



Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political.—Thomas Jefferson.

VOLUME 7.

NEW YORK, JUNE 9, 1892.

NUMBER 23.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES,
ASSOCIATE EDITORS,
C. P. BOLLMAN, W. H. MCKEE.

THE House of Representatives, in Congress assembled, on May 23, upon a division being taken, decided by deliberate vote that the day of the week commonly known as Sunday is the Sabbath. Incidentally, in connection with this, it was ordered that no ice should be sold or delivered in the District of Columbia, upon the Sabbath which the House of Representatives had created as distinctively and legislatively the United States Sabbath, except within certain specified hours.

—o—

ON May 25, the House of Representatives being in Committee of the Whole, with Mr. Lester, of Georgia, in the Chair, and having under consideration the sundry civil appropriation bill and especially the items in reference to the Government exhibit at the coming World's Fair, salaries of the United States Commissioners, Lady Managers, etc., Mr. Johnstone, of South Carolina, with the fact in view that the House had, on the second day preceding, voted that Sunday was the Sabbath, offered an amendment to the bill appropriating funds for the Government exhibit, which read as follows:—

Provided, That no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be available unless the doors of the Exposition shall be closed on Sunday.

The House of Representatives having in due form created a Sabbath for itself, and having decided to begin its legal enforcement in the District of Columbia, naturally objects to the desecration of the day in Chicago which it has declared holy, and to be kept holy in Washington.

—o—

THE presentation of this amendment

created such a scene in the House as was not equalled by the wildest moments of excitement in the contest over the silver bill. A correspondent who has been present in the House nearly every day during this session, writes, "I have never seen such confusion as it produced." The proceedings, as published in the *Congressional Record*, show that the members crowded the aisles and the space about the Speaker's desk, and the tumult was such that the Chairman was obliged to suspend proceedings and demand order before gentlemen addressing the Chair could be heard. Whom the devil would destroy he first makes mad seemed to be exemplified on the floor of the House; but there were occasional flashes of reason, sense, and sanity, manifested, as witness the point urged by Mr. Culberson, of Texas, Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Culberson said:—

Let me ask whether this whole subject is not regulated by the laws of Illinois?

MR. JOHNSTONE, of South Carolina. I am aware, or at least am informed, that an act of the Legislature of the State of Illinois does provide that no place of public amusement shall be kept open on Sunday; but what harm can there be in this American Congress signifying by this amendment its approbation of the laws of the State of Illinois?

MR. CULBERSON. Does the gentleman know what the laws of the State of Illinois are on this subject?

MR. JOHNSTONE, of South Carolina. I do not, but I have just been informed that there is such a law as I have stated.

MR. CULBERSON. I do not understand that Congress has any right to go into the State of Illinois and regulate the conduct of an Illinois corporation.

MR. JOHNSTONE, of South Carolina. That is correct. But this Congress has certainly a right to withhold its aid from the Illinois corporation unless that corporation is willing to accept it under the limitations.

The calm and correct legal sense of the sound jurist is in strong contrast here with the frivolous appeal and shallow fallacy of the zealot pleading for the establishment of a religious rite by act of Congress.

—o—

MR. JOHNSTONE asks, "What harm can there be in this American Congress signi-

fying by this amendment its approbation of the laws of the State of Illinois?" Certainly that is a proper question, What harm? By the First Amendment to the Constitution, Congress is prohibited from making any law towards an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. Shall Congress approve in the State of Illinois of that interference with religion which is prohibited to Congress? Shall Congress force upon Illinois the revival and application of laws which are contrary to the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State itself, which says that no preference shall be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship?

But it may be Mr. Culberson realized that the previous action of the House in deciding that Sunday was the Sabbath, and forbidding ice to be sold on that day, had estopped him from making that plea. Perhaps Mr. Johnstone comprehended that the First Amendment according to the latest action of the House now reads, "Congress may make laws respecting an establishment of religion, etc., and may require obedience to religious laws on the part of the several States."

Another instance of sound views, and a willingness to express them, was given by Mr. Little, of New York, who said:—

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will not prevail. It seems to me that it is an attempt to commit this Congress to a line of policy which we have no right to undertake. Congress has already recognized the Illinois Corporation in the act of April 25, 1890, as the proper body to manage this Fair. . . . They have done nothing to indicate that they, on their part, intend in any manner to violate the law of the State of Illinois or of the United States; and, as has been said here there is a strict Sunday law in Illinois, and it is hardly possible that the law-abiding corporation, incorporated under the laws of that State, which has received the sanction of this Congress, would exhibit an intention of violating the statute law of their own State. It is dragging into the subject the question of religious matters which we have no right to consider, and I hope it will not be entertained.

At the close of Mr. Little's remarks, there were, as also several times previ-

ously, cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" and Mr. Holman, of Indiana, in the course of a strenuous attempt to shut off further debate on this question, said:—

Everybody understands this question. Every gentleman has considered it, and has made up his mind how to vote. I have made up my mind how I shall vote in regard to it, and I presume every other gentleman has his mind made up.

If it is true, as Mr. Holman says, that all congressmen understand this question, it is surprising how many must have voted contrary to their convictions.

BUT Mr. Holman found that the question would not down, and Mr. Hooker, of Mississippi, offered an amendment, in these words:—

Provided, That in no event shall the exhibit made by the Government be opened to the public on Sunday.

Mr. Johnstone objected to this because as he said the point that he desired to emphasize was,—

that this appropriation of money of the American people should not be expended at all unless the institution upon which, or in connection with which, this fund is to be expended shall be closed on Sunday.

Mr. Hooker expressed himself as concurring fully with Mr. Johnstone in the sentiment of his amendment, but considered that it should be modified so as to be— an expression of the legislative sentiment of the country, on the part of the Congress of the United States, and in respect to the Christian sentiment of the civilized world.

and saying further,—

I am in favor of accomplishing the object, and of giving a legislative construction to the sentiment of the people of this country, as the representatives of the people, that the Exposition should be closed on the Sabbath day.

It was agreed between Mr. Hooker and Mr. Johnstone that the two amendments should be joined, so as to read:—

Provided, That no part of the amount of this appropriation shall be available unless the doors of the Exhibition shall be closed on Sunday; *Provided further*, That in no event shall the exhibit to be made by the Government be open to the public on Sunday.

Mr. Johnstone continued to urge the adoption of his amendment and was interrupted by Mr. Bland, who said:—

Suppose that we should declare that this Exposition shall be open on Sunday, and suppose on the other hand the laws of Illinois say that it shall not. The State of Illinois not having granted jurisdiction to Congress, what right have we to interfere with the laws of that State upon the subject?

MR. JOHNSTONE, of South Carolina. I had given the gentleman credit for more acumen than his question indicates.

MR. BLAND. I am after your acumen, and not mine. [Laughter.]

MR. JOHNSTONE, of South Carolina. I do not for a moment contemplate—[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

MR. JOHNSTONE, of South Carolina. Gentlemen, you shall not howl me down!

Then followed a scene of great disorder and intense excitement which was not quelled until the Committee rose for the purpose of limiting debate; the Speaker resumed the Chair and called upon the Sergeant-at-Arms to request members to be seated and maintain order.

AFTER a motion to adjourn was lost, the House again resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union, and again took up the consideration of the same question with a limitation of debate to two minutes, Mr. Lester of Georgia still in the Chair.

