

The Churches and the Public Treasury

A. T. Jones

IN the Senate of the United States, July 24, there was the most important debate that has been conducted in Congress, not only during this particular term, but for many years before. The debate arose on the Indian Appropriation Bill, which had passed the House, and was now to be considered in the Senate. The particular point in debate was the consideration of the two following items. We quote from the record:—

"The Presiding Officer.—The reading of the bill will proceed.

"The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, was, on page 60, to strike out the clause from line 19 to line 21, inclusive, as follows:—

"For support and education of sixty Indian pupils at St. Joseph's Normal School at Rensselaer, Indiana, \$8,330.'

"Mr. Dawes.—I ask unanimous consent that that amendment and the next one may be considered together, for the same reasons.

"The Presiding Officer.—The next amendment will be stated.

"The next amendment was to strike out the clause from line 25, on page 60, to line 2, on page 61, inclusive, as follows:—

"For the education and support of one hundred Indian children at the Holy Family Indian School, at Blackfeet Agency, Montana, \$12,500.'

"Mr. Dawes.—Mr. President, the Committee recommend the striking out of those two appropriations, and I desire as briefly as possible, to state the reasons which have actuated the Committee in this recommendation. They both stand on the same ground, if one should be stricken out both should, and if either remains both should remain.

3

"These are schools under the management of the Catholics. They are new appropriations by the Government for the maintenance of two new Catholic schools, and the one between them, the St. Boniface's Industrial School, is also one of the same kind. That the Committee did not strike out, for the special reasons which I will state in a moment.

"What influenced the Committee to strike out these schools was simply this consideration: They desired not to go any further than the present condition of affairs in appropriating the Government's money for the maintenance of schools of particular religious denominations. The present and existing state of things in that

particular, if these schools are not added, will be precisely what it was last year."

Thus it seems that the Government of the United States has already been appropriating public money for the support of schools of religious denominations, and that this question would not have been raised, had not the Catholics made a request for support of these additional schools of their own. The way the matter has stood, up to the present time, not including the appropriations contemplated in this bill, is thus set forth by Senator Dawes, the Chairman of the Committee:—

"The appropriations in this regard have run from the year 1886, as follows: For Catholic schools in 1886, \$118,343, as against \$109,916 for all others; in 1887, \$194,635 as against \$168,579 for all others; in 1888, \$221,169 for Catholic schools, and \$155,095 for all others; in 1889, \$347,672 for Catholic schools, as against \$183,000 for all others; in 1889-90, as I have said, \$356,967 for Catholic schools, as against, for all other denominations and all other schools, \$204,993."

That is the condition of things which the present administration found when it entered upon office. Hundreds of thousands of dollars given outright to religious denominations for the purpose of teaching their denominational views—virtually a union of Church and State! The present administration desired to put a stop to this, keeping the Church and

4

the State separate, and letting the churches support their own schools, and teach their own schools, and teach their own doctrines, at their own expense, but says Mr. Dawes:—

"The present management was in favor of divorcing the eminent absolutely from them all, *but it found it impossible thee.*"

And has it come to this, that, through the Indian Department, the different religious denominations of the country have already got such a hold upon, the United States Government that they cannot be shaken off? Is it possible that already there is such a union between the State and these churches that it is impossible to divorce the government from them? That this is so, is proved not only by the statement of Mr. Dawes, but by the result of this discussion in the Senate. Although the effort was to strike out two items of appropriation to Roman Catholic schools, the result was that not only was neither of these stricken out, but both, with two more were *adopted*. Strong opposition to the measure however, was made by Senator Reagan, of Texas and Senator George, of Mississippi, whose speeches will be found at the end of this tract; but their noble effort availed nothing. The tide was too strong; the political power of the churches, and especially of the Catholic Church, had already become too great.

The history of this matter is worth relating. It began in 1885, the first year of President Cleveland's administration, when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs made this statement:—

"The government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in school

5

established by those denominations. It should throw open the door and say to all denominations, 'There should be no monopoly in good works. Enter, all of you, and do whatever your hands find of good work to do, and in your efforts the governmental will give you encouragement out of its liberal purse.' In other words, the government, without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor."

And according to the list given by Mr. Dawes, the first appropriation of public money that was given for this purpose was \$118,343 to Roman Catholics, with \$109,916 for all other denominations put together, and that it steadily increased until, by the appropriation for the fiscal year of 1889-90, the Roman Catholics received \$356,967, and all other denominations \$204,993. That is, within four years the Roman Catholic Church received \$1,238,786, while all the other denominations together received \$761,583. In other words, within four years the Roman Catholics were enabled to increase their appropriations \$238,624 above the amount with which they began, while all other denominations were enabled to increase theirs but \$95,077.

