

"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."

Vol. 11, No. 26.

NEW YORK, JULY 2, 1896.

Price, Three Cents.

American Sentinel,

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

30 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY

MEANING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

THE Declaration of Independence has a deeper meaning than that of simple renunciation of allegiance to the government of Great Britain. While it was just that that allegiance should be renounced, the occasion was a vastly greater one than could be measured by the commercial and personal interests bound up in our colonial relationship with the mother land. A greater cause was to be championed by that declaration—a vaster audience addressed than the assembled Parliament of Great Britain.

"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; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." Such a declaration was of necessity addressed to the whole civilized world. It

spoke in behalf not only of the thirteen American colonies, but of all the victims of oppression the world over.


"The heart of Jefferson in writing the declaration, and of Congress in adopting it, beat for all humanity; the assertion of right

make the circuit of the world, passing everywhere through the despotic countries of Europe; and the astonished nations, as they read that all men are created equal, started out of their lethargy, like those who have been exiles from childhood, when they suddenly hear the dimly-remembered accents of their mother tongue."*

The Rights of the People.

In the long contest which has made all lands its battlefield, between liberty and oppression, the time had at length arrived when the world was to hear proclaimed in no uncertain tones the doctrine of individual rights, and not merely the rights of certain individuals, but the rights of all individuals, or in other words, the rights of the people. The world had long been hearing about the "divine right" of kings; the monarchs had diligently proclaimed this doctrine to the people. The world had heard also about the rights of barons and nobles; Magna Charta had proclaimed them. The Petition of Right, Bill of Rights, and the Writ of Habeas Corpus, had also struck more or less effectually against monarchical usurpation of power, in favor of the rights of the people. But in the immortal Declaration put forth by Jefferson and his associates, the doctrine of the rights of the people first found full and complete expression. Then

was heard a voice proclaiming liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof,—a voice which went "out through all the earth," and its "words to



THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE. AT PHILADELPHIA, JULY 4, 1776.

was made for the entire world of mankind and all coming generations, without any exception whatever; for the proposition which admits of exceptions can never be self-evident. As it was put forth in the name of the ascendent people of that time, it was sure to

* Bancroft's History of the United States, Vol. IV., p. 450.

end of the world;" and which, while it could not directly confer liberty upon the oppressed, announced to them their possession by divine right of a personal independence of those oppressive relations which had bound them in slavery to their rulers, and roused them to put forth manly efforts to make that freedom real.

One more proclamation of liberty remained to be given,—the Proclamation of Emancipation;—and that was necessary only because the principles of the Declaration of Independence had been denied and prevented from being universally carried into effect in the very land which gave it birth, by the institution of negro slavery.

To Deny Rights Is to Deny the Creator.

The significance of the Declaration of Independence lies in the fact that it speaks for the individual. Considered from the standpoint of what is theirs by creation, the human race must be considered as individuals; and it is upon the fact of creation that the whole Declaration is based. "All men are created equal;" they "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," among which "are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and "to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." These are the fundamental, self-evident principles which support and justify all else which the Declaration sets forth. Man has certain rights which are unalienable; and he has these rights not as a part of society, but as an individual. And therefore the primary rights of mankind are individual rights, and not rights which pertain to men in the aggregate. The rights of the organized body are secondary, growing out of the rights of the individuals composing it. And any form of government which subordinates the individual's right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" to the real or supposed rights of the majority, ignores the fact of man's creation, and with that ignores God.

The Declaration of Independence has lost none of its force by transmission through the century that has elapsed since its original proclamation. It is to-day a charter of civil liberty for every individual,—a declaration of independence from the despotism which to-day would mask itself in the garb of civil authority, as it did formerly in the days of George III. He who sees in it only an interesting relic of antiquity,—a mere memento of the wisdom and determination of our forefathers—is blind to its real significance, and to his own best interests as well.

The Declaration of Independence is the world's charter of civil liberty, as the gospel is its charter of soul liberty. It was—and is—the mission of Jesus Christ "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Isa. 61:1. It was the same Jesus Christ who created man, † and by creation endowed him with the unalienable rights which the Declaration of Independence sets forth. The two are in harmony with each other. s.

"THE SHADOWS OF VICTORY."

THE National Bureau of Reforms was incorporated on the 23rd of May, under the name of the Reform Bureau. In a circular issued under date of May 25, the secretary, Mr. Crafts, states that "the receipts for the last four weeks have been only \$109.14,

while the liabilities for the same time are \$290."

The work of the Bureau for a single week is thus recounted by Mr. Crafts:—

The Shadows of Victory.

On May 25th, President Cleveland sent to the office of the Reform Bureau the pen with which he had just signed the F. H. Gillett divorce bill, in recognition that the Bureau had originated and promoted the bill, in coöperation with the Congressman named, who had ably done his part. Only a week previous, May 17, the Bureau, in coöperation with a movement originated by the Endeavorers of Mt. Vernon, N. Y., had secured not only the sabbath closing of the post-office in that place, but also the implied adoption of the local option principle, originated by Hon. John Wanamaker, for all such cases, of which Endeavorers and others in many towns should hasten to avail themselves. The Saturday preceding, the distinguished trustees of the Bureau named elsewhere, incorporated it: and the Monday following the Commissioners of the District of Columbia approved the sabbath law for the Capital which the Bureau had introduced in Congress in coöperation with the Churchman's League. This is but a week of the Bureau's work.

Do our readers realize that a powerful ecclesiastical lobby is at work in our national capital, and that already our institutions have begun to bend under the weight of its influence?

THE CASE FOR SUNDAY "LAWS."

"TIME is money." What right then has the State to demand one-seventh of an individual's time by a Sunday "law"? If time is money, it is property, and the State cannot, by the express declaration of the National Constitution, deprive any citizen of it "without due process of law."

What does the State want with a person's time, anyway? Unless that time is spent in labor for the State, the State can have no possible use for it. And the State has no right to appropriate the labor of an individual except in the case of a criminal. But by a Sunday "law," the State appropriates no labor, but merely the individual's time. It simply robs the individual without enriching itself.

The Creator alone has the right to demand one-seventh of every individual's time, and he has done this by the commandment to rest on the seventh day. But he does not, like the State, demand mere idleness, but he asks that the seventh day shall be actively employed in communion with him, through his word, his works, and by prayer and other forms of religious devotion. This is the purpose for which the Sabbath was instituted, and the only basis upon which it can in reason be sustained.

And this is the basis which in the minds of men upheld the Sunday "laws," when such "laws" were first framed. They were, in other words, based solely on religious grounds. They were religious "laws," and as such they have come down the centuries to us. The thousand and one civil "reasons" for them were never heard of until their manufacture became a necessity on account of the enlightened sentiment of modern times, which repudiated the principle that the State can rightfully enact laws on religious grounds.

It is absurd for the State to assume the right to claim a part of the people's time; it is sacrilegious for it to thus—albeit unwittingly—put itself in the place of God. It is unjust for it to tax the people by taking one-seventh of their time, and foolish to demand a tax for which it can have no possible use. This presents in part the case for Sunday "laws," considered from the standpoint of reason and justice. s.

PROPOSED OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

A CORRESPONDENT sends us the following for publication:—

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

TO AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY, DESIGNED TO FORM A PART OF THE LEGAL QUALIFICATION OF EVERY AMERICAN VOTER.

