



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

VOLUME 9.

NEW YORK, MARCH 15, 1894.

NUMBER 11.

American Sentinel.

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

EDITOR, - - - - - ALONZO T. JONES.
 ASSOCIATE EDITORS, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
 WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

It is perhaps expected by the readers of the **AMERICAN SENTINEL** that, in discussing opposition to the papacy in the United States, we should say something in regard to the A. P. A.

THIS we are not unwilling to do, both on our own part, and because the A. P. A. has attracted a good deal of attention for some time, and is now being condemned and denounced without measure by prominent politicians, by prominent newspapers, and by the Catholic Church.

To be condemned by the papacy is in itself an evidence of merit. And as the A. P. A. is unqualifiedly condemned and denounced by the papacy and her "Protestant" apologists in the United States, this in itself is a strong suggestion that there is at the very least *something* about the A. P. A. that is commendable.

WHAT, then, is the A. P. A.? and what is it for? Let it be understood, however, that we are not qualified to speak officially, nor in any other way, as a representative of the A. P. A., nor as in any way connected with it, but *only as an observer*. As an observer though, as one who has studied this subject for a longer time than the A. P. A. has been in existence, if we mistake not, and as one who has studied every phase of the subject that has yet appeared, and some phases which have not yet appeared—as such an observer we may be allowed to express ourselves.

THE initials "A. P. A." signify "American Protective Association." As we understand it, the object of this association is chiefly, and in brief, to protect the American Government and people from the domination of the papacy, by opposing every kind of union of Church and State. It is therefore necessarily opposed to the encroachments of the papacy upon the

Government through any of her political scheming or aggression. That there is abundant room and great need of something of this kind being done is evident to every person who has watched, in any sort of fair-minded way, the course of public or governmental affairs for the past twenty years or any part thereof, or who will so watch affairs now. This the regular readers of the **AMERICAN SENTINEL** know full well; because all that the **SENTINEL** has ever existed for is to point out these very evils and dangers. And now there are so many of them and they multiply so fast we can hardly describe them all as they pass.

THAT such work is proper according to every principle of the Government and Constitution of the United States, is plain to every person who knows the A B C of these principles or of the history of the making of the Constitution and Government of the United States. The Government of the United States was established upon the principles of the total separation of the Government from *any* church or religion and specifically the Christian religion: and this for the express purpose of escaping any establishment of the *Catholic Church* or religion. Jefferson and Madison, and their fellow-workers for civil and religious liberty, declared that "To judge for ourselves and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own conscience, is an inalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, and *the Reformation from popery carried on*, can never be transferred to another." They said that "it is impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the *Church of Rome*." They opposed all governmental favors to "the Christian religion," because, as they said, "Distant as it may be in its present form, from *the Inquisition*, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance." Thus spoke the heroes and patriots who established on this continent the separation of religion and the State as a governmental principle, and who

made the Government of the United States with the principle declared in its Constitution. *And they did it*, as they repeatedly declared, *that the people* of the United States *might not* be led back to Rome, to popery, and to the Inquisition.

AND the maintenance of these principles to-day for the same purpose for which they were established is as proper and as honorable as was the establishment of those principles in the beginning. It is as proper and as honorable for men to-day to maintain these principles as it was for Jefferson and Madison to advocate them, and secure their establishment as the principles of the Government, when the Government was made. So far, therefore, as the *object* of the A. P. A. is concerned, it is precisely the object which the makers of the Government had in view when they prohibited any connection of the Government with any religion. In the *object* announced the A. P. A. are in the company of Jefferson, Madison, and their fellow-workers in "the times of '76." This, as to their *object*, we say. Some of their *methods* may be wrong. But even though *some* of their methods be wrong; or even though *all* their methods be wrong, that cannot prove the *object* wrong. Whatever the *methods*, the *object* is as certainly right as that the principles of the United States Government, as founded by our fathers, are right.

OF the political methods of the A. P. A. we know nothing personally. We have seen statements by Catholic papers and their partisans of what these methods are. But if we understand rightly, the methods of the A. P. A. are really known to only the members. And so, not knowing for ourselves these methods, and not being willing to take our information from the avowed enemies of the order, we are prepared to examine, with perfect impartiality, whatever those methods may be supposed to be. By the report of the case in the Toledo Court, it appears that the A. P. A.'s of that city, at least, are arming. We gave our view of this matter last week, that it is clearly wrong. It is only following the methods of the papacy, and it cannot win in opposition to the papacy. If this be true of the A. P. A.'s through-

out the country, then they are all wrong in this particular, and should change their course at once in this matter.

If it be true that the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its object by disfranchising or curtailing the political or civil rights of Catholics, that method is certainly wrong. If, however, the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its object by recognizing the political and civil rights of Catholics equally with all others, while at the same time insisting that every citizen and every candidate for office shall faithfully maintain the fundamental principles of the Government, and the plain provisions and intent of the Constitution, then this is certainly right. If the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its right object by the application of a religious test in any case, that method is wrong. If the A. P. A. proposes to accomplish its proper object by the test of the fundamental principles of the Government and the provisions of the Constitution *in every case*, then that method is *certainly right*. If the A. P. A. should apply even the test of the Constitution and the fundamental principles of the Government *only to Catholics*, this method would be wrong. If the A. P. A. applies this proper test to professed Protestants and all others alike, then this is certainly right. If the A. P. A. opposes only Catholic aggression and encroachments upon the Government, this is not enough. To be right it must oppose "Protestant" aggression and encroachment as well, and also every other that infringes to a hairbreadth the fundamental principles, or the Constitution, of the Government. If the A. P. A. opposes only Catholic interference with the public school, this is not enough. It must equally oppose "Protestant" interference with the public school. If the A. P. A. opposes only religious interference with the public school, this is not enough. To be right and to further its avowed objects the A. P. A. must oppose every shadow and every vestige of Sunday legislation, whether by Congress or State legislatures; it must oppose all Government chaplaincies whether national or State; it must oppose all assumption on the part of the President of the United States or the governor of any State of the prerogative of proclaiming religious exercises on any day; it must oppose all appropriations of public money to any churches or religious orders for any purpose whatever; it must oppose this joint resolution, which is now before Congress, to add a religious amendment to the national Constitution; it must oppose the assumption, on the part of the judiciary, whether State or national, of insinuating religious matters into their decisions and imposing them upon the people as the law—all this must the A. P. A. do if it will make good its avowed object of protecting the American Government and people from the domination of the papacy, and prevent the union of Church and State. It may be that the A. P. A. is doing all this: We sincerely hope so. It may be also that the A. P. A. is doing all this in the right way and accomplishing the good and proper object of its organization by *right methods* in all things. This also we sincerely hope it is doing; for, as the object of the A. P. A. is certainly right, we sincerely desire to see all its methods right also, so that it can win. And, indeed, we want it to be right, whether it wins or not.