Is it difficult for any reader to see a direct connection between these facts and figures, and the frequent visits of Cardinal Gibbons to the White House during the presidential administration from March 4, 1885, to March 4, 1889? There is no room for reasonable doubt that the suggestion in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1885, was secured by the Roman Catholic Church. This problem is made stronger by the fact that in the year 1885, the very year when this thing began, there

6

was established in the city of Washington a Catholic Bureau of Missions, of which Mr. Dawes says:—

"They have been on the ground here for the last five years, pushing Catholic schools upon the government as earnestly as was in their power, and largely to that influence is attributed this great increase, which has come to be three-fifths of all the appropriations. They are active still."

No one can fail to see the direct connection between these facts and the above figures. It is true that because of their being accessories, after the fact and upon the principle that "the partaker is as bad as the thief," the Episcopalians; Methodists, and Presbyterians are inexcusably guilty of participating in this iniquity. But, from the facts, it seems certain that the scheme was originally a Roman Catholic one.

Further particulars are also at hand. The present administration desired to stop the flow of this evil tide, and to break the grasp of the churches upon the national government. But finding it impossible to do so at once, it thought at least to put a check upon it, and, therefore, absolutely refused to recommend any increase of appropriation to any church and did recommend that the government conduct its own schools and teach the Indians itself. The Catholic Bureau of Missions applied to the present administration for aid in establishing three new schools. There were also applications on the part of the Episcopalians, the

Presbyterians, and the Methodists; but all such applications were refused. With the refusal, the Protestant denominations contented themselves; "*but the Catholic Bureau*," says Senator Dawes, "having failed to get a contract for these

7

three schools from the government, in addition, and aggravating the inequality that had already aroused public sentiment, they went to the House of Representatives, *without any estimate or recommendation from the department*, and obtained the insertion into the bill of these three schools."

When the bill reached the Senate, an amendment was there added to it voting an appropriation to yet another school, making four in all that the Catholics had secured. As soon as the other denominations heard of this, they hurried up to Congress with a protest against the proposed appropriation; but there was no suggestion of any protest from them against having the appropriation of former years continue both to the Catholics and to themselves. But it seems that the protest came only because the Catholics had succeeded in obtaining, additional money, when they themselves could secure nothing additional. Their protest, therefore, simply amounts to nothing. It has no force whatever; and their protest never will have any force as long as they continue, to receive money from the government in support of their own church schools. Let these protesting denominations absolutely refuse to take any more money from the government; let them return to the government the money which they have already, and unconstitutionally, taken, then let them protest against the appropriation to Roman Catholic schools, and there will be some force to their protest. This, however, is hardly to be expected, because, having been sharers with the Roman Cath-

8

olics in the iniquity of the thing these five years and now raising a protest only because the Catholics get more than they can get, it is so far contrary to the nature of church encroachments on governmental power, as to be beyond all expectation that these denominations could by any possible means be led to take such a proper and honest course

It is just to state here, however, that the Baptist Missionary Association is among those who have protested against these appropriations; and *their* protest is consistent, because they have never been partakers in the evil. The Baptists have pursued a consistent course, and have refused to avail themselves of these offers from the "liberal purse" of the administration of 1885-90, and have maintained their own right, as well as their own ability to teach the religion which they believe, at their own expense, without selling their honor, as well as their rights, to the national government.

The condition of things exposed in this debate on the Appropriation bill is one of the most startling revelations that has ever been made on the subject of the union of Church and State in this government. The fact that there is already formed such an alliance between the national government and the church power that it is considered impossible to break it, ought so to arouse every man who loves religion or the government that the supposed impossibility of breaking the

alliance shall be annihilated, and the whole question be put upon its genuine constitutional basis, and the government have

9

nothing at all to do with religion in the teaching of it, or in any other way.

WHY IS IT POSSIBLE?

Senator Dawes says that the present administration has found it impossible to divorce the government from parochial schools. Let us examine the reasons which are given why this thing is held to be impossible. After stating the amount of appropriations to parochial schools, from the years 1886 to 1890, with an item of \$356,967 for Catholic schools, and \$204,993 for schools of other denominations, for the year ending June 30, 1890, Senator Dawes, who had charge of the bill, said:—

"That was the condition of things last year when the present management of the Indian Bureau came into power. That is maintained to-day in precisely the same condition."

