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

VOLUME 5. NEW YORK, JULY 10, 1890. NUMBER 27.

The American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,

No. 43 BOND ST., NEW YORK.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS,

C. P. BOLLMAN, W. H. McKEE.

THE *Signs of the Times*, of Oakland, California, says, that it "is just as strenuously opposed to laws for the seventh-day Sabbath as it is to laws for Sunday. Government has no business to legislate on the question." And so say we.

THE Supreme Court of Indiana has decided that a will drafted on Sunday is valid, and that such labor is not in violation of the law forbidding "common labor" on Sunday, and holds that there is a "wide distinction between the execution of contracts, notes, and bonds on Sunday, and the execution of a will." It is well that the Court so decided, else it must also have forbidden dying upon Sunday, since it might easily happen that a man, neglecting to make his will upon Sunday, would die before Monday and so leave no will.

CRITICISING certain so-called Sunday-law arguments the *Western Herald* of Burlington, Iowa, says:—

> Facts are worth stating, even in a church and at a meeting whose aim is the civil enforcement of a religious institution. The speaker who asserted that the French Revolution was the result of the abolishment of Sunday, the so-called day of rest, and the substitution therefor of every tenth day in its stead, was either quite uninformed or wilfully perversive. The causes of that Revolution were multiplex—but chiefly due to the poverty of the masses who had long been preyed upon by the nobility, the common people seemingly being regarded as born only for the use of the upper class. Atheism was widely prevalent, it cannot be denied, but it was largely the outgrowth of the oppression and flagrant immorality of the ruling classes.

Yes, facts are worth stating; but those who plead for compulsory Sunday observance are not as careful to state facts as they should be. The fact that it was the abuses practiced by a corrupt church that more than anything else caused the atheism which was so pronounced in France at the time of the Revolution, would not be of service to their cause, and so they don't state it. They find it more convenient, even if less logical, to attribute that atheism to what were in fact some of its results.

An Interesting Question Raised.

IN the last number of THE SENTINEL we reprinted from the *Sun*, a dispatch from Nashville, Tennessee, stating that the conviction of a Seventh-day Adventist for working on Sunday had been confirmed by the Supreme Court of that State; and that the National Religious Liberty Association was about to make an appeal to the United States Supreme Court. The dispatch stated that the point on which the appeal is to be taken, is the rights of a citizen of the United States under the First and Fourteenth Amendments. This question is both interesting and important. In Tennessee and Georgia at the present time, religious people who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and who are honest and model citizens in every respect, are being meanly persecuted, as have been others of the same class in Arkansas, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, at other times, by those who profess to observe Sunday.

It is important to know as soon as possible whether it is true that in this Nation one class of citizens must be compelled to pay tribute to the religious views of another class. Is it true anywhere in this country that there is a class of religionists who have a monopoly of religious views secured to them by the State? As these things have been going on for a considerable length of time, we have longed to see the day come when the matter should be tested by the National Constitution, and we are glad that the prospect of its being tested is now so good, and we hope that the Religious Liberty Association will make good the announcement which we have read in this dispatch. We have no doubt whatever that if the decision shall be rendered according to justice, and the logic of the Constitution, it will put a quietus upon this exercise of the persecuting propensities of certain Sunday religionists.

If the First Amendment to the Constitution stood alone, there would be no ground of appeal on this point, because it simply forbids *Congress* to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; but in that amendment there is no inhibition upon the States. The States are not forbidden to do what Congress is there forbidden to do. The powers not prohibited to the States by the Constitution, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people, and as that amendment does not forbid the State to do thus, that power may be exercised by the State to any extent. So far as this amendment goes in itself, any State in the Union might establish any religion and forbid the exercise of any religion but that. But this amendment, taken in connection with the Fourteenth, assures perfect, religious liberty to every citizen of the United States.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States established a new order of things under this Government. Before this amendment was adopted, there was primarily no such thing as a citizen of the United States. Every person was a citizen of a State first, and a citizen of the United States only because he was a citizen of a State; but the adoption of that amendment made all persons born or naturalized within the United States, citizens of the United States, and of the several States in which they reside; so that *now* every person is a citizen of the United States first of all, and after that is a citizen of whatever State it may be in which he resides. The Fourteenth Amendment further says that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or im-

munities of citizens of the United States." Citizenship of the United States, therefore, and the rights, privileges, and immunities of persons as such, under this amendment takes precedence of all the powers of the States. Under the First Amendment there is secured to all citizens of the United States perfect immunity from any form of oppression on account of religious convictions; because the power of the United States is positively forbidden to be exercised in any such way. And as, by this amendment, every citizen has perfect immunity and privilege secured to him in the free exercise of his religious convictions, and as by this amendment every State is absolutely prohibited from either making or enforcing any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, it therefore follows logically and justly, that no State can make any law, or enforce any law that is already made, which would interfere in any way with the right of an observer of the seventh day, or any other, to be free from any interference whatever on the part of, or in behalf of, those who observe Sunday or any other day.