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I believe in and will ever strive to preserve, unimpaired, American Constitutional Liberty, as thus defined:

The right and privilege of every civilized American citizen of adult age and sound mind, to act upon his or her personal conscience and judgment, in every action that may arise, without interference from others, till it can be plainly shown that his or her action is a positive interference with or a serious menace of the equal rights rights of others.

Our correspondent adds this comment in a subsequent paragraph:—

Most intelligent American citizens are willing to defend American liberty if they can only get a clear concept of what it is; and this measure is designed to give every voting citizen, and, through them, all others, such a concept.

This suggests the only value such an oath could possibly have. The man who is genuinely attached to the principles of liberty will cheerfully award to every other man the rights which he demands for himself; and this he will do to the best of his understanding, whether bound by an oath to do so or not. On the other hand, the man who has not this genuine love of liberty, but who is actuated simply by a selfish desire for freedom for himself, will not regard the rights of others, even though he has taken a solemn oath to do so. What the American people want is not to take iron-clad oaths to do justice, but the principles of justice implanted in their very souls. The form of oath to which we have given place may, as our correspondent suggests, assist some to an understanding of the subject, and for this reason we print it.

THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT ON SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

WE print on another page of this paper the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois declaring void the so called "Cody Law" of that State prohibiting barbering on Sunday.

The opinion of the Court in this case is of more than ordinary interest, because unlike many judicial decisions it deals more in principles than in technicalities.

The broad principle underlying the decision is that "if the law prohibits that which is harmless in itself, or requires that to be done which does not tend to promote the health, comfort, safety and welfare of society, it will in such a case be an unauthorized exercise of power; and it will be the duty of the courts to declare such legislation void."

It is true that the court does say that "if the public welfare of the State demands that all business and all labor of every description, except work of necessity and charity, should cease on Sunday," etc., "the legislature has the power to enact a law requiring all persons to refrain from their ordinary callings on that day." But before using this language the court very clearly shows that no such condition exists, and that in the very nature of certain employments it could not exist, for barbering and other secular pursuits are declared to be not only not harmful but laudible and even necessary to the health and comfort of the people; and if harmless and even nec-

essary six days in the week they certainly cannot become harmful upon one day by reason of anything of which the legislature can take cognizance.

Some of the remarks made by Justice Craig in passing seem very favorable to general Sunday legislation, but common sense forbids such an interpretation of his language. The court holds that the workingman's labor is his capital, and asks: "Can a law which takes that from a laborer be sustained?" The question admits of only a negative reply; and it is obvious that the case would not be made better by making the law broad enough to deprive all laborers in the State of one-seventh of their capital instead of taking it from a certain class only. It is a well-established principle of constitutional law that no one can be deprived of property without compensation. A man's time being property the State has no right to deprive him of any portion of it unless the public service requires it, and even then a man's time can no more be taken from him without compensation than could his land or his money.

The fact is, that under this decision the State of Illinois cannot maintain any Sunday statute prohibiting either labor or business on that day, but only such laws as may be necessary to protect "the peace and good order of society," which in the very nature of the case could not be disturbed by ordinary employments on Sunday followed in a quiet and orderly manner. It is safe to say that for the present, Illinois is safe from the inroads of Sunday "law" fanaticism. But be it remembered that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

WILL IT SATISFY ANYBODY?

MAY 28, the following bill was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Kyle, by request, was read twice and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:—

A BILL

To regulate labor and business on Sunday in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the heads of Government Departments or bureaus, the courts of justice, and the board of trustees of common schools in Washington shall not, except as hereinafter provided, require subordinate officers or employes to perform work on or during Sunday: *Provided however*, That nothing herein contained shall apply to the Executive Department, the Capitol, the Naval Yard, the Weather Bureau, the Metropolitan Police, or the employes about the courts, the police stations, the jail, or the District buildings.

Sec. 2. That it shall not be lawful for any person to keep open on Sunday any place of business for the transaction of business in which money is received, except restaurants, apothecaries, physicians, bakers, undertakers, venders of milk, venders of ice, venders of fruit or other perishable merchandise, venders of soda water, ice cream, or refreshments other than intoxicants, publishers and venders of newspapers, telegraph and telephone operators, street-car, railroad, steamboat, herdic, and omnibus companies, hotels and boarding-house keepers, and salaried preachers, janitors, livery-stable keepers, and other persons whose business contributes to the comfort or instruction of the public and is not of such a nature as to disturb public assemblies or the peace or good order of the community.

Sec. 3. That public assemblies of any kind held on Sun-

day shall be conducted in a quiet and orderly manner, so as not to interfere with the peace of residents in their neighborhood.


Sec. 4. That no church bells shall be rung before eight o'clock antemeridian, or after seven o'clock postmeridian; and no bell shall be rung more than two minutes at a time or oftener than every half hour.

Sec. 5. That the Congressional Library, National Museum, Smithsonian Institution, Monument, and Capitol shall be kept open on Sundays, from nine o'clock in the forenoon to four o'clock in the afternoon, for the accommodation of the public.

Sec. 6. That the penalty for the willful violation of any of the provisions of this Act shall be a fine not exceeding twenty dollars or imprisonment not exceeding ten days, at the discretion of the court; but it shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for labor on Sunday that the defendant usually keeps another day of the week as a day of rest.

Sec. 7. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed.

This bill is a curious illustration of the universality of the idea that there must be some legislation concerning Sunday. It reminds one of the story of the boys in a sinking boat. They could neither pray nor sing, so one of them, remarking that "something religious has got to be done," proceeded to take up a collection!



House at 702 Market Street, Philadelphia, in Which the Declaration of Independence Was Written.

An unwholesome sentiment demands something religious of the government, and so divers Sunday bills are proposed. This, the latest one introduced, would be about as harmless as any such "law" could be, so far as interfering with anybody is concerned; but it violates the principle just as much as though it were an ironclad National Reform measure.

SOUTH AFRICAN CORRESPONDENCE.

BY G. B. THOMPSON.

THE South African Republic, or Transvaal, is governed by the Dutch, the larger part of whom are supposed to be descendants of the Huguenot refugees who landed in Cape Colony in A. D. 1688, and afterwards emigrated across the Vaal River, and thus laid the foundation of what is now the Transvaal.

The legislative power is vested in two chambers, called the Volksraad (from *volks*, people, and *raad*, advice, or counsel). The members of both chambers are elected by the

people. The following qualifications for office are required:—

The qualifications of a member of the First Chamber are that he must be thirty years of age, and that he must either have been born in the country or have been a qualified voter for fifteen consecutive years. *He must, furthermore, be a member of a Protestant church, a resident in the country, and in possession of fixed property within its limits.* No person of an openly bad character, or one who has been sentenced for some criminal offense, or an rehabilitated insolvent, or persons being to each other in the relationship of father and son, or stepson or colored persons, or bastards, or officials receiving salary, are allowed to take a seat in the Volksraad.—*The Transvaal, by John De Villiers, p. 16.*

Unbelievers and Catholics are thus excluded from a voice in the law-making assembly; also persons of color. Religion is a qualification for office. This is very different to the stipulations of the American Constitution; and much might be said concerning the iniquity and injustice of such requirements. With such legislators, and a strict Sunday law, such as already exists, the country is one on which the most puritanical National Reformer can look and exclaim, Thou art a child after my own heart! It is a Christian

government, according to National Reform Christianity. Yet, what do we find? Many of the inhabitants, thinking that their lives were in danger from revolutionary strife in Johannesburg, fled at the beginning of this year from the country. The country for months has been seemingly on the point of war, and every preparation for the probable conflict has been made. At the present time about three-score of the leading citizens are in the jail of the capital under sentences of imprisonment for the crime of treason in a greater or less degree. Rumors are everywhere rife of corruption, both State and municipal. Boodlers abound, and capital rules the same as in other places; prostitution flourishes, and

poverty and wretchedness about the same as in other lands.