This is a statement worth examining:—

1. It is shown by the senator that the United States Government is allied with the churches in the United States to such an extent as to be spending more, than one-half million dollars each year for the support of the schools of these churches. That is, more than one-half million dollars is taken each year from all the people, and given outright to certain churches with which to conduct church schools, and to teach the religious dogmas of those churches.

2. It is stated by the senator that the question whether the government should be connected with parochial schools at all, is a "great question." That is the truth. It is a great question. It is the great

10

question that caused the Dark Ages, and has been the curse of every government until now. It is this question that our fathers sought to have this government avoid, when they forbade Congress to have anything to do with religion. But, although the whole spirit and intent of the United States Constitution forbids this thing which is now being done by the government for certain churches of the United States, yet both the government and the churches have deliberately gone ahead in the matter, and are still going, ahead, and the people sit still and let it go without any protest.

This is a forcible and practical illustration of what has often been said: that constitutional safeguards are such only so long as the intelligence of the people is kept up to the level of the Constitution. A people may have a perfect Constitution, and yet, if they neglect it, so that the public intelligence falls below the level of the Constitution, and the real character of the Constitution is forgotten, then the Constitution is of no more value than so much blank paper. This is the condition of things in the United States now. So far as the subject of religion and government is concerned, the United States Constitution is as nearly perfect as a human production can be made. It declares an absolute separation between the church, or churches, and the State, and prohibits the government

from having anything to do with establishing any religion, or with any religion already established. And yet the people of the United States have so far forgotten these principles,

11

and the necessity of maintaining them, that Congress goes on, year after year, bestowing national aid upon certain churches, and the people say not a word. They still elect men to Congress who are carrying on the same iniquity, and the people suffer this thing to go on, until the churches get such a hold upon the government that it is officially declared that it is impossible to be broken. And this declaration is made by the very men who are sent to Congress, and who sit there under a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Of what benefit is the Constitution of the United States, in its provision for the separation of Church and State, when the men who take oath to support it thus violate it, and when the people are so careless and indifferent about the whole matter as to suffer it to go on year after year, with not a word of protest? This is indeed a great question.

And yet, as great a question as it is, and as great a question as it is acknowledged by Senator Dawes to be, he considers any discussion of the question to be "unprofitable and in every possible light an unfortunate discussion." How is it possible that the discussion of the great fundamental principles of the United States Constitution can be unfortunate and unprofitable? If this statement be true, then it was an unfortunate and unprofitable thing for our fathers to put this principle in the Constitution at all, because it is certain that every subject embodied in the Constitution is properly a subject of discussion. Therefore, if the statement of Senator Dawes be true,

12

that the discussion of the question as to whether the government should be connected with parochial schools, in other words, whether there shall be a union of Church and State—if the discussion of that question can ever be unfortunate and unprofitable, then that is only to charge that the action of the fathers, in making such a provision in the Constitution, was only unfortunate and unprofitable. But Mr. Dawes even repeats this proposition, He says:—

"The present management was in favor of divorcing the government absolutely from them all, but it found it impossible to do that. Perhaps it would have been better had the Indian education set out upon this principle, but it had gone so far and got so interwoven with the whole system of Indian education that it was utterly impossible to retrace the step, and to avoid the precipitation upon the country of such a discussion as that, which could do no good anywhere."

Senator Dawes is from Massachusetts. Does he express; the opinion of the people of that State, when he declares the discussion of the question of national support to parochial schools to be unfortunate, unprofitable, and such as can do no good anywhere? Are the people of the United States, as a whole, ready to admit that the discussion of one of the greatest principles embodied in the United States Constitution, can ever be either unfortunate or unprofitable, or such as

can do no good anywhere? We cannot believe that such is the sentiment of the majority of the people of the United States, but we shall very soon know whether it is or not. If this is allowed to go on, as it has been going for the last five years, and as Congress proposes to keep it going, without such a discussion throughout the

13

whole, country as the importance of the subject demands, then we shall know that Senator Dawes has rightly represented the matter. Then, too, we shall know how great a mistake our fathers made, when they considered that question of sufficient importance to make it one of the leading principles of the Constitution of the country.