Mr. William A. Stone, of Pennsylvania, offered a substitute, which read:—

That before any money appropriated by the Gov-

ernment is paid, the managers of the Columbian Exposition shall pass and file with the Secretary of the Treasury a resolution or agreement to close the Exposition on Sunday.

Mr. Pattison, of Ohio, then obtained the floor, and said:—

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there has not been a more important question before the House this session than the one now before the Committee. . . . The United States is a peculiar country. The Sabbath of our country is a peculiar Sabbath. It is known as the American Sabbath all over the wide world.

The Sabbath day is recognized in some way by every civilized nation of the world, but the Sabbath, as we understand it, is peculiar to the United States alone, and hence we can very properly call it the American Sabbath. To us the Sabbath day was a part of our very being. It came with the *Mayflower*; it came with almost every band of Pilgrims; it was the corner stone of every State. It was in the web and woof of every State Constitution, its spirit permeates every article of the Confederation of States, and when the Constitution was adopted the American Sabbath was as firmly established in the hearts of the American people as was the spirit of liberty itself, and we but voice the sentiment of the many millions of Christian people in all sections of the country, when we declare in favor of the American Sabbath, and by our votes say that the World's Fair shall not be open on the Sabbath day. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

MR. HOPKINS, of Illinois. What would the gentleman do with those people who have Saturday for their Sabbath?

MR. PATTISON, of Ohio. There are very few of those, and while they venerate the religious ideas of their own people, they respect American institutions.

MR. HOPKINS, of Illinois. But their conscientious scruples are as sacred to them as those who desire the doors to be closed on Sunday.

MR. PATTISON, of Ohio. Certainly, and as such they are entitled to consideration.

Thus cavalierly are the different objections treated, objections that are founded in reason and a just conception of the limitations of congressional action; and yet Mr. Holman says these men all understand this question, and are fully determined upon it in their own minds. Certainly the last part of his assertion is apparent.

MR. PAYNTER, of Kentucky, then offers as an amendment to the substitute of Mr. Stone, the following:—

Provided, That the building, or buildings, containing the Government exhibit, shall not be open to visitors on Sunday.

This amendment was voted upon and rejected. Without having accomplished anything further, the Committee arose and reported that no conclusion had been reached.

Thus closed, for that day, the most remarkable scene ever witnessed in the Congress of the United States, but to be reopened the following day. The report of this day's proceedings on this question occupy more than eight full columns of the *Congressional Record*.

On the next day, May 26, the House, being again in the Committee of the Whole, with Mr. Lester, of Georgia, in the Chair, a long and unsuccessful effort was made to postpone the decision of the Sunday-closing question until the remainder of the bill had been considered and passed upon. There was a repetition of the wild and disorderly scene of the previous day. Mr. Stout offered an amendment to the substitute for the original amendment which was before the House, reading as follows:—

All buildings containing the exhibits under the control of the United States shall remain closed on Sunday, and no intoxicating liquors shall at any time be sold therein.

This was rejected. Great confusion ensued, in the course of which Mr. Williams

moved that each member "be allowed an hour to read the Illinois statute on this subject." This, it was impossible to grant, probably because, outside of parliamentary reasons, it would have necessitated a full course in civil government and religion for a majority of the members in order to their comprehension of the anomalous place which the statutes of this character hold in our law.

The confusion and disorder increased until the Chairman was obliged to suspend business until order was restored. The clerk then read the full text of the substitute and amendment before the House, as follows:—

That before any money appropriated by the Government is paid, the Managers of the Columbian Exposition shall pass and file with the Secretary of the Treasury a resolution and agreement to close the Exposition on Sunday.

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available until the Board of Managers of the World's Columbian Exposition shall give satisfactory assurances that no intoxicating liquors will be sold on the grounds of said Exposition.

This being put to vote, was lost, on the first vote, 37 to 122, on a second vote, tellers being ordered, 43 to 124.

Mr. Dockery, of Missouri, then offered, as a substitute for the original proposition, offered by Mr. Johnstone, this proviso:—

Provided, That the Government exhibits at the World's Columbian Exposition shall not be opened to the public on Sundays.

this was carried, ayes 131, noes 36.

Thus the House of Representatives, by a vote of almost four to one, committed itself to this acknowledged religious legislation, and, if Mr. Holman can be believed, did so deliberately, and after due consideration.

A NOTABLE incident immediately followed this decision of the Sunday-closing question. As the quickest way of suggesting to the House, evidently, the utter impropriety of the action it had just taken, Mr. Bowers, of California, offered an amendment to this action, and made the accompanying remarks as follows:—

Resolved, That the Government exhibits at the World's Fair shall not be opened to the public on the Sabbath day; which is Saturday.

MR. BOWERS. This is a religious question, and Saturday is the only Sabbath day. It was the Sabbath day when Christ was on earth, and it is the Sabbath day now. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The question being taken,

THE CHAIRMAN said. The noes seem to have it.

MR. BOWERS. I call for a division.

The question again being taken, the amendment of Mr. Bowers was rejected; there being ayes 11, noes 149.

A private letter from Washington says of the reception which this nobly outspoken expression of truth and fact received in the House: "It was met with derision, laughter, and contempt, by every member in the House. I suppose the proposition is that Christ is dead, but there are a great many living men who have votes—hence the derision."

Notice was given by Mr. Lynch, of Wisconsin, that he would call for the yeas and nays in the House on the proposition to close the Government exhibit on Sunday, which had just been passed. Mr. Bergen, of New Jersey, then offered a further amendment, as follows:—

And provided further, The employes in the service of the Fair during the week shall be relieved from service and others employed in their places on Sunday.

This was rejected, and nothing further was offered in reference to the Sunday closing of the Fair, other business being then resumed.

The report of the second day's proceed-

ings in regard to Sunday at the World's Fair occupies six full columns of the *Congressional Record*.

THE day following this action of the House in Committee of the Whole, Representative William A. Stone, of Pennsylvania, sent a telegram to the United Presbyterian General Assembly, in session at Pittsburg, which conveys some information, and read between the lines is full of suggestions. This is the telegram:—

DR. DAVID MAC DILL, Moderator U. P. Assembly. Telegram received. House action yesterday only a preliminary skirmish to the battle that will be fought on special bill appropriating \$5,000,000. We think it can not pass without proviso closing Exposition on Sabbath. Yeas and nays can then be called. W. A. STONE.

"Only a preliminary skirmish," the "Yeas and nays can then be called," these are not phrases without meaning. The congressmen who object to the levy of "political blackmail"—which this means, —and who intend to place themselves on record, when the yeas and nays are called, as standing for civil liberty and equity, and religious truth and righteousness, should note carefully these phrases and study their meaning.

If this is only a brush on the skirmish line, it may perhaps be hoped that in the contest to which this is preliminary there may be so full a presentation of the principles which should govern Congress in regard to such legislation as this, that Mr. Holman's assertion that "Everybody understands this question," may then be true, before the final vote is cast; so that, if the wrong be chosen, it be not chosen through ignorance.