HON. W. F. VILAS, United States Sen-

ator from Wisconsin, in a letter to the *Catholic Citizen* of Milwaukee, condemning and denouncing the A. P. A., says:—

Its enemies accuse the Catholic Church of aggression. When they point out an act which crosses the line of separation [of Church and State] they may call for its repulsion. But the false charge as the basis of a crusade ought to deceive no man.—Copied in *Catholic Mirror*, January 20, 1894.

It is perfectly easy to point out an act of aggression of the Catholic Church which crosses the line. In 1885, the first year of Mr. Cleveland's first administration, while Mr. Vilas himself was a member of Mr. Cleveland's cabinet, the Catholic Church established "The Catholic Bureau of Missions" in Washington, D. C., as stated by Senator Dawes in the Senate July 24, 1890, "for the express purpose of pushing [Catholic] Indian schools on the Government" for support. She succeeded and has been drawing public money ever since for her church work among the Indians, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, she received \$365,935 of public money for this purpose. And ever since Harrison's first year there have been calls "for its repulsion." President Harrison tried to repel it, but was forced to confess to the nation that he "found it impossible to do that." Did Senator Vilas vote for this appropriation for 1894, and will he vote for its renewal for 1895? or is he doing his duty, under his senatorial oath, to repel it?

BUT it is said, the A. P. A. is a secret organization. This is a queer cry to raise by anybody who knows anything of the papacy. The papacy is the most secret organization that was ever on the earth. And for people who apologize for the papacy to make against other organizations the charge of "secrecy" is entirely characteristic of the spirit of that crafty institution. Senator Vilas remarks on this point, against the A. P. A., thus:—

When a secret organization can make dangerous headway in political affairs among us, it will be time, not for your [Catholics'] special alarm, but for terror to us all.

This, in view of Jesuit Thomas Sherman's late piece of manuscript that slipped out, and in view of the general dangerous headway in political affairs of that mistress of secrecy, the papacy, is worthy of a medal for innocence. We are not apologizing for the secrecy of the A. P. A., that is an affair of its own—we are only calling attention to the precious innocence displayed in this sentence of Senator Vilas'. We may be allowed to remark, however, that neither the A. P. A. nor any other organization nor person, can cope with the papacy by secret methods. The papacy being perfect mistress of every method and element of secrecy, there can be no plan of secrecy devised in opposition to her, that can win. She can undermine them all. The Scripture declares that "craft shall prosper" in her hand, and every one is at a disadvantage who attempts to oppose her by crafty or secret methods.

A. T. J.

Spread of Catholicism.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM is spreading rapidly in the three Scandinavian kingdoms, which have been regarded ever since the days of King Gustav of Sweden, as the stronghold of Protestantism. So great is the number of proselytes that the Vatican has just placed Denmark, Sweden and Norway under the pastoral care of three

bishops. As usual, a feature of the work of propagation is the establishment of parochial schools, where the younger generation of Scandinavians are being educated in accordance with the doctrines of the Catholic Church.—*New York Tribune*.

The Limits of Civil Jurisdiction.

IN an article in these columns last week it was shown that the conflict between Christianity and the Roman Empire was one involving the rights of conscience. Christianity taught that the fear of God and the keeping of his commandments was the whole duty of man; Rome taught that to be the obedient servant of the State was the whole duty of man. This was the irrepressible conflict. Yet in all this Christianity did not deny to Cæsar a place; it did not propose to undo the State. It only taught the State its proper place; and proposed to have the State take that place and keep it. Christianity did not dispute the right of the Roman State to be; it only denied the right of that State *to be in the place of God*. In the very words in which he separated between that which is Cæsar's and that which is God's, Christ recognized the rightfulness of Cæsar to be; and that there were things that rightfully belong to Cæsar, and which were to be rendered to him by Christians. He said, "Render therefore to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." In these words he certainly recognized that Cæsar had jurisdiction in certain things, and that within that jurisdiction he was to be respected. As Cæsar represented the State, in this scripture the phrase represents the State, whether it be the State of Rome or any other State on earth. This is simply the statement of the right of civil government to be; that there are certain things over which civil government has jurisdiction; and that in these things the authority of civil government is to be respected.

This jurisdiction is more clearly defined in Paul's letter to the Romans, chap. 13: 1-10. There it is commanded, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." In this is asserted the right of the higher powers—that is, the right of the State—to exercise authority, and that Christians must be subject to that authority. Further it is given as a reason for this, that "there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." This not only asserts the right of the State to be and to exercise authority, but it also asserts the truth that the State is an ordinance of God, and the power which it exercises is ordained of God. Yet in this very assertion Christianity was held to be antagonistic to Rome, because it put the God of the Christians above the Roman State, and made the State to be only an ordinance of the God of the Christians. For the Roman empire, or for any of the Roman emperors, to have recognized the truth of this statement would have been at once to revolutionize the whole system of civil and religious economy of the Romans, and to deny at once the value of the accumulated wisdom of all the generations of the Roman ages. Yet that was the only proper alternative of the Roman State, and that is what ought to have been done.

Civil government being thus declared to be of God, and its authority ordained of God, the instruction proceeds: "Whoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they

that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. . . . Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." Governments being of God, and their authority being ordained of God, Christians in respecting God will necessarily respect in its place, the exercise of the authority ordained by him; *but this authority, according to the words of Christ, is to be exercised only in those things which are Caesar's and not in things which pertain to God.* Accordingly, the letter to the Romans proceeds, "For this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." This connects Paul's argument directly with that of Christ above referred to, and shows that this is but a comment on that statement, and an extension of the argument therein contained.

The scripture proceeds: "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Let it be borne in mind that the apostle is here writing to Christians concerning the respect and duty which they are to render to the powers that be, that is, to the State in fact. He knew full well, and so did those to whom he wrote, that there are other commandments in the very law of which a part is here quoted. But he and they likewise knew that these other commandments do not in any way relate to any man's duty or respect to the powers that be. Those other commandments of the law which is here partly quoted, relate to God and to man's duty to him. One of them is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" another, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," etc.; another, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" and another, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," etc.: and these are briefly comprehended in that saying, namely, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." According to the words of Christ, all these obligations, pertaining solely to God, are to be rendered to him only, and with man in this realm, Caesar can never of right have anything to do in any way whatever.

As, therefore, the instruction in Romans 13:1-10 is given to Christians concerning their duty and respect to the powers that be; and as this instruction is confined absolutely to man's relationship to his fellow-men, it is evident that when Christians have paid their taxes, and have shown proper respect to their fellow-men, then their obligation, their duty, and their respect, to the powers that be, have been fully discharged, and those powers never can rightly have any further jurisdiction over their conduct. This is not to say that the State has jurisdiction of the last six commandments as such. It is only to say that the jurisdiction of the State is confined solely to man's conduct toward

man, and never can touch his relationship to God, even under the second table of the law.

