

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

VOLUME 4.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH 13, 1889.

NUMBER 8.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK;
18 POST ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.;
12TH & CASTRO STS., OAKLAND, CAL.

E. J. WAGGONER, }
ALONZO T. JONES, } - - - - - EDITORS.

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS:

J. H. WAGGONER, E. W. FARNSWORTH, DAN T. JONES

ALL freight trains on the Pennsylvania Railroad, except those bearing stock and perishable freight, were stopped at Pittsburg, on Saturday, February 16, at 10 P. M., to give the employes a rest on Sunday. The Pennsylvania Company proposes to adopt this plan on all of its lines.

THE Field Secretary of the National Sunday Union, Rev. W. F. Crafts, is now in the South, trying to get up a boom for a National Sunday law. On Friday, February 8, he spoke on the Sunday-Rest movement to the Legislature of Florida. It is said that he has received a very cordial reception as the representative of the Union.

THE Sunday bill which was introduced into both Houses of the California Legislature, and which we printed last week, with a few comments, met an ignominious death in the Senate, where it was refused a second reading. This will leave California free from any danger of a Sunday law for two years more, as it is not at all probable that another bill would fare any better. Meanwhile the Sunday-law agitators may agitate themselves to their heart's content.

DENVER papers of February 18 give glowing accounts of a monster mass-meeting that was held in the Tabor Opera House, the day before, Sunday, in the interest of a Sunday law. The meeting was, as usual, engineered largely by ministers, who, as usual, strenuously disclaimed any thought of doing anything religious. They were all working for temperance. We make a few short comments on some things that were said, in various parts of this paper.

WHILE the ministers of Denver are united in desiring to have a Sunday law strictly enforced, they are not agreed as to the reason for such a law. Some think that the day should be kept strictly, while others think that any business except the saloon should be allowed to run. The ideas vary according to the degree of straitness of the religious creed of the individuals expressing them. If it were purely a temperance affair, or if they wanted a civil holiday, religious opinions would have nothing to do with it.

Blair Educational Amendment Bill.

(Continued.)

THE question now to be decided is, "What are the principles of the Christian religion, which are to be taught if the amendment is adopted?" The Methodists would give one answer, if it were left with them, the Baptists another, the Presbyterians another, and other denominations still another. All would differ, yet each would present something common to all. But the question is not to be left to any one denomination; for the latter part of the second section expressly stipulates that no public money shall ever be appropriated for the instruction of children in any of the tenets or doctrines peculiar to any sect. It is this part of the amendment, so wondrously worded, which catches the multitude, and blinds them to the principle of Church and State union, which is involved. They think it will be so fine a thing to settle it forever that no public money shall be appropriated for the purpose of sectarian teaching, that they lose sight of the real gist of the thing. Protestants think that it would forever shut Catholics off from any share in the school money, whereas it would give them practical control of the schools, as we shall show later on.

We will now consider the amendment adopted, and Congress ready to enforce it by proper legislation. It finds a score of denominations, each strenuous to have its own peculiar views taught in the public schools, if any are to be taught. But this will not do; only those can be taught which are common to all—upon which all can agree. It is manifest, therefore, that the churches themselves are the only ones who could determine this. They only can tell the principles upon which they can all agree. Congress cannot decide this point, nor would they allow it to if it could, for they have already expressed themselves on the matter. In the *Christian Statesman* of February 21, 1884, Rev. J. C. K. Milligan said in regard to theological questions:—

"The churches must settle these questions among themselves, and with each other, and at least we will not allow the civil government to decide between them, and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."

Further on in the same article he said:—

"The churches and the pulpit have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points, and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these [the churches and the pulpits] the chief discussions and the final decisions of most points will be developed there."

In short, before Congress could enforce the new article, it would be obliged to call a council of the churches. Representatives of all the churches would convene and decide what they

could all agree upon, and would then inform the Government just what it should enforce. This would be an exact parallel to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, which Constantine convened in order that the bishops might settle upon some common principles which could be enforced by imperial authority. Now as that action is universally recognized as the celebration of the union of Church and State, this would necessarily be the same. The churches in America would, by the adoption of the Blair Educational Amendment, which they desire, be forced to follow in the steps of the bishops of the church in the fourth century. The State would then be simply the agent to execute ecclesiastical decrees.

Remember that in such a council all professed Christian churches would have to be represented. That would include the Catholic Church, for it is reckoned as a branch of the Christian Church. But from many States the Catholics, according to a fair representation, would have a very large majority of the delegates; and their delegates in the council would nearly equal those of all the Protestant churches. So the Catholic Church would be able to dictate terms to the council. For of course a vote would have to be taken to decide upon the principles of the Christian religion, and the Catholics could carry more of their points than the Protestants could. Thus the Catholic Church would secure the practical control of the public schools. The Protestants might not like this very well, but having committed themselves to the theory of religious teaching by the State, they would have to abide by the decision of the majority.

As stated before, the State would be simply the agent of the church, to carry into execution its decrees. And this would be exactly in accordance with the ideas of the Papacy, as set forth by an eminent and highly educated Catholic. Speaking of natural and revealed law, Dr. Brownson says of the church:—

"She is, under God, the supreme judge of both laws, which are for her but one law; and hence she takes cognizance, in her tribunals, of the breaches of the natural law as well as of the revealed, and has the right to take cognizance by Nations as well as of its breaches by individuals, by the prince as well as by the subject, for it is the supreme law for both. The State is, therefore, only an inferior court, bound to receive the law from the Supreme Court, and liable to have its decrees reversed on appeal."—*Brownson's Essays*, p. 284, quoted in *The Papacy and the Civil Power*, p. 32.

Let the Blair Educational Amendment be adopted, and we should have a very pretty likeness of the Papacy—an American Papacy. There might not be any one man acknowledged as Pope, but that would make no difference. There was not in Constantine's time. It took time to grow into that.

Anybody can see that while such a council

would be a nominal union of all the churches, there would be no real union. All would be satisfied with the enunciation of those teachings which were really common to all, while everybody, except those belonging to the sect having the strongest representation in the council, would be dissatisfied. It was just so in the fourth century. Neander says:—

“In fact, however, the manner in which the controversies had been decided by the Council of Nice, could only contain the seeds for new disputes; for there was here no cordial union springing freely, by a natural course of development, out of inward conviction; but a forced and artificial union of men, still widely separated by their different modes of thinking, on a creed which had been imposed on them, and which was differently expounded according to the different doctrinal interests of the several parties.”

And just so it would be in this case. Their union would be no real union, but only a confederacy.

But Senator Blair would contend that nothing of this kind could take place, because he does not intend to have anything but the empty shell of religion taught. Following are the remarks which bear directly upon this question of religion in schools, in the Senator's speech in the Senate, December 21, 1888, made on the occasion of his calling the bill from the table to have it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:—

“Of course the clause to require instruction to be given those between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge only, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion, brings up a question much discussed, and upon which the public mind is not settled. . . .

“It is said that this sort of instruction should be turned over to the clergy, to the churches, to other influences, to the family especially; but we all know, not perhaps mathematically, for we cannot settle it exactly, that there are not far from one-third of the children of this country who never see the inside of a church, and who in their family relations are so unfortunate as to have little, if any, training in the ordinary principles of virtue and morality. If it is indispensable that they have training in these ideas, that these ideas be implanted in the young mind with a view to safe and proper citizenship in the future, the instruction must be given by the public schools dependent on the power of the State. The preservation of the State demands it, and self-preservation is the first law of nature to the State as of individuals.