It is easy enough to understand how Senator Dawes, and other senators, should deem the discussion of this question to be unfortunate and unprofitable, and barren of good anywhere. They are politicians, and there are votes that depend upon the course they take; and therefore it is easy to understand how they can count any question unprofitable that will put them into the place where the course which they may take may jeopardize votes. We speak this advisedly, because it stands on the face of the speech of Senator Dawes, all the way through. He pretended to speak in support of the administration in its endeavor to divorce the government from the parochial schools. He pretended to speak in opposition to the State aiding the church schools. He, started out in a tone and with a statement of facts, which seemed as though he was determined to smite the evil with mighty blows, right and left. He seemed to be rallying all his strength for a mighty effort, that which might naturally be supposed to be intended to crush, as with a pile-driver, the whole wicked scheme but it ended every time in tickling, as with a feather, all the churches concerned, and particularly the Roman Catholic Church.

14

For instance, when he had given the items of appropriation of public money, to the amount of \$2,060,069 in support of church schools, apparently with the idea of opposing any further appropriation—after he had thus raised this great question of giving aid to parochial schools, he passed off the discussion of this "great question" as one altogether "unfortunate," "unprofitable," etc.!!

Again, when he had given facts which involve the Catholic Bureau of Missions in the playing of as clear a Jesuitical trick as ever was played, and upon which it would be naturally expected he would denounce the whole scheme, he mildly toned down the vigorous array of facts, and partly apologized for it all, by saying:—

"They had just as lief the government money would go to carrying on that school as any other denominational school; and if the government is to go further into this connection with denominational schools, it might as well do this. . . If the senate think it wise to go further, the committee have nothing to say."

Again, of the Bureau of Catholic Missions, he said:—

They have been on the ground here for the last five years piling Catholic schools upon the government as earnestly as was in their

power, and largely to that influence is attributed this great increase, which has come to be three-fifths of all the appropriations. They are active still."

And when he had shown that that Bureau, in its activity, and in open defiance of the Indian Bureau and of the administration, had gone to Congress, and had secured four additional schools with the appropriation of thousands of dollars to each—when he knew all this, and when he made the statement in his speech; yet, in direct and immediate connection with these statements, he said:—

"There is a very efficient, and urgent, and active Catholic Bureau of Missions in this city . . . which deserves both personally and in the purpose for which it is organic in the highest commendation. I know personally those who are at the head of it, and I have taken occasion, with great pleasure, to say that they are men worthy of confidence."

That is to say, here is a Bureau, an organized church association, organized solely for the purpose of pushing Catholic schools upon the government, and to secure government money for the support of these schools, in violation of the Constitution of the United States; and yet Senator Dawes stands before the nation and states that that Bureau, "both personally and in the purpose for which it was organized, deserves the highest commendation," and that the men who are at the head of it "are men worthy of confidence"! All this when he knew that the men at the head of that Bureau had played as deliberate a trick upon the United States as could ever be played. How can the Constitution of the United States, how can the interests of the people, be safe in the hands of such men, and in the presence of such organizations?

And such are the reasons why the discussion of this great question is considered unprofitable and unfortunate. It is true that such a discussion as was carried on by Senator Dawes is unprofitable and unfortunate. It is true that that can do no good,

16

but only harm everywhere, because such pandering of church power, such a tickling with straws, and such, compromising of the Constitution, can have no other effect than to embolden the means of the church power upon the government and the Constitution until the whole shall be comely swallowed up.

This is why it is considered impossible to divorce this church power from the Government. This is why it is found impossible to retrace the steps already taken. Those who are in the place to retrace the steps are so afraid of losing votes, so afraid of losing party prestige, that they dare not discuss, much less denounce, the encroachment of church power upon the Constitution of our government.

Do the American people indorse the speech of Senator Dawes? Is his position upon this question the position of the American People? Do the American people adopt his views, that the discussion of the constitutional question of the absolute divorcement of Church and State in every form is unprofitable and unfortunate, and of no good to anybody? Do the American people indorse his view that it is impossible to break the hold which the church power has already secured upon the national government?

And yet one more question: Are the American people ready to admit, and sit quietly down with the admission, that the church power in the United States has already so far encroached upon the national government as to have absolutely strangled free discussion of one of the greatest principles of

17

the Constitution, and thus virtually to have strangled all successful efforts at resistance?

A PROBLEM FOR SOLUTION

There has been a great deal said, in and out of Congress, upon the question of a national system of education. There is much still being *said*, and there is also much that is proposed to be *done*. Senator Blair and many other senators worked diligently to secure the passage of an act by which the United States Government should assume a considerable part in the control of the public schools in all the States. Then, again, Mr. Blair proposes, and large organizations of people support, a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States so that thereby the national government shall be empowered to as assume complete and total charge of the education, religious as well as secular, of all the children in the United States. Then, again, Senator Edmunds proposes a bill for the establishment of a national university, for the higher education of people in the United States.