This doctrine asserts the right of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, as he pleases, and when he pleases. Just this, however, was the subject of the whole controversy between Christianity and the Roman empire. There was never any honest charge made that the Christians did violence to any man, or refused to pay tribute. Therefore, as a matter of fact the whole controversy between Christianity and the Roman empire was upon the simple question of the rights of conscience,—the question whether it is the *right* of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, or whether it is his *duty* to worship according to the dictates of the State.

No Practical Difference.

IN the account of the informal hearing on the so-called Christian amendment to the national Constitution, the *Christian Reformer* says:—

A free and easy and somewhat general conversation on certain aspects of the resolution occupied the time while waiting for one of the members of the committee, and prepared the way for a more formal presentation of the argument. The chief subject of this conversation was the difference between the Roman Catholic idea of the ultimate standard of right and wrong for a nation, and the idea of Protestant denominations. It was brought out by different speakers that Romanism makes the pope the final authoritative interpreter of moral law for nations as well as for individuals. Nations must accept moral law as interpreted by the infallible pope as final. Protestants hold that the nation must interpret moral law in its own sphere of action for itself, taking help from advice and counsel from churches or other bodies or individuals that may address it by petitions or memorials or public meetings.

None are so blind as those who will not see. This seems to be the case of Dr. McAllister. It ought not to require any great amount of discernment to see that Rome is just as likely to advise as that Dr. McAllister will do so; and as Rome has in this country a much larger following than has the doctor, or any other "Protestant," and as that following is in shape to be wielded politically much more effectively than is even the small sect represented by Dr. McAllister, Rome has all the advantage. And she will use it too.

But as between the two is not the Roman Catholic idea the better one? If the moral law must be interpreted for the nation, surely the Church must do it for God has never committed instruction in morals to any other organization on earth. The true Protestant idea is the right of private judgment. This the McAllister idea denies as surely as does the Roman Catholic idea. Moreover, the National Reform idea makes moral questions a football for contending parties. That which is moral to-day under a Democratic administration might be immoral to-morrow under Republican rule, and *vice versa*. The fact is that governments as such have nothing to do with the divine law as such. Each individual not only in the government but in the nation is individually responsible to God and under the jurisdiction of the divine law; and just in proportion as this responsibility is recognized and this obligation respected will men be honest and administer the affairs of government honestly. But when the government as such interprets the divine law it interprets it not only for the individuals, who as the government make that interpretation, but for all others in the nation

as well, and the power of the government is exercised to force upon the people that interpretation, which at best is not divine law, but only that which some man or set of men think is in the divine law.

An illustration of this is furnished by the Sunday laws of our States. The divine law says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Most of the States have interpreted this law to mean Sunday, and the prohibition against work they have interpreted to mean except works of necessity and charity, etc., including often the running of railroad trains, the operating of ferries, the selling of meat, etc. Would it not be much better to leave the whole matter of interpreting not only this divine law of the Sabbath, but of every other divine law, to the individual? and the government give its undivided attention to defining and protecting inherent natural rights? In short would it not be better for government to confine itself to the sphere described in the Declaration of Independence, namely: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The interpreting of moral law was not, in the opinion of the founders of our Government, any part of the duty of civil government; and in this opinion they were clearly right. The right of private judgment may be invaded by the National Reform régime, as it has been already, but that right being God-given cannot cease to be, and some men will continue to exercise it even if it costs them life itself.

"Nothing," says Dr. McAllister, "could so effectually guard against all uniting of Church and State and all dictatorial interference of ecclesiastical powers with the conduct of national life than this principle which it is proposed to acknowledge here. Let the nation itself recognize its own obligations in its proper sphere of law and rights, as distinct from that of the Church, to take the law of God as the rule of its conduct, and then let it interpret and apply that law for itself, and there will be embodied in our fundamental law the most effectual barrier possible against all intermingling and confounding of the relations and functions and duties of Church and State."

That is to say, let the State voluntarily give its power into the hands of the Church, or of a combination of churches, and accept as its rule of action the moral law as interpreted by them, and there can be no possible conflict! Certainly not. There is never any conflict between the obedient slave and his master. The doctor proposes to prevent "all intermingling and confounding of the relations and functions and duties of Church and State," by making it perfectly clear that it is the function and duty of the State to be the obedient slave of the Church. A fine scheme truly!

C. P. B.

AN Irish gentleman, by way of complimenting the king, said that "The only difference he knew between the pope and his majesty was, that the first was infallible and the second could do no wrong."—*Christian at Work.*

Hearing Before the House Judiciary Committee.

TUESDAY, March 6, 1894, there was held by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives in Congress, a hearing of the promoters of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States establishing "the Christian religion." The resolution to amend the Constitution runs as follows:—

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, "acknowledging the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations."

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amended form of the preamble of the Constitution of the United States be proposed for ratification by conventions in the several States, which, when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the States, shall be valid as a part of the said Constitution, namely:

PREAMBLE.

We, the people of the United States (devoutly acknowledging the supreme authority and just government of Almighty God in all the affairs of men and nations, grateful to him for our civil and religious liberty; and encouraged by the assurances of his Word to invoke his guidance, as a Christian nation, according to his appointed way, through Jesus Christ), in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America.

This hearing on March 6, was only of those who favor this thing. It was in fact a Reformed Presbyterian hearing, something like a car-load of them having come down from Pittsburg and Allegheny. With the exception of Representative Morse, who introduced the resolution into the House, every one who spoke was a Reformed Presbyterian preacher. There were eight speakers—H. H. George, T. P. Stevenson, R. J. George, W. J. Robinson, J. M. Foster, R. C. Wylie, D. B. Wilson, and D. McAllister.

The names are all familiar to the old readers of the SENTINEL. And with the announcement of the names the views set forth will be readily recalled as these are all familiar too. It was the design in the arrangement of the speakers to have each speaker present a distinct line of argument, but it was a hard task to carry out the programme. For except in the *heading*, each speech covered about the same ground as all the others in about the same way.

H. H. George opened the discussion, and called out the speakers in succession. He said that both philosophy and revelation demand this recognition of God and Christ by the Government. And to prove the obligation of the Government to do so he cited the fact of "prayers in Congress." He declared that the adoption of this amendment is the only thing that will separate Church and State: that thus the "Church will have its own sphere, and the State its own sphere." This has been the theory of the papacy ever since its original establishment by Constantine. See "Two Republics," p. 496-498 and 717-720.