“In regard to the general principles of the Christian religion, no one but a bigot would think of having introduced into the public schools instruction in any form of sectarianism; but a knowledge of the Christian religion, even if there be no enforcement of those truths upon the conviction and belief of the child, instruction in those principles, a statement or explanation of what they are, exactly as instruction is given in the principles of arithmetic and geography, and any of the common branches of science, is exceedingly desirable and important for every citizen to possess, whether he applies the principle in his personal conduct or not, because they are the warp and woof, the very fabric of society, of the surroundings in which he lives, the basis of our customs and laws, and of the conduct of life. These general principles are exceedingly essential and important not only to apply in personal conduct, but a knowledge of them should be possessed by anyone who is to enter successfully into the ordinary competitions and relations of life. There never was a great Nation yet which was without an affirmative religious belief and practice—a religion which was the source and aspiration of perhaps the noblest deeds of the people.”

The Senator well says that this is a question upon which “the public mind is not settled.”

May it be long before it becomes settled upon the side which he advocates. As to his argument, we wish to say:—

1. Virtually admitting that the churches are the bodies to teach the principles of the Christian religion, which is true, since they are organized for that purpose and for no other, he would give that work to schools supported by the State. Thus he would have the schools do the work of the churches. He would have the State support the work of the church, only that work would be done in the school-houses instead of in the church buildings. But it makes no difference where the work is done, whether in the churches, the school-houses, or in the woods; when the State carries on the work of the church, you have simply a State church. That is all there is of it. The State, under the working of the Blair amendment, will be a grand church school.

2. This amendment, according to Senator Blair's explanation—and he ought to know, for he made it—puts the State not only in the place of the parent, but above the parent. Take his argument that the State must educate the children in religion, because so many of them never go to church. Now suppose the case of an infidel, or of a man who strongly dissents from the decree of the council. He refuses to send his children to a school where they will be taught what he believes to be error. And then the State must necessarily, in the discharge of its duty as laid down by Mr. Blair, take that child away from its parents, and place it where it can be educated in the religion of the State. Protestants have been justly indignant when such things have been done in countries where Catholicism was the religion of the State. Read the account given by Dowling (“History of Romanism,” pp. 794–800) of the abduction of the boy Edgar Mortara, whose parents, being Jews, naturally wanted to educate him in their own religion, but who was abducted, and brought up as a Catholic. That very thing might, and almost undoubtedly would be, repeated in this country if the Blair Educational Amendment were adopted. This again marks it as a measure that would make this country a likeness of Papal governments. E. J. W.

THE DENVER *Republican* states that a bill has passed the Colorado Senate providing that no one shall be compelled to observe Sunday as a day of rest, who makes it a practice to observe some other day, and says that the bill should be killed as a matter of course. We don't have any faith in exemption clauses, but the *Republican's* position shows how utterly regardless of the rights of workingmen those are who clamor for Sunday legislation. Here is the situation: Without any Sunday law every workingman is free to work or to refuse to work, whenever he wishes. No one can force him to work on Sunday; and if it be true, as it is claimed, that the great majority of workingmen want Sunday as a day of rest, then there would be very little danger of his losing his place. If the most of the workingmen want to rest on Sunday, then they have the matter in their own hands, and need no laws. This does no injustice to anybody, and leaves those free to work on Sunday who must work on that day in order to get in the six days which are theirs by divine right.

On the other hand, as soon as the Sunday law is passed and enforced, a good many workingmen are thrown out of employment, forced to quit work to gratify nothing but religious bigotry. For no matter how much they seek to evade it,

the fact is that it is only at the instigation of the ministers and the church people that Sunday legislation is sought. If it were not for the fact that the intolerance of the thing has been shown up so much, there would be no pretense of any other basis for a Sunday law than that of religious obligation. Next week we intend to show, from the testimony of the prime movers in this Sunday business, that all other reasons that are given for Sunday legislation are simply feints, to divert the minds of different classes of people from the real spirit of the movement.

A Practical Lesson.

IN the *Christian Statesman* of January 10, National Reform Secretary R. C. Wylie draws a practical lesson from the late election, for the benefit of the Prohibition party. He says that at the Indianapolis Convention the watch-word was, “A million votes for Fisk!” and that the Prohibition party were certain that Fisk and Brooks would receive “a million votes;” and, that even the least sanguine would not put it below half a million. But the returns show that only about 250,000 votes were cast for the Prohibition nominees. Now the lesson which Mr. Wylie wants the Prohibition party to learn is, Why this great falling off between the estimate and the reality? The reason of this, he claims, is that the Prohibition party failed to acknowledge the authority of Christ and his law in their party platform. He says that two delegations, one from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the other from the National Reform Association, went to Indianapolis to urge upon the Prohibition Convention this very acknowledgment; that these delegations presented their cause, both in the convention and to the platform committee; but that instead of acknowledging Christ as the Nation's ruler, they actually left out the reference to his law, which they had put into the platform of 1884. Hence their loss of the great number of votes. Therefore, he says:—

“The first lesson for the Prohibitionists to learn is that the way to the White House is not made so short and easy as they supposed by ignoring Christ and his law.”

Whether the Prohibition party will consider itself instructed by such a lesson as this, we do not know. But it seems that the National Reformers are becoming quite familiar with the use of their idea of the Saviour as a “divine politician,” when they can attribute the loss of 750,000 expected votes to His judgment upon a party for not being recognized in their political platform. If they would study the Saviour's word more, they would find there the statement that, “God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.”

Against the Sunday-Rest Bill.

THE San Francisco *Examiner* of February 22 contained the following dispatch sent from Washington the day before:—

“In the House of Representatives, Representative O'Donnell, presented to-day an enormous petition against the Sunday-Rest bill, which bears the signatures of 230,000 Seventh-day Adventists, in all parts of the country.”

That humble body known as Seventh-day Adventists must wonder how it has grown in one year from 25,000 to 230,000; for the last Year Book of that denomination gave its membership

at 25,841 in the United States. The *Examiner* reporter has given them more than 200,000 members that do not belong to them.

But the *Examiner* is not entirely wrong, for a great number of petitions against the Sunday-Rest bill have been presented to Congress. Over 250,000 signatures have been secured; and the fact that there are not more than one-tenth of that number of Seventh-day Adventists in the United States, shows that the opposition to Sunday laws is not sectarian. It shows that there are many people in this country who believe in civil and religious liberty.

Another thing should be remembered in this connection, and that is, that none of the signatures to the petitions are by proxy, nor are they what are known among Sunday-law advocates as "representative signatures." Every signature on those petitions represents an individual. More than this, every signature indicates that some adult person has with his own hand signed the remonstrance.

Of the more than 250,000 signatures that have been obtained, more than 36,000 have been obtained in California. We know one man who has secured the signatures of more than 1,300 voters in a single California town of about 7,000 inhabitants. It may be added that there are not fifty Seventh-day Adventists in that town, counting women and children.

But there are more than 250,000 adults who are opposed to the Sunday-Rest bill. In many places no effort whatever has been made to secure signatures to the petition against it, and nothing whatever was done until within the last three months. The records show that nothing like this number of individual signatures has been secured for the petitions in favor of the bill.

Only the Name, Not the Power.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Carrier Dove* says:—

"I say it in all seriousness, there is no name under heaven, the power of which we as a progressive people have greater reason to fear, than the name of Jesus, as used by religious people. It is the rallying-cry under which they are striving to unite Church and State; the claim is that he shall be the ruler of, not only this, but all Nations; the Sabbath bill is being backed by the power of Jesus' name, and step by step we are thus being deprived of our liberties."

This is only one of the things that the National Reformers and their allies are responsible for; but this is enough to stamp their whole scheme as antichristian. While they profess that theirs is a Christian movement, there is nothing else in the world that is doing so much to bring Christianity into disrepute. Just as the false Christianity of the Roman Catholic Church, which was accepted as true Christianity, was responsible for the infidelity of Paine and Voltaire, so this professed National Reform, which will be taken by many as being just what it pretends to be,—an exhibition of real Christianity,—will disgust many with the very name of Christ and Christianity.