Logically and justly the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States would absolutely prohibit any State from making or enforcing any law for the observance of Sunday, and much more, any law compelling the observance of Sunday by those who have already observed another day.

We know that the turn is now attempted to be taken by the courts, that Sunday legislation is not religious legislation, and that Sunday laws are not enacted or enforced in the interests of religion; but this is false. There is not a Sunday law on any statute book in Christendom that is not there out of deference to religion, and that is not there because of the distinctively religious idea that attaches to it; and for judges on the bench to undertake to make it appear that these laws are not religious, and that such legislation is not religious legislation, is to falsify the record in two particulars. First, Sunday is in itself religious, and religious only. The first Sunday law that ever was made was enacted solely in the interest of religion, and the object of the law was to devote the day to "the purposes of devotion," thus putting into the law the religious idea that attaches to the day; and every Sunday law that has ever been enacted from that day till this has been enacted with this same idea in it.

Sometimes, indeed, the laws are found to read, "The first day of the week, commonly called Sunday," but that does not modify the matter in the least. The idea of the first day of the week as such, and as a distinctive day, is religious, and there is no other idea that attaches to it in the laws that have been enacted or in the minds of those who observe the day or who seek to enforce the law. The first day of the week owes its precedence to the fact that Christ rose on that day, and it is in honor of this event that the day is said to have been set apart and to be observed; *and this is entirely religious*, so that whether it be as "the first day of the week" or as plain "Sunday," the thought that is in the phrase and that is in the law wherever it may be found is religious only, and for judges on the bench to attempt to make it otherwise is simply to do violence to all the logic of the question, and to contradict all the facts in the history of the question.

Again, every one of these laws has been enacted with the distinct intention of showing deference to the religious idea that is expressed in the day. The laws were enacted solely for that purpose. The original laws of this country were the Sunday laws of the colonies. Each one of the colonies having an established religion and considering itself to be set for the propagation of the kingdom of God in the earth, established by law the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, or the Lord's day, solely with the intention of compelling all people within its jurisdiction to comply with the forms of the religious establishment of that particular colony. All the Sunday laws of the other States, and the idea of them have been taken bodily from those of the original thirteen. Now it is a principle in the interpretation of law, that no meaning shall be given to a law that was not in it when it was enacted. The rule is that a statute "is not to be made to mean one thing at one time, and another at some subsequent time, when the circumstances may have so changed as perhaps to make a different rule in the case seem desirable. . . . The meaning of the Constitution (or statute) is fixed when it is adopted, and it is not different at any subsequent time when the Court has occasion to pass upon it." And says Cooley: "A Court or Legislature which should allow a change of public sentiment to influence it in giving to a written Constitution a construction not warranted by the intention of its founders, would be justly chargeable with reckless disregard of official oath and public duty."

This is as true of a statute as it is of a Constitution. No Court has any right to give to any law a meaning other than that which was in it when it was made. As the Sunday laws have been enacted solely out of regard for religion; and as the purpose in the enactment of the laws was solely religious; when a Court attempts to read into the statute any other meaning, and to give to the laws any other purpose, it simply does violence to the rules of law established for the guidance of courts, and sets up the mere opinion of the judges who so decide, and makes their will to be the law.

Legislation and laws in behalf of Sunday, being religious legislation solely, are clearly prohibited to Congress by the First Amendment to the Constitution. It therefore follows that so far as the power of the United States is concerned, every citizen of the United States has perfect immunity from any such legislation. And as the Fourteenth Amendment makes all persons born or naturalized in the United States citizens of the United States first of all, and then positively prohibits any State from making or enforcing any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, it follows that properly and logically the Constitution of the United States absolutely prohibits any State from making or enforcing any Sunday law. And much more does it prohibit the enforcement of the observance of Sunday upon those who religiously observe another day.