The Volksraad is now in session, and some steps are contemplated toward a more strict censorship of the press. A new press law has been published in the *Staats Courant* which is to be laid before the present session of the Volksraad. One article of this contemplated law reads as follows:—

The State president has at all times the right (with the advice and consent of the Executive Council) to prohibit entirely or temporarily the dissemination of publications printed outside the republic, the contents of which, are, *in his opinion*, contrary to good morals or dangerous to peace and order in the republic.

It is through some such imperial ukase as this that the *Herold der Wahrheit* a paper published in Hamburg, Germany, and devoted entirely to the teaching of Bible truth as understood by its managers, and which takes no sides whatever in political questions, has been proscribed in Russia. What was taught in the paper did not coincide with the "opinions" of the law-making power of the government, and was, therefore, deemed to be against the best interests of the State, and inimical to peace; so it was prohibited.

The prospective law of the Transvaal seems to find its precedent in the imperial ukases of the Czar. While the intent of the law-making power may be the very best, such a law is exceedingly dangerous, and apt to be made a wrong use of. Take, for instance, the literature which is printed outside of the domain ruled by the Republic which teaches that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and that Sunday is only a relic of popery, and a day on which it is no sin to do manual work. This, in the "opinion" of the State president (the executive concurring), might be deemed heresy, and therefore "contrary to good morals," or "dangerous to peace and order in the Republic." Especially so, when they could cite such examples as in Canada where some gospel ministers were sentenced to imprisonment for such acts as pouring water in a barrel, etc., on the "venerable day of the sun." And in various portions of free(?) America, where Christians who had kept the Sabbath "according to the commandment," have been immured in filthy prison cells for such misdemeanors(?) as husking corn, gardening, cutting a little fuel for a widow, plowing away from any residence or road, removing sprouts from stumps in a secluded place, lifting a wheel-barrow over a fence, etc., on Sunday.

Another important division of South Africa is the Orange Free State. This is also a republic governed by the Dutch. The Volksraad is now in session; and the Sunday question has been introduced, and an effort is being made to secure a more strict Sunday law. The following, taken from the *Cape Times*, of May 16, 1896, will show what is being done:—

This morning the Raad discussed the law for the better observance of the sabbath. The commission reported the work at the mines was necessary for the welfare of the industry, recommended doubling the tariff on Sunday telegrams, and were of the opinion that not much sabbath desecration in way of amusements existed. Mr. C. Wessels opposed it on the grounds that it infringed the liberty of the subject, and referred to the case of the Jews, whose Sabbath was on Saturday, but would, under the proposed law, be compelled to observe the Christian sabbath. Messrs J. Wessels and Steyn objected that if the Jews did not care to observe the Christian sabbath, they should stay away. Mr. Clote argued that the law was contrary to the institutions which guaranteed full religious liberty. Mr. Van der Walt said that under this law the President could be arrested for driving to church on Sunday. This afternoon in the Raad the discussion was continued. The law was strongly supported by Mr. Fraser, who said that mine owners rest on Sunday as well as burghers, and there was not the slightest necessity for games such as tennis, football, etc. After a lengthy discussion, the Raad approved of the principle of the law.

It is thus that Church and State are bound together in all lands, and the dove of freedom, with weary wing, hovers over all civilized lands, seeking for a place of rest, but finding none. The place of her abode, if found, must be amid the haunts of the untutored aborigines. Can it be that religious freedom,—the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience,—has taken its everlasting flight from the earth? Verily, it seems so.

Cape Town, So. Africa, May 20.

RESIGNED FOR CONSCIENCE' SAKE.

[*Cincinnati Commercial Tribune, June 18.*]

MIDDLETOWN, O., June 17.—Rev. Lyman J. Fisher, a retired Baptist minister, has resigned from the Board of City School Examiners, giving as his reason that the duties of that office conflict with his conscience. He sent a paper to the Board saying that he had, after a life-long investigation of the Script-

ures, concluded that Saturday is the Sabbath, and as most of the examinations fall on that day he can not, in keeping with his conscience, hold the position longer. He says:—

I will attempt no self-justification further than to say that my convictions of personal responsibility in the matter are the result of a life long search of the Scriptures. For a longer period than I have held the position to which you called me, I have been persuaded that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord. But it was first a disclosure mainly to my intellect. Meanwhile, the immenseness of the fact of Sabbath perversion dazed me, and left me with a feeling of helplessness to stem such a current. I still feel like a breaking, momentary bubble on the bosom of a resistless tide. But not wholly so, at least. An appeal breaks in from the skies. With tender directness it speaks to my conscience and heart. I feel my littleness enabled in the presence of a duty, which I am sure I can do for my King.

The resignation was unanimously accepted.

BISHOP WIGGER'S QUERY.

[*Journal (New York), June 8.*]

THE Catholic Diocesan Union of New Jersey held a large and enthusiastic meeting in the Y. M. C. A. hall in Harrison, N. J., yesterday afternoon. President Murphy, of Jersey City, was in the chair, and delegates from all parts of the State were present.

The coming Presidential election was discussed, and Rev. Father Bogan, of St. Mary's Church, Rahway, at the request of Bishop Wigger, of the diocese of Newark, offered a resolution that the secretary of the union be directed to forward to each of the Republican candidates for the nomination for President the following question:—

In the event of your election to the Presidency of the United States, will you, in the administration of that office, make any discrimination against Roman Catholics on account of their religious belief?

When the question was read there was great applause, and the resolution was adopted unanimously. Bishop Wigger was prompted in having the resolution offered by a letter which he received from the Marquette Club, of St. Louis, which recently took similar action. The letter was indorsed by Rt. Rev. John J. Kane, bishop of St. Louis. Other Catholic societies throughout the country will take similar action.

IMPRISONED FOR HIS FAITH.

P. M. HOWE, one of the three Seventh-day Adventist ministers, convicted of Sunday work some months since at Darrell, Ont., has at last been committed to jail at Chatham. He writes as follows to the president of the International Religious Liberty Association:—

Chatham Jail, June 19, 1896.

ELDER ALLEN MOON—*Dear Brother*: I am a prisoner in jail since 9:30 yesterday morning. The chief of police of Ridgeway came for me at 7 o'clock. He made many excuses for not taking me before. He has told so many tales that we hardly know when to believe him.

The jailer came very near refusing to take me, but did at last, and went to Judge Bell to see if I could be legally imprisoned. He said I could, and so settled the dispute as far as this court is concerned.

They treat me well. I have the same food as the other poor fellows have to eat; and besides, the comfort of the Holy Spirit bringing me joy and peace, with a contented mind. I feel as satisfied to be here as though I were sent to work for my heavenly Master in the open sunshine of heaven.

The Spirit has impressed upon my mind for some years that I would be imprisoned sooner or later, and I am sure that He who doeth all things well, will care for me while here and make me a power to some souls hereafter.

I never felt more determined to live out the truth of the Third Angel's message than now.