We can tell our neighbor that although the name of Jesus is used very often by these would-be reformers, "the power of Jesus' name" is altogether wanting. It matters not how much they may claim that he is to be king of this Nation, he himself has declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." The power of Jesus' name has never been exercised except for the benefit of the human race; but the mere name, the sound, has been used to back up crimes that would almost make

a demon blush. It was the power of his name that healed the sick and raised the dead, in the days of the apostles. When, however, the sons of one Sceva, a Jew, thought to accomplish the same wonders that the apostle did, by calling the name of Jesus over one possessed with a devil, the demon overcame them, and drove them from the house naked and wounded, proving to them that the name of Jesus without the power could accomplish nothing towards diminishing the woes of the world. National Reformers should learn a lesson from the seven sons of Sceva.

The "power of Jesus' name" has done more than to raise the dead; it has enabled men to resist the strivings of appetite and passion, has delivered them from the bondage of vice and sin, so that they have stood free men, pure and clean, changed so greatly as scarcely to be able to recognize themselves. The power of the name of Jesus can and does diminish sin; but nobody can apply that power but Jesus himself. When men attempt to diminish sin by law, using the name of Jesus, they will find that they only increase it. Jesus does not have any vicegerents in this world, and his reign is a reign of love. National Reform Christianity is of the kind described by the apostle Paul, when he says that in the last days men shall be "lovers of their own selves," etc., "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." From such we are exhorted to "turn away." E. J. W.

The Sunday Petition Socialistic.

A GOOD deal of effort is being made, especially by certain preachers, to discredit the opposition of the SENTINEL to the Blair Bill by classing us with Socialists. There probably are some Socialists who are opposed to the bill; but though the Socialists should oppose what the SENTINEL opposes, that does not make the SENTINEL a Socialistic journal. It is not a sufficient answer to our opposition to say that certain other classes oppose the bill. We know that the principles which underlie our opposition to the Blair bill are not Socialistic. We also know that the principles upon which the bill is advocated, and by which the support of certain classes is gained, are essentially Socialistic. This we propose to prove.

Much has been made of the petition of the Knights of Labor. But the Knights of Labor never took any such step except at the solicitation of Doctor Crafts. The Blair bill had been scarcely introduced before Mr. Crafts made a trip to Chicago and other cities, soliciting the support of the Knights of Labor. Instead of their petitioning for a Sunday law, the object of it had to be explained, and objections answered before they could even be brought to support it. The object of the petition for the Blair bill was explained by Dr. Crafts to the Central Labor Union of New York, and its indorsement secured. The Central Labor Union embraces a number of labor organizations, and the *Christian Union* declares the Central Labor Union to be a "radically Socialistic" organization. This, in itself, would not be particularly significant were it not for the fact that the arguments which Dr. Crafts presents to these organizations to gain their support are entirely Socialistic. Nor are these confined to Dr. Crafts. Other leaders of the movement also advocate the same principles.

Dr. Crafts went to the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor at Indianapolis last November to get the delegates there to indorse the petition for the passage of the Blair Sunday bill. A re-

port of his speech was printed in the *Journal of United Labor*, the official journal of the Knights of Labor of America, Thursday, November 29, 1888. He said to them there:—

"Having carefully read and re-read your 'declaration of principles' and your 'constitution,' and having watched with interest the brave yet conservative shots of your *Powderly* at intemperance and other great evils, I have found myself so closely in accord with you that I have almost decided to become a Knight of Labor myself. If I do not it will be only because I believe I can advance your 'principles' better as an outside ally."

The following question was asked by one of the Knights:—

"Would it not be the best way to stop Sunday trains to have the Government own and control the railroads altogether, as the Knights advocate?"

Dr. Crafts answered: "I believe in that. Perhaps the best way to begin the discussion of Government control for seven days per week is to discuss this bill for Government control on one day. If the railroads refuse the little we now ask, the people will be the more ready to take control altogether."

The Knights of Labor advocate the doctrine that the Government shall take control of all the railroads in the country, and hire all the idle men in the country at regular railroad wages, and run the roads, as it now runs the Post-office Department, without reference to the question whether anything is made or lost by the Government. This is what gave rise to the above question. Dr. Crafts proposes to play into the hands of that kind of an element by making the bid for their support, that if they will help the Sunday workers get Government control of the railroads one day in the week, then the Sunday-law workers will help the Knights to get Government control every day in the week. Another question that was discussed both there and at the Convention of Locomotive Engineers at Richmond, Va., was the following:—

"Will not one day less work per week mean one-seventh less wages?"

The response to this was as follows:—

"As much railroad work as is done in seven days can be done in six days, and done better, because of the better condition of the men. And on this ground the engineers would be sustained in demanding, and if necessary compelling, the railroad company, to so re-adjust the pay schedule that the men will be paid as much as at present."

That is to say, that Dr. Crafts and the Sunday-law workers propose to stand in with the laboring men to compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is made certain by the following petition to the State Legislatures, which is being circulated everywhere with the petition for the Blair bill:—

"To the State Senate (or House):—The undersigned earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding anyone to hire another, or to be hired for more than six days in any week; except in domestic service, and the care of the sick; in order that those whom law or custom permits to work on Sunday may be protected in their right to some other weekly rest-day, and in their right to a week's wages for six days' work."

Now a week consists of seven days. A week's wages for six days' work is seven days' wages for six days' work. This petition asks the Legislatures of all the States to pass a law protecting employes in their right to seven days' wages for six days' work. No man in this world has any right to seven days' wages for six days' work. If he

has a right to seven days' wages for six days' work, then he has an equal right to six days' wages for five days' work; and to five days' wages for four days' work; and to four days' wages for three days' work; to three days' wages for two days' work; to two days' wages for one day's work; and to one day's wages for no work at all. This is precisely what the proposition amounts to. For in proposing to pay seven days' wages for six days' work, it does propose to pay one day's wages for no work. But if a man is entitled to one day's wages for doing nothing, why stop with one day? Why not go on and pay him full wages every day for doing nothing?

But it may be argued that we have misinterpreted the meaning of the petition; that, as it asks that nobody be allowed to hire another for more than six days of any week, it may mean only that six days are to compose a week; and that it is a week's wages of six days only that is to be paid for six days' work. That is not the meaning of the petition. It is not the intention of those who are gaining the support of the Knights of Labor by inventing and circulating the petition. At the hearing on the Sunday bill before the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 13, 1888, Dr. George Elliott, pastor of the Foundry Methodist Church, Washington City, was speaking in favor of the bill. Senator Call asked him this question:—

"Do you propose that Congress shall make provision to pay the people in the employ of the Government who are exempted on Sunday, for Sunday work?"

Mr. Elliott—"I expect you to give them adequate compensation."

Senator Call—"Do you propose that the same amount shall be paid for six days' work as for seven?"

Mr. Elliott—"I do; for the reason that we believe these employes can do all the work that is to be done in six days. And if they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay."

There it is in plain, unmistakable words, that they deliberately propose to have laws, State and National, which shall compel employers to pay seven days' wages for six days' work. This is sheer Socialism; it is the very essence of Socialism. No wonder they gained the unanimous indorsement of the Convention of the Knights of Labor, and of the Locomotive Engineers, and the Socialist Labor Union of New York City, by proposing to pay them good wages for doing nothing.

