elks lodges, and all lodges are directed to deny admission or recognition to any of the suspended lodges or their members. If seven or more law-abiding Elks of suspended lodges desire to reorganize their lodges, a dispensation will be granted on application.—*Sun, Sept. 25.*

A Catholic Innovation.

CONSIDERABLE attention is being attracted to a Roman Catholic Church in Minneapolis on account of innovations that have been introduced into its religious life. It is so seldom that the Catholic Church adopts anything that savors of Protestantism, that the press at large makes mention of this particular case. In the first place, a Bible class was organized about a year ago for the study of the Catholic Bible. It would be unheard of to study the Protestant Bible; but it was the Bible nevertheless. This class was thrown open to the general public, and during the last season there was an average attendance of sixty. But, *mirabile dictu!* this same church, and, by the way, it is one of the largest and most influential in the Northwest, has now introduced congregational singing. This is something entirely new in America, although it has been in vogue in England and Germany. But this is not to be chanting or anything in that nature. A regular hymn book is being prepared, and they are to enjoy genuine congregational singing. They will use many of the favorite Protestant hymns, too, and with the same old tunes that have made them so familiar to that church. These innovations will undoubtedly be welcomed, not only in the Protestant, but even in the Catholic Church, as showing a marked progress towards the spirit of the times.—*New York Sunday World, Sept. 23.*

Pope Leo's Interest in America.

BALTIMORE, Md., Sept. 21.—Bishop Keane, of the Catholic University, at Washington, arrived in Baltimore this evening from Rome, and is the guest of Cardinal Gibbons at the archiepiscopal residence. While in Rome, Bishop Keane had two long audiences with the pope.

"His holiness took a great interest in what was and had been going on in America," said the bishop. "He asked me about the church here, and about the political and economic conditions of this country. He wanted to know about the political struggles, and inquired about our labor troubles, and I found that he shared, to a great extent, the prevalent belief in Europe that the riots here were the outgrowth of Socialism, and foreshadowed a possible revolution. I relieved his mind on that point by telling him that, in this case, out of evil good was certain to come. His love for his eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, was very manifest from his talk. Mgr. Satolli, too, shares the warmest affection of the pope. He is pleased with the acts of Mgr. Satolli since his appointment as the representative of his holiness in this country. Leo does not believe that either monarchical or imperial forms of government will be tolerated in the future, but that democracy will wield its sway. He regards America and France as the foremost and broadest types of that form

of government. America he looks upon as the bulwark of the church.

"The relations between the Vatican and Quirinal," continued his grace, "have scarcely changed an iota in recent years. The pope is proof against influences brought to bear upon him to withdraw his influence from France and place it with the Triple Alliance. Humbert now realizes that he has been foolish in his attitude. The pope's standing on this point remains unchanged and he will die in the same policy he has all along maintained. Italy is bankrupt and on the verge of dissolution," said the bishop. "It is held together for the time by Germany. The latter has taken her loans again and again, but will not do so any more. The Italian national government, however, will never be broken up. It will become in the future, I suppose, a republic, with the pope having the undisputed gubernatorial privilege in the city of Rome. The pope was very much pleased to know that his eminence, Cardinal Gibbons, contemplated a visit to Rome."—*Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1894.*

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LIBRARY.

No. 1. **Due Process of Law and the Divine Right of Dissent.** A review of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case. By A. T. Jones. 120 pages. Price, 15 cents.

No. 2. **Religious Intolerance in the Republic.** A portrayal of recent persecutions in Tennessee. 16 pages. Price 2 cents.

No. 3. **Church and State.** By James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore Bar. 60 pages. Price, 10 cents.

No. 4. **The National Sunday Law.** Arguments by A. T. Jones in opposition to the Blair Sunday-rest Bill. 192 pages. Price, 25 cents.

No. 5. **Sunday Laws in the United States.** By James T. Ringgold. 24 pages. Price, 3 cents.

No. 6. **The Captivity of the Republic.** 128 pages. Price, 15 cents.

No. 7. **Appeal and Remonstrance.** 24 pages. Price, 3 cents.

No. 8. **Appeal from the U. S. Supreme Court Decision Making this a "Christian Nation." A Protest.** By A. T. Jones. 86 pages. Price, 15 cents.

No. 10. **Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question.** 20 pages. Price, 2½ cents.