T. P. Stevenson followed by first presenting "petitions," as he said, from twenty-two out of twenty-four senators of the present Iowa legislature. He said that the petition had been presented for signatures to only twenty-four of the senators of Iowa, and that all these had signed it but two. He presented a petition also

from the preachers of Newcastle, Pa., and read letters from "Rev." A. A. Miner, of Boston, Bishop Michalson, "Rev." Clarke, "President of the United Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor," and Joseph Cook; all calling for the immediate adoption of the resolution by Congress. Joseph Cook supported his call with the citation of the Supreme Court decision of Feb. 29, 1892, that "this is a Christian nation," and a bundle of "precedents." Mr. Stevenson then spoke on his own part and began by citing this same Supreme Court decision, and declaring "the nation's faith in God." He declared that the liberals in demanding the abolition of chaplaincies and all other religious exercises and religious legislation, "are seeking to conform the Government to their own opinions;" that they cite the Constitution as it reads to sustain these views; and that "in seeking to sustain our Christian institutions, we [the National Reformers] ought not to be obliged to meet the effect of the silence of the Constitution as it is employed by those who oppose us." He said that it was not the intention of the makers of the Constitution that such use should be made of it, and mentioned "Story's Comments on the Constitution." But that such was precisely the intention of the makers of the Constitution, Story to the contrary notwithstanding, the history and documents of that time plainly show. See "Two Republics," pp. 681-698.

R. J. George followed, arguing the kingship of Christ—The claims of Christ as Ruler of Nations. He declared that this is "exclusively a question of revelation," "God has commanded all to acknowledge the Son," Psalm 2; "God requires this honor to the Son as to the God—man;" and "this claim rests on the fact that Christ is Redeemer." "He won the crown of thrones, and it is right he should wear the crown of glory."

W. J. Robinson argued the "Divine claim in civil government—Civil government is supreme among men." "It is a Christian nation. Ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people believe in the Christian religion. The Supreme Court declares this a Christian nation." And "in a conflict between atheism and God's Word, atheism appealing to the Constitution, eventually the Supreme Court might decide that though it is a Christian nation, it is not a Christian Government. And, therefore, this amendment is essential to assure success as a Christian Government as well as a Christian nation."

J. M. Foster argued "The Nation a Moral Person." He went over the same ground as the others, citing the Supreme Court decision in considerable detail with precedents also, and declared that "lynch law prevails largely in the South, and although this is all forbidden by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments nothing but Christianity can stop it, and therefore there must be this Christian amendment to make the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth effective—that we may have Christianity."

R. C. Wylie proposed to argue "The Practical Effects" of the proposed amendment. But the nearest that he got to it was to go over the ground covered by the others before him and then to declare that "As the educating power of the Constitution is great, this amendment would have a good moral effect upon the people who think that religion and politics do not go together."

D. B. Wilson said that "the country

was settled by Christians," "the laws are Christian and our civilization is Christian." He asked that the amendment, as introduced, should be made to recognize in words "Christ as ruler and his revealed will as the supreme law."

D. McAllister dwelt upon "an historical scene in the United States Senate in 1863," when a resolution almost in the same words as this proposed amendment, and deploring "our national sins" was passed asking the President to appoint a day of humiliation and prayer. It is plain on the face of it that the resolution cited was written, or originated at least, by a Reformed Presbyterian, probably by Mr. McAllister himself, so that it could well be cited as a precedent for the adoption of this resolution now before the committee. He said that there were no prayers offered in the sessions of the convention that framed the Constitution, and that Franklin's motion to have prayers was defeated by adjournment, "no doubt because of a fear of the entanglements of a union of Church and State." And that it might be "the prerogative of the committee now to go back to the Pilgrim fathers."

Representative Morse closed the discussion by "re-affirming the statements of these learned and eloquent divines who have spoken." He said that "petitions and telegrams by the hundreds" were being received by members in behalf of the proposed amendment. He cited the Supreme Court decision that "this is a Christian nation," "the example of forty States," the inscription on the coins "In God We Trust," etc., but said the Constitution makes no such recognitions. "Why should we not correct the deficiency by recognizing the name that is above every name—God Almighty and Christ as our Saviour?"

The chairman of the committee said he had received hundreds of telegrams and letters without number, calling for the adoption of the resolution; other members of the committee said they were receiving many letters and telegrams also in behalf of it.

No speeches were heard in opposition to the measure. The committee adjourned stating that as there was not a quorum present they would not declare as to hearing the opposition until their regular meeting on Friday, the 9th inst. Several persons were present to speak in opposition, and it is hoped they may be heard soon. A. T. J.

The Progress of the Great Iniquity.

THE January-February issue of *Our Day* contains this in its editorial notes:—

Sabbath reform is still needed, although our Waterloo was won in the six victories achieved in the Sabbath-closing of the World's Fair. The gates were officially closed by Congress and court and commission and directory, and we should not make too much of the fact that lawlessness and technicalities nullified the closing. A more serious damper of our joy in victory is the fact that many who petitioned against Sunday opening went to the Fair on Sunday trains, and our appreciation of the act of Congress is dampened by the fact that its chief committee in January, 1894, held a meeting to discuss the tariff bill on the Sabbath day, which is more and more being used here as on the continent, for political purposes by men of both great parties in national and State capitals. One more has been added to the decisions of the State Supreme Courts sustaining the constitutionality of Sabbath laws. The Maryland Court of Appeals, being the court of last resort for the State, on January 23, 1894, decided that the Sabbath law of Maryland, which is one of the most strict, is not in contravention of the national constitutional amendment forbidding the union of Church and State. Judge Boyd, in this case, remarked that a decision would have no less weight

because "in accordance with divine law as well as human." The decision itself accords with the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court on February 29, 1892, that "this is a Christian nation." That decision and the action of Congress in closing the World's Fair on the Sabbath should logically be followed by the passage of the "Blair Sunday Rest Bill," soon to be re-introduced by ex-Senator Blair in the House of Representatives, by which all Sunday work under control of Congress, including the mails and interstate trains, is forbidden. And the Christian amendment introduced in January, 1894, by Congressman E. A. Morse, which puts a recognition of the supreme authority of the law of Christ into the preamble of the national Constitution, is also but a fitting incorporation into fundamental law of the Supreme Court decision that has just been cited.

This shows very well the logical and necessary sequence of each succeeding step in this great iniquity. That the remaining steps will follow is just as sure as that these have been taken. Is it not time for congressmen, legislators, lawyers and citizens, who have ridiculed the possibility of the adoption of any such measures in this country, to wake to an understanding of what is going on and what the result will be?

W. H. M.

Court of Appeals of Maryland.

John W. Judefind vs. State of Maryland.

January Term—January 23, 1894.

Writ of Error to the Circuit Court for Kent County.

James T. Ringgold, for appellant.

Attorney-General Poe and Wm. M. Slay, for appellee.

Argued before Robinson, C. J., Bryan, Fowler, McSherry, Page and Boyd, JJ.

No writ of error lies to the Court of Appeals from the decision of the Circuit Court of a county on an appeal to it from the judgment of a justice of the peace. Section 247, of Article 27, of the Code of Public General Laws which prohibits work on Sunday is not in violation of the Constitution of the United States nor of the Constitution of the State of Maryland.

BOYD, J.—The plaintiff in error was arrested under a warrant issued by a justice of the peace for Kent County, for husking corn on Sunday. He was tried, convicted, and fined five dollars and costs, in accordance with the provisions of Art. 27, Sec. 247, of the Code of Public General Laws. He appealed to the Circuit Court, where he elected to be tried before the court, and was convicted and fined five dollars and costs by that court. He has brought the case to this court by petition in the nature of a writ of error, in which he designates the following as the points of law to be reviewed:—

That Sec. 247 of Art. 27 of the Code, is void, because it is in violation of the first paragraph of the 14th Article of the Constitution of the United States.