But this is not all. The Knights of Labor not only accept the proposition, but they carry it farther, and logically too. This principle has been advocated for some time by the Knights of Labor in demanding ten hours' pay for eight hours' work, virtually two hours' pay for doing nothing. The *Christian Union* and the *Catholic Review* propose to help the workingmen secure their demanded eight-hour law, and then have the workingmen help to get the six-day law by forbidding all work on Sunday. Dr. Crafts and Dr. Elliott go a step farther, and propose to secure the support of the workingmen by having laws enacted compelling employers to pay them full wages on Sunday for doing nothing. But the Knights of Labor do not propose to stop with this. The same copy of the *Journal of United Labor* which contained Dr. Crafts's speech, contained the following in an editorial upon this point:—

"Why should not such a law be enacted? All the work now performed each week could easily be accomplished in five days of eight hours each if employment were given to the host of willing

idle men who are now walking the streets. It is a crime to force one portion of a community to kill themselves by overwork, while another portion of the same people are suffering from privation and hunger, with no opportunity to labor. The speech of the Rev. Mr. Crafts, published elsewhere, furnishes an abundance of argument as to why such a law should be put in force."

So when the Sunday-law advocates propose to pay a week's wages for six days' work of eight hours each, because all the work can be done in six days that is now done in seven, then the Knights of Labor propose to have a week's wages for five days' work, because, by employing all the idle men, all the work that is now done in seven days can be done in five. And as Dr. Elliott has said, "If they do all the work, they ought to have all the pay." But if a week's wages are to be paid for five days' work of eight hours each, that is to say, if two days' wages can rightly be paid for no work at all, why should the thing be stopped there? If the Government is to take control of the railroads all the time in order to pay two days' wages for doing nothing, and if the States are to enact laws compelling employers to pay employes two days' wages for doing nothing, then why shall not the Government, both State and National, take possession of everything, and pay the laboring men full wages all the time for doing nothing? For if men have the right to one day's wages for no work, where is the limit to the exercise of that right? The fact of the matter is that there is no limit. If a man is entitled to wages for doing nothing part of the time, he is entitled to wages for doing nothing all the time. And the principle upon which Dr. Crafts and his other Sunday-law *confrères* gain the support of the workingmen to the Blair Sunday bill is nothing at all but the principle of downright Socialism.

NOTE.—The statement of the *Christian Union* referred to above is as follows:—

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath is to be preserved at all—and we are sanguine of its preservation—the *non-religious sentiment of the country must be brought in to re-inforce the religious demand for Sabbath rest*, and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable. And, curiously, what renders this practicable is that horrid 'Socialism' which keeps some good people lying awake o' nights in fear and trembling. One of the Sabbath Committees in Philadelphia is, indeed, represented as relying 'upon the law of the Sabbath as promulgated by the Creator.' But the majority of Americans, including large proportions of those who are most desirous of preserving the Sabbath, will never consent to see a purely religious obligation enforced by civil penalties. On the other hand, pure individualism affords an entirely adequate legal basis for anything like adequate Sabbath legislation. . . . Modern, and, if our readers please so to regard it, Socialistic political economy . . . holds that the community has a right to act as a unit; . . . it has a right to fix upon a legal holiday or an eight-hour standard for the normal labor day—if it judge this best. In short, no eight-hour man can consistently deny the right of society to maintain a Sabbath by legal provisions; and . . . no advocate of Sabbath laws, unless he maintains the right of the State to establish a purely religious observance, can consistently deny the right of the community to fix a normal labor day; . . . and *Christian Socialism finds a place for both.*"

The statement of the *Catholic Review*, also referred to, is as follows:—

"The time is near at hand when those who have so warmly advocated eight hours as a workman's day will find it necessary to agitate for six days as a workman's week. If the labor organizations

are really anxious for an issue on which they can have the help of the vast majority of the American people, let them take up this of Sunday labor. They will find enormous obstacles to contend with in the widespread avarice of the non-Catholic workingmen as well as of the capitalists. If the limit of a day's labor to eight hours is calculated to restrain the overproduction to which they object, the cessation of Sunday labor, which is now carried on to an extent enormously in excess of what the general public is disposed to believe, would exercise a still further restraint in this direction."

A. T. J.

What Does It Mean?

WHAT means the introduction of a Sunday bill and a resolution for a change of the Constitution by Senator Blair, so as to secure certain religious observances, and the first and second reading of that bill in the Senate without a dissenting vote?

What means the petition favoring the passage of the bill circulated in our streets and the presentation of the names of 5,000,000 petitioners by the National Reform Association, the Evangelical Alliance, and the W. C. T. U., for the enactment of those laws?

What means the invitation to the Catholic Church, by the National Reform League, to cooperate in these measures?

What means the command of Pope Leo XIII., that all Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled on the principle of the true church?

What means Cardinal Gibbons, a prominent Catholic, being taken as an exponent of 7,200,000 Catholics in favor of the proposed measures?

Does it not mean a gigantic conspiracy to revolutionize our Government, and in its stead to establish a theocracy, or ecclesiastical Government?—*Alexandria (Minn.), Post.*

False Religion Not Incompatible with Good Citizenship.

It is possible that a religion may be at variance with common sense and with the word of God, and yet so far as civil society is concerned, be perfectly harmless. For instance, some may believe that the body and blood of Christ are, in contradiction to their senses, *verily and indeed* taken by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, and yet be as temperate, upright and beneficent as their neighbors who believe that the bread and wine in that ordinance are merely symbols of the body and blood of Christ. Again, some may be pleased to have other gods besides Jehovah, the living and true God, in opposition to the first precept of the decalogue; and some may go a step further, and have pictures and images of God, in defiance of the second, and yet be as good citizens as the most rigid Unitarians, or the most orthodox Calvinists. Probably some of my readers begin to think that this is carrying toleration too far, and that the writer is criminally indifferent to the honor of God; and yet, perhaps, there is not one of all these who is not in the daily habit of breaking the third commandment, by taking the sacred name in vain!

"Religion is the cause of God, and it is at our peril that we neglect to support it." And does it follow, that we are to support it by whatever means the devil, or his emissaries, may suggest? If we make a distinction between what is divine and what is human, we ought much more to distinguish between what is divine, and what is infernal. Do we serve God, that God who is good

to all, and whose tender mercy is over all his works—who, when he was importuned to reveal his glory, declared himself the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in goodness and truth; that God, all whose perfections are but different forms of love—by making him guilty of a religion, dark and lowering as a thunder-storm, which blasts and desolates the earth as it advances? Can this be that religion which was ushered into the world with “glory to God in the highest; peace on earth; and good-will towards men”? Granted, “genuine religion is the cause of God;” and this great truth furnishes many arguments against every species of persecution.

“Is, then, every ridiculous vagary on which the human mind may light, to be tolerated in religion?” Why not? Considered in a political point of view, there is not a worse, in a religious point of view, not a more absurd, vagary than intolerance; and the tendency of intolerance, to give consistence and perpetuity to the fleeting shades of mental weakness, may be received as a good *argumentum ad hominem*, by those who think it may be employed to promote truth and uniformity.—*Clarke's History of Intolerance.*

Upon What It Is Founded.

“THE Sabbath,” says the *Lutheran Observer*, “is founded upon the constitution of man. It was ordained at the creation to supply his physical and moral wants, not only during his state of innocence in Eden, but also after the fall and when scattered over the face of the earth. Demanded by the well-being of the family, its institution immediately succeeded that of marriage; and promotive of the best interests of Nations, it was enacted as a civil statute, and enforced by moral and legal sanctions, as well as by disciplinary chastisements.”

So far as physical rest is concerned, one day is just as good as another, and very many people manage to get along very well without any stated day of rest at all. But the matter of physical rest is dwelt upon so much for the reason that to say aught of the memorial character of the Sabbath is to call attention at once to the fact that the day generally observed as the Sabbath has no claims whatever to be regarded as such. The Sabbath was ordained primarily as the memorial of creation, and in this respect no other day can possibly take its place.

But the evident intent of the *Observer's* remarks is to show that Sunday keeping ought to be enforced by law; and on the surface there is a degree of plausibility in the theory, for under the Jewish theocracy Sabbath keeping was enforced by legal sanctions, but so was the worship of God. Concerning the day of atonement we read: “For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people.” Lev. 23:29. But does the *Observer* think that people should now be put to death for failing to worship God according to his appointment? If not, why not? Certainly no reason can be urged against the one which could not be with equal force against the other.