No. 11. **The "Civil Sabbath;" or Disguised Religious Legislation.** 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 12. **The Columbian Year, and the Meaning of the Four Centuries.** 44 pages. Price, 5½ cents.

No. 13. **The Limits of Civil Authority.** 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 14. **Christ and the Sabbath.** 40 pages. Price, 5 cents.

No. 15. **Rome's Challenge: Why Do Protestants Keep Sunday?** 40 pages. Price, 5 cents.

No. 16. **Our Answer: Why Do Seventh-day Adventists Suffer Imprisonment Rather Than Keep Sunday?** By A. F. Ballenger. 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 18. **Christ and the Pharisees; or, Christ's Faithfulness in Sabbath-keeping.** 40 pages. Price, 5 cents.

No. 19. **Protestantism, True and False.** 32 pages. Price, 4 cents.

No. 20. **Civil Government and Religion.** 182 pages. Price, 25 cents.

No. 21. **Congress on Sunday Legislation.** 16 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 22. **The Legal Sunday: Its History and Character.** 260 pages. Price, 40 cents. The same in cloth, 75 cents.

No. 23. **The Sabbath Question in the Dominion Parliament, as viewed by Hon. G. Amyot, M. P.** 12 pages. Price, 1½ cents.

No. 24. **What Do These Things Mean? The true meaning of the present unsettled condition of "Capital and Labor," finances, etc.** 20 pages. Price, 2½ cents.

Annual subscription to the Library, \$1. Liberal discounts on any of the numbers in quantities and to the trade.



You can Bind

One Sheet, or three hundred sheets, in ten seconds.

The Klip binds loose sheets, pamphlets, or magazines.

If you want covers also, you had better send for a Klip price-list—that's free. If you will try the Klip, I will mail a sample dozen, six sizes, and a pair of Klip-Keys to put them on with for seventy-five cents.

H. H. BALLARD, 193, Pittsfield, Mass.

PRISON LIGHT Edited by one sending the Third Angel's Message to the perishing in prisons all over the land. Agents wanted. 50 per cent. commission. Trial year 20 cents. Terms and sample copy 2 cent stamp. Inlaid by the SENTINEL. PRISON LIGHT, 40 Green Street, Brattleboro, Vt.



NEW YORK, OCTOBER 4, 1894.

One receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

ON another page we print a portion of a speech by Hon. W. S. Linton, member of Congress from the State of Michigan, on the bill "making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes." It is this bill which makes appropriations for the "contract schools," or, in other words, the denominational schools, supported by the Government. The bill passed, and was approved Aug. 15, 1894. The figures given by Mr. Linton are valuable, and should be saved for future reference, as should also the figures given on page 302 of the SENTINEL of Sept. 27.

IF anything had been lacking to show the power of Rome in this State it would be supplied by the action of the late Constitutional Convention. This convention, which had a Republican majority, started in with a flourish of trumpets to so amend the constitution of the State as to forever prohibit appropriations to sectarian schools. To this end the educational article was adopted as follows:—

ARTICLE 9, Section 1. The legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a system of free common schools, wherein all the children of this State may be educated.

Section 2. The corporation created in the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty-four, under the name of the regents of the University of the State of New York, is hereby continued under the name of the University of the State of New York. It shall be governed and its corporate powers, which may be increased, modified or diminished by the legislature, shall be exercised by not less than nine regents.

Section 3. The capital of the common school fund, the capital of the literature fund, and the capital of the United States deposit fund, shall be respectively preserved inviolate. The revenue of the said common school fund shall be applied to the support of common schools; the revenue of the said literature fund shall be applied to the support of academies, and the sum of \$25,000 of the revenues of the United States deposit fund shall each year be appropriated to and made part of the capital of the said common school fund.

Section 4. Neither the State nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection of any school or institution of learning, wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught.

