

insurance is there that they could retain it? None whatever. When power has been taken from the hands of the people, their property is insecure. There is no protection against poverty like the political independence of the masses. The "new nationalism" is a school of politics that is at war with the one to which the founders of the United States belonged.

TO ABOLISH THE COMMISSION.

FOLLOWING is the full text of the bill to abolish the Utah Commission, introduced in the House of Representatives, on March 18th, 1890, by Mr. Stone. It was read twice and referred to the committee on judiciary:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the board of five persons, commonly called the Utah Commission provided for in the ninth section of "An act to amend section fifty-three hundred and fifty-two of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in reference to bigamy, and for other purposes," approved March twenty-second, eighteen hundred and eighty-two, be, and the same is hereby, abolished and all the powers and duties thereon shall devolve upon a board of three persons, to be styled "the Board of Registration and Elections of the Territory of Utah," a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum.

Sec. 2. That said board shall consist of the Governor, Territorial Secretary, and President of the Council of the Legislative Assembly of Utah, and for their services as such board they shall each receive one thousand dollars per annum in addition to the pay and emoluments of their offices, respectively.

Sec. 3. That all laws appertaining to said board of commissioners created by said ninth section of said act approved March Twenty-second, eighteen hundred and eighty-two, shall apply to the board established by this act the same as if expressly re-enacted: *Provided,* That the compensation of the three members of said board shall not exceed said sum of one thousand dollars each for their services on said board.

Sec. 4. That immediately on the taking effect of this act said Utah Commission shall deliver and turn over to their successors all books, papers, and other property appertaining to their office.

Sec. 5. That all laws and parts of laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

AN ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION.

AT no time in the history of the American Republic have so many important constitutional questions arisen in relation to existing and proposed legislation. One of the latest is associated with what has been called a "religious amendment." Under the caption of "The Revolutionary Resolution," the *American Sentinel* contains the following pithy article:

There is a point in that religious amendment to the Constitution that has not been made as much of as it ought to be. The title of the proposition is this:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, respecting establishments of religion and free public schools.

Now set that alongside of this clause of the Constitution *as it is*, and consider them together:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.

If the purpose of this proposed amendment is not to annul that clause of the Constitution as it is, and so open the way for a national establishment of religion, then what can possibly be the purpose of it?

This being, logically, the purpose of the resolution as defined in the title, a further question is, does the body of the resolution bear out the logic of the title? Let us see. Section 2 says:

Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in knowledge of the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity.

And section 3 says:

The United States shall guarantee to every State and to the people of every State, and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as herein provided.

The analysis of these sections is this:

A system shall be established which shall embody "the principles of Christianity."

The United States shall guarantee the maintenance of such a system.

Therefore this resolution does propose that the United States Government shall maintain an establishment of Christianity.

Now Christianity is the expression and embodiment of a religion.

This resolution proposes to pledge the United States Government to the maintenance of an establishment of Christianity.

Therefore this resolution does propose to pledge the United States Government to the maintenance of an establishment of religion.

Again: Section 4 of the resolution says:

Congress shall enforce this article by appropriate legislation when necessary.

As the preceding sections of this article provide for and guarantee an establishment of religion—of Christianity; and as this section provides that Congress shall enforce the article by appropriate legislation; therefore the resolution does provide that Congress shall make laws respecting an establishment of religion.

The analysis of the whole resolution, therefore, is this:

It proposes that the United States Government shall establish a religion; and that Congress shall make laws respecting that establishment of religion.

But the Constitution as it is says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

Therefore, both in its title and its provisions the Blair resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States is distinctly a proposition to annul that clause of the Constitution as it is which forbids an establishment of religion.

That clause of the Constitution is, and was intended to be, the declaration of one of the fundamental and distinctive principles of our form of government.

The Blair resolution, being a proposition to annul that clause, is a proposition to destroy one of the distinctive features of our form of government, and is therefore REVOLUTIONARY.

THE BIBLE EXCLUDED FROM THE SCHOOLS.

A FEW days ago the Supreme Court of Wisconsin rendered a decision the effect of which is to prohibit the reading of the Bible in the public schools of that State. Following is a quotation from the opinion:

"Some of the most valuable instruction a person can receive may be derived from reading alone, without any comment or exposition of the question; therefore, the question seems to narrow down to this: Is the reading of the Bible in the public schools, not merely selected passages therefrom, but the whole of it, sectarian instruction of the pupils, in view of the facts already mentioned, that the Bible contains numerous doctrinal passages upon some of which the peculiar creed of almost every religious sect is based, and that such passages may reasonably be understood to inculcate the doctrines predicated upon them? An affirmative answer to the question seems unavoidable. Any pupil of ordinary intelligence who listens to the reading of doctrinal portions of the Bible will be more or less instructed thereby in the doctrines of the divinity of Jesus Christ, the eternal punishment of the wicked, the authority of the priesthood, the binding force of the efficacy of the sacraments, and many other conflicting sectarian doctrines."

Among the Protestant citizens of Wisconsin much indignation is expressed over this remarkable decision, but it is, of course, in line with the policy of the Catholic church. It is certainly a remarkable innovation upon what is deemed to be the law in all or nearly all the other States in the Union.

A LIVE COMPANY.

THE extension of the street railroad along First East Street and the connections it makes, seem to have stirred up quite a commotion among the promoters of projected car lines and others interested in rival schemes. We are not thoroughly acquainted with the legal merits of this matter, but the public benefits that will accrue from the extension are obvious and need no explanation. The residents along the route of the extension have been clamoring for it for some time, and we understand the rails would have been laid last fall if the company had been able then to prosecute the work and the weather had been sufficiently favorable.

To quiet the queries of a good many people as to the right of the company to lay down their line