If, however, such penalties were inflicted in these days, who would decide when they should be inflicted, and upon whom they should be inflicted? Manifestly the strongest party. In Catholic countries Protestants would be punished for alleged violation of the divine law, while in Protestant countries Romanists would suffer like

penalties for not doing the same things. And not only so, but the various sects of Protestants would war among themselves, each invoking the powers of the law against the other, all fully believing they were doing God's service. Does not the *Observer* know that invoking the legal enforcement of any religious duty upon which men differ, as, for instance, the binding obligation of the seventh or the first days of the week, and making this or any other religious question a matter of law, is to empower men to decide what is the true faith? Can we afford to do it in this country?

Sunday Legislation in Illinois.

A BILL was introduced in the House of the Illinois Legislature January 25, which is another evidence of the drift toward enforcing religious beliefs by civil law. Notwithstanding the fact that the constitution of Illinois provides for the “free exercise and enjoyment of religious professions and worship, without discrimination,” these apostles of church and State want to compel, contrary to the supreme law of the State, the observance of a religious institution. Following are the first two sections of the bill:—

“SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly,* That whoever shall keep open on Sunday any shop, store, factory, or other public place, for the manufacture, or preparation, or packing, or sale, or other disposition of any goods, wares, or merchandise, except as in this act expressly provided, shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not less than fifty, nor more than five hundred dollars, for each offense, and shall be committed to the common jail, till the fines and costs are paid.

“SECTION 2. Whoever shall procure, or permit to be employed in any secular business on Sunday in any of the places mentioned in section 1 of this act, any clerk, workman, or other person, except as in this act expressly permitted, shall be deemed guilty of a like misdemeanor, and shall suffer the like penalty as is prescribed in the foregoing section.”

These sections prohibit only a certain class of labor. However, the mover of the bill says privately that it does not cover all they want. But if they make the bill too sweeping on the start, they fear it will be defeated; and he thinks that half a loaf is better than no bread. This will prove a stepping-stone toward getting stronger legislation in the future in favor of Sunday. True to the watchword of Sunday-law advocates, the standard of the ideal Puritan Sunday is erected in the background, and they try to lead us on cautiously, step by step, till we shall be hemmed in on all sides, and the only thing allowable on Sunday will be to go to church to listen to the lengthy disquisition of some prosy divine. But even as an initiatory measure, on the class the bill touches, it imposes a fine that would soon use up a small fortune. The author of the bill frankly stated to me that it was intended to protect the religious interests of Sunday. It seems strange to hear men talk of imposing such fines if we refuse to observe in sacred style a dogma of disputed origin in the Christian church. Think of it! from fifty to five hundred dollars! Would it not be well before making such laws in favor of what he thinks to be the Christian religion, to examine the records to see if the Author of the Christian religion would be in harmony with such action?

According to these sections of the bill, the offender “shall be deemed guilty of *high* misdemeanor.” The criminal code of the Illinois statutes divides offenses into “felonies,” “misdemeanors,”

and “infamous crimes,” but I do not find anything referring “to *high* misdemeanor.” In view of the fact that this is only a “stepping-stone” to the legislation they want in favor of Sunday, I suppose it was deemed unwise to call a violation of this act either “felony” or “infamous crimes.” And yet the simple term of “misdemeanor” in the statutes is not strong enough, so the term “high misdemeanor” must be used. The “Library of Universal Knowledge” defines “*high* misdemeanor” as “an offense short of, but closely bordering on, treason.” And in the Articles of Confederation between the original thirteen States (Art. 4) we have the expression, “If any person guilty of or charged with treason, felony, or other high misdemeanor,” etc., thus associating “high misdemeanor” with treason and felony. Fellow-citizens, are we ready to be classed with those guilty of the infamous crime of *treason* just because we choose to dissent from the idea of observing a religious institution, no matter whether we are conscientious about it or not? God does not in the Christian dispensation delegate to anyone the authority to inflict temporal punishment on the violators of his law. Would it not be well for these would-be defenders of the Christian religion to be more moderate in their proposed enactments? The third section is as follows:—

“SECTION 3. This act shall not apply to the printing or circulation of newspapers, nor to the sale of medicine, nor to the delivery of milk, nor to the running of railroad or street-cars, or other means for the necessary transportation of the people for all lawful purposes, nor to the circulation of proper books, tracts, or papers, nor to any other work of necessity or charity. In case of any question whether any particular work be a work of necessity or charity, any person may apply to any court having equity jurisdiction, to enjoin the same, and upon such application the question aforesaid shall be determined.”

This section very graciously exempts newspaper men, druggists, milkmen, and railroad and street-cars, because, as the father of the bill says, they do not care to have the opposition of these industries at present. After they get the bill passed, they will be able to use it as a lever to get stricter legislation, and stop everything on Sunday. But the worst feature of this section is the loose way in which it leaves works of “necessity or charity.” The bill says that “in case of any question whether any particular work be a work of necessity or charity, any person may apply to any court having equity jurisdiction, to enjoin the same, and upon such application the question aforesaid shall be determined.” We are here informed that there really are works of necessity and charity. But the only way to find out “in case of any question whether any particular work be a work of necessity or charity” is to go ahead, do the work, and be subject to the caprice of *any person* who wishes to “apply to any court having equity jurisdiction, to enjoin the same,” and by a suit at law have the matter determined. Our statutes should be so framed that we may know what is lawful and what is not, without first having to do some deed and be “enjoined,” and have a lawsuit in order to ascertain what the law is. Such a law would be expected from a tyrant, but is not becoming to a free people. An article in the special edition of the October SENTINEL, entitled, “The Savor of Tyranny,” is to the point here, and we request all our readers who have not a copy of the paper to send and get it. The article is well worth reading and re-reading. The bill continues:—

"SECTION 4. In addition to the penalties in this act provided, the several remedies hereinafter specified may be had, for any offense described in this act. A fine not exceeding \$200 may be recovered in a common suit, before a justice of the peace or police magistrate commenced by summons in the name of the people of this State, on the relation of any person who may make complaint. Each and every of the offenses described in this act is hereby declared to be a nuisance, and it shall be the duty of all courts of equity in this State upon the proper application, to enjoin and prohibit the same, and no bond shall be required of the complainant in such a case. A bill, or petition for injunction, may be filed, by any person aggrieved, either in his own name, or in the name of the people on his relation."

This section endeavors to provide "remedies." But instead of remedies it furnishes the most unobstructed liberty to those who may desire to show their religious zeal by harassing those who may not desire to observe Sunday so strictly as their Puritan neighbors. Chapter 69, paragraph 9, of the Illinois statutes, under the caption of "Injunctions," reads: "In all other cases [except injunctions to enjoin a judgment], before an injunction shall issue, the complainant shall give bond in such penalty, and upon such condition and with such security as may be required by the court, judge, or master granting or ordering the injunction, *provided* bond need not be required when, for good cause shown, the court, judge, or master is of opinion that the injunction ought to be granted without bond."

This provides that in case a person has an injunction served on him or is enjoined to cease doing anything, the person so enjoining shall be required to give bonds to cover the damage done the defendant, in case the injunction proves to be unjust. For instance: A man is building a house, and his neighbor concludes that when the structure is up it will prove a damage to him. So he has an injunction issued to have the building stopped. This will necessitate the stoppage of all the hands on the building, and everything in connection with its erection must cease. Anyone can see that this would involve a big expense to the builder. To cover the damage thus accrued, in case the injunction proves to be unjust, the law requires that the complainant shall give bonds.