THE sentiment of those who have charge of matters pertaining to the World's Fair in the Senate, has been expressed by Senator Pettigrew, of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee on the Columbian Exposition, in an interview, to a reporter for the *Mail and Express*. The interviewer says:—

The Senator has taken a positive stand against desecrating the Sabbath by opening the Exposition on that day. "The action of the House yesterday, when sitting as a Committee of the Whole," he said, "insures, I think, the closing of the Exposition on Sunday." The Senator said that the Senate Committee, of which he is chairman, was in favor of closing the Exposition on Sunday. "I have no doubt," he added, "that the sentiment for closing the Exposition on the Sabbath will be successful." Not long ago our Committee had protests against Sunday opening from over five hundred and twenty thousand persons, and now the number has doubled. Only a few Adventists, who think our Sunday is not the Sabbath, have proclaimed themselves in favor of Sunday opening.

Then you think the action of the House means Sunday closing?
"I do not see how it can be interpreted otherwise."

If the reporter has represented the Senator fairly, what Mr. Holman said of the House is not true of the Senate, for here is, then, one senator, and that too, Chairman of the World's Fair Committee, who does not understand this question. No one with the least comprehension of the principles at stake in this matter would say that the "Adventists have proclaimed themselves in favor of Sunday opening." They are intelligent enough to understand that they have no more right to petition for Sunday opening than others have for Sunday closing. Their petition is that Congress should avoid legislation upon that over which it has no jurisdiction, either to close or to open. If the reporter has been just to Mr. Pettigrew, his place is not in the United States Senate, Chair-

man of the Committee on the World's Fair, but in the district school at the foot of the classes in civil government and United States history. But Mr. Pettigrew has his peers both in the House and the Senate.

The flood-gates are about to open. We shall see what we shall see, and we shall see it soon. W. H. M.

Seventh-day Adventists in Court.

As the readers of THE SENTINEL are aware, the Grand Jury of Henry County, Tenn., at the January term of Court, found indictments against five Seventh-day Adventists, residents of that county, for maintaining a nuisance by working on Sunday. The parties indicted were J. H. Dortch, W. S. Lowry, J. Moon, James Stem, and W. H. Ward. The following is a *verbatim* copy of one of the indictments which differed only in names and dates:—

State of Tennessee, }
Henry County. }
Jan. Term, A. D., 1892.

The Grand Jurors of the State of Tennessee, elected, empanelled, sworn and charged to inquire in and for the body of the county of Henry, in the State aforesaid, upon their oath, present that.....W. S. Lowry,

late of said county, laborer, heretofore to wit on the 8th day of Nov., A. D. 1891, that day being Sunday, and divers other Sundays before that date and up to the taking of this inquisition, in the county of Henry, aforesaid, then and there, unlawfully, openly, publicly, notoriously and unceasingly did engage in his secular business, and did perform and follow his common avocations of life on Sundays by working on the farm, plowing, hoeing, chopping, hauling wood, mauling rails, and doing various and divers other kinds of work on Sundays, said work not being necessary or a matter of charity, and it was and is to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people, to the evil example of society, prejudicial to public morals and a public nuisance to the citizens of the county and against the peace and dignity of the State.

J. W. LEWIS, *Att. Gen.*

Sec. Count.—And the Grand Jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present that the said W. S. Lowry, on the days and dates aforesaid, and in manner and form as aforesaid, was guilty of a public nuisance by said working on Sunday, to the prejudice of society, and against the peace and dignity of the State.

J. W. LEWIS, *Attorney General.*

None of the defendants had actually done all the kinds of work enumerated in the indictments, nor was it necessary to prove that such was the case; indeed the particular phraseology employed was only a roundabout way of saying that the parties indicted were farmers and that instead of resting on Sunday they followed their ordinary pursuits upon that day.

Inasmuch as the gist of the charge was that the work "was and is to the great annoyance and disturbance of the people" "and a public nuisance to the citizens of the county," it naturally would be supposed that the indictments were found at the instigation of people living in the neighborhood, and that some at least of those who were so greatly annoyed were among the witnesses for the State; but such was not the case. Every witness in each of

the cases was asked if the work disturbed or annoyed him? and each witness testified that it did not.

The reader will naturally inquire, if those living in the immediate neighborhood in which the work was done were not annoyed by it, and if the indictments were not found at their instigation, why were they found at all? The facts, as nearly as the writer has been able to ascertain them, are as follows: A man from the neighborhood in which the work complained of was done, happened to be at Paris, the county seat of Henry County on business at the time of the January term of Court. He was summoned before the Grand Jury and was asked by the Attorney-General, first if he did not live in the "Advent" neighborhood. He said that he did. He was then asked if they worked on Sunday. This too, was answered in the affirmative. The witness was then required to give the names of five of the leading members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in that neighborhood; which he did, giving the names of the two elders, the deacon, and of two prominent lay members.

So far as the writer is able to learn, the only evidence before the Grand Jury was the general statement of this one unwilling witness, that the Adventists worked on Sunday; and upon this evidence the indictments were found. The writer is also informed that the statement was made by the Attorney-General, that he was determined to put a stop to "that Sunday work," that he would prosecute the Adventists to "the extent of the law," and that he wanted if possible to get the preacher who taught them to work on Sunday. This was not done, however, as the church has no resident pastor.

The manner of the Attorney-General in conducting the trials throughout was in keeping with the way in which the indictments were found. In his mind those on trial were being tried, not as individuals, but as members of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This is clearly shown by some of his questions; for instance, one witness was asked: "Do you know anything of the workings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church?" Another was asked, "Are you a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church?" "Is it the habit of that church to do secular business on Sunday?" This question was asked of every witness until the Judge objected to it and told the Attorney-General to confine his questions to the practice of the individual defendant. However, in his plea to the jury the Attorney-General returned to the same idea, saying, "I am sorry that we have among us this class of people."

None of the defendants employed counsel, and all declined to permit the court to appoint counsel for them. They felt that they were being tried for their religious faith, and so chose to stand upon the word of God: "And when they shall bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say."

Each of the five defendants declined to plead to the indictment and the court entered for each the plea of not guilty. The reason of the defendants for not pleading was that they felt that they could not consistently and truthfully either acknowledge or deny every allegation of the indictment. That they had habitually la-

bored on Sunday was true, but that they had in any proper sense of the word been guilty of a nuisance they felt was not true; hence their refusal to plead. Moreover they felt that the very Scripture which bid them rest their cases in the hands of the Lord forbid them to close their own mouths by a plea of guilty; and that all they could do was to let the trial proceed in regular form, that at the proper time they might have opportunity to speak for themselves.

As a matter of course there was in these trials no quibbling as to the admissibility of evidence. Except for the restraints of the Court the Attorney General had all the liberty that he wished to take. Consequently some evidence was introduced which should have been excluded. This probably did not, however, affect the result.

In the four cases in which verdicts of guilty were rendered, Sunday work was clearly proved by the State and was not denied by the defendants; but, as before stated, not only was there no evidence to support the charge that the work constituted a nuisance, but every witness testified that he was not annoyed by it. This point was emphasized by J. H. Dortch, one of the defendants, when asked if he had anything to say before the judgment of the Court was pronounced. The result was that the Judge said he wished time for consideration, and so final judgment was deferred for one week, and the defendants were instructed to be on hand at that time. An attorney present at the trials, but in no way concerned in them, expressed to the writer his opinion that the court would either impose a very light fine or else set aside the verdicts and give each of the defendants another trial. However that is only conjecture.