We know that this point has never yet been raised under the Constitution, and consequently the Constitution has never yet been officially construed with reference to this question. But that this is the logic of the Constitution upon this point, there can be no question; and that we have excellent authority for saying that this is the proper construction of the Constitution is equally clear. Hon. James G. Blaine was in Congress when the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted. He played a leading part in all the movements which secured the adoption of this amendment as a part of the Constitution. His opinion of the meaning of this clause of the amendment can be only second in weight to that of the official declaration of the Supreme Court of the United States; and as the Supreme Court has not yet been called upon to pronounce upon the question, Mr. Blaine's opinion is, so far, of the very highest importance and of the greatest value. On pages 312–314, Vol. II of his work, "Twenty Years of Congress," Mr. Blaine discusses the value and importance of the Fourteenth Amendment, and on page 314 are the following words:—

> The language of the Fourteenth Amendment is authoritative and mandatory: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; 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." Under the force of these weighty inhibitions, the citizen of foreign birth cannot be persecuted by discriminating statutes, nor can the citizen of dark complexion be deprived of a single privilege or immunity which belongs to the white man. Nor can the Catholic, or the Protestant, or the Jew be placed under ban or subjected to any deprivation of personal or religious right. The provision is comprehensive and absolute, and sweeps away at once every form of oppression and every denial of justice.

This clearly touches the point at issue in the case which is proposed to be carried up from Tennessee. If the Catholic, or the Protestant, or the Jew cannot be placed under ban, or subjected to any deprivation of personal or religious right, then certainly each one of these classes is free from religious subjection to the religious

dictates or observances, of any of the others. And as this is true as between Protestants and Catholics, and between Catholics and Jews, and between Protestants and Jews, it is equally true as between one class of Protestants and another; and therefore the Sunday-keeping people of Tennessee or of any other State, cannot place under ban, or subject to their religious dictates, under penalties of law, a people who choose to observe another day than Sunday.

Again we say, this is a question of the deepest interest and of the greatest importance to every citizen of the United States. We are glad that the question is to be brought to the test; we hope the Religious Liberty Association will do indeed what the Nashville dispatch says that it has proposed to do, and we wish the Association complete success in its noble undertaking. The Constitution, the logic, the justice, and the probabilities are all on the side of the Association. Whether the law will be put there also, remains to be seen; for that depends upon how the United States Supreme Court shall decide. A. T. J.

St. James and the Vatican.

THE following we clip from the San Francisco *Examiner*, of May 30:—

London, May 30.—The appointment of Judge Andriano Dingle, Chief Justice of Malta, as English Ambassador to the Vatican, is the outcome of the mission of Sir Mintern Simmons to the Vatican, and has reference alone to Malta.

There is nothing in the appointment which need alarm those earnest Englishmen who are inclined to take fire at the opening of diplomatic relations with the Papacy. It is forgotten by many well-meaning people that the British flag floats over a very considerable Roman Catholic population in various parts of the world, and that the crown has taken control over territory in which, by solemn treaty, all the religious rights of Catholics are guaranteed.

Such is the position in Lower Canada, in a section of India, in the West Indies and in Malta, and if ever it seems to call for modification, the British Government of the day must trample arbitrarily upon all its pledges or open negotiations with the papal authorities.

The canon law is the civil law of Malta. Her Majesty's government desired a certain concession regarding the validation of managers, the use of English by the clergy, and the appointment of bishops, and all that is required has practically been obtained.

We wish to call attention to the following points:—

1. Such negotiations between England and the Papacy would once have been considered by Englishmen as little less than treason.

2. It would be so considered now were not the Papacy a power which England dares not ignore. The fact that England has taken such a step shows the increased power and influence of the Papacy in European affairs.

3. The fact of the negotiations proves that the Roman Catholic Church is not only an ecclesiastical power, but a political power.

4. The second paragraph quoted is the thinnest sort of fallacy. Because England rules over Roman Catholic subjects, does it follow that she must negotiate with the Vatican and send an ambassador to St. Peter's? Does she rule over her people as members of different sects, or as British subjects? If the fact that there are many Roman Catholics in the dominion of Great Britain is reason why the British Government should send an ambassador to the head of that church, ought not that Government, to be consistent, to open negotiations with other religious denominations? There are many Wesleyans, and Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, in the British dominions. Why is not an ambassador sent to their General Conferences? The Salvation Army has many thousands of British subjects. Why should not an ambassador be kept at the royal palace of General Booth?

5. The action ought to alarm every true Englishman. The conclusion is unavoidable; an English ambassador at the Vatican is a recognition of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. A proposition to open negotiations from the head of any other sect would be treated with ridicule or silent contempt by the Court at St. James. But the Roman Catholic is no more entitled to it than is the smallest sect in the dominions of Her Britannic Majesty. As was remarked by a leading London journal a few years ago, Rome is a power which must be taken into account in solving the great questions of the day. Both England and Germany are finding it to be the case more and more. The outcome of it all is revealed in the prophetic word.—*Signs of the Times*.

Religious Observance.