[2.] That said statute is void, because it is in violation of Article 36 of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Maryland.

[3.] That the Circuit Court for Kent County had no jurisdiction to try and convict the traverser since the justice of the peace had no jurisdiction.

(1.) Because (a) the warrant charged no offense under the statute, as it failed to set forth that the husking of corn on Sunday was not work of necessity or charity. (b.) The warrant shows upon its face that it was issued on Sunday, and its mandate is to apprehend the traverser immediately; "it is admitted that it was actually served on Sunday; for these reasons it is void and no jurisdiction could be acquired under it. [2.] That the bond for appearance of the traverser in the Circuit Court is void, because it held him to answer a

charge of Sabbath-breaking," and no such offense is known to the laws of this State, and it is also in fatal variance with the warrant, which says nothing of Sabbath-breaking by the traverser, but charges him with husking corn on Sunday.

The Attorney-General, on behalf of the State, moved to quash the writ of error, on the ground that no writ of error lies to this court from the decision of the Circuit Court on an appeal to it from the judgment of a justice of the peace. That motion must prevail. It is well settled in this State that when the Circuit Court has jurisdiction to hear and decide an appeal from a justice of the peace, its decision is final, and an appeal or writ of error to this court will not lie, unless, of course, the statute authorizes such appeal or writ of error to this court. If the traverser desired to contest the constitutionality of the law under which he was arrested and have that question properly presented for the consideration of this court, he could have applied for the writ of certiorari upon the specific ground of the constitutionality of the law and the consequent want of power and jurisdiction of the justice of the peace to proceed under it. This court could then have reviewed the judgment of the Circuit Court on an appeal or writ of error. Nor can we review the decision of the Circuit Court on the question of the alleged defects on the face of the warrant and bond.

That court had the power and authority to entertain the appeal from the judgment of the justice on the question of jurisdiction as well as on other grounds, and the plaintiff in error having invoked and submitted himself to its jurisdiction, its judgment is final and conclusive. The case of *Rayner vs. State*, 52 Md., 368, is directly in point, and it is unnecessary to refer to the decisions of this court.

The attorney for the plaintiff in error argued at considerable length the constitutionality of the Sunday law involved in this case, and urgently requested this court to pass upon that question, regardless of our views on the motion to quash the writ of error. Having determined that the case is not properly before us, we do not feel called upon to discuss at length the cases cited or reasons assigned by the learned counsel, but as a refusal to state our conclusions might be deemed by some an indication of doubt on our part, we will briefly state our views on this subject.

We have not the slightest hesitation in announcing that the law complained of is not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States or of Maryland.

Although the argument of the attorney for the plaintiff in error gave evidence of thorough research and great labor, as well as ingenuity and ability, he was compelled to admit that if we were to be governed by precedent he had no standing in court as the cases were opposed to his contention. There has been numerous decisions in this country, as well as elsewhere, sustaining such law, and we have no desire to be the exception to the general rule.

Nature, experience and observation suggest the propriety and necessity of one day of rest, and the day generally adopted is Sunday.

There are and always will be honest differences of opinion as to how Sunday shall be spent, but the advantages of having a weekly day of rest, "from a mere physical and political standpoint," are too apparent to permit us to doubt the propriety of

having reasonable law to regulate work on that day.

In interpreting them, courts must not place unreasonable constructions upon them.

There may be some circumstances under which it would be deemed harsh and severe to punish a man for husking corn on Sunday; but if he defies the laws of the State or makes himself obnoxious to those desiring the quiet and peace of this day of rest, he should expect the machinery of the law to be put in motion. If the position taken by the plaintiff in error in reference to the law in question is correct, then the law prohibiting the sale of liquor, etc., on Sunday is unconstitutional as would be most, if not all, of our laws concerning Sunday. If the legislature cannot prohibit work, etc., on Sunday, as forbidden by Section 247 of Article 27 of the Code why should it be permitted to prohibit the sale of liquor, goods, wares or merchandise, or prohibit dancing saloons, opera houses, barber shops, etc., from being kept open on that day?

The laws and courts of this State have recognized Sunday as a day of rest from the time the State was formed, and statutes on the subject that were in force in colonial days are still in our Code. This court has, from time to time, given expression to its views on the question in very clear and unequivocal terms. In *Kilgore vs. Miles et al.*, 6 G. & J., 274. Judge Chambers, in delivering the opinion of the court, said, "The Sabbath is emphatically the day of rest, and the day of rest here is the 'Lord's day,' or Christians' Sunday. Ours is a Christian community and a day set apart as the day of rest is the day consecrated by the resurrection of our Saviour, and embraces the twenty-four hours next ensuing the midnight of Saturday."

In *State vs. Fearson*, 2nd Md., 313, Judge Mason, in passing upon the charge of permitting persons to bet on cards on Sunday, contrary to the statute then in force, sustained the law, and added, "that independent of any statutory prohibition, this is a gross offense against decency and public morals, and, therefore, richly merits punishment." In *P. & B. R. Co. vs. Lehman*, 56 Md., 227, Judge Alvey, in speaking of Sunday laws in the different States, said: "They are substantially the same in their general scope and provision—all looking to keeping the day sacred, and as one of rest from secular employment," and in other cases our Sunday laws have been enforced.

Some of the statutes in force in this State were passed as early as 1723—the one complained of in this case bearing that date originally and being continued in the Code of 1888. The tendency of legislation in this country is to provide for further rest, rather than to take away the "day of rest" that is welcomed by the industrious and hard working people of our land. As late as 1892 the legislature of Maryland passed a law authorizing banks in the city of Baltimore to close their doors for business at 12 o'clock, noon, on every Saturday in the year, and provided for the payment of notes, etc., falling due on Saturday "on the next succeeding secular or business day."

Article 36 of our Declaration of Rights guarantees religious liberty, but the members of the distinguished body that adopted that Constitution, never supposed they were giving a death-blow to Sunday laws by inserting that article. Those laws do

not prohibit or interfere with the worship of God on any day other than Sunday, nor do they compel any one to worship him on Sunday.

It is undoubtedly true that rest from secular employment on Sunday does have a tendency to foster and encourage the Christian religions of all sects and denominations that observe that day, as rest from work and ordinary occupation enables many to engage in public worship who probably would not otherwise do so. But it would scarcely be asked of a court in what professes to be a Christian land to declare a law unconstitutional because it requires rest from bodily labor on Sunday (except works of necessity and charity), and thereby promotes the cause of Christianity. If the Christian religion is, incidentally or otherwise, benefited or fostered by having this day of rest, as it undoubtedly is, there is all the more reason for the enforcement of laws that help to preserve it. Whilst courts have generally sustained Sunday laws as "civil regulation," their decisions will have no less weight if they are shown to be in accordance with divine law as well as human.