The feeling in the court room and also among business men in Paris was very favorable to the defendants. The prosecutions were denounced by some as religious persecution, and an attorney was heard to remark: "If they would only indict men for not working instead of for working, they would be more in the line of duty."

While each of the several defendants was speaking there was absolute silence in the court room. The whole court seemed to feel ill at ease. The Judge and Attorney-General both seemed to be impressed by the simple, unvarnished, yet straightforward pleas of the accused, who, while frankly acknowledging not only that they had worked on Sunday, but that such was their habit, asserted their God-given right to work six days after having observed the seventh day according to the letter of the fourth commandment. The judgment of the Court is awaited with interest.

C. P. B.

Springville, Tenn., June 1.

What Attitude Ought the Church to Take Toward Politics?

[Paper lately read by the Rev. J. H. Bruson, before the Methodist ministers' Monday meeting, of La Crosse, Wis.]

I PRESENT this line of thought because I believe that there is a special danger at this day that men will lose faith in the gospel as the means of saving the world, at least from certain glaring sins, and look to politics to accomplish the results. The danger is that politics will be promoted to the first place, and the gospel, if used at

all, retired to a subordinate place. There can be no doubt that there is a tendency in these days to substitute political machinery and lodges and societies, open and secret, for the services of the church.

Civil and religious forces are not organically related in the United States. Each pursues an independent course in its own sphere. The religious life having to do with spiritual things, has free course in all that pertains to the kingdom of heaven. The civil power, having to do with social affairs, controls in all the functions that belong to civil government.

The Jamestown type of Colonies was planted largely under the conviction that the highest functions of the English Government was to propagate the gospel. Matters went along in this way for a period, but after a while the time came for federation for purpose of protection from the warlike spirit of the Indians, the encroachment of the mother country, and for commercial advantages. Only one thing appeared possible in this federation, and that was to give the social compact solidarity on a secular basis; and preserve simply the equilibrium of the religious forces without formal action concerning them.

It will be remembered also, that the Revolution accomplished for the Colonies more than independence: it gave freedom from the established forms of Europe, both political and religious. It produced a strong opposition to English methods and ways. In November after the Declaration in July, Maryland made a declaration of rights, with a purpose to dissolve all civil relation with the church. [Virginia made her Declaration of Rights, with a like purpose, June 12, 1776.—EDITOR SENTINEL] In December a dissolution was affected in Virginia. The same thing occurred soon after in the Carolinas. Forty years afterward the Congregational State Church of Connecticut was abolished. And, lastly, Massachusetts cut away the last excrescence of State support of religion. In a journey of eight-hundred centuries, the course of religious history has made a complete circle, and for the first time since the departure, we are in the apostolic succession.

After more than a hundred years of successful history in our country, in which man's civil life has had its largest expression, and his religious life its most glorious development, we are coming on the border days which may lead to perplexing complications. There are evidences of confusion in the multitude of issues before us. The relations between the religious life and the civil life are becoming so intricate and so vital that we fail to distinguish between the purely political, and purely moral and spiritual phases of the same questions as they appear. At present there seems to be much clashing and strife.

In a prosperous civilization, one of the first evidences of weakness in the social bond is the advocacy of short and easy methods for the cure of social evils. It is seen first in a slow giving away of that strength of character which has kept the moral truth in the foreground and brought a people to prosperity.

In the youth time of a nation's life there is such a necessity that things become so; there is the mastery of the physical forces, sparse populations, lack of means of luxury and of opportunity of ease, all of which conditions are builders of the sterner elements of character. With a

new people, after the governmental forms have gone beyond the period of experiment, after they have become successful in material concerns, it is usual to find the second and third generations living under the fascinating temptation that the wrinkles and frowns have all been taken out of the face of Providence, and that moral issues can be faced and settled in some other way than the old prosy way of resistance of sin, man by man, and a daily life of self-denial, man by man.

Among social agencies there is a success which is quickly gained, but it is not worth what it costs. Superficial means only reach superficial ends. Immediate outside results regardless of consequences, are not satisfactory. Deliverance from social ills through the machinery of the law rather than by growth of character, is an impatient haste.

Civil and statutory regulation may fence about and lessen in some measure the opportunities and temptations, but the shutting off of these do not make men. We must have men before we can have desirable outside conditions. Men are not made by outside statutes, but by such social forces as in themselves build character. Is there any record of a lecherous man having been made chaste and virtuous by statute laws forbidding adultery and kindred sins? Human society may be protected by such laws, and thereby a good accomplished; but no one expects to banish licentiousness in this way. This vice can be cured only by something that shall purify the very springs of life.

Here is a strange fact which each one may interpret to his own liking. The sins that human legislation has most concerned itself with, are the sins that have been the least thoroughly eradicated in the lives of professed Christians. We have stringent laws touching licentiousness, Sabbath-breaking, dishonesty, and drunkenness; and now can we find four other sins, which the laws of the State have not tried to restrict, that have become so prevalent, and that have given the Church so much trouble? It looks on the surface of things as though human legislation was not helping Christianity very much in saving the world from these sins.

Reform by statutory enactments has three fatal weaknesses which must not be overlooked.

1. It attacks one sin at a time. But the divine method seems to be to save man from all his sins.

2. The statutory method of reforming men is faulty in that it makes use of compulsion rather than persuasion. Can human governments compel men to be virtuous when God does not think it wise to do so? We have the highest authority for saying that "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." It looks very much as though the violent methods sometimes employed by Christians in these days were awakening the wrath of the ungodly and uniting them in a solid phalanx against all moral reform. The Church has invoked political power, and the ballots of the unregenerate have, in many instances, buried politico-moral measures out of sight.

3. Moral reform by political legislation is only a continuation of the multiplied efforts that have been made in all ages to save men from sin by human instrumentalities; but that such efforts, while praiseworthy, will come short of the mark, the history of the past compels us to believe. All heathen religions have vainly tried to

save men from sin by human appliances; and modern reform agencies that ignore the gospel are doomed to like failure. The moral sentiment of irreligious people is extremely superficial and unreliable. They may be induced to vote for no-license one year, but if it be found that their taxes are increased a few cents thereby, they will wipe out all these reform measures at the polls the next year. They may be persuaded to keep the Sabbath for appearance's sake, but grain exposed to a coming thunder shower will be sufficient to convert them into Sabbath-breakers. But when a man is thoroughly saved from his sins by divine power, the question of moral reform for him is very easily settled. When there is a sweeping revival of religion in town, the sale of liquor, Sabbath-breaking, profanity, and other evils are correspondingly reduced.

From these facts I am led to believe that our work as Christians is in the religious, and not in the political, fields. The gospel deals with the individual.

Where Will It End?

THE following is clipped from the *Iowa Sunday-School Teacher*, for May. It certainly shows that the mania for securing governmental action in closing the World's Fair on Sunday is not alone confined to our own Union, but that it has crossed the line and invaded the domain of the Queen.

A deputation from the Ontario Provincial Sabbath School Association, consisting of officers of the Association and other influential clergymen and laymen, waited upon the Government of the Domain of Canada, at Ottawa, to urge that the appropriation for the Canadian exhibit at the World's Columbian Exposition to be held in Chicago, Ill. 1893, be conditioned that the gates be closed on the Lord's day, or at least the Canadian department be closed; and after a respectful hearing the Premier, Hon. Mr. Abbot, replied that the wishes of the Association would be carried out. Surely out of respect to Christianity, and precedents at Philadelphia, Paris, London, and Vienna, as well as the acknowledgment of the God of nations, in whom the United States of America profess to trust, see American coins, "In God We Trust;"—the Directors of this Exposition will close the gates on the Lord's day, and thus objectively teach the people of the assembled nations to remember the Sabbath and keep it holy.