If such bonds were not required, we should be exposed to the caprice and malice of any unprincipled person who might, to annoy us, keep asking a continuous round of injunctions on the pretext of various "grievances." This would not only be very annoying, but would involve much expense on the part of the person enjoined. But the statute, to prevent such annoyance and injustice, provides that bonds must be given, except in cases where "the court, judge, or master is of opinion that the injunction ought to be granted without bond." The framer of this Sunday bill would claim, perhaps, that it should come under this provision of the statute, thinking that Sunday desecration is so clear an offense as to require no bonds. But he was not so clear on the subject when he was framing section 3, for there we are left in doubt as to what are works of "necessity or charity." And the only way to find out what such works are is to get "enjoined" and go before the court for a decision. Could anything be worse? Leave a law so loose that we can't tell just what it means, and then have the effrontery to presume that an injunction provided by such law was so obvious and palpably clear that the complainant, no matter who, if he be only "aggrieved," may pray for an injunction without giving bonds!

There are diversities of opinion in regard to works of "necessity or charity," as well as works

of *privilege* among many who observe Sunday; and there is also a respectable class of Christians who do not believe in keeping Sunday at all, but observe the original Sabbath or Saturday. And still outside of these there is a large number who claim the privilege of skepticism in regard to all religious beliefs, and consequently have no conscience upon any sabbath. All of these classes have a right to protection in a civil government, and none should be allowed to set up his conscience as a standard, and compel the rest to come to it. But this bill, if passed, would allow the narrowest-minded zealot in the land to harass with impunity his less enthusiastic neighbor. For, mark you, "any person aggrieved" may file a petition for injunction without giving bond for the same. It will surprise us to learn how easy some persons are "aggrieved" on this subject. When prominent clergymen within the last year of this enlightened nineteenth century will say, "*Nothing outside of the home and the sanctuary is proper recreation for the Sabbath-day,*" and, "*Oh, for a breath of the Puritan!*" anyone can see that they are only waiting for such laws as the foregoing to furnish them the unobstructed opportunity of making their ideas and desires felt. The above is only a sample of the kind of legislation that is being asked in so many places in favor of Sunday. Again, fellow-citizens, let me ask, Are you ready to accept such laws and be subject to the intolerance of religious bigots who are even in our enlightened day clamoring for law that they may compel, under pains and penalties, the observance of religious dogmas? The bill closes thus:—

"SECTION 5. Subject to the provisions of this act, and of other laws of this State, all persons may spend Sunday in any orderly and peaceable manner, as they deem proper, and no person shall be prosecuted, harassed, or annoyed under color of this act for anything done on Sunday, which is not prohibited by some law or ordinance, or which is not in its nature offensive and contrary to the peace and good order of society."

This section would seem to give some privileges after all in advance of the "Puritan Sabbath." But take the bill as a whole, and how much is not prohibited by some law or ordinance? Section three makes everything unlawful on Sunday except circulating books, tracts, and papers, the sale of medicine, the delivery of milk, and the running of railroad and street-cars and "works of necessity or charity;" and we are assured that this law is only an initiatory step toward the stricter legislation that is to follow later on. And while this last section might seem at first to soften the whole bill, yet in reality it is only a blind to lead us into the narrow confines of the ideal of the Puritans.

Even if all were settled in regard to Sunday being the right day to observe as the Sabbath, the words of Him who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," would forever forbid us to enforce by civil enactment any religious institution. And with all the history of religious intolerance coming to our minds, are we ready to be drawn into the same thing again? The great clamor at the present time for civil law to enforce religious beliefs and observances, should arouse every American citizen from his feeling of security, and cause him to consider whether he is ready to submit to all the intolerance resultant upon a union of Church and State. A. O. TARR.

CONGRESS shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.—*U. S. Constitution.*

THE *Denver Republican* says: "The State names Sunday as a day of rest by the same power that it names the Fourth of July as a legal holiday." Then why does the State treat Sunday so much differently from the Fourth of July? It compels people to rest on Sunday, whether they want to or not, but it leaves them free to do just as they please on the Fourth of July. Anybody can see that it is not the exercise of the same power in each case. There is all the difference in the world. No one complains that Sunday is made a legal holiday, although it commemorates nothing in connection with the State; but the Sunday-law people are not satisfied with that. They do not want it made such a holiday as the Fourth of July. Just let somebody introduce a bill into Congress, providing that everybody should celebrate the Fourth of July in a certain way, and that nobody should do any work upon it, and there would be a protest against such unjust interference with people's rights. Much as we honor the Declaration of Independence, such an act as that would show that the principles of the Declaration of Independence had been forgotten, and so will a Sunday law. There is not one point in common between Sunday and the Fourth of July; and when the advocates of a Sunday law mention the National holiday as a precedent for Sunday legislation, they but make emphatic the fact that there is a feature in their work from which they would fain attract attention.

THE Rev. S. M. Johnson, a Presbyterian pastor in Denver, spoke on Sunday, February 17, on the Sunday-closing movement, and in his discourse said:—

"If we were to distinguish, we would say that it is unskilled laborers with whom the Sunday saloon has much to do. Many of them are employed as shovelers and diggers on the streets. They take a ten-cent lodging. It is good enough during the week, when the day is spent in hard work, and the men go to their rooms to sleep. But a ten-cent lodging is quite dreary when Sunday comes. How will they spend the day? Go to Trinity to hear the great organ? But how many churches in Denver would be inviting to those men? Go to the Y. M. C. A. rooms? But they are too finely furnished to be home-like to such men. Where then? What other doors are open? The saloon doors."

That is all true; but whose fault is it? One of the proofs which Christ gave that he was the Christ was that he preached the gospel to the poor. But here we find a professed follower of Christ pleading for a civil law to keep the poor back from that to which the unchristlike position of professed Christian workers has driven them. They want the State to do for these people that which they ought to do, but are not willing to do. We commend to them the words quoted in another part of this paper from the *Catholic American*.

In his essay on "Southey's Colloquies," Lord Macaulay said:—

"The ark of God was never taken till it was surrounded by the arms of earthly defenders. In captivity, its sanctity was sufficient to vindicate it from insult, and to lay the hostile fiend prostrate on the threshold of his own temple. The real security of Christianity is to be found in its own benevolent morality, in its exquisite adaptation to the human heart, in the facility with which its scheme accommodates itself to the capacity of every human intellect, in the consolation which it brings to the house of mourning, in the light with which it brightens the great mystery of the grave. To such a system it can bring no addition of dignity or of strength, that it is part and parcel of the common law."

Advertisements.

ADVERTISING RATES made known on application. No advertisements of patent medicines, novelties, cigars, tobacco, liquors, novels or anything of a trivial, intemperate, immoral or impure nature accepted. We reserve the right to reject ANY advertisement.

The circulation of the AMERICAN SENTINEL during the past six months has averaged 27,935 copies per week. The paper goes to every State and Territory in the Union, Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, etc.

ALASKA GOLD

And Silver Mines for Sale. The richest and most extensive mining belt in the world. Owners will give Capitalists an opportunity to form a Company, by taking Bonds for their property. This is a rare opportunity for Bankers, Brokers and Speculators to realize fortunes. All communications confidential. Address, T. M. Antisell, Prest. Alaska Exploring Co., 1101 Market Street, San Francisco, CALIFORNIA.

CROWN JEWELS.

A beautiful book of nearly 650 pages, and illustrated with the finest steel engravings. Prices remarkably low and discounts to agents large. Send for circulars and full particulars. PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal., General Agents for Pacific Coast.

PHOTOGRAPH ALBUMS.

Large variety in Plush and Morocco bindings. Prices low for first-class goods. Terms to agents, and catalogue, sent on application. PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

VIEWS OF NATIONAL REFORM.