ON Monday night, June 16, the Rev. W. F. Crafts gave a lengthy lecture in Boulder, Colorado, on "The *Civil* American Sabbath." He exhibited a chart and explained the physical detriment of continued labor, and enthusiastically spoke of the need and benefits of laws to better enforce the observance of this civil Sabbath. The *religious* Sabbath would not down, but kept continually coming to the front, all through the lecture. In the beginning of his speech he made the statement that all the States, excepting California, had Sunday laws, and in no State did these laws compel any religious observance. At the close of his lecture, one in the audience arose and asked, if a man observed the seventh day as a rest day, thus meeting all his physical necessities, and then on Sunday pursued his labor of such a nature and in such a place as to disturb no one, on what ground did Sunday laws fine him seventy-five dollars for so laboring? The speaker replied that he did not countenance the few cases of that kind which had occurred, but all Sunday laws should exempt those who kept the seventh day. It will be seen at once that this was an evasion of the point in question. What the law *should* do, and what it *did* do are very different things. The man was punished, not for disturbing his neighbors, for he did not disturb them; not for injuring himself by continuous toil, for he had rested the day before; it is therefore easy to see that the punishment inflicted by these laws was to compel the religious observance of Sunday. All Sunday legislation is religious legislation; and it is plain to be seen that any and every Sunday law, in any and every State, is for the sole purpose of enforcing the *religious observance of that day*.

E. R. JONES.

The Bible and Public Schools.

WE have read, with hearty approval, the opinions recently delivered in the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, in regard to the question of the Bible in the public schools of that State, the full text of which has been published in the Albany *Law Journal*. This reading only confirms our opinion of this decision as heretofore expressed.

Mr. Justice Lyon delivered the opinion of the Court; and Messrs. Justices Cassoday and Orton delivered concurring opinions. The case before the Court was that of a petition for a *mandamus*, commanding the School Board in the city of Edgerton to cause the teachers in one of the public schools of that city to discontinue the practice of reading, during school hours, portions of the King James version of the Bible. The petitioners for the *mandamus* were residents and tax-payers in Edgerton, and presumptively Catholics in their religious faith, although this fact is not stated in these deliverances. They complained of the practice above referred to.

This petition brought squarely before the Court the question whether such a practice is consistent with the Constitution of the State of Wisconsin; and this question the Court unanimously answered in the negative. And, that our readers may the better understand the case, we submit in the following order the several points decided:

1. The first point is the construction of Article X, Section 3, of the Constitution of the State, which declares that "the Legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools, which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, and such schools shall be free and without charge for tuition to all children between the ages of four, and twenty years, and *no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein*." The Court held that the reading of the King James version of the Bible in public schools of the State during school hours, is "sectarian instruction" within the meaning of this constitutional prohibition, and hence inconsistent there-

with. Mr. Justice Lyon said that the prohibition "manifestly refers exclusively to instruction in *religious* doctrines," and in such doctrines as "are believed by some religious sects and rejected by others." The Court took judicial knowledge of the fact that the King James version of the Bible is not accepted and used by *all* "religious sects" in Wisconsin, but is accepted by some of these sects and rejected by others. Hence, as between them, all having the same constitutional rights, the Court held that version to be a "sectarian" book, and the reading of it in the manner and for the purpose set forth in the complaint to be forbidden by the Constitution of the State.

How any other conclusion could have been drawn from the premises, we are not able to see. We presume that there is not a Protestant in Wisconsin who would hesitate a moment on the point, if the book read had been the Douay version of the Bible which is acceptable to Catholics, or the Koran, or the Book of Mormon. The reading of such a book as a part of school exercise, whether for worship or religious instruction, would be offensive to Protestants, and they would have good cause for complaint, just as the reading of the King James version, which is sometimes called the Protestant Bible, is offensive to Catholics. It should not be forgotten that, under the Constitution of Wisconsin, Catholics and Protestants have on this subject precisely the same rights, and that neither can claim any precedence over the other. The Constitution of that State makes no distinction between them, and determines no question relating to their differences, or any other religious differences. It deals with all the people simply as *citizens*, no matter what may be their religious tenets, or whether they have any such tenets.

2. The second point decided is that "the practice of reading the Bible in such schools can receive no sanction, from the fact that pupils are not compelled to remain in the school while it is being read." On this point we quote, as follows, the language of Mr. Justice Lyon:—

When, as in this case, a small minority of the pupils in the public school is excluded, for any cause, from a stated school exercise, particularly when such cause is apparent hostility to the Bible, which a majority of the pupils have been taught to revere, from that moment the excluded pupil loses caste with his fellows, and is liable to be regarded with aversion, and subjected to reproach and insult. But it is a sufficient refutation of the argument that the practice in question tends to destroy the equality of the pupils which the Constitution seeks to establish and protect, and puts a portion of them at a serious disadvantage in many ways with respect to any others.