The question is pertinent and natural, Where will this craze for governmental recognition of religious institutions end?

Principles of American Government— Personal Rights Guaranteed.

THE foundation upon which this Government is built, and which has made it the best Government on the earth, is civil and religious liberty. This is, in fact the only true foundation for civil government. Where individual rights are respected and guarded, we see prosperity; but the reverse of this where these are trampled under foot, by any class who may happen to be in power.

In this country as in no other, all, whether Jew or Gentile, Christian or infidel, stand before the law upon a level, while in matters of conscience, the most perfect freedom is guaranteed to all, by the fundamental law. This is perfectly just; for a law to be just must treat all alike, and civil governments must not recognize any one religion, but give freedom and protection to all alike; and taking the care that no one class of religionists shall go beyond and infringe upon the rights of another class of religionists.

Civil government can not decide as to which is the true religion; for should it make the attempt, it would, as in the days of Constantine, be a human decision—a wrong decision might be made. But to avoid the conclusion of a possible error, the next logical step would be to decide that the power that made the decision was infallible. This is just what Rome did. Governments can not decide in matters of religion; for religion is purely a matter of the heart and conscience of the individual. Each must be left perfectly free to decide in this important matter as between his own soul and his Maker. If at any time governments invade these sacred rights, the realm of conscience in any one person, true liberty is gone; for if it may invade in the one person where is the limit? There is none. It is a grand thought that these rights are guaranteed by our national Constitution. Article VI., last clause, reads:—

No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

George Washington when asked if he thought religious rights were sufficiently guarded by the Constitution—made answer that if he thought they were not, no man would be more willing that it should be changed than himself.

It is a remarkable fact that the very first Congress that ever met under the Constitution adopted the following as the First Amendment:—

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Thus we see it was the studied intention of the founders of this Government, in the formation of that document, that the utmost freedom of conscience should be forever enjoyed by all the subjects of this Republic. However, to have forever secured this most desirable of all objects, one more amendment should have been adopted at that very time, prohibiting all and every State from engaging in this very work. It is a most humiliating thought with all our boasted claims of liberty, that almost every State in the Union has some law more or less stringent in matters of religion, partaking of the spirit of the Dark Ages, which, in the hands of bigotry and superstition, can be, in fact are being, made the cause of much suffering to quiet, inoffensive citizens. These laws are just so much a union of Church and State in this country. They are a blot upon our national record, and should be repealed at once.—*H. F. P., in Labor's Tribune.*

Church and State in Canada.

To the student of history and of politics the Province of Quebec, in the Dominion of Canada, furnishes a modern object lesson in the exhibition of the power of an established dominant Church to control the State, to develop its ecclesiastical polity, and to carry out its temporal and spiritual designs unchecked, as well as to maintain and perpetuate itself by influencing and controlling the political action of its adherents. No modern European or American State furnishes such an example of complete spiritual unity, which is the synonym of national unity.

By the census of 1881, the population of the Province was 1,359,027; of this number the Romish Church claimed 1,170,000, and thus outnumbered all other sects nearly a million. Of the entire population

of the Dominion, 4,324,810, nearly two millions were members of the Roman communion. With such a preponderance of numbers it is master of the politico-religious situation in Quebec, and is able by its powerful organization and influence to direct and control legislation in its behalf in the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa, as well as in some, if not all, of the neighboring provinces. The extent of this power is best indicated by what it claims to have accomplished in legislation, as an important factor in the conservative party since the federation.

Among the measures in which it takes a particular pride are: (a) The law establishing religious orders, under which the bounty of the State is bestowed upon religious refugees from persecutions in France and other countries. (b) The law authorizing the organization of canonical parishes as civil corporations having a legal existence: a law which emphasizes the close relation of Church and State. (c) The law exempting ecclesiastical and religious educational property from taxation, provincial or municipal. Such property in the Province of Quebec is supposed to be worth a hundred million dollars. (d) The law by which the education of all classes is put under the immediate control of a body ruled by the bishops of the Roman Church, and which was obtained by their influence.

This, with the law establishing in Canada foreign religious orders, marks a long step backward towards the days of religious propagandism, whose shackles even Italy long since cast off, declining longer to yield the control of its public schools to any religious body. In complete harmony with this legislation is the Act of the Province, passed in 1888, giving to the Jesuits \$400,000 as compensation for their estates confiscated by the British Government; of which sum \$60,000 was assigned to Protestant educational purposes to satisfy the opposition.

This act of the province has been described by Goldwin Smith as "a rampant assertion of Roman Catholic ascendancy, by the endowment, out of a public fund, of an order formed especially for the subversion of Protestantism, and at the same time a recognition of the Pope as the ecclesiastical sovereign of Quebec."

Another instance of this ascendancy is the granting of a special lottery charter by the Dominion Parliament to the Province of Quebec for church or educational or charitable purposes; such associations being classed as criminal under the general law of the Dominion. But these are but modern additions to a power almost imperial. With the consent of Great Britain, Canada was allowed to retain, with her language and law (the Code Napoleon), the *dime ecclesiastique* and the *dime seigneuriale*; the former still survives in full vigor, the latter having been extinguished in 1854.

Among the most significant victories of the Church, and, to an American, one of the most intolerant of its hierarchical measures, is the division of the public school fund. The effect of this division of the school fund instead of softening racial prejudices and increasing social harmony, has been to increase intolerance and intensify social feeling, and to create them where they had no previous existence. The division of the school fund is the entering wedge of social disintegration.

Ultramontanism is in the ascendant.

The hostility and preponderance of the Romanists and their intolerance of Protestants are rapidly driving out all opposing elements.

The New England of the Puritans is rapidly becoming the New England of the Romanists. The French Canadians swarm in our northern manufacturing villages, and it is their hope and belief, carefully fostered by their teachers, that at a time not far distant, the Roman Church will not only dominate New England, but the whole of Canada eastward of the Ottawa River.

The Government of Quebec is as clearly a hierarchy as was that of Rome during the temporal power of the Pope, or as the Government of Massachusetts Bay two and a half centuries ago.—*George R. Stetson, in Andover Review, May.*

Georgia W. C. T. U. Convention.

THE Georgia State Convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has just closed a five days' session at Mill-edgeville, Georgia. It is said that this, the tenth annual convention, "was the most interesting and enthusiastic ever held." However this may be, from the resolutions which were framed and adopted during the session, it is certain that the Georgia Woman's Christian Temperance Union is undertaking almost everything but that for which the society was organized.

This is one of the resolutions which the society adopted at its meeting May 24.:

Resolved, That we heartily endorse the action of Southern women in voting to close the doors of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday, and that our superintendent of petitions memorialize the Directors of the Columbian Exposition on this subject, and demand the closing in the name of our Christian civilization.

It will be noticed that this resolution authorizes their superintendent of petitions to "demand" Sunday closing in their memorial. Will it then be a petition?

Their next resolution read:—

Resolved, That the department of Sabbath observance be emphasized by each local union, and that we ourselves enforce it by example.