This package contains thirteen tracts (184 pages), treating upon the various phases of the National Reform movement, as follows:

No.	PAGES.
1. Religious Legislation,.....	8
2. Religious Liberty,.....	8
3. A National Reform and the Rights of Conscience,.....	16
4. The American Papacy,.....	16
5. Bold and Base Avoval,.....	16
6. National Reform is Church and State,.....	16
7. Purity of National Religion,.....	8
8. The Salem Witchcraft,.....	8
9. What Think Ye of Christ?.....	8
10. National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy,.....	24
11. The Republic of Israel,.....	8
12. National Reformed Presbyterianism,.....	32
13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity,.....	16

The above package will be sent post-paid to any address for twenty cents. Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL, Oakland, Cal.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET


NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

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

PRICES.

No. 1, Russia Leather, for 2 pens	10c.
No. 2, " " " 3 " "	15c.
No. 3, " " " metal back,	
2 pens - - - - -	15c.
No. 4, Russia Leather, metal back,	
3 pens - - - - -	20c.
No. 5, Seal Skin, for 2 pens, -	15c.
No. 6, " " " 3 " " "	25c.
No. 7, Russia Leather, for 4 pens,	25c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets SUPERIOR IN EVERY PARTICULAR to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.



— THE —

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

A SIXTEEN-PAGE

RELIGIOUS FAMILY JOURNAL,

Published Weekly, in the Interest of the International Tract Society.

This journal is devoted to expositions of prophecy and the dissemination of general Biblical knowledge. Its contents are of the most varied kind, the departments embracing Editorial and General Articles, Health and Temperance, Home Circle, Sabbath-school, Missionary, and Secular and Religious News.

Among expository journals it takes the lead, both in quality and quantity of matter. It has proved of unusual interest to its tens of thousands of readers, who everywhere pronounce it a *live religious paper*, a reliable expositor of Scripture; and a household journal, the contents of which are pure and cleaving.

Terms, per year, \$2.00. Three months trial subscription, for 50 cents. Send for free sample copy, and circular. Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

Fourth Edition; Prices Greatly Reduced.

AN ELEGANT SOUVENIR OF THE WONDERFUL YO SEMITE.

"In the Heart of the Sierras."

A Complete Historical and Descriptive Summary of the Great Valley and its Marvelous Surroundings.


It is by J. M. HUTCHINGS, the Old Pioneer and Long Resident of Yo Semite, who took the First Sketches of it ever taken, and was the First to make its Marvelous Grandeur generally known to the world.

IT IS A BOOK OF NEARLY 600 PAGES,

WITH 160 ILLUSTRATIONS

Of which 28 are Beautiful

FULL-PAGE ARTOTYPES



DESIGN OF COVER.

FINE CALENDERED PAPER.

CLEAR, NEW TYPE.

Elegant Binding

AND

Artistic Workmanship

THROUGHOUT.

A BOOK OF THRILLING INTEREST.

All who have seen the Volume pronounce it one of the Most Elegant and Intensely Interesting Works ever published. An Ornament to any Center Table. A Beautiful and Acceptable Present to a Friend.

SOLD BY SUBSCRIPTION.

For Terms and Territory, address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 43 Bond St., N. Y., 12th and Castro Sts., Oakland, Cal.

DIPHTHERIA; ITS CAUSES, PREVENTION, AND PROPER TREATMENT.

By J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.

The increasing prevalence of this devastating disease, and its alarming fatality in so many cases renders the subject of its nature and treatment one of the greatest importance.

This work gives a concise account of the Nature, Cause, and Modes of Prevention, and also

THE MOST SUCCESSFUL METHODS OF TREATMENT

Of this prevalent and fatal malady. It should be in every household, as its instructions, if faithfully carried out, will save many a precious life. Price, in board covers, 25 cents.

Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

SHORTHAND WITHOUT A TEACHER.

Stenography taught complete in 60 lessons by the use of the

NEW CARD METHOD.

This is not a new system of Shorthand, but a new method of teaching a standard and reliable system, such as is used in nearly all of the courts, legislatures and public assemblies throughout the United States.

No books whatever required. Each lesson is printed on a heavy card, and the series embrace, every principle known to the art. Price, post-paid, \$1 50. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

GOLDEN GRAINS: A SERIES OF TEN BOOKS FOR CHILDREN.

Each little book or pamphlet contains thirty-two pages of carefully selected stories. The following are the titles: Robin's Judgment Book; Annie's Savings' Box; Always the Bible; The Sisters' Lesson; The Hard Way; The Schoolboy's Dinner; Seven Times; The Wicket Gate; The Sensitive Plant; The Two Gardens. The whole set of ten books, over 300 pages, will be sent post-paid for 50 cents. Address, PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., Oakland, Cal.

PROPHETIC LIGHTS.

BY ELDER E. J. WAGGONER.

Some of the Prominent Prophecies of the Old and New Testaments, Interpreted by the Bible and History.




FAC SIMILE OF FRONT COVER.

"PROPHETIC LIGHTS" shows the exact fulfillment of the predictions of the Bible concerning Egypt, Tyre, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome; also of the prophecies concerning the first advent of Christ, which prove the inspiration of the Bible, and give assurance that other prophecies which are noted will as surely and exactly be fulfilled. Its unique and original illustrations are prophetic studies and specimens of art. It is beautifully bound in cloth, front cover embossed in brown and gold, has gilt edges, and its dress is well worthy the interesting matter which the author treats in the most entertaining manner possible. The book contains nearly 200 large octavo pages, and costs only \$1.25, post-paid. Send for one.

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

THE RURAL HEALTH RETREAT,

CRYSTAL SPRINGS, ST. HELENA, Napa County, Cal.



A DELIGHTFUL RESORT AND SANITARIUM,

Offers unrivaled advantages to

TOURISTS AND ALL CLASSES OF INVALIDS,

BOTH IN SUMMER AND WINTER.

The Retreat is situated on the south-western slope of Howell Mountain, a locality of enviable reputation for health-recuperating qualities, 400 feet above and overlooking the

NOTED AND BEAUTIFUL NAPA VALLEY.

Its natural advantages are equal to those of any other health resort. It is noted for its pure water, dry atmosphere, clear and balmy sunshine, even temperature, mild breezes, and the absence of high winds.

Patients are under the constant care of skillful Physicians, whose efforts are supplemented by skillful trained nurses.

Different forms of baths, electric appliances, and massage are among the many remedial agencies employed.

CRYSTAL SPRINGS is two and one-half miles from St. Helena, which is on a branch of the Central Pacific Railroad.

Persons sending notice will be met at the St. Helena depot by a carriage from the RETREAT.

Telephone connection between St. Helena and the RETREAT.

EXPENSES MODERATE!

Come and see for yourself this beautiful Resort. Persons desirous of knowing whether their case is one of probable cure can ascertain by addressing RURAL HEALTH RETREAT.

For descriptive pamphlet and further particulars address

RURAL HEALTH RETREAT, St. Helena, Napa Co., Cal.

— THE —

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL, Devoted to the defense of American institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of CIVIL and RELIGIOUS Rights.

The SENTINEL will ever be uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact. It is well known that there is a large and influential association in the United States bearing the name of the "National Reform Association," which is endeavoring to secure such a *Religious Amendment* to the Constitution of the United States as will "place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." While there are many persons in this country who are opposed to, or look with suspicion upon, this movement, there are few, outside of the party, who realize what the influence of this amendment would be. The object of the AMERICAN SENTINEL will be to *Vindicate the Rights of American Citizens*, which we believe, are threatened by this association. It will appeal to the very fundamental principles of our Government, and point out the consequences which would be sure to follow should they secure the desired Amendment to the Constitution. Every position taken will be carefully guarded and fortified by sound argument. Due respect will always be paid to the opinions of others, but the rights of conscience will be fearlessly maintained.

TERMS.