The plain fact is that *not* to compel the attendance, upon such reading, of the children of parents who object to it, for the sake of continuing the reading, is a virtual confession that the reading has a "sectarian" character, as between those who desire it and those who object to it. It is merely an attempt to get round what is apparent on the face of the case.

3. The third point decided is that "the reading of the Bible is an act of worship, as that term is defined in the Constitution; and hence the tax-payers of any district who are compelled to contribute to the erection and support of common schools, have the right to object to the reading of the Bible, under the Constitution of Wisconsin, Article I, section 18, clause 2, declaring that no man shall be compelled to . . . erect or support any place of worship." This provision is in what is called the "Declaration of Rights." The opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Cassoday on this point is, to our understanding, clear and conclusive. Bible-reading in public schools has the form and intention of religious worship; and this being the fact, then to compel the people by taxation to erect and support public schools, in which such reading is a practice, is to compel them by law to erect and support places of worship. The fact that these places are also used for other purposes does not relieve the difficulty. The Constitution expressly declares that the people shall not "be compelled to erect *any* place" that is used for the purpose of worship. To tax a man to erect and support a public school, and then to introduce the element of religious worship into that school, is to make a combination which the Constitution forbids.

4. The fourth point decided is that, "as the reading of the Bible at stated times in a common school is religious instruction, the money drawn from the State Treasury in support of such school is 'for the benefit of a religious seminary,' within the meaning of the Constitution of Wisconsin, Article 1, section 18, clause 4, prohibiting such an appropriation of the funds of the State." The design of the clause referred to, is to prevent the State from using the public funds to defray the expenses of religious instruction; and this design is frustrated just as really when these funds are used to support common schools in which such instruction is given, as it would be if these funds were used to support "religious societies, or religious or theological seminaries." Mr. Justice Cassoday in his opinion sets forth this point very clearly.

We have thus given the pith of the argument on this subject as stated by the three Justices of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin. We see no escape from the conclusion reached, and have no desire to escape it, since we thoroughly believe in its correctness everywhere. To the argument that "the exclusion of Bible reading from the district schools is derogatory to the value of the Holy Scriptures, a blow to their influence upon the conduct and consciences of men, and disastrous to the cause of religion," Mr. Justice Lyon thus replied:—

We most emphatically reject these views. The priceless truths of the Bible are best taught to our youth in the church, the Sabbath and the parochial schools, the social religious meetings, and, above all, by parents in the home circle. There these truths may be explained and enforced, the spiritual welfare of the child guarded and protected, and his spiritual nature directed and cultivated in accordance with the dictates of the parental conscience. The Constitution does not interfere with such teaching and culture.

The doctrine of the Constitution of Wisconsin, as thus settled by the Supreme Court of that State, is, in our judgment, the true doctrine for every State in the Union. It remits the question of religious instruction, as to what it shall be, as to the agency giving it, and as to the cost thereof, to voluntary, private, and individual effort, and devotes the public school, created and regulated by law, and supported by a general taxation of the people, exclusively to secular education. This principle is in harmony with the nature and structure of our political institutions, and is, moreover, just and equitable as between religious sects. It favors no one of them and proscribes no one of them; and while it leaves them all free to propagate their religious beliefs in their own way, and at their own expense, it gives to the whole people, at the cost of the whole, a system of popular education that is certainly good as far as it goes, and is *all* that the State can give, without itself becoming a religious propagandist. Catholics and Protestants alike ought to be satisfied with it. There is no other basis on which the school question can be justly settled as between different religious sects.—*N. Y. Independent.*

Some Pertinent Questions.

WHILE some of the advocates of Sunday laws are still urging the passage and the enforcement of such laws in the interest of religion, others are more wise, even if less honest, and are pleading for a "civil sabbath" for "civil reasons." In a recent discourse in Denver, Rev. W. F. Crafts said: "It is genuine labor reform, this six-day law."

"There is a general agreement," said he, "that the rest day must be made, by law. When men think that ten hours out of twenty-four is enough for work, it is incorporated in law, and everybody thinks it all right. Our movement is a six-day one, and on a par with the ten or eight-hour law." But where is the parallel? No ten or eight-hour law ever made, forbade men to work more than eight or ten hours; such laws simply forbid employers to require men to work more than eight or ten hours for a day's wages; if the men themselves are willing to work extra time, they may do so. But Sunday laws forbid work upon a certain day; they aim to protect not the employee, but the *day*.

If the real purpose of Sunday legislation is to prevent men from being required to do unnecessary work upon Sun-

day, why do the advocates of such legislation not ask that the day be made a legal holiday, and that employers be required to pay double wages for all work done upon that day—with the provision also that a claim for such extra wages shall never outlaw, and that no agreement on the part of an employee shall be a bar to the collection of such wages? Such a law would stop all the unnecessary Sunday work now carried on, and give working people every advantage that they could justly claim on the score of a *right* to rest; and at the same time it would leave all who wish to labor on their own account free to do so, as they are not now in some States. But no law whatever is really necessary to secure to every man the right to rest.