I know the power of a fallen Israel will unite with the State to crush out the truth by every kind of persecution; but God says for the comfort and encouragement of his little flock: "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word; Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." Isa. 66:5.

I am glad to suffer with Him.

Your brother in bonds,

P. M. Howe.

It will be remembered by our readers that this man's offense, for which he must spend forty days in jail, was assisting in preparing some mortar preparatory to erecting a church building at Darrell late last fall. The work interfered with no one, and disturbed no one, except as it occasioned mental annoyance to bigoted minds simply from the fact that it was done on Sunday. It was only the annoyance of intolerance. Imprisoning a man for such an offense is not as bad as burning him at the stake, but the principle is the same.

THE TROUBLES IN CRETE.

[*New York Observer, June 11, 1896.*]

SERIOUS fighting in Canea, the political capital of Crete, between the Christians and the Turks, promises to bring the Cretan question again to the front. It is true that something approaching civil war has existed in the island for some months past, the Cretans have virtually besieged the Turkish garrison in Vamos, but as the disorder has been inland, and the lives of foreign consuls and merchants were not menaced, no attention has been given it. The outbreak in Canea, and the report that the Cretans are preparing for further trouble with a view to forcing some action in their behalf, has, however, at once aroused the interest of the powers, doubtless in the fear that the disturbances may reopen the Eastern question in an acute form. Though order has been temporarily restored in the capital, and the siege of Vamos has been raised, the Cretans retreating to the mountains, the hurried despatch of reinforcements by the Porte excites suspicion that it intends to restore order in its usual summary fashion. It is not impossible that this is precisely what the Cretan Christians hope it will attempt, in the certainty that it would compel the intervention of Greece, which claims Crete in reversion, and so that of all the powers if a general war were to be averted. Since the island was restored to Turkey in 1840, revolt after revolt has occurred, but either through concessions on the part of the Porte, or the use by the powers of concerted pressure upon Greece, any general embroilment has been staved off. The danger now is that the concert of the powers may no longer exist, and thus that the Cretan outbreak may give the signal for the long-expected convulsion; the assumption being that in the event of a change in the relations of Crete to the Porte, England would oppose its cessions to Greece, as being under Franco-Russian influence, while France, Russia, and probably Germany would support it. That any action will be taken by the powers until a general insurrection has occurred is not to be expected, though if proper pressure were brought to bear upon the Porte the whole question of Turkish sovereignty over the island, the rights of Moslems and the liberties of the Christians in it, might be bridged over until the Ottoman Empire is broken up. If the sultan were induced to recall his garrison and appoint a foreign Christian prince ruler of Crete for life, with absolute powers, binding him only to send an annual tribute to Constantinople, the Cretan

question would be settled for a generation. Such a prince could create his own army for the preservation of order, just as Prince Alexander did in Bulgaria, could protect Moslems and Christians equally as is now done in Bosnia, and could in time make government more liberal as was done in Servia. The Cretans are not advanced enough for popular government, do not care for it so long as government is good and their rights are protected, any more than the prince would care whether his subjects were Moslem or Christian so long as they were orderly and paid their taxes. In this way the sultan could get all that he now gets out of Crete—his tribute—would still be sovereign, and as he has already promised the island a Christian governor, would not suffer indignity by delegating his authority to a Christian prince.

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER BY THOMAS JEFFERSON.

The following letter, written by Thomas Jefferson to Governor John Davis, of Worcester, Mass., was recently presented to the American Unitarian Association, by Hon. Horace Davis, of San Francisco. It will be of interest to all readers of the SENTINEL, not only as coming from the pen of the writer of the Declaration of Independence, but as bearing upon the subject of Jefferson's religious views, concerning which history has supplied us with little, if any, definite information:—

“Monticello, Jan. 18, '24.

“I thank you, sir, for the copy you have been so kind as to send me of the Rev. Mr. Bancroft's Unitarian sermons. I have read them with great satisfaction, and always rejoice in efforts to restore us to primitive Christianity, in all the simplicity in which it came from the lips of Jesus. Had it never been sophisticated by the subtleties of commentators, nor paraphrased into meanings totally foreign to its character, it would at this day have been the religion of the whole civilized world. But the metaphysical abstractions of Athanasius, and the maniac ravings of Calvin, tintured plentifully with the foggy dreams of Plato, have so loaded it with absurdities and incomprehensibilities as to drive into infidelity men who had not time, patience, or opportunity to strip it of its meretricious trappings and to see it in all its native simplicity and purity. I trust however that the same free exercise of private judgment which gave us our political reformation, will extend its effects to that of religion, which the present volume is well calculated to encourage and promote.

Not wishing to give offense to those who differ from me in opinion, nor to be implicated in a theological controversy, I have to pray that this letter may not get into print, and to assure you of my great respect and good will. THOS. JEFFERSON.”

INGERSOLL ON LEGAL RIGHTEOUSNESS.

(Contributed.)

In a recently published work by Melville D. Landon (Eli Perkins), entitled, “Kings of the Platform and Pulpit,” I find the following:—

He [Mr. Ingersoll] is opposed to the enforcement of the old Connecticut Blue Laws to make people good. He believes a man made good by law is not really

good at heart, but is simply made to appear good. He is a legal hypocrite.

One day a fanatical talker—a Puritanical Blue Law man—who was in favor of enforcing strict Sunday laws, absolute prohibition, etc., came in on the New York Central train. Mr. Ingersoll heard him talk a spell and then asked him several questions.

“Would you like to live in a community where not one cigar could be smoked and not one drop of spirituous liquors could be sold or drunk?” “Certainly,” said the Blue-Law man, “that would be a social heaven.”


“And you would like to live where no one could play on the sabbath day; and where no one could laugh out loud or enjoy a frolic?”

“Yes, sir; that would suit me. It would be a paradise to live in a community where everyone was compelled to go to church every Sunday; where no one could drink a drop; where no one could swear; and where the law would make every man good. There the law would make every man's deportment absolutely correct.”

“Then,” said Mr. Ingersoll, “I advise you to go right to the penitentiary. At Sing Sing there is a community of 1,500 men and women governed in precisely that manner. There all are good by law.”

There is many an infidel who to-day stands nearer the ideal taught by Christ than some of his professed followers. The same thing Jesus himself declared true in his time. “The publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.” Matt. 21:31. This was addressed to those who made the loftiest profession ever made by men.

These modern would-be reformers who are so anxious to regulate the conduct of others had their prototypes in



The Press, on Which the Declaration of Independence Was Printed.

the first century. Jesus addressed them, “Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye.” Matt. 7:5.

Jesus Christ never used force and never approved of it, but always condemned it. If our friends who are trying to make men good by law would drink in a little more of the Spirit of the Master, it would lead them to labor more to convert the hearts of men, and not to be so strenuous about the outward conduct of sinners and those Christians who differ from them in some prominent points of doctrine.

When I consider how recent events in Canada and Tennessee and other places have revealed the disposition of professed Christians to inflict hardship and suffering on other professed Christians because they differ in the matter of Sabbath observance, I am almost dumb with amazement. Are not these Sabatarian Christians men who live above reproach and endure many inconveniences to carry out those principles which are impressed on them as they read the sacred volume? Is it not as painful to them to see men work on the seventh day of the week as it is to others to see them work on the first day? Are not these men kind neighbors, honest in their dealings and faithful in all their duties as citizens?