In view of all these things, it is proper to inquire what facilities and what qualifications the national government has for educating the people of the United States, whether partially, as proposed in the Blair bill, or totally, as in the Blair amendment, or in a university course, as proposed by the Edmunds bill? And, happily, there is a means of answering, to some extent, this interesting question.

In the discussion of the Indian Appropriation bill,

18

some important items are given which throw light upon this question. There are, it appears, somewhere about thirty or forty thousand Indian children in the United States. These have been adopted by the United States Government. The government has assumed the responsibility of their education; and how has it discharged this responsibility? Virtually acknowledging itself unable to educate these few Indians, it has let out the work by contract to about fifteen different churches; and in the debate in the Senate it was claimed that this was necessary, and the best thing the government could do in discharging its responsibility in educating the Indians. Now if the United States Government finds itself unequal to the task of educating thirty or forty thousand Indian children, how will it be able to educate all the children of the sixty-three millions of people in the United States?

More than this, it was openly and soberly argued, on the floor of the Senate, that the government could not properly educate these Indian children without the aid of the churches. It was there claimed that religion is necessary to the education of these children, and that it is proper for the government to unite with the churches in giving to the Indians such an education as only the churches can

give. And this is clearly the view of the United States Senate, as is proved by the fact that the appropriations of the past year are renewed to all the churches, with the addition of four new schools, with thousands of dollars each, to the Roman Catholic Church. This,

19

therefore, being the view of the United States Senate in regard to the education of Indians, if any one of these educational measures proposed by Senators Blair and Edmunds, and supported by thousands upon thousands of the people in the United States, should be adopted, how would it be possible to keep the national government separate from the churches in carrying these educational views into effect?

It is of interest and profit further to inquire what kind of an education these Indians get, from the expenditure of so much public money through the churches? Children, whether Indian or white, are most forcibly and permanently taught by example. What examples have been set, in some things, by some of these churches, and in one thing by all of them?

Senator Dawes spoke of one denomination (unfortunately he did not give the name of it) which in last year's appropriations took pay for sixty Indian students, when they had but forty—a clear case of downright swindling. Are the Indians which the United States Government paid this church for teaching, expected to follow the example of the church which taught them? And if so, would it not be better if those children were not taught at all? Is it necessary that the United States Government shall give to a church organization thousands of dollars a year to set before the Indians and the nation at large such an example of thievery?

Again, there was an appropriation to the Roman Catholic Church for the teaching of the St. Boniface

20

School of Mission Indians in Southern California; the result of one hundred and twenty-five years of Roman Catholic teaching of these Indians is thus stated by Senator Dawes:—

"For a hundred and twenty-five years the Mission Indians have been under the education and influence of the Jesuits of the Catholic Church. They are to-day as incapable, though; industrious and of good habits, of self-support, as citizens of the United States, as babes. They are more than ever reliant upon those from whom they receive their instruction. They go in their 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 they sow where they tell them to sow; and when the Mexican Government secularized all that Southern mission band, and took away the priests, those poor Indians, with as good personal habits as any white men in the country, were like a flock of sheep without a shepherd, and have been appealing to this government for protection, which, if they had been self-reliant citizens, they could have had in, and with, and of, themselves under the law."

And although the result of one hundred and twenty-five years' teaching by the Catholic Church has been to make these Indians as incapable of self-support as are babies, and that instead of this teaching causing them to be more self-reliant, it was only to cause them to be more dependent upon their instructors, even to depending upon them to tell them where to plant and where to sow, and to depend as much upon them to know what to do as though they were children that had never, been taught anything; yet to the Roman Catholic Church, the present fiscal year, there was appropriated not much, if any, less than four hundred thousand dollars of gov-

21

ernment money to pay that church for the teaching of Indian children! Would it be possible to make a worse appropriation of the public funds than to give this money to the Roman Catholic Church for its service in teaching Indians to be grown-up babies, the more incapable the older they grow?