While upon the Pacific Coast, a few weeks since, Mr. Crafts was asked if a Saturday law was not necessary to protect the Jew in the religious observance of the seventh day. Mr. Crafts replied: "It is not sufficiently emphasized that the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day. He can close his shop; he can refuse to work." Mr. Crafts is quite right in this answer; but it is just as true of the Sunday keeper: he can refuse to work. If the demand was as general as Mr. Crafts would have us believe, men would strike for Sunday rest just as they now do for shorter hours and higher wages. But nobody ever heard of a strike against Sunday work.

But Mr. Crafts, though professedly working for a civil law for the protection of a civil rest day, is not content to place the seventh-day observer and the first-day observer upon the same footing as regards the law. He not only wants to provide that nobody shall be compelled to work upon the first day, but that nobody shall be permitted to work upon that day, with these exceptions: "We concede," says he, "that three exceptions must be made—for labors of necessity, mercy, and for those who keep Saturday, the latter to work behind closed doors." But why behind closed doors, Mr. Crafts? If the law is only for the protection of labor, only to prevent men from being *compelled* to work on Sunday, why provide that those who want to work upon that day shall do it behind closed doors? There can be but one reason, namely, to place Sunday work under the ban of the law, and merely tolerate it just as Protestant worship is tolerated in some of the South American countries, behind high walls and in buildings not having any outward resemblance to churches.

Referring to Mr. Crafts' work, the Denver *News*, of June 17, well says:—

> It needs no analysis to see the drift of the legislation he advocates. He would have the civil power enforce a religious conception of Sunday observance, save that he would forego compulsory attendance at church.

One fact is, that look at the matter from whatever point of view you will, the real design of Sunday laws is to protect and honor the day, not to protect the men who might otherwise labor upon that day. This fact is "not sufficiently emphasized;" indeed, it is even denied by the American Sabbath Union.

C. P. B.

Unique Legislation.

THE last clause of the Blair Sunday-rest Bill, is worded as follows:—

> Nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to prohibit or sanction labor on Sunday, by individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath, or a day of religious worship, provided that such labor be not done to the disturbance of others.

This is unique. No such legislation as this was ever before offered in this country. The restrictions of the Bill, if passed, would bear upon all persons within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress,—the District of Columbia, the Territories, ships on the high seas, military and naval stations, military and naval service; the postal service, and those engaged in inter-state commerce and trade with the Indians.

The influence of such a measure would not be as circumscribed as some of its promoters would have us think. Its restrictions upon the postal service, and inter-state commerce, would cause its effects to be seen, and its results manifested in every corner of the land. Those who planned it, well know this, and have worked accordingly. But from the effects of this far-reaching law, they make an ostensible exception. What is it? It specifies a certain class of people, who are characterized in the bill, as "individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday, as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship," and declares that, as regards them, the bill is non-committal. Concerning this class, it withdraws its prohibition, but at the same time refuses its sanction. As regards them, it refuses to legislate.

These people who "conscientiously believe," etc., are therefore thrown outside the pale of the law. They are ignored in the laws of the United States. They are outlaws. There is something so darkly mysterious in their case, that Congress cannot acknowledge their existence, but must deny itself to them utterly, either in favor or displeasure.

But who is it that thus assumes to ask for the outlawry of a body of American citizens? It is a number of men who form the nucleus of a party known as the National Reform Association, and who deny their own citizenship, and refuse to exercise their right of suffrage. This Government, and the people (who are the Government), should consider whether "conscientious" citizens who obey the law, pay their taxes, and value their franchise, using it for the benefit of their country, should be scorned and outlawed, at the demand of a few men who are aliens by choice—voluntary aliens, because the great founders of this republic were too intelligently and profoundly reverent to embody the name of God in the civil document upon which the polity of this Nation is based. Shall the Congress of the United States say of any person or any class of persons within its jurisdiction, "We wash our hands of you;" "We neither prohibit nor sanction your acts;" "We deliver you up to the Committees of One Hundred, to the Law-and-Order leagues, and to the White Caps"? If this can be accomplished by a demand from such a source, who governs this country? and who may not come next under the ban of outlawry?

W. H. M.

Bellamyism In Fact.