Their only offending is the violation of Sunday statutes which have come to us from the Dark Ages. And these modern professors who put this law in operation have forgotten the Golden Rule if they ever knew it. And most amazing, of all of the thousands of religious papers in the world, only about one in a hundred raises its voice in protest against these unchristian proceedings.

If these things had transpired a century or two in the past, they would have been classified with the doings of Nero and the Spanish Inquisition. It seems almost useless to appeal to the sensibilities of men who are so blind to the blazing light of the Christ who even prayed for his enemies. But let the hearts of those who cry for religious freedom take courage. Outside of the ranks of professed Christians are those who, like the Samaritans of old, will gladly welcome the divine light of the King of kings, who is the King of peace. “The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.”

SUNDAY LAWS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN ILLINOIS. *

WILLIAM S. EDEN vs. THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS.

Filed at Springfield, May 12, 1896.
161 Ill. Reports, p. 296.

1. SUNDAY—Common law rule as to observance of. The common law does not prohibit ordinary labor on Sunday.
2. CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—“Due process of law”—Laws of unequal operation. A barber is deprived of property without due process of law by a statute making it unlawful for him to do business on Sunday, where it does not apply to any other class of business.
3. SAME—Police power does not justify unequal statute. The police power does not justify a statute making it unlawful for barbers to do business on Sunday, without including any other class of business.
4. COURTS—May determine what callings are within police regulation. It is a judicial question whether a trade or calling is of such a nature as to justify police regulation.

Wilkin, J., dissenting.

Writ of Error to the Criminal Court of Cook County; the Hon. Judge Gibbons, presiding.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

This was a prosecution begun before a justice of the peace in the city of Chicago, under what is known as the “Cody law,” which prohibits, under penalty, the keeping open of any barber shop on Sunday. An appeal was taken from the judgment of the justice of the peace convicting and fining the defendant. In the Criminal Court of Cook County, the case was, on appeal, tried *de novo* before Hon. John Gibbons, without a jury. In deciding the case the trial judge, after discussing extensively the statute, and holding it to be unconstitutional, said: “While I am irresistibly led to the conclusion that the law in question is void, I am, notwithstanding, anxious that the question should be decided and finally settled by the Supreme Court: and as the defendant may, and the State cannot, appeal, the judgment of the court is that William S. Eden be fined the sum of \$25 and costs, and that judgment be and the same is entered accordingly.” From that judgment the present appeal is prosecuted.

BASIS OF OPINION.

Neither the common law nor any general statute of the State of Illinois prohibits the pursuit of one's ordinary labor, business or calling, in a quiet manner, on Sunday. *Richmond vs. Moore*, 107 Ill. 429; *State vs. Brookshank*, 6 Ired. 73; *Rex vs. Brotherton*, 1 Strange, 702; *Comyns vs. Boyer*, Cro. Eliz. 485; *Sayles vs. Smith*, 12 Wend. 57; *Drury vs. Defontaine*, 1 Taunt. 131.

Any legislation which is not general in its scope,

* For editorial comment, see page 202.

and which affects only one class or body of citizens, is in conflict with the spirit of this Government and with the Constitutions of the United States and of this State. *Calder vs. Bull*, 3 Dall. 386; Constitution of U. S. 14th Amendment; Constitution of Ill. 1870, Art. II., Sec. 2, and Art. IV., Sec. 22; *Ritchie vs. People*, 155 Ill. 98; *In re Jacobs*, 98 N. Y. 98; *Low vs. Printing Co.* 41 Neb. 127; *Ex parte Westerfield*, 55 Cal. 550; *Butchers' Union Co. vs. Crescent City Co.* 111 U. S. 746; *Millet vs. People* 117 Ill. 294; *Frorer vs. People*, 141 Ill. 66; *People vs. Gillson*, 109 N. Y. 389; *State vs. Goodwill*, 33 W. Va. 179; *State vs. Loomis*, 115 Mo. 307; *Railroad Co. vs. Jacksonville*, 67 Ill. 37; *Johnson vs. Railroad Co.* 43 Minn. 223; *Cooley's Const. Lim.* 393; *Railroad Co. vs. Baty*, 6 Neb. 37; *Godcharles vs. Wigeman*, 113 Pa. St. 431.

Where the ostensible object of an enactment is to secure the public comfort, welfare or safety, it must appear to be adapted to that end. It cannot invade the rights of persons and property under the guise of a police regulation when it is not such in fact. *Ritchie vs. People*, 155 Ill. 98; *Lake View vs. Cemetery Co.* 70 Ill. 191; *Railroad Co. vs. Jacksonville*, 67 Ill. 37; *People vs. Gillson*, 109 N. Y. 389; *Millet vs. People*, 117 Ill. 296; *Calder vs. Bull*, 3 Dall. 386; *In re Jacobs*, 98 N. Y. 109.

OPINION OF THE COURT.

Mr. Chief-Justice Craig delivered the opinion of the Court:—

Plaintiff in error was convicted in the Criminal Court of Cook County for the violation of an act to prohibit barber shops from being kept open on Sunday, and for a violation of the law he was fined \$25. The act was passed in the last session of the legislature, and contained two sections, as follows:—

"Sec. 1. Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly, That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons to keep open any barber shop, or carry on the business of shaving, haircutting or tonsorial work, on Sunday, within this State.

"Sec. 2. Any person, by himself, agent or employé, violating the provisions of Section 1 of this Act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined in any sum not exceeding two hundred dollars (200) for each and every offense."

It is contended in the argument that by the act in question that part of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution (Sec. 1) has been violated, which reads as follows: "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." It is also contended that the act violates Section 2 of Article 2 of the Illinois Constitution of 1870, viz.: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law," and also Section 22 of Article 4, the general clause of which reads, "In all other cases where a general law can be made applicable no special law should be enacted." It is conceded in the argument that if the legislature had enacted a law prohibiting all business on Sunday its validity could not be questioned,—that such a law would violate none of the constitutional provisions relied upon.

Common Law Does Not Prohibit Sunday Labor.

The common law of England, as adopted in this State as a part of our jurisprudence, does not prohibit the citizen from pursuing his ordinary labor on Sunday, nor is a contract entered into between two parties in this State void because executed on Sunday. (*Rex vs. Brotherton*, 1 Strange, 702; *Drury vs. DeFontaine*, 1 Taunt. 131; *Sayles vs. Smith*, 12 Wend. 57; *Richmond vs. Moore*, 107 Ill. 429.) On the other hand, at common law Sunday has always been regarded *dies non juridicus*—a day upon which courts could not transact other than necessary or ministerial business. In England, however, the law which permitted the transaction of business and the pursuit of one's ordinary labor was changed by statute (29 Char. II.), which provides that "no tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer or other person whatsoever shall do or exercise any worldly business or work on the Lord's day," works of necessity and charity being excepted.

This statute has been substantially adopted by the legislatures of many of the States in the Union. This State has not, however, followed the other States in the adoption of the English statute, but we have legislated on this subject for ourselves in a manner thought to be for the best interest of our people. That legislation will be found in paragraph 261 of our Criminal Code, as follows: "Whoever disturbs the peace and good order of society by labor (works of charity and necessity being excepted), or by any amusement or diversion, on Sunday, shall be fined not exceeding \$25. This section shall not be construed to prevent watermen and railroad companies from landing their passengers, or watermen from loading or unloading their cargoes, or ferrymen from

carrying over the water travelers and persons moving their families, on the first day of the week, nor to prevent the due exercise of the rights of conscience by whomever thinks proper to keep any other day as Sabbath." The preceding paragraph (260) provides: "Sunday shall include the time from midnight to midnight."