Single copy, one year, for - - - - - \$1.00
AMERICAN SENTINEL one year and "Prophetic Lights," paper cover, - - - - - 1.50
Sample copies of the paper FREE.

If no Agent in your vicinity, write to the

AMERICAN SENTINEL, 1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.

The American Sentinel.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, MARCH 13, 1889.

NOTE.—No papers are sent by the publishers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL to people who have not subscribed for it. If the SENTINEL comes to one who has not subscribed for it, he may know that it is sent him by some friend, and that he will not be called upon by the publishers to pay for the same.

THE *Censor*, a professedly Prohibition journal, published in Los Angeles, Cal., thus shows itself to be a strictly National Reform organ:—

"The ten commandments are the basis of a perfect National Constitution, and the sermon on the mount and the Lord's prayer the model of a perfect city charter."

We have no fault to find with the ten commandments, the sermon on the mount, or the Lord's prayer; they are perfect; but we should hate to live in a city governed by mortals, in which the sermon on the mount was taken as the charter. We should say, with King David: "Let me fall now into the hands of the Lord; for very great are his mercies; but let me not fall into the hands of man."

THE *Advance* of February 21 thinks that "there is promise of good things in the announcement that John Wanamaker is to be Postmaster-General." It thinks that, as an active Sunday-school worker, he will use his influence to stop Sunday work in the Post-office Department of the Government, and says: "There is so much room for improvement of this kind in the department that Mr. Wanamaker may look upon it as a wide field of religious usefulness." That caps the climax of cabinet speculations. If the ideas of some people could be carried out, the entire Government would be simply a religious machine. The reader should not fail to note these unpremeditated admissions that legislation to stop the mails on Sunday is religious legislation.

At the Sunday mass-meeting in Denver, the Rev. Father Carr said:—

"We know that there is less crime, lawlessness, and drunkenness in Denver than in any other city of its size in the Union. We know it, but how can we explain it to our Eastern friends, with the condition of affairs as they now exist? Let me tell an Eastern friend that our saloons and gambling-places are open on Sunday, and he cannot understand how it is that the good order which I may at the same time claim, prevails."

That is the latest excuse yet devised for a Sunday law, and it is about the thinnest. They have the best of order in Denver, with practically no Sunday law, but they want the Sunday law so that they can attribute the good order to it. The great plea for a Sunday law is on the ground that it will tend to peace and prosperity; but unfortunately for the argument, they have that condition of things already, and they are anxious to hurry up the Sunday law, or the enforcement of what they have, so that they can point to the good order that already exists, and say, "See the result of strict Sunday laws." This is sufficient to show that it is not in the interest of temperance that they are working, but it is just as certain that they are not working in the interest of religion, that is, if telling the truth is a part of religion. It is indeed a *form* of religion that they are working for, but a form of religion that has no connection with Christianity.

THE New York preachers' meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church, embracing ministers in that denomination in New York and adjacent cities, at a recent session heartily indorsed the principles of the American Sunday Union, declaring that "its methods and plans, so far as they have been developed, are singularly wise and efficient." No one can question but that its methods are "efficient," and they no doubt exhibit the wisdom of the serpent, in that they are crafty; but we are sure that a method by which one name is multiplied by 7,200,000, and a single church or other organization is represented three or four times over upon the strength of a vote by a few of them, is a manifestation of almost anything but the wisdom that comes from above. But then, such methods are "efficient," and that proves their wisdom.

THE *Pearl of Days* says that the practice of holding mass-meetings on Sunday, in the interest of labor, has resulted in a vigorous protest on the part of many workingmen in Cincinnati, and quotes from the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* to the effect that the Central Labor Union having called a meeting for Sunday, February 24, instead of February 22, as at first intended, a mass-meeting of trade unionists to protest against Sunday meetings in general, and this one in particular, was appointed. The *Inter-Ocean* says that "the workingmen are nearly equally divided on this question." The *Pearl of Days* says: "We can but rejoice in this hopeful sign." Yes, but how does this tally with Mr. Crafts's statements that the Sunday-Rest bill was framed to satisfy the clamor of the workingman? This doesn't look as if the clamor had been very great. The most of the clamor has been stirred up by Mr Crafts himself.

At the anniversary dinner of the Catholic Club, in Philadelphia, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Corrigan, and Archbishop Ryan were present and made speeches. Among other things, Archbishop Ryan told of the meeting between a Protestant and the Pope, and how well pleased the two men were with each other, and said: "So many Protestants who have met the Pope, while not religiously Catholic, are personally Papists. He then continued:—

"On the great dogmas we are all united. We have a common love for religion. In an age when society is threatened with grave dangers it is well that men who love Christianity and Christian civilization should unite. I was glad to find when I came to Philadelphia that most of the public men were Christians, and I see no reason why on the great questions we may not agree."

This speech was greeted with "great applause," therefore the National Reformers may take courage. There is a growing prospect that their overtures to the Roman Catholic Church will not much longer be repulsed.

PROTESTANT preachers inveigh against the Sunday newspapers, for the reason that the newspapers keep people from church. The Sunday newspaper has become a popular necessity in this country; it has come to stay. That is a fact to be faced, whether you like it or not. Whatever the Sunday newspaper may be or may become, they must be poor preachers, poor churches, and poor creeds indeed which confess themselves beaten by a Sunday newspaper. There must be something radically wrong with them, as in truth there is. No Catholic priest would complain of the Sunday newspaper on the ground that it drew people away from mass and the sacraments of the

Lord's day. Catholics, a comparatively small minority happily, do stay away from mass and the sacraments; but this grave sin of theirs is not owing to Sunday newspaper reading. It is because they have fallen into the habit of neglecting what they know to be their duty; Catholics read the newspapers on Sunday just as Protestants do; but the Catholic Churches, crowded at all the masses, as any inquirer may convince himself by visiting the churches, testify to the fact that newspaper reading affects in no wise Catholic faith and worship. The trouble of which the Protestant preachers complain does not lie with the newspapers, but with themselves, rather, their vague doctrinal teachings, and their soulless worship on empty altars.—*Catholic American*.

Sentinels for Missionary Work.

SIXTY assorted back numbers (four different dates) of the AMERICAN SENTINEL sent post-paid for \$1.00. Just the paper to hand to your neighbor or mail to a friend. All about the National Reform movement, the Sunday question, the Blair bills, etc.

Cloth Bound Sentinels.

WE have a few Vol. 3, 1888, monthly AMERICAN SENTINELS, with index and special campaign number, bound in cloth, which we can send post-paid for \$1.00. Our complete three-year sets have all been sold. If you need Vol. 3 (in paper at 75 cents, or cloth at \$1.00) send for it now, as they are nearly all sold.

Agents Wanted.

To canvass for the weekly AMERICAN SENTINEL, at \$1.00 per year, to whom liberal cash commissions will be paid. Send now for sample copy, terms to agents, etc.

M. L. Huntley, secretary International Tract Society, Battle Creek, Mich., is general agent for all that territory lying south of Pennsylvania and the Ohio River, and east of the Mississippi River. Persons desiring to canvass in any State included in that territory will please apply to the secretary mentioned above.

Canvassers in any other States will write to the State T. and M. secretary of the State in which they wish to work, or to AMERICAN SENTINEL, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal.

Agents' complete canvassing outfit for the SENTINEL alone, consisting of sample copies of the paper, guarantee cards, circulars, terms to agents, etc., sent free.

Agents' complete canvassing outfit, including a sample copy of the illustrated pamphlet, "Prophetic Lights," post-paid, for 50 cents.

Agents' complete canvassing outfit, including a sample copy of the illustrated, 500-page, cloth-bound, popular edition of "Great Controversy," for \$1.00.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,
DEVOTED TO

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

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

Single Copy, Per Year, post-paid, - - - \$1.00.

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

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
1059 Castro St., OAKLAND, CAL.