Again, that Bureau of Catholic Missions, in the city of Washington, in 1889, informed the government that it desired to put up necessary buildings for the establishment of an industrial or boarding-school in the Black Feet Reservation, in Montana; and asked that the government allow them the use of one hundred and sixty acres of land on the reservation, for buildings and grounds. The Secretary of the Interior, on May 6, 1889, granted this request. The Catholic Church went ahead and put up the buildings, *and then it demanded that the government should grand public money* for the support of the school, whereas at first they only asked the use of the grounds on which to build it. And they justified their demand for money by the Jesuitical argument that when the government granted authority to establish the school upon the reservation, "the implied, if not expressed, understanding was that government would contribute toward the support of the Indian children that might attend it." And upon this argument a demand was made for \$12,500, for the support and tuition of one hundred Indian children—and the money was forthcoming, too. This is but an example of the character of the Catholic Church everywhere. And any other

22

church, that begins encroachments upon the authority or treasury of the State is not far behind it.

Such is the Bureau that Senator Dawes advertises as deserving of "the highest commendation." And such are the men whom he takes "great pleasure in commending to the country as "men worthy of confidence." Now, is it intended by the United States Government that these Indian children shall be taught such things as are clearly set forth in these examples of the Roman Catholic Church, and that other church that was not named? It must be so, or assuredly the appropriations would not be renewed, and the system would not be continued. But as that is counted by the Senate as the best thing that can be done by the government in the education of the Indians, then we submit to every candid mind in the United States the question: Would it not be better for the government to keep the public money, and let the Indians alone, than to spend more than half a

million of dollars a year to teach the Indians swindling and trickery and general worthlessness, by the example of these churches?

In addition to all this, there is the example of all these fifteen denominations together, of disregarding the fundamental principles of American institutions, and deliberately violating the spirit of the United States Constitution in taking the money of the State to support the church. If the Indians learn from this example to disregard the Constitution and the fundamental principles of the United States Government in other things; as these churches and the Gov-

23

ernment are doing in this, then are the Indians benefited by the teaching which they derive from such example? Take this whole mixture of Church-and-State teaching of the Indians, with the dishonesty, the trickery, and the unconstitutionality that pervades it all, and how much are the Indians really benefited by such an education?

Again, we say, If such is the result of a governmental attempt to teach the children of a few Indians, what would be the result of an effort by the government to teach the children of all the people?

We here submit to our readers the following problem for solution: If the attempt of the United States Government to educate thirty or forty thousand Indian children creates such a union of Church and State as is considered by senators to be impossible of divorcement, how strong a union of Church and State would be formed in an attempt of the United States Government to educate fifteen or twenty million white children?

THOSE NON-SECTARIAN SECTS

We have already referred to the protest that was entered after it was discovered by the Protestant churches involved that the Roman Catholic Church was getting an increase when they could get none. But, as already shown, there was nothing heard of the protest by any of the Protestant churches so long as they, with the Catholic Church, got their proportionate share of the public plunder. It was only when they discovered that the Catholic Church

24

was getting something that they could not get that a protest was raised.

This illustrates the beauties of that idea of non-sectarian religion, that is made so much of nowadays, and which is demanded shall be taught by the State and the nation in the public schools. By this it is seen that the theory of the non-sectarian religion is apparently a very nice thing, and seems to work very well so long as each sect gets its proportion of the public plunder; but just as soon as one denomination gets a little advantage over the other, then the jealousy of all the others is aroused; that denomination instantly becomes "sectarian," and whatever appropriation is made to it becomes an appropriation for "sectarian" uses. All the other "non-sectarian" sects then stand up nobly, and in righteous indignation virtuously "defend American institutions" from the encroachments of sectarianism.

In this we speak from the *Record*. Among the protests that were made in Congress on this subject when it was under consideration, was one from that so-called League for the Protection of American Institutions, which has its headquarters in New York City. From all that we can gather, it appears that the chief protest was raised and carried on by this League, and the following is a part, if not all, of the protest that was made. It was read by Senator Jones, of Arkansas, as a statement which had been sent to him by an "eminent man, a minister, resident of New York":—

25

"Last year there was given to the Roman Catholics, for Indian education, \$358,000. They demanded from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs \$44,000 more, making a total of over \$400,000. The request was denied, and the commissioner announced that he would not extend the contract system, and would make no contracts with new schools. On this the Catholics endeavored to defeat his confirmation, but did not succeed.

"Foiled in this raid upon the public treasury, they then attempted to accomplish their ends through Congress. In the Indian Appropriation bill as introduced into the House of Representatives there are two items, one appropriating \$3,330 for a Roman Catholic school at Rensselaer, Indiana, and the other appropriating \$12,500 for a Roman Catholic school to be opened among the Mission Indians in California.