There are many most excellent citizens of this State who worship God on a day other than Sunday, and our Constitution guarantees to them the right to do so, a right which no one can interfere with.

The legislature of this State has not undertaken to prohibit work on the day observed by them, and hence they do not have in their religious work the advantage of having their Sabbath made a "day of rest" by human law, but the legislature has not in any way interfered with their religious liberty, or with their worship of God in such manner as they think most acceptable to him, as they have a right to do under the above provision in the Declaration of Rights.

If, then, the question was properly before us, we would decide that Section 247 of Article 27 of the Code was not in violation of the Constitution of the United States or of the constitution of this State, but as stated above, must quash the writ of error for the reasons given.

Writ of error quashed with costs.—*Daily Record, Baltimore, Md.*

Be Admonished.

LET no one deceive himself with the idea that we have outlived the time when men need to trouble themselves about the relation of the State to the Church; that men are no more to be called upon to suffer for conscience' sake. It is true that some centuries now intervene between us and the time when the Church of Rome allied to the power of the empire, sat supreme, drunken with the blood of martyrs, "and death and hell followed" the footsteps of its career. But let us not forget that human nature is in itself incapable of improvement, and that it is moved upon by the same malign spirit that has ever dogged the pathway of God's cause, to cast down and destroy his people and his truth. And even in our day these evil promptings are finding avenues for the exhibition of their real character, and they are seen to be the same that they were in the Dark Ages. Satan does not fully control human affairs, thank God, but he loses no chance to put in his malicious work to destroy the truth. In no way has he ever found a more satisfactory method of working his dreadful designs

than when he could, by placing the civil power in the hands of one set of religionists, incite them to persecute, to slay their fellow-men—their fellow-servants even—those whom they ought to have loved with the same love with which Christ loved all men. And if Satan in these days could induce men to follow the same diabolical work, he would be no less pleased than he was in the days now gone by.

Does some one say that this cannot be? Let such beware, let them be admonished to look closely at the influences that are now molding society and moving the world. Let them watch carefully the trend of political and ecclesiastical events; let them take notice of the prestige that the Church is gaining in the political world, and the readiness with which statesmen listen to her counsels and heed her directions. It will not be difficult in all these things to see premonitions of coming danger. A vivid sense of this danger is our only safeguard. The situation need not be viewed with the eyes of an alarmist; it is a subject that requires sober thought and not hasty conclusions. It demands deliberate study, a close discernment, a fine discrimination between the true and the false, between logic and sophistry, between the genuine and the specious, for this question is not settled yet; and it never will be settled till it is settled right, and it never will be settled right till He comes whose right it is to reign, and the government is administered by Him who reigns in righteousness.

G. C. TENNEY.

Sunday Laws.

THERE seems to be an idea in the minds of the people, or at least, some of the people, that enforcement of Sunday laws is not persecution any more than is the enforcement of the law against theft. The enforcement of the Sunday law carries with it the idea of a religious creed. All Sunday laws are the offspring of the union of Church and State; and wherever there has been a union of Church and State, there has been persecution more or less. Under such unions persons have been robbed of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And the more extensive and complete the union, the greater will be the loss of life, and liberty, and the greater will be the unjust restriction of the pursuit of happiness.

The law against Sunday work is based on the fourth commandment, and carries with it the idea that Sunday is the Sabbath of the Lord. The Lord, in speaking of the Sabbath, says, "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Here is a positive prohibition against work—against honest labor. And the reason assigned for this inhibition is, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." The reason why Sunday law advocates have enacted laws prohibiting work on Sunday, and are laboring with all their might and main to enact more stringent ones, is because the fourth commandment says: "The Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." It is impossible to exclude the idea of religion from a Sunday law. Sunday laws are the offspring of religion. Religion connects the idea of sacredness

to the day, and the Sunday law connects the same idea with it. Religion does not forbid work on Sunday because the work in itself is wrong, but because the day is too sacred to devote to such a use: because the Lord has said thou shalt not work. The Sunday law does not forbid work on Sunday because the work in itself is wrong, or because it is a nuisance, or uncivil, or because it is a violation of any man's natural rights, civil or religious; but because of the idea of the sacredness of Sunday. The Sunday law regards the day as too sacred to be devoted to secular pursuits. From this we may fairly conclude that when a man is fined for Sunday work it is not for the work in itself, for that is done on every other day in the week; therefore it must be on account of the sacredness of the day on which it is done.

All religious denominations claim, and pretend to keep, some sacred day as a holy day. However, they do not all claim and pretend to keep the same day as a holy day. In this country the great majority claim, and pretend to keep, the first day of the week as a holy day. Now, if there never had been a person in all the past, down to the present, that ever challenged or doubted the sacredness of Sunday, and had all refrained from work, of a secular character, on that day, then there would not be a Sunday law on the statute books of any State on the face of the earth. From some cause somebody challenges or doubts Sunday as being the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and, consequently, have seen fit, in their judgment, to regard some other day as a holy day. Right here we find the foundation for Sunday law. It is because somebody else believes that some other day is the Sabbath, or that somebody else does not believe that one day is more sacred than another, that we have Sunday laws in our country. It is just because of difference of opinion that Sunday laws have been enacted; and that difference of opinion is a religious difference. The Sunday law advocates do not concede that their fellow-citizens, who differ with them, have the right to believe or practice what they believe. To afflict, harass, or destroy, for adherence to a particular creed, or system of religious principles, or to a mode of worship, is persecution. To fine a man for Sunday work is just the same thing as to fine him for his belief or faith, for there is no other way for a man to show his faith but by his works. A man that believes Sunday is the Sabbath day, if consistent, will keep it as such. The only way he can show his respect for Sunday is by not doing on that day what he does on all other days of the week; and certainly this is a right none can justly be deprived of by human opinion or enactment. Just so with the man who believes that Saturday is the Sabbath. He has no other way to show his faith but by his works. And the only way he has to show his respect for Saturday as a Sabbath day is by not doing on that day what he does on all other days of the week. And certainly, this is a right none can be justly deprived of by human opinion or enactment. If any man be fined, imprisoned, harassed, or afflicted, because he worked on Sunday, it is, most certainly, religious persecution for conscience' sake: just, forsooth, because he differs from the majority; and further, if a man believes one day is just as sacred as another, the only way he has to show his faith is by his

works, viz., by doing the same things on every day of the week, and this is a right that none can be justly deprived of by any human opinion or enactment. So that, if a man be fined, imprisoned, harassed, or afflicted, because he works on every day of the week alike, it is, most certainly, religious persecution for conscience' sake: just, forsooth, because he differed from the majority. Then, most evidently, the enforcement of Sunday law is persecution.

J. W. HANNER.
Madisonville, Ky.

Persecution in Georgia.