There is a wide and well-marked distinction between the English statute and ours. The English statute prohibits labor and business on Sunday, while our statute merely prohibits labor and amusement which disturbs the peace and good order of society. In *Richmond vs. Moore*, supra, in speaking of the difference between the two statutes, it is said (p. 433): "A mere glance at that and our statute will show that they are materially different. That prohibits labor and business; ours only prohibits labor or amusement that disturbs the peace and good order of society. The offense by that statute is the performance of labor or amusement against the peace and good order of society. The offense by that statute is the performance of labor or business, and by ours it is the disturbance of the peace and good order of society. The British statute is much more comprehensive in its purposes and language than ours. Ours only prohibits labor that disturbs the peace and good order of society, not naming business, whilst the British statute renders the mere act of labor or business penal."

Under the law of this State, as it existed prior to the passage of the act in question, each and every citizen of the State was left perfectly free to labor and transact business on Sunday or refrain from labor and business, as he might choose, so long as he did not disturb the peace and good order of society. By the act in question an attempt has been made by the legislature to inaugurate a radical change in the law as to a class of the laboring element of the State,—the barbers. The statute, as has been seen, declares "that it shall be unlawful for any person or persons to keep open any barber shop, or carry on the business of shaving, hair-cutting or tonsorial work on Sunday."

Labor Is Capital.

That act is plain, and its meaning is obvious. The owner of a place where is carried on the barber business is prohibited from doing any business whatever during one day in the week. He may have in his employ a dozen men, and yet during one day in seven he is deprived of their labor and also deprived of his own labor. The income derived from his place, and his own labor and the labor of his employés, are his property; but the legislature has by the act taken that property from him. The journeyman barber who works by the day or the week, or for a share of the amount he may receive from customers for his services, is by the law denied the right of laboring one day in the week. He may rely solely upon his labor for the support of himself and family; his labor may be the only property that he possesses, and yet this law takes that property away from him. His labor is his capital, and that capital is all the property he owns. Can a law which takes that from a laborer be sustained?

The Constitution of the United States says the State shall not deprive any person of property without due process of law, and our State constitution declares the same thing. What is understood by the term "due process of law," is not an open question. "Due process of law" is synonymous with "law of the land," and the "law of the land" is "general public law, binding upon all the members of the community, under all circumstances, and not partial or private laws, affecting the rights of private individuals or classes of individuals." (*Millet vs. People*, 117 Ill. 294.)

Is the act in question a law binding upon all the members of the community? A glance at its provisions affords a negative answer. The act affects one class of laborers and one class alone. The merchant and his clerks, the restaurant-keeper and his employés, the clothing-house proprietor, the blacksmith, the livery-stable keeper, the owners of street car lines, and people engaged in every other branch of business, are each and all allowed to open their respective places of business on Sunday and transact their ordinary business, if they desire; but the barber, and he alone, is required to close his place of business. The barber is thus deprived of property without due process of law, in direct violation of the Constitutions of the United States and of this State.

In *Millet vs. People*, supra, the validity of an act of the legislature requiring owners and operators of coal mines to weigh coal in a certain specified manner arose, and it was held not competent for the legislature to single out owners and operators of coal mines and provide that they should bear burdens not imposed on other owners of property or employers of labor, and prohibit them from making contracts which it is competent for other owners of property or employers of labor to make, and that such legislation cannot be sustained as an exercise of the police power.

In *Frorer vs. People*, 141 Ill. 171, where the validity of an act of the legislature arose which prohibited persons engaged in mining or manufacturing from keeping stores for furnishing supplies, tools, clothing, provisions or groceries to their employés while so engaged in mining or manufacturing, the law was held to be in conflict with the constitution. In the decision of the case it is among other things said (p. 180): "The privilege or liberty to engage in or control the business of keeping and selling clothing, provisions, groceries, tools, etc., to employés, is one of profit,—of presumptive value; and thus, by the effect of these sections, what the employers in other industries may do for their pecuniary gain with impunity, and have the law to protect and enforce, the miner and manufacturer, under precisely the same circumstances and conditions, are prohibited from doing for their pecuniary gain. The same act, in substance and in principle, if done by the one is lawful, and if done by the other is not only unlawful but a misdemeanor. . . . The privilege of contracting is both a liberty and a property right, and if A is denied the right to contract and acquire property in a manner which he has hitherto enjoyed under the law, and which B, C and D are still allowed by the law to enjoy, it is clear that he is deprived of both liberty and property to the extent that he is thus denied the right to contract."

In *Ramsey vs. People*, 142 Ill. 380, the case last cited was quoted with approval, and it was held that the act of 1881, which requires the owners and operators of coal mines, when the miner is paid on the basis of the amount of coal mined and delivered by him, to weigh the coal on pit cars before it is screened, and to pay on such weights, is a violation of Section 2 of Article 2 of the State Constitution, as depriving a class of persons of the liberty and property right of making contracts without due process of law.

In *Braceville Coal Co. vs. People*, 147 Ill. 66, the question of the validity of an act of the legislature arose which required certain specified corporations to pay their employés their wages weekly. It was held that as an act was applicable only to certain corporations, and did not operate upon all corporations for pecuniary profit, and individuals, it was unconstitutional, as depriving the corporations affected thereby of the right of liberty and property without due process of law.

Liberty Defined.

In speaking of the term "liberty," as used in the constitution, it is there said (p. 70): "There can be no liberty protected by government that is not regulated by such laws as will preserve the right of each citizen to pursue his own advancement and happiness in his own way, subject only to the restraints necessary to secure the same right to all others. The fundamental principle upon which liberty is based in free and enlightened government is equality under the law of the land. It has accordingly been everywhere held that liberty, as that term is used in the constitution, means not only freedom of the citizen from servitude and restraint, but is deemed to embrace the right of every man to be free in the use of his powers and faculties, and to adopt and pursue such avocation or calling as he may choose, subject only to the restraints necessary to secure the common welfare."

In *Ritchie vs. People*, 155 Ill. 98, the question arose in regard to the validity of a statute which provided that no female shall be employed in any factory or workshop more than eight hours in any one day or forty-eight hours in any one week, and it was held that the right to labor or employ labor, and make contracts in respect thereto, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, is both a liberty and a property right, and is included in the guaranty of Section 2 of Article 2 of the Constitution, and that the act prohibiting the employment of females in any factory or workshop for more than eight hours a day is unconstitutional, as being partial and discriminating in its character.

In the decision of the case it is said (p. 104): "Labor is property, and the laborer has the same right to sell his labor and to contract with reference thereto as has any other property owner. In this country the legislature has no power to prevent persons who are *sui juris* from making their own contracts, nor can it interfere with the freedom of contract between the workman and the employer."

If the legislature has no power to prohibit, by law, a woman from being employed in a factory or workshop more than eight hours in any one day or forty-eight hours in a week, upon what principle, it may be asked, has the legislature the right to prohibit a barber from laboring and receiving the fruits of his labor during any number of hours he may desire to work during the week? If a woman may be allowed to determine the number of hours she may work in a week, why not allow a barber the same right? Moreover, if the merchant, the grocer, the butcher, the druggist, and those engaged in other trades and callings, are allowed to open their places of business and

carry on their respective avocations during seven days of the week, upon what principle can it be held that a person who may be engaged in the business of barbering may not do the same thing? Why should a discrimination be made against that calling, and that alone?