This article alone would not have accomplished all that was to be desired, for it still leaves the door wide open for that colorless thing called "unsectarian religious instruction," and which is unsatisfactory to man and displeasing to God; but it would have cut off all appropriations to distinctively sectarian institutions. This was not to be, however; the Roman Catholics rallied their forces and "influence," and, invoking all the saints in the

calendar and all the political "pull" in Tammany, succeeded in getting the following provision inserted in the section on charities:—

Nothing in this Constitution contained shall prevent the legislature from making such provision for the education and support of the blind, the deaf and dumb and juvenile delinquents as to it may seem proper, or prevent any county, city, town or village from providing for the care, support, maintenance and secular education of inmates of orphan asylums, homes for dependent children or correctional institutions, whether under public or private control. Payments by counties, cities, towns and villages to charitable, eleemosynary, correctional and reformatory institutions wholly or partly under private control for care, support and maintenance may be authorized, but shall not be required by the legislature. No such payments shall be made for any inmate of such institutions who is not received and detained therein pursuant to rules established by the State Board of Charities. Such rules shall be subject to the control of the legislature by general laws.

This leaves the sects an open door to the State treasury, and we may expect to see the usual shameless scramble of papists and "Protestants" for funds at each recurring session of the legislature. As usual, however, Rome will be in the van and will bear off the lion's share; thanks to the weak-kneed "Protestantism" that truckles for votes and denies a principle for lucre.

BISHOP KEANE, Rector of the Catholic University at Washington, returned recently from Rome, and is, according to the *World*, of this city, authority for the statement that Mgr. Satolli is ere long to be clothed with supreme authority in Roman Catholic Church affairs in this country. Hitherto appeals have been made either to Mgr. Satolli or direct to the propaganda at Rome, at the option of the appellant; but when the contemplated change shall have been made, all cases must first go to the vice-pope at Washington, after which the pope in Rome can permit an appeal to himself, if he sees fit.

It is also stated that the pope will issue another important encyclical in November, which will deal with "the questions of political government," and will contain a reiteration of the pope's "views of democracy, not alone in this country, but abroad." The letter will be addressed specially "to the Catholics of the United States, and will recite anew the position of the church here." Bishop Keane believes that "it will transcend in importance the encyclicals on the labor and parochial school questions."

According to Bishop Keane, the pope finds in American political as well as religious affairs an unceasing source of interest. "The pope believes America is to be the bulwark of the Catholic Church of the future, and rejoices that the political evolutions of the Old World are on the lines of democracy followed in the United States."

The pope is said to have asked all kinds of questions relative to political matters in this country, and to have manifested a

lively interest in all things American. He wished to know about the American Protective Association, and the use of troops in the recent labor troubles. He was much interested when told that the military took no sides but simply appeared as guardians of property.

Probably His Craftiness was weighing the chances of becoming arbitrator of the differences between labor and capital in this country.

Why does the pope believe "America is to be the bulwark of the Catholic Church of the future"? and why does he rejoice "that the political evolutions of the Old World are on the lines of democracy followed in the United States"? Simply because democracy is the people, and Leo believes that he can use the people better than he can the princes. That many of the people stand ready to be hoodwinked, seems evident; but while, as Lincoln said, it is possible to fool all the people part of the time and some of the people all the time, it is not possible to fool all the people all the time. The pope may, yea, will, largely realize his expectations in this country, but not all will be deceived by him, or by the system which he represents.

A New Sabbath-school Song Book.

"THE Gospel Song Sheaf," "gleaned by F. E. Belden," is the name of a well-bound and attractive looking book of 240 pages just issued by the Pacific Press Publishing Co., New York City; Oakland, Cal.; and Kansas City, Mo.

Pages 1 to 50 are devoted to songs especially adapted to use in the primary division of the Sabbath-school. This is an excellent feature of the book and will be greatly appreciated by the little folks. The author's experience in kindergarten work has stood him in good stead in the preparation of this part of the book.

The intermediate division has also been specially remembered, and pages 51 to 150 are devoted to words and music appropriate to this division, but suitable also for the use of persons of more mature years. All, both old and young, will be glad to find in this part of the book a number of familiar pieces in addition to many new ones.

Pages 150 to 218 contain special and gospel songs suitable for the more general purposes of the Sabbath-school, as well as many of them for social worship. The remainder of the book is given up entirely to old hymns and tunes, and here is found a large number of the old favorites, as many as six appearing on a single page, but in such cases of course with only a single bar of the music, but all the words.

Taken altogether we think the "Song Sheaf" is an excellent book and will meet a hearty welcome wherever introduced.

This book is neatly and substantially bound, and though somewhat larger than other books of its kind sells at the usual price: 35 cents per copy, by mail, or \$4.00 per dozen; \$30 per hundred by express, not prepaid.

Address the publishers as above.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Set for the defense of liberty of conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 Bond Street, New York City.