[The *Cottage Pulpit*, of Nashville, Tennessee, makes this editorial mention of the cases of Messrs. McCutchen and Keck who are awaiting retrial in May, under the Georgia statute forbidding Sunday labor.]

We are sorry to learn that the two Seventh-day Adventists who were arrested and fined, and we believe imprisoned, in the town of Gainesville, Ga., some months ago for doing work on Sunday, after faithfully observing the Sabbath of the Bible, are still suffering under the ban of Georgia law for their devotion to the law of God, and likely to be yet more roughly handled for their "crime" by the higher courts under the Blue Law code of that "Christian commonwealth." It is lamentable to think that the moral sentiment of this enlightened age is not powerful enough to overawe such disgraceful proceedings, and have this and all similar clear-cut cases of religious persecution thrown out of court, as perversions of the laws themselves under which the pretended offenders were indicted, since it could never have been the intent of a "Christian legislature" to make criminals of Christians whose only offense is that they have literally followed the example of the Lord, who worked on the first day of the week and rested on the seventh!—that they are in this Sabbath doctrine at least true to the Bible and their faith as a body of Christians! That be the work of jesuitical Rome, and not of Protestant America!

Will our Georgia friends allow us to commend to their attention—and adoption of its patriotic sentiments and spirit if still worthy of the honor of being descended from an Oglethorpe and his revolutionary compatriots—the annexed extract from an old letter? The signature is familiar, and its genuineness is indisputable:—

"If I had the least idea of any difficulty resulting from the Constitution adopted by the convention of which I had the honor to be president when it was formed so as to endanger the rights of any religious denomination, then I never should have attached my name to that instrument. If I had any idea that the general Government was so administered that liberty of conscience was endangered, I pray you be assured that no man would be more willing than myself to revise and alter that part of it, so as to avoid all religious persecution. You can without doubt remember that I have often expressed my opinion, that every man who conducts himself as a good citizen is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience.—George Washington."

BE discouraged only when in your study of the Word of God, you can find where he has spoken a single word of discouragement to you.

SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS.—Why Kennan went to Siberia. By William Jackson Armstrong. This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. Everybody should read this book, because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. 160 pages, paper covers, 25 cents.

THE POCKET ATLAS OF THE WORLD—A comprehensive and popular series of maps, illustrating physical and political geography, with geographical statistical notes, 54 double maps, cloth, \$1.00.

MEMOIRS OF EDWIN BAINBRIDGE.—The subject of this memoir is the young English tourist who met his death at the dreadful volcanic eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand, on the 10th of June, 1886. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions—By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN GRIFFITH, Founder of the Hankow Mission, Central China—By William Robson, of the London Missionary society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

SAMUEL CROWTHER, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson." 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Raratonga and New Guinea—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

THOMAS J. COMBER, Missionary Pioneer to the Congo—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, price, 75 cents.

JOHN BRIGHT, the Man of the People—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson," "Samuel Crowther," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

MISSIONARY LADIES IN FOREIGN LANDS—By Mrs. E. R. Pilman, author of "Heroines of the Mission fields," etc. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

FAVORITE BIBLE STORIES FOR THE YOUNG—With numerous illustrations. 16mo, handsomely illuminated board covers, 50 cents.; cloth extra, 75 cents.

HENRY M. STANLEY, the African Explorer—By Arther Montefiore, F. R. G. S. Brought down to 1889. 12mo. 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

BISHOP PATTERSON, the Martyr of Melanesia—By Jesse Page. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

JOHN WILLIAMS, the Martyr of Erromanga—By Rev. J. J. Ellis. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

Order of PACIFIC PRESS,
43 Bond Street, New York City

Or Oakland, Cal.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET.

NEAT, CHEAP, SERVICEABLE.

It perfectly secures pen or pencil in the pocket, so that it can not 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.	Sealskin, 2 "	15c.
No. 4.	" " 3 "	25c.
No. 5.	Russia leather, for 4 "	25c.
No. 6.	Sealskin, 4 "	40c.

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.

FATHERS

OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH

BY E. J. WAGGONER.

History repeats itself, because human nature is the same in all ages of the world. Hence, he who would know

HOW TO AVOID ERROR IN THE FUTURE

must know how errors have developed in the past. The "Fathers of the Catholic Church" shows the condition of the heathen world at the time of Christ, briefly states the principles of ancient heathen philosophy, and shows how the adoption of these principles by prominent men in the church, and the incautious lowering of the standard of pure Christianity, developed the Papacy, which was simply a new phase of paganism. The chapter on

SUN-WORSHIP AND SUNDAY

is alone worth the price of the book. Fine English cloth, substantially bound, contains about 400 pages, and will be sent post-paid for \$1.00.

BOOKS FOR LITTLE ONES.

We are pleased to say to our many friends who have asked us in regard to books for little ones that

BIBLE PICTURES AND STORIES,

AND ITS COMPANION,

Little Folks' Bible Gallery,

contain the most perfect and complete outfit of Bible illustrations and stories that we have been able to find. We can recommend them, or either one, to every one desirous of obtaining something good as a gift for a child. Size 7 x 9 inches, 96 pages each; 44 full-page pictures in one, 45 in the other.

Price \$1 each, or both together, post-paid, \$1.75.

Address Pacific Press,
43 Bond Street, New York City.

The Grand Trunk Railway OF CANADA

AND THE

Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway

Form the GREAT THROUGH LINE to all Points in the West,

AND OFFER TO THE TRAVELING PUBLIC THE ADVANTAGE OF THROUGH TRAINS WITHOUT TRANSFER, AND A VIEW OF

THE ST. CLAIR TUNNEL,

"THE LINK THAT BINDS TWO GREAT NATIONS."

It is the greatest submarine tunnel in the world, extending from Port Huron, Mich., under the St. Clair River to Sarnia, Ontario, and connecting the Grand Trunk Railway System of Canada with the Chicago & Grand Trunk Railway. It has just been completed at a cost of \$2,700,000.

The tunnel proper is a continuous iron tube, nineteen feet and ten inches in diameter, and 6025 feet, or more than a mile, long. The length of the approaches, in addition to the tunnel proper, is 5603 feet, making all told a little over two miles.

Trains of the Grand Trunk and Chicago & Grand Trunk Railways are hauled through this tunnel by engines specially constructed for the purpose. They are said to be the largest engines in the world. The entire weight of the engine and tender rests upon ten drive-wheels. The weight of one of these monster engines in actual service is found to be approximately one hundred tons.

N. J. POWER, W. E. DAVIS,
G. P. A. Grand Trunk Ry., G. P. & T. A. C. & G. T. Ry.,
MONTREAL, CANADA. CHICAGO, ILL.

FRANK P. DWYER,
Eastern Passenger Agent, G. T. Ry.,
271 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY.



NEW YORK, MARCH 15, 1894.

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

No one who reads the decision rendered in the Judefind case, published elsewhere, can fail to see its distinctively religious character. As to the specious plea made that in commanding the observance of Sunday "the legislature has not in any way interfered with their religious liberty, or with their worship of God in such manner as they think most acceptable to him," read the tract, published by the International Religious Liberty Association, entitled "Our Answer," and its fallacy will be made immediately apparent.