But it is said that the law may be sustained under the police power of the State. In Tiedeman on Limitations of Police Powers, the author (Sec. 85) says: "The State, in the exercise of its police power, is, as a general proposition, authorized to subject all occupations to a reasonable regulation, where such regulation is required for the protection of the public interest or for the public welfare. It is also conceded that there is a limit to the exercise of this power, and that it is not an unlimited, arbitrary power, which would enable the legislature to prohibit a business the prosecution of which inflicts no damage upon others." The author also lays down the rule that it is within the discretion of the legislature to institute such regulations when a proper case arises. But it is a judicial question whether the trade or calling is of such a nature as to justify police regulation.

In Millett vs. People, supra, in speaking of police powers of the State as applicable to the case then before the court, it is said (p. 303): "Their requirements have no tendency to insure the personal safety of the miner, or to protect his property or the property of others. They do not meet Dwarri's definition of police regulations. They do not have reference to the comfort, the safety, or the welfare of society. (Potters' Dwarri on Stat. 458.) In Austin vs. Murray, 16 Pick. 121, it was said: "The law will not allow the rights of property to be invaded under the guise of a police regulation for the promotion of health, when it is manifest that such is not the object and purpose of the regulation." See also Waterman vs. Mayo, 109 Mass. 315, and cases referred to in Matter of Application of Jacobs, 98 N. Y. 109."

In Cooley's Constitutional Limitations (Sec. 484), in speaking in reference to a regulation made for one class of citizens, it is said: "Distinctions in these respects must rest upon some reason upon which they can be defended,—like the want of capacity in infants and insane persons; and if the legislature should undertake to provide that persons following some specified lawful trade or employment shall not have capacity to make contracts or receive conveyances, . . . or in any other way to make such use of their property as was permissible to others, it can scarcely be doubted that the act would transcend the bounds of legislative power, even though no express constitutional provision could be pointed out with which it would come in conflict."

Not a Sanitary Measure.

It will not and cannot be claimed that the law in question was passed as a sanitary measure, or that it has any relation whatever to the health of society. As has been heretofore seen as a general rule a police regulation has reference to the health, comfort and welfare of society. How, it may be asked, is the health, comfort, safety, or welfare of society to be injuriously affected by keeping open a barber shop on Sunday? It is a matter of common observation that the barber business, as carried on in this State, is both quiet and orderly. Indeed, it is shown by the evidence incorporated in the record, that the barber business, as conducted, is quiet and orderly,—much more so than many other departments of business. In view of the nature of the business and the manner in which it is carried on it is difficult to perceive how the rights of any person can be affected, or how the comfort or welfare of society can be disturbed. If the act were one calculated to promote the health, comfort, safety and welfare of society, then it might be regarded as an exercise of the police power of the State.

In Toledo, Wabash and Western Railway Co. vs. City of Jacksonville, 67 Ill. 37, it was held that if the law prohibits that which is harmless in itself, or requires that to be done which does not tend to promote the health, comfort, safety or welfare of society, it will in such case be an unauthorized exercise of power, and it will be the duty of the courts to declare such legislation void.

In Ritchie vs. People, supra, in speaking of the police power of the State, the court (110) said: "The police power of the State is that power which enables it to promote the health, comfort, safety and welfare of society. It is very broad and far-reaching, but is not without its limitations. Legislative acts passed in pursuance of it must not be in conflict with the constitution, and must have some relation, to the ends sought to be accomplished,—that is to say, to the comfort, welfare and safety of society. Where the ostensible purpose of an enactment is to secure the public comfort, welfare or safety, it must appear to be adapted to that end. It cannot invade the rights of persons and property under the guise of a mere police regulation, when it is not such in fact; and where such an act takes away the property of a citi-

zen or interferes with his personal liberty, it is the province of the courts to determine whether it is really an appropriate measure for the promotion of the comfort, safety and welfare of society."

We do not, therefore, think the law was authorized by the police power of the State. If the public welfare of the State demands that all business and all labor of every description, except works of necessity and charity, should cease on Sunday, the first day of the week, and that day should be kept as a day of rest, the legislature has the power to enact a law requiring all persons to refrain from their ordinary callings on that day. (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 725.) All will then be placed on a perfect equality, and no one can complain of an unjust discrimination. But when the legislature undertakes to single out one class of labor, harmless in itself, and condemn that and that alone, it transcends its legitimate powers, and its actions cannot be sustained. The judgment will be reversed.

Judgment reversed.

Mr. Justice Wilkin, dissenting.

From a Subscriber Who Ordered Four of Our Premium Bibles.

North Liberty, Ind., May 26.

PUBLISHERS AMERICAN SENTINEL—*Gentlemen*: I received my Bibles and can say I am very much pleased with them. I thank you for the names stamped on each. I am also glad through your liberal offer to have the SENTINEL sent to so many of my friends. The SENTINEL is to me a very valuable paper. Wishing you success, I remain your friend,
CLARA M. WHITMER.

A PARTY who has seen our "Premium Bible" and orders a Combination Bible says: "Your \$3 Premium Bible with the SENTINEL gives the very best of satisfaction, and I expect mine will do the same when it comes." Circular of the Combination Bible free. Send card for it.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
39 Bond St., New York.

"OUR NATION'S HISTORY AND SONG."

"OF making many books there is no end." One of the latest that has come to our table is "Our Nation's History and Song with the Campaign Songs Our Fathers Sung." The book contains 480 pages, is bound in paper covers, and sells for fifty cents. It is well worth the price, as it gives much of real interest not to be found in common histories.

Address the publishers, Charles H. Kerr & Co., 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago, Ill.

ONE of the very best numbers of the *Bible Students' Library* ever issued is "The Eastern Question. What Its Solution Means to All the World." Everybody ought to read it. Price 2 cents. Pacific Press Publishing Co., 39 Bond Street, New York.

PURE PRODUCT OF NUTS.

NUTTOSE

Perfect Substitute for Beef and other Flesh Foods,

Makes Fat and Blood.

The contents of each can are equal in nutritive value to 2½ lbs. of beef, 3 lbs. of salmon, 2½ lbs. of chicken.

Thoroughly Sterilized. Partially Predigested.
Easily Assimilable. Delicious.
Ready to Eat at Once. Will Keep Indefinitely.

Price, 1 1-2 lb. can, 40 cents.

A reasonable discount in quantities.

SANITAS FOOD CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

(Send five two-cent postage stamps for sample package.)

The Only Alternative of Success.

—By G. H. LYON.—

Some Condition of Success in the Prohibition Party is Wanting. What Is It?

The Sunday issue has become so involved with the prohibition issue, by reason of the compulsory holiday, making an idle day; and by reason of diverting of work for prohibition to one day in seven; that it behooves Prohibitionists quickly to give heed to it.

NOTE THE ABSOLUTE CONDITIONS.

See page 22, "For Repeal of the Sunday Laws." Protection for every man equally in his right to one day of rest in seven; whichever day he holds, not by compulsory Sabbath laws, but in freedom to worship God.

PRICE, 15c. 8 COPIES \$1.00,

Address, G. H. LYON, Sistersville, W. Va.

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.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
39 Bond St., New York.
Oakland, Cal. Kansas City, Mo.