Thus the temperance (?) work goes on in Georgia.

W. C. DALBEY.

Lodi, Ga.

A Broad Application.

THE law under which the Law and Order League of Pittsburg is operating, is a special act passed in 1855 for Allegheny County. The penalty for the violation of the law of 1794 is a fine of four dollars. That was found insufficient to stop the running of a certain omnibus line. There was also trouble with some liquor dealers, and under cover of the sentiment aroused by this feature a demand was made on the Legislature in 1855 for a more stringent law. The rest of the State, however, protested against any such move, so the Legislature finally compromised the matter by passing a special enactment for Allegheny County. This act, after increasing the penalties for Sunday liquor selling, provides that—

any person violating the provisions of the first section of said act for the suppression of vice and immorality, and of unlawful gaming, and to restrain disorderly sports and dissipation, approved April 23, 1794, within the county of Allegheny, being summarily convicted thereof before any mayor,

burgess, justice of the peace or alderman, shall forfeit and pay the sum of twenty-five dollars, with costs, and in default of payment, or of goods to levy upon to satisfy the same, shall be committed to the county prison for not less than ten nor more than thirty days.

Of this section the Pittsburg *Dispatch* remarks that—

it would puzzle a mind not having the advantage of a legal education to determine what "unlawful gaming, disorderly sports and dissipation" have to do with the completion and delivery of the news of the hour, or in what the running of a street car or omnibus, or the sale of a glass of soda water conflict with the "suppression of vice or immorality."

Nevertheless, this is the section under which all violators of the Sunday law in Pittsburg are fined twenty-five dollars, no matter if the offense has been only the sale of a single newspaper, or a glass of soda water.

Christian Whisky.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Voice*, writing from Glasgow, Ky., complains that the *Herald* of that place, whose business manager "is a Baptist preacher, in good standing with his church," and who "has regular preaching appointments on Sunday in the country;" "through the week, for a moneyed consideration, advertises the devilish product of a man who also has a good standing in one of our city churches." A portion of the advertisement complained of runs thus:—

Four years in the Revenue Service, and three years as a practical distiller, have given me superior information in regard to making good whisky. I advertise no whisky or apple brandy that I do not make; and sell nothing of the kind except that of my own make. The utmost care taken to make a pure article, and will sell my whisky on its own merits. Will tell the truth as to its age. I do not at all times keep the oldest whisky in Barren County; it would be falsifying to say I did. My whisky is not for sale on Sunday (sickness excepted).

Probably it is the assurance that the whisky is not for sale on Sunday that reconciles the Baptist elder to running the "ad." It was candidly stated some years ago in the *California Prohibitionist* that "if the saloons will only close on Sundays it is about all we can ask." Does the *Voice* correspondent ask more than that? If so he is in advance of very many of his party.

IN answering the assertion that "Sunday is the sacred day of America, and should be protected from desecration," by closing the World's Fair on that day, Mr. A. B. French, of Clyde, Ohio, says:—

The first day of the week is not the sacred day of all America. It is not so recognized by many, whose religious zeal is no less fervent than that of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It is estimated that in New York City alone there are 250,000 Jews, who own real estate to the value of \$209,000,000, and have invested in trade \$27,388,000, yet it is not their sacred day. Nor is it the sacred day of the Seventh-day Adventists and many others. Moreover, we may safely say that in defiance of all statutes, three-fourths of the citizens of the Republic do not regard the day with any particular religious sanctity. To abstain from trade and labor in compliance with a statute is no evidence they regard the day as sacred.

If the day was regarded half as highly as some people would have us suppose, there would be no trouble about the question of closing the Fair. The fact is that a minority is trying to compel the majority to show a regard for Sunday which they do not feel, in short to be hypocrites for the moral effect it would have on foreigners!

Sunday Reading Supervised.

REV. W. F. CRAFTS professes that it is not his purpose nor wish to prevent by law certain reading on Sunday, but only to prevent the Sunday work of preparing and circulating the Sunday paper; nevertheless he quotes approvingly in his book, "The Sabbath for Man," these words by a New York judge, in a decision against the legality of Sunday advertising:—

In any view of religious obligation, it would be difficult to contend that the reading of advertisements in a Sunday newspaper, or aiding a person to do so, is a work of either necessity or charity. The mind, certainly, on that day needs no such sustenance, and even as a mere matter of taste, it must be admitted that common advertisements of mere buying and selling are a very unsuitable outfit for a feast of reason. Six days, at all events, of such a diet are enough. Thought perpetually running in one channel, like matrimony in one family, dwarfs the intellect. It is rather a work of charity in such cases to withhold than to give. Abstinence, not sustenance, is what is needed. (19 Barb., 581; 24 N. Y., 353.)

If this decision does not look very strongly in the direction of State supervision of Sunday reading for the individual, we would like to know what would. Yet Mr. Crafts approves it. It is only just to state, however, that the Legislature did not, and something over a year ago made advertising in Sunday papers legal in this State.

A National Reform organ says,—

We believe the reading of such matter as the Sunday papers contain, keeping the mind in its weekday ruts of fashion and politics and business, is unhealthy for the mind as well as the soul, but if this reading was sold on Saturday we could only protest; we could not prohibit.

And why not prohibit it on one day as well as on another? Has not the State as much right to guard the morals of the people one day as it has to guard them on another day? If it is the people who are to be protected, why not protect them alike on all days? It is not however the people but the day that is to be guarded. It is the day about which the safeguards of the law are to be thrown. It is the day that is to be honored. Whether it is better or worse for the people is a minor consideration. Sunday must be exalted to a place above other days, and so acts not only harmless, but even necessary on other days are forbidden and declared to be criminal on Sunday, for no other reason than because of the supposed sacred character of the day. Sunday laws have no other object than to compel the observance of a religious institution, and would have no existence but for the religious character of the day.

THE Observer complains that—

while tens of thousands of Christian people all over the land have been protesting against the opening of the Chicago World's Fair on Sunday, the managers have thrown open the Fair grounds on that day to all who care to pay a small admission fee. This is letting the camel's head in with a vengeance. It is evident that measures more vigorous than any yet taken will be needed to induce the management of the Fair to so far conform to American customs, and the truest American public sentiment, as to close the institution on Sunday.

That is, the boycott must be invoked, simply because the people of Chicago are now permitted to go for pay where they formerly had the privilege of going free of charge—namely, to one of the parks of the city? How long will it be until the demand will be made that the people be excluded from the parks altogether?

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

At the Illinois State Prohibition Convention lately held at Springfield, Ill., a resolution was adopted declaring in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday. These Prohibitionists are looking forward to fusion with the National Reformers, the American Sabbath Unionists, and all their following, through which to hold the balance of political power and control legislation, State and national.

A DISPATCH from the Presbyterian Assembly in session at Pittsburg, says:—

The United Presbyterian General Assembly here to-night, by adopting the report of its committee on reform, characterized the exclusion of Chinese from America as unchristian, unpatriotic, and a monstrous injustice.

The President's signature to such a bill was pronounced to be an evidence that he was not a Christian. In reference to the events of the past year it said: "The most significant thing is the decision of the United States Supreme Court that we are a Christian Nation. The President has no longer a valid excuse for refusing the recognition of Christianity in his annual Thanksgiving proclamation.