"The special appropriations for the Roman Catholics in the Indian bill for last year were, for St. Ignatius school, in Montana, \$45,000, and for Roman Catholic schools in Minnesota, \$30,000. This made a total last year of \$75,000. The, total amount this year is \$95,830. In addition to this large sum, they will demand of the commissioner, doubtless, the same amount granted them last year.

"It should be remembered that in 1886 the amount of money secured from the government by the Roman Catholics was \$113,000, and in 1890 had reached the large sum of \$356,000. Is it not time that this perversion of public money to sectarian uses should cease?"

Now that would be an excellent protest if it were an honest one. It would be a strong one if, it were only fair. From this statement alone, nobody would ever get the idea that any church but the Catholic was engaged in this "raid upon the public treasury," or had been a beneficiary of "this perversion of public money to sectarian uses." Yet this statement was written and distributed to United States senators by a Minister—clearly a Protestant minister. Was that minister Rev. James M. King, D. D., general

26

secretary of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions? It was written by a minister who knew the facts. He knew that last year the Roman Catholics received \$356,967, and must also have known that the Protestants received \$204,993. He must have known that while the Roman Catholics asked

an increase of \$44,000, the Protestants also requested the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to increase the appropriation to them. He must have known, also, that in 1886, although the Roman Catholics received \$118,343, the Protestants at the same time from the same source received \$109,916; and that although in 1890 the appropriation to the Roman Catholic Church had "reached the large sum of \$356,967," the amount secured by the Protestants in the same time, and from the same source, had also reached the large sum of \$204,993. Yet, in the face of these figures, showing the large amount of money received by Protestant denominations from the public treasury for church uses, he says not a word about it, and lays against the Roman Catholics only the charge of that "raid upon the public treasury," as though they were the only guilty parties in the whole transaction.

Now if the Roma Catholics' securing from the national government \$118,343 was a "raid upon the public treasury," the securing by Protestants from the same source "109,916 is just as certainly a raid upon the public treasury; and if the continuation and increase of the appropriation to the Roman Catholics up to the amount of \$356,967 was a con-

27

tinuous raid upon the public treasury, then the continuation and the increase of the appropriation, from the same source, to Protestants up to the amount of \$204,993 was just as certainly a continuous raid upon the public treasury. The only difference is that the raid of the Protestants was not quite so successful as the raid of the Catholics.

Nor is it exactly correct to put it in this way. The raid was not made by the party in two distinct divisions. They were united in solid phalanx in the raid, each division supporting the other. It was only when the Protestants found that the Catholics were securing the larger share of the plunder that there was any division at all among the invading hosts separated in two divisions—the "sectarian" and the "non-sectarian,"—and the Protestants, the "non-sectarian" division, suddenly discovered that there was a "raid being made upon the public treasury," and that there was being carried on a "serious perversion of public money to sectarian uses."

This is a hint, but a powerful one, of what would come of the "non-sectarian" religion which Senator Blair's proposed amendment to the Constitution, Senator Edmund's University bill, the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, the Presbyterian General Assembly, and the New York Methodist Conference demand shall be taught in the public schools, and established by constitu-

28

tional amendment. It would soon end in the total destruction of the whole public-school system. If any such provision as this were enacted into law, just as soon as it was discovered that one denomination was getting some advantage over the others, there would be an all-around "protest;" the public-school system would be torn to pieces amongst the wrangling sects; civil government would be subverted to ecclesiastical control; and the State would be distracted, and out of

the tumult one leading denomination would rise to power and supremacy, as was done in the making of the Papacy.

Is it indeed impossible to break this grasp which the churches already have in this country upon the State?

SPEECH OF SENATOR REAGAN, OF TEXAS

MR. PRESIDENT: The provisions of the bill under consideration this morning, and the discussion we have heard, and the condition of things in the country, show the wisdom of the framers of the republic in providing in the first section of the first article of the Amendments to the Constitution for separation of Church and State, while guarantying the freedom of religious opinion.

The history of the world is full of the dangers of Church and State. The subject has given rise to as much trouble and as many wars as almost any other subject, and the framers of our government desired, so far as the people of this country were concerned, to protect them from any such danger.

29

Besides that, Mr. President, while all the States of the Union, I suppose, have their systems of free public schools, in all of them special pains is taken that those schools shall be non-sectarian and free from religious control, showing that the people of the various States have the same idea of the danger of the union of Church and State which the fathers of the republic had, and that they were determined to preserve the barriers against the union of Church and State.