THE decision of the Appellate Court of Illinois, in its final disposition of the Clingman World's Fair injunction suit, enjoining the Fair management from closing the gates on Sunday, is that Judge Stein's Court had no jurisdiction in the matter. Of this the *Christian Reformer* says:—

Christian citizens must be blind if they fail to see how this injunction case demonstrates the necessity of an authoritative and undeniable constitutional basis for Sabbath laws and all such distinctively Christian institutions of our Government. . . . Of all the practical arguments for the Christian amendment of our national Constitution, this Clingman injunction suit is the strongest that can be urged. . . . Let the attitude of the nation in all its courts and laws, toward the Sabbath and the Lord of the Sabbath, be so clearly defined by a constitutional acknowledgment that all such trickery will be hereafter impossible.

The arrogance of this demand for Church control over the State is suggestive of the manner in which it will be enforced when once the dignitaries of the Church militant feel sure of their seats on the bench of the religious court-martial.

THE opinion of the court in the Judefind case, lately rendered in the Court of Appeals of Maryland, is reprinted on another page, from the *Daily Record*, of Baltimore. It is due to the counsel in this case, James T. Ringgold, Esq, to state that the appeal had been taken before he was called in to defend it, and the time had then passed for the issuance of a writ of certiorari, and the case was carried up by petition in the nature of a writ of error. This being so, it was Mr. Ringgold's contention that, the want of jurisdiction being apparent on the face of the proceedings, no special form of pleading was necessary to call attention to it. This decision is not a surprise, because of the previously known views of the chief justice who had already heard the cases of Baker, Bryan, Marvel, and others, of Maryland, in the lower court. There is an interesting point, however, in the definite holding, not previously made, that unless certain points

of practice are followed, the question of validity of proceedings in the court below, though apparent on the face of the proceedings themselves, cannot be considered in the appellate court. Thus this decision makes it still more difficult for those who do not or can not employ counsel, and from the opening of their cases, to obtain the proper offices of the courts. It is interesting to note that in this decision as in that of Judge Hammond, in the King case, and that of Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, that "this is a Christian nation," the religious portion of the opinion is a *dictum* of the court, not necessarily involved in the technical decision itself.

PETITIONS are being presented to Congress which the *Congressional Record* describes as "in favor of an amendment to the Constitution recognizing the Deity," and "favoring an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution recognizing the kingship of Christ on the nations of the world, and the Bible as the basis of moral legislation." Very soon, probably, Congress will be flooded with this style of petition in greater quantities even than for the Sunday closing of the World's Fair. Is it not time for those, who thought and said that the demand for religious legislation was but an evanescent craze, to see their error and come out openly with the honest opposition which they have privately expressed?

THE *Mail and Express* is editorially roused over the consolidation of a Catholic parochial school and the Riverside public school, West End, Pittsburg, by which the Sisters of Mercy, heretofore teaching in the parochial school, are transferred to the public school, with their peculiar religious garb and tenets. This the *Mail and Express* says will make this public school "distinctively a Romanist school." True! But the *Mail and Express* should have thought of this before. Such a fusion does certainly make a Romanist school. But such a thing is only consistent with what has gone before. There has been a fusion with Roman Catholicism in the enforcement of Sunday observance and religious law which has made this a Romanist country. The *Mail and Express* should be consistent and repudiate it all.

IN the trial of Messrs. McCutchen and Keck for Sunday work, in Gainesville, Ga., Mr. Keck said to the jury:—

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY: I am happy to-day to stand here as a representative of my Saviour. It is not that you are trying me here to-day for what I have done; for the Lord, with whom I have become acquainted, has said, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." It is the Lord, the Saviour of mankind, who is on trial here. I thank him that he has said, "No man can serve two masters." One master, the Roman Catholic Church says, You keep Sunday, and you will show allegiance to me. The Lord says, Keep the seventh day as the Sabbath, and you will show allegiance to me. I bow in obedience to the Lord;

and if he wishes me to suffer for exercising my right to work on the first day of the week, I am perfectly willing to do it.

In the course of his address to the jury the prosecuting attorney referred to this in these words:—

Mr. Keck says he is not on trial—that it is the Lord who is on trial. If that is so, gentlemen, I ask you to acquit the Lord right now. If we are prosecuting the Lord, I ask you to let him loose. But if this prosecution is against Keck and McCutchen and they violated the law, what will you have to say? that they shall not be convicted?—No! it is your duty to do it. They may think they represent the Lord, I don't say they do not, but I do say we cannot bother with the Lord by criminal indictment.

From these extracts it will be evident that in this case the actual issue was raised.

THE telegraphic news contains this item:—

CHICAGO, ILL.—The Seventh Infantry Regiment of the National Guard, which is composed of men of all denominations, has been ordered by the commanding officer to attend the service of St. Patrick's day at St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church in uniform and with side arms.

The service is to include the first military mass celebrated in the United States in many years. The order is strongly criticised by the Protestant members of the regiment.

The claim has been made that the Roman Catholics are in the majority in many of these military organizations. If this be true, and it be also true that the minority must bow to the rule of the majority in religious things, why then are these Protestant members objecting?

THE Ancient Order of Hibernians, and other Irish Catholic societies of Brooklyn, have asked the mayor of that city to hoist the green flag over the Brooklyn City Hall on St. Patrick's day. A considerable delegation interviewed the mayor on the subject, and this is part of the *New York Sun's* report of what was said:—

Miles F. McPartland then followed in a brief argument, much after the style of Mr. O'Donnell. Mayor Schieren cut him off by asking what he should do if some person came and asked him to put up a flag in celebration of Martin Luther. Mr. O'Donnell replied that such a celebration would smack of religion.

"Wasn't St. Patrick a religious man?" demanded the mayor.

MR. O'DONNELL.—St. Patrick was not only a religious man, but he broke the chains of paganism and slavery.

MAYOR SCHIEREN.—What has this country to do with this question, anyhow? I have not made up my mind, but I will give no preference to anybody.

Just as one delegate reached the door, he turned back, and, looking straight at the mayor, said:

"Mr. Hewitt did the same thing once in New York." "Mr. Hewitt has nothing to do with me," was the mayor's parting shot.

Such straws as these have a very apt suggestiveness when it is remembered that the next time Mr Hewitt ran for mayor of New York, after his collision with the Catholic societies, he was defeated.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

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

In clubs of	5 to 24	copies to one address, per year,	- - -	90c
	25 to 99	" " " " " "	- - -	80c
	100 to 249	" " " " " "	- - -	75c
	250 to 499	" " " " " "	- - -	70c
	500 to 999	" " " " " "	- - -	65c
	1000 or more	" " " " " "	- - -	60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,			- - -	5 shillings
Address,	AMERICAN SENTINEL, 43 Bond Street, New York City.			