This touches the key-note of the political religion of which Justice Brewer's decision is the legal expression.

AND this, from the *Mail and Express*, runs the whole gamut of "religion is politics":—

Stupid Intolerance!—The spectacle of a handful of religionists sitting at Pittsburg pronouncing Benjamin Harrison "not a Christian" because, perchance, he differs with them as to a Chinese policy, would be shocking were it not also amusing. Such incidents cast discredit on the Church universal. Probably not one in twenty of the men and women who voted on the resolution, know even the outline of this Nation's dealing with the Chinese.

The *Mail and Express* has led in the movement to secure the Celestials their rights, but we respect honest opinions, we recognize the exigencies of statecraft, and we deprecate any anticipation of the differentiation of sheep and goats, especially when so enlightened and earnest a Christian as Benjamin Harrison is side-tracked with reprobates.

This is politico-religious consistency.

THE movement for Sunday closing of the World's Fair is attracting attention in France. A Protestant clergyman in Paris is quoted as expressing the following views:—

On theological grounds, I do not think that opposition can be made to opening of exhibitions in general. Local considerations, however, may make it preferable that the Chicago Exposition be closed on Sundays. If the majority of pious citizens are scandalized by the opening of the Fair on Sunday, it certainly ought not to be opened that day. Speaking as a European, who has studied both theology and political economy, I point out that on Sunday the working classes, free from labor, can visit the Fair without loss of money. Sunday opening is not really opposed to piety.

As an expression of views this is exquisitely Parisian. It antagonizes no one, and delicately and gracefully sides with both parties, or all parties, to the controversy.

THE following "special" from Racine, Wis., is an evidence of the activity which is everywhere being infused into the "Sunday-law war" by the recent utterances of court and Congress at Washington: "The Citizens' League was victorious in its first case against the baseball players to-day. Peter Herman, catcher for the Racines, was found guilty and paid a nominal fine. Mayor Case was the first witness. The district attorney asked him if he was present at the ball game last Sunday. The Mayor refused to answer, for the reason that it might have a tendency to criminate himself. The justice said that he might answer, but he still refused, when the district attorney asked that he be committed to jail for contempt. Then Mayor Case left the court room, but was soon brought back by the sheriff and answered some questions

that would in no wise criminate him. Two detectives employed by the Citizens' League from the Illinois Detective Agency, then testified that they had been present at the game and had secured the names of the players.

The other ball-players under arrest will plead guilty and pay their fines in the morning. After the trial the detectives were insulted on the street and threatened with violence, and are now under the protection of the officers. It is also learned that the detectives visited saloons last Sunday and that several arrests will follow in a few days.

"The Sunday-observance law war is expected to be more exciting than last summer, as out-door sports and picnics will be strictly prohibited within the city limits on the Sabbath day."

It would seem from this Associated Press dispatch, that the Federation of Labor proposes to stand directly for the Sunday opening of the World's Fair, without reference to the principle of non-interference, which is the only sound basis of protest:—

The American Federation of Labor has come out flatly in favor of the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday. Samuel Gompers, the President of the Federation, has addressed a circular letter to all the trades unions in the United States, urging them to use whatever influence they each may have to secure the opening of the Fair on Sunday. He claims that this is the only day on which a large majority of workingmen can visit the great Exposition.

However, it does not follow that, because Mr. Gompers' circular is so represented, it does ignore the real question at issue. Indeed, it is very certain that Mr. Gompers would not advocate the antithesis of Sunday-closing legislation and ask for Sunday-opening legislation.

THE United States has by no means a monopoly of the discussion of the Sunday question, as is shown by the following cable to the New York *Sun*. "The members of the corporation of London had a heated discussion to-day, lasting three hours, over the question of opening the Guildhall Art Gallery on Sundays. Numerous petitions for such action has been received from trade unions, Sunday societies, and various other sources, while protests against the proposed change have come from other quarters in great numbers. At to-day's meeting, when a vote was reached, the petitions for Sunday opening were rejected, but by a majority so narrow as to furnish a surprising proof of the growth of liberal ideas, for the corporation is the embodiment of political and religious bigotry. During the debate those who favored Sunday opening cited the action of the Archbishop of Canterbury in personally attending the opening on Sunday of a picture gallery in the Whitechapel district some time ago. They also pointed to the fact that the Bishop of Rochester is advocating the opening of public art galleries, museums and libraries on the Sabbath. They argued that a course of action approved by such eminent lights of religion as these could not be far wrong."

THE Seventh-day Baptists of the United States have entered the following earnest protest against legislation by Congress in reference to Sunday at the World's Fair. The memorial has been introduced in both Senate and House, and copies sent to each senator and congressman.

A MEMORIAL AGAINST NATIONAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

To the Honorable, The Senate of the United States: In view of the fact that your honorable body is urged to forbid the opening of the Columbian Exposition on Sundays by national law; and because such legislation is sought in order to protect Sunday as a religious institution, under the deceptive plea of enforcing only the "Civil Sabbath"; therefore the undersigned, officers of the *American Sabbath Tract Society*, which represents thousands of citizens who are Seventh-day Baptists, earnestly petition and respectfully urge, that your honorable body do not thus enter upon the work of legislat-

ing concerning religious questions. Your petitioners believe that such a law would be contrary to the principles of religious freedom, and the entire separation of Church and State, upon which the national Government of the United States is based.

In support of this we beg leave to recall attention to the report upon a similar question made to the second session of the Twentieth Congress, and communicated to the Senate by Hon. Richard M. Johnson on the nineteenth of January, 1829, in which report it was truthfully said:

"If the principle is once established, that religion or religious observances shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum."

In the corresponding report, also by Mr. Johnson, made to the House of Representatives, at the first session of the Twenty-first Congress, March fourth and fifth, 1830, it was further said:

"If Congress shall by authority of law sanction the measure recommended, it would constitute a legislative decision of a religious controversy, in which even Christians are at issue."

Your petitioners submit that the correct position taken at that time, with reference to the mail service, demands even fuller recognition at this time, and in the matter of the Columbian Exposition.

We urge our prayer in the name of religious liberty, and the non-interference of Congress, directly or indirectly, in religious matters.

In behalf of the Seventh-day Baptists of the United States, and of all lovers of religious liberty, We have the honor to remain, your obedient servants.

ARTHUR L. TITSWORTH,
Rec. Sec'y.

CHARLES POTTER,
President.

THE Pittsburg *Dispatch* publishes, under the display head, "Sunday Soda Water Sold to Ten Thousand Persons in a Market Street Drug Store," this article, which is very suggestive of the intensity which this controversy is already attaining, even from a point of view measurably outside of its religious aspect:—

"Ten thousand people slaked their Sunday thirst at a Market Street drug store yesterday, and Law and Order Agent McClure was powerless to punish them or the plucky dealer. The proprietor, William T. Espy, did not shut off the soda-water fountain, nor the cigar cases, at midnight on Saturday, as has been the custom, and never a moment from that time until Sunday midnight was the clerk behind the counter idle.