We find that for several years considerable appropriations have been made for the education of the Indians in contract schools,—schools conducted by religious denominations; and we find a controversy between the religious denominations as to whether the government has fairly divided its patronage amongst them. It is not unnatural that that controversy should arise, when the government commits itself to the policy of having religious schools. It is not unnatural that denominations large in number and influence, after receiving but a very small portion of that patronage in comparison with others, should say, "If this government means to establish religious schools, it should divide its patronage amongst the various denominations equitably."

Mr. President, I have no partiality for religious schools by any denomination, and I believe that they are wrong by any denomination, and it is for that reason that I arose to make a few observations.

In 1886, \$228,259 was appropriated for these private schools. Of that sum \$118,343 was given to

30

the Catholic denomination. In 1887, \$363,214 was appropriated for private schools, and of that sum \$194,635 went to the Catholic denomination, in each case over half the amount appropriated. In 1888, \$376,664 was appropriated to private schools, and \$221,169 of that went to Catholic schools. In 1889, \$530,905 was appropriated for this purpose, and \$347,672 of it went to the Catholic schools. In 1890, \$561,950 was appropriated for private schools, and \$356,957 of that sum went to the Catholic denomination, leaving but \$204,993

out of the \$561,950 for fifteen other denominations that were interested in Indian schools; fifteen other denominations, perhaps embracing five-fifths of the religious population of this country, allowed but \$204,998 out of last year's appropriation, while that single Catholic denomination received \$356,967!

The senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Dawes) assures that this was because of the greater zeal of the Catholics. Perhaps so. Perhaps it was because of their greater aggressiveness; perhaps it was because of their greater anxiety to get control of the State and of politics. At any rate, there stands the fact that the fifteen other denominations received only about two-fifths of the entire appropriation—fifteen other religious denominations engaged in education. Is it surprising that they should make complaints? And are senators to be muzzled through fear of giving offense to an aggressive denomination? Are they to be intimidated and prevented from speaking on this subject, and doing justice as among the various denominations interested? So far as I am concerned, that shall not influence me; and the way to get rid of this whole subject is not by adding one more to the number of Catholic schools, as suggested by this bill; and by the senator from Massachusetts, but if into separate the whole of these appropriations

31

from the religious denominations, and put the schools under the government, and let its teachers and its agents instruct these Indians.

It is urged here as a reason why this should not be done that the religious denominations will do the work cheaper than the government can do it, and it is assumed that they will do it better than the government can do it. Mr. President, if they can do that, they can carry on education in the States cheaper, and they can carry on education in the States better, than the State government can do it. It is an admission that ought not to be made that the government is incompetent to provide persons who can carry on these schools with advantage to the Indians.

I recognize, in view of the relations which the Indians of the country bear to the government of the United States, that it is the duty of the United States to do whatever it can do reasonably, to promote their civilization and their welfare, and whatever is reasonable and right and necessary to that end shall have my support. But I wish to be understood as protesting now, and for all time, against the union of Church and State in any educational department of this government, and for the reason that it necessarily leads to the very troubles which have now come up, and to controversies between religious denominations as to who shall use the money of the government in this business of educating the Indians.

It is an unseemly and unnatural condition of things in this country, and an improper condition of things, one that ought to be frowned down, and voted down, and put out of existence. There is no more reason why the government of the United States shall make an alliance with religious denominations for education than that a State should make

32

an alliance with religious denominations for educational purposes. It is wrong, it is dangerous, it mischievous, and I had hoped that the Committee Indian Affairs

this year, would take some steps towards breaking down this union of Church State upon the subject.

Instead of that, the chairman of the committee consents, and they have agreed, to add one more the number of Catholic schools, although they have refused to add any other for any of the Protestant denominations. They allow the aggression to still further. Mr. President, that is wrong, and if no other senator moves, I shall move to strike out the St. Boniface school from the provisions of this bill.

I thought it right to make this statement, in view of the mischief which underlies this whole system.

Now, I desire to say one more thing in reference to what was stated by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Davis), that this matter about the education of the Indians in the Blackfoot Reservation, I think it was, originated in 1885, under a promise, a pledge, I believe he said, of the Secretary of the Interior, that Catholics there should have the control of the schools, and he proposed to provide them with one hundred and sixty-acres of land on which to place them.

Mr. President, is it so that a pledge of the Secretary of the Interior is to control the policy of the government? Is it so that a promise of the Secretary of the Interior is sufficient title for land, no title being made by authority of Congress or law? I do not assent to either proposition. I do not assent, especially, to a proposition, fraught with as much mischief as it is, to either the origination of a policy or the grant of the land.