A LITERARY WONDER.

THE NEW WEBSTER DICTIONARY

AND

Complete Vest-Pocket Library.

45,800 Words.

Absolutely Full Punctuation.

In quantity it is greater than any other abridged dictionary by several thousand words. More than this—the same covers contain **Four Other Complete Books.**

A GAZETEER—PARLIAMENTARY MANUAL—EXPERT CALCULATOR—LITERARY GUIDE.

Condensation without omission is a notable feature of this book. It abounds in novel time-saving and space-saving devices; but the greatest of all achievements in modern dictionary-making is the addition to the dictionary of **25,300 words by means of a single page, called the—**

"COLUMBIAN WORD BUILDER."

Bound in Morocco leather, with gold edge.

REGULAR PRICE, \$50
WITH SENTINEL, one year, \$1.25

ADDRESS, **AMERICAN SENTINEL,**
39 BOND ST., NEW YORK.



THE "CYCLONE" STILL WHIRLS Sweeping Everything Clean Before It.

SEE WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY:

Terra Ceia, Fla., Jan. 29. 1896.

CYCLONE WASHER Co: I received the machine, and to say that I am pleased is too tame. I am perfectly delighted with it. I have shown it to several and they are all pleased with its work, and talk of buying it. I shall try for orders, and if successful will want one dozen at once. MRS. E. A. LENNARD.

Address, **COON BROS., Battle Creek, Mich.**



NEW YORK, JULY 2, 1896.

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.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Pittsburg American* complains that Roman Catholic influence is so strong in the management of some of the soldiers' homes of the country that meat is tabooed on Friday.

WE desire to call special attention to the advertisement of "The Only Alternative of Success," on the preceding page. The author has stated some vital truths in a striking way. His pamphlet ought to accomplish great good.

A SABBATARIAN in Germany writes to one of his brethren in London, saying: "In some parts of Germany the police already visit the houses to see whether the Sunday laws are strictly carried out, and these laws are becoming more and more severe."

"PATERNALISM" in religion is antichristian. "Call no man your father," said Christ, "for one is your Father, which is in heaven." Matt. 23:9. The child must be obedient to the father's word; and in spiritual things only the word of the Omniscient is invested with paternal authority.

JULY 13, four Seventh-day Adventists will be placed on trial at Tiptonville, Lake County, Tenn., for refusal to keep Sunday. One member of the same church has been in prison at Tiptonville since March 13, and will not be released until about the middle of September.

The SENTINEL will be represented at these trials, and we expect to publish illustrated reports of the proceedings.

"AN affecting incident," says the *Christian Leader*, "connected with the massacre at Oorfa, was that of a mother, in whose presence her two sons were caught by the mob, while men with drawn swords, ready to cut them down, demanded of the young men that they should accept the Moslem faith. But the mother called out to them: 'Die, but don't deny the Lord.' They stood firm, and were immediately cut down."

AS reported in the *New York Journal*, of the 11th ult., Monsignor Antonio D. D. Conte Renior, an aged priest of the church of Rome, now ministering in this city, but for a number of years attached to the Vatican in Rome, has written a book entitled, "The Open Vatican." This fact was made public by the theft of the manuscript and the arrest of the thief. The priest intimates

that it was stolen for the purpose of suppressing it.

"The Open Vatican' is the revelation of the politics and diplomacy of the Vatican from 1846 to 1881. It gives new light upon European diplomacy showing how the Vatican's politics are pernicious to the development of civilization."

This is the priest's own description of his book, which is of course not yet published; but it is to be hoped that he will be successful in recovering his manuscript and giving the book to the world.

"THE National W. C. T. U. association is pushing its efforts," says the *Evangel and Sabbath Outlook*, "to sustain Sunday laws, with great vigor. It is making special efforts to secure the enactment of a Sunday law in the District of Columbia, in order to commit Congress to the principle of National Sunday legislation. While professing a certain patronizing toleration toward Sabbath-keepers, the W. C. T. U. is far from advocating genuine 'religious liberty.'"

A PRESS despatch from New Orleans, La., dated June 27, states that "after ten years' trial of the Sunday law, the Louisiana legislature has finally decided to abandon it, so far as New Orleans is concerned." Evidence upon the question of the repeal of the "law" was brought before the Judiciary Committee of the State Senate, and after a hearing of several days, every member of the committee was opposed to its further enforcement. With regard to the working of the "law," it was testified by four of the five members of the Police Board, that it tended greatly to demoralize the police force and to encourage blackmail. It was also testified that the attempt to enforce the Sunday "law" drew upon the strength of the police department so that not enough men were left to properly police the city; also that the arrests for drunkenness had not decreased but had increased since the "law" was passed.

June 26, the chaplain of the legislature created very much of a surprise in the Senate. When called up to begin the legislative services with prayer, he opened with a strong denunciation of the Sunday repeal bill.

THE *New York Observer*, in its issue of June 11, remarks that "the American people have come to a point when they must choose between Sunday and sabbath." The *Observer* hastens to explain that it does not mean by this a choice between the first and seventh days of the week, but only between the "Christian sabbath" and the "pagan Sunday." But there is no evading the fact that the choice must be made between the days as well.

It must ever remain as true as any other declaration of Holy Writ that "the seventh day is the Sabbath;" not a seventh day chosen by men, but the seventh day according to God's arrangement, ordained by his

word and assigned by his providence an undisputed and indisputable place in the calendar of all nations.

Sunday can never rise above its sanctions. Its weakness lies in the fact that its observance rests upon no divine authority. He who seeks to put it in the place of the Sabbath must first weaken the fourth commandment in the mind of the one upon whom he would impose first-day sacredness; but when that is done, when the divine law has been "abrogated" or made to appear indefinite, what is to bind the conscience?

The *Observer* quotes the words: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be persuaded in his own mind." If, as the *Observer* seems to infer, this text applies to the matter of Sabbath-keeping, by what authority does it or anybody insist upon Sunday-keeping? There can be none. The fact is, that in their mad zeal to strike down the seventh day, the advocates of Sunday sacredness deny the very authority to which they appeal, and thus practically destroy the only sanctions that can bind the conscience. "It is time for thee, Lord, to work: for they have made void thy law." "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

THE church organizations in Jersey City having invoked the Sunday "law" against the saloons, the latter are attempting to retaliate upon the churches by using the same weapon against paid Sunday organists and church choirs. It is sad that organizations professing to be doing only gospel work should make use of weapons which can only drive further away from Christ the men whom they should be seeking to bring to him. The Church of Christ can have no excuse for not attempting to lead to Christ all souls which it can reach, whether they be saloon-keepers or others. There can be no true Christian endeavor which is not of this kind.

THE *Christian Statesman* says that the action of the British Parliament in opening museums and galleries on Sunday has stirred the people of both England and Scotland to renewed activity in behalf of the day. "Scottish papers," says the *Statesman*, "have published the list of members from Scotland who voted for the resolution; and the sentiment of the friends of the Sabbath is finding emphatic utterance against them."

Public Opinion is the busy man's friend. Its aim is to reflect public opinion. The utmost care is taken to treat each question upon which extracts are given in a perfectly clear, non-partisan, and unbiased manner. It is carefully edited and contains the cream of the entire press of the country. It is worth a score of other papers. Subscription price, \$2 50 per year; five cents per single copy. Address Public Opinion Co., New York.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

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

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
39 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.