THE following bill has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senator Plumb, of Kansas:—

> Be it enacted, that the President of the United States shall forthwith issue a call addressed to all citizens of this republic over twenty-one years of age, inviting them to serve in the grand army of labor of this republic for not less than one day, under the following terms and conditions; First, the hours of labor shall not exceed four hours per day for more than five days in each week, nor more than six successive weeks without an intermission of two weeks; second the rate of wages shall be four dollars per day, and be payable weekly, in the declaratory, full legal tender, silk-threaded, greenback, paper money of the United States of America exclusively.
>
> SECTION 2. That an Executive Department of Labor be and is hereby established, and the office of Secretary of the Department of Labor, at a salary of $4 per day, is hereby created, for the purpose of enabling the said President to rapidly commission and assign said volunteers to duty in the public service, where their abilities will reflect credit upon themselves; and it is hereby distinctly provided that the tenure of office in said service shall be held exclusively at the pleasure of the said volunteer, and not, as heretofore, at the pleasure of some spoilsman who may happen to hold a commission issued by the President of the United States or other officer thereof.
>
> SECTION 3. That the money necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect, be, and is hereby appropriated out of any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in case there shall be no money in said treasury, then it shall be the duty of the Treasurer of the United States to inform the Secretary of the treasury of that fact, and he shall at once cause a sufficiency thereof to be prepared and covered into the Treasury for said purpose.
>
> SECTION 4. That all laws, and parts of laws, in conflict herewith, be, and are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect when approved.

That is Bellamyism, otherwise called Nationalism, reduced to legal form. Of course so far as Senator Plumb is concerned this is only a "take off;" but as for Bellamyism it is the genuine article set in statutory phrase. Nothing more than this is expected to be done with the bill; but it is worth something to have Mr. Bellamy's extravaganza reduced to a definite proposition and put into plain every-day English. We should like to see Mr. Bellamy or any who holds his fancy, either advocate or oppose it.

The Basis of Civil Sabbath Laws.

I LEARN from the *Christian Statesman* of May 29, that the editor, and Judge Hagan, of Cincinnati, Ohio, though agreed in the propriety and necessity of a civil Sabbath, differ from each other on the basis of such legislations. The Judge says, "No legislation on this subject, unless it is founded on some basis beside the Christian duty of observing a day of rest, can be justified. So keen and incisive was the intention of the founders of the Government to divorce the Church from the State, entirely and forever, that there cannot be, as there ought not to be, any legislation to enforce the performance of a Christian duty as such; but all laws must be founded on civil rights, duties, and obligations."

But the editor argues that without the divine law for the Sabbath there would be no basis for a civil Sabbath law. He says, "The moment we depart from an immutable moral basis, that moment we are left adrift without compass or chart. The logic which runs us into such absurdity and such wickedness should show us that we must base our civil Sabbath laws on the divine law. This is where our ablest jurors have based them. Judge Flandrau, of the Supreme Court of Minnesota, declared that the Sabbath law of that State 'can have no other object than the enforcement of the fourth of God's commandments.'" The editor also quotes Judge Caldwell, of the Supreme Court of Texas, as saying that "the object of the legislation was to forbid all secular employments on the Sabbath, not excepted in the act. The disregard of the Sabbath, the refusal to recognize it as a day sanctified to holy purposes, constitutes the offense."

Judge Hagan, to avoid the union of Church and State, would have the civil Sabbath based on reasons wholly outside of religious obligation; but the editor thinks such an idea absurd, and would have the civil Sabbath based on the command of God, so that it will reach men's consciences, and so that "the refusal to recognize it as a day sanctified to holy purposes" will constitute the chief offense against the law. Any one can see that the enactment of such a law would be an effort to compel men to acknowledge the claims of the religion of the Bible, and of what they call the Christian Sabbath; and yet this is not religious legislation, but purely civil! But however they differ in regard to the basis on which to found it, in one thing they agree, and that is, we must have a "civil Sabbath."

The advocates of error will differ widely in their premises, but still come to the same conclusion; but those who plead for truth are united in the reasons they offer in its support, because they are ready-made, and they do not have to invent them.

R. F. COTTRELL.

NATIONAL
RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ASSOCIATION.

DECLARATION of PRINCIPLES.

We believe in the religion taught by Jesus Christ.
We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.
We believe in supporting the civil government, and submitting to its authority.
We deny the right of any civil government to legislate on religious questions.
We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.
We also believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent religious legislation by the civil government; that we and our fellow-citizens may enjoy the inestimable blessings of both religious and civil liberty.

OFFICES.

43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY;
225 A ST., N. E. WASHINGTON; 28 COLLEGE PLACE, CHICAGO.

C. ELDRIDGE, - - - - - - - - *President.*
W. H. MCKEE, - - - - - - - - *Secretary.*

Liberty of Conscience.