"During the early Sunday hours there was a continual coming and going of the thirsty ones, and after nine o'clock, when the people began to turn out to the churches and elsewhere, it became necessary to increase the force of clerks to five men, including the cashier, Mr. Espy himself. From that time until after midnight the store was continually crowded. Several barrels of soda water, and many boxes of cigars were sold, besides the regular sale of drugs permitted by the Blue Laws. People of all classes of society were among the thirsty patrons, and as he had announced through the newspapers and by large placards on the store windows that he was selling, people went squares out of their way to show by their presence the support they were willing to give. Business and professional men of all branches seemed happy to avail themselves of the opportunity to slake their thirst on Sunday, and at least a dozen preachers were among the crowd that thronged the store during the day. At times the crowd was so great that the capacity of the store was taxed to hold them, and well-known business men of high standing were observed waiting for from ten to fifteen minutes to be served.

"In order to prevent a vexatious suit by the highly moral young men who go around for the Law and Order Society, a friend of Mr. Espy's went before a down-town alderman at midnight and entered a suit against him for violating the Blue Laws by selling soda water, cigars and other prohibited articles on Sunday. The suit was entered and notice served inside of five minutes after the clock had turned the hour of midnight. By this the Law and Order Society is cut off from any of the fines and costs they so dearly love to rake in, as only one suit can be entered for the violations of one day.

"Mr. Espy last night said: 'I do not defy the Law and Order Society. I appreciate the necessity of giving the people some refreshment on Sunday. The fact that ten thousand people patronized my place to-day shows that such a place is a necessity, and I have been assured by hundreds of the best men in the city to-day of their entire support. So long as my receipts are as large as they were to-day I will continue to sell and pay my fine regularly, and if any pressure is brought against me I have money enough to take the case to the Supreme Court.'"



NEW YORK, JUNE 9, 1892.

NOTE.—Any one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

OF the five Seventh-day Adventists indicted and tried in Henry County, Tenn., for working on Sunday, one was acquitted before the jury left their seats, the Judge having so recommended. The other four were found guilty, and after one week's consideration of their cases, Judge Swigart has affixed the nominal fine of one dollar and costs. This is, under the circumstances, virtually, an arraignment of the law as unworthy to remain on the statute books.

THE *Congressional Record* now regularly contains, in the column of petitions and memorials, a record of the presentation of memorials from the Seventh-day Baptists urging the non-interference of Congress in religious matters. The full text of the memorial is reprinted elsewhere. The language of the petition is dignified and earnest; while the references to the report of Hon. Richard M. Johnson on the question of the Sunday mail service, to the Twentieth, and Twenty-first, Congress, should draw the members of the Fifty-second Congress to a consideration of the merits of the matter and the principles which must here either be upheld or ignored.

THE article on another page of this paper, entitled, "Church and State in Canada," contains a lesson for those who think that an essential element in a union of Church and State is formal action making some particular sect the State Church. This is not true in Quebec, yet in the language of Mr. Stetson, "The Government of Quebec is as clearly a hierarchy as was that of Rome during the temporal power of the Pope, or as the Government of Massachusetts Bay two and a half centuries ago." The reason of this is that while there has been no formal action making Romanism the State religion, it so completely dominates the Government as to amount to the same thing.

IN the course of the trial of the Adventists, in Henry County, Tenn., referred to on another page, the Attorney-General after vainly trying to get a witness to say that he had seen the defendant at work on Sunday, asked rather impatiently, "Well, what does he do on Sunday? does he go to church?" The question was sig-

nificant. If the defendant was not in the habit of going to church on Sunday the presumption would be that he worked. How long will it be before habitual absence from church on Sunday will be taken as *prima facie* evidence of Sunday labor?

IN Adventist cases, in Henry County, Tenn., both the Judge and the Attorney-General insisted that it was not a question of religious belief and practice but of obedience to a civil law; yet the Attorney-General treated it as a matter of religious belief by asking witnesses as to their church relations, the practice of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and by seeking to make it appear that one of the defendants did work on Sunday, because he did not go to church on that day. A queer institution is the Sunday truly!

"THE time has come," says the *Mail and Express*, "to call a halt in the use of public money for purely sectarian purposes." Why not say that the time has come to call a halt in the use of public money for religious purposes and to confine the operations of civil government, both State and national, to its legitimate sphere? Simply because that is not what the proposed Sixteenth Amendment means, nor is it what its friends wish it to mean. It is only a skillfully arranged bait to catch unwary secularists.

REV. MR. MCGILL, of Allegheny, said in the Pittsburg Sunday Convention, "Are we going too far in this matter? We are asking only obedience to the law. Is that going too far? If the law is bad, let it be enforced as the best way of repealing it." The same argument might have been made with equal force two hundred years ago in Massachusetts in justification of the witchcraft craze. They only enforced the law; and as the law was bad, the outrages committed under color of it did finally arouse the people to a sense of its wickedness, but too late to benefit the luckless victims of the fatal delusion. The fury of the bigots had spent itself, but the victims of their hate were dead. The best thing to do with a bad law is to repeal it; the next best thing is to allow it to fall into "innocuous desuetude." The worst possible use that can be made of a bad law is to enforce it, and thus make it a precedent for worse laws.

THE *Examiner*, a Baptist paper of this city says:—

The tendency to crowd all manner of public meetings and church work into the hours of Sunday is of recent origin, and already threatens the day of rest quite as seriously as the desecrations of the irreligious. We are not sure that the Sabbath is not in greater danger from its friends than from its foes.

Upon this, the *Sabbath Recorder*, Seventh-day Baptist, remarks:—

Go tell it to Colonel Shepard, Mr. Crafts & Co., and then circulate a petition asking Congress to pass a law that no church shall be allowed to hold more than six services upon any "American Sabbath day," or "civil rest day," popularly called Sunday! This would be, of course, purely "in the interest of the laboring classes."

And why not? If the State may properly guard Sunday against the encroachments of labor, why not against the encroachments of too numerous church services? If it is a "civil rest day," surely the State has the right to protect and regulate it to any extent deemed necessary for the promotion of rest. If not, why not?

BUT in practice Sunday is not the kind of a "civil rest day" to be regulated by Congress in opposition to the churches. It is "civil" only in the sense of being enforced by civil law. In every other way it is religious, and nothing would be tolerated that should in any way interfere with its use for religious purposes. Indeed, the demand for the civil Sabbath is simply and only to secure to the churches a monopoly of the day. The "civil Sabbath" is simply "a good enough Morgan" till the required legislation is secured.

IN a recent speech in Battle Creek, Mich., in the interests of the American Sabbath Union, so-called, Rev. F. W. Ware said:—

There ought to be a great convention held here under the auspices of the local organization, and the largest hall you have should be filled, when several men will come right into Battle Creek, say once a year, and stand right up in the interests of our great commonwealth and her material interests, social and moral interests, and plead and argue with the people that this day [Sunday] shall be maintained as a civil rest day, as a day of religious opportunity.

The italics are ours for the purpose of calling particular attention to this official definition of a civil rest day. It is a day of religious opportunity. Exactly; that is just what we have been saying for years, namely, that the Sunday preachers wanted a monopoly of Sunday for religious purposes; and that the only civil feature about the whole business was that they seek to use the civil law to enforce the observance of a religious institution. They have all along denied this, but now that one of the secretaries of the American Sabbath Union has said the same thing they will of course all admit it, and apologize for ever having denied it.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL,

A WEEKLY PAPER

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

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

In clubs of less than 100 copies, per year, each, - - 90c.

In clubs of 100 or more copies, per year, each, - - 75c.

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,

43 Bond Street, New York City.