R. M. KING, of Obion County, Tennessee, belongs to a sect which holds Saturday and not Sunday to be the Sabbath. He observes Saturday with great strictness, and on Sunday quietly proceeds with the labor on his farm.

For doing so, Mr. King was indicted, tried, convicted and fined last March. The National Religious Liberty Association—an organization composed entirely of believers in the Christian religion—has undertaken King's defense, and the case has been appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States for the purpose of testing there the constitutionality of State laws enforcing the religious observance of Sunday as a Sabbath.

Whatever the judicial ruling may be as to the constitutional power of a State to enforce such laws, there can be no doubt that their enforcement in such cases as that of Mr. King is a gross violation of natural rights and rights of conscience. It is not contended that Mr. King disturbed any neighbor in the enjoyment of a quiet Sunday, but merely that his working on Sunday and his observance of Saturday as his Sabbath instead, was an offense to the moral sense of the community, and a violation of the law of the State.

If it was so, it is high time for the community in which Mr. King lives to discipline its moral sense, and for his State to rearrange its laws in conformity with that principle of individual liberty which lies at the foundation of American institutions.

The principle involved is simple and its application plain. The State has nothing to do with religion except to protect every citizen in his religious liberty. It has no more right to prescribe the religious observance of Sabbaths and holy days than to order sacraments and ordain creeds.

In recognition of the general custom of the people, the State rightfully makes Sunday a legal holiday, in order that no man whose conscience or convenience forbids may be compelled to work on that day. The law also properly protects citizens against unnecessary disturbance of their quietude on that day, but beyond that it has no right to go, in a country where Church and State are totally separated by fundamental law. To go further is for the State to assume powers inconsistent with its being and very dangerous to religious liberty.

And this doctrine is held by all enlightened men of all creeds, not in antagonism to any but in defense of all. It is the doctrine of perfect religious liberty in a purely secular State as opposed to the doctrine of State absolutism and intolerance in religion.—*Editorial in New York World, June 23.*

THE Rev. G. E. Gordon, whom many of our citizens met at the recent Dairymen's Association, promulgates some sensible ideas. He recently signed a remonstrance against the enactment by Congress of laws to enforce the observance of the Sabbath. "I am opposed to all legislation of that kind," he said, when questioned about it. "I believe that the people have the right of quiet assembly, and that meetings should be protected from both inside and outside disturbance. I am opposed to rowdy Sundays, and I am opposed to rowdy Mondays. I do not believe that a Catholic corner-stone laying procession, with its band has any more right to disturb a meeting of Turners, than a Sangerfest band has to disturb a church meeting. Legislation for the observance of Sunday, because it is Sunday, is not in harmony with American principles. After nineteen centuries of existence if the Church can not conquer the world without special legislation, it would better give it up. I think the freer the Church is from legislative enactments the more chance it has, the further it reaches, and the more good it does."—*Columbus, Wisconsin, Democrat.*

SECTARIAN instruction should be sedulously excluded from the public schools of the land. The Catholics, as they have a right to do, object even to the reading of the Protestant Bible in such schools: but now comes Rev. Charles O. Brown, of Dubuque, in a letter to the Des Moines *Capital*, saying there are "at least seven district schools in Dubuque County where the Catholic catechism is taught." A church so strenuous in preventing unwelcome reading in the presence of its children should not employ the public funds to promote their doctrines, nor expect that other people will be willing to have it done.—*The Lyons, Iowa, Mirror.*

FOR blank petitions against religious legislation, address W. H. MCKEE, 225 A Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

THE ODELL

TYPE WRITER

$20 will buy the *ODELL TYPE WRITER* and *CHECK PERFORATOR*, with 78 characters, and $15 for the *SINGLE CASE ODELL*, warranted to do better work than any machine made.

It combines SIMPLICITY with DURABILITY, SPEED, EASE OF OPERATION, wears longer without cost of repairs than any other machine. Has no ink ribbon to bother the operator. It is NEAT, SUBSTANTIAL, nickel-plated, perfect, and adapted to all kinds of type writing. Like a printing press, it produces sharp, clean, legible manuscripts. Two to ten copies can be made at one writing. Any intelligent person can become a good operator in two days. We offer $1,000 to any operator who can equal the work of the *DOUBLE CASE ODELL*.

Reliable Agents and Salesmen wanted. Special inducements to Dealers.

For Pamphlet giving Indorsements, etc., adress

ODELL TYPE WRITER CO.
Rookery Building. CHICAGO, ILL.

WATERMAN'S IDEAL

FOUNTAIN PEN.

HAS THE MOST RELIABLE arrangement for feeding the ink from the reservoir to the pen.

It has the same sure principle of operation (capillary attraction) and simple construction (a split) that have been used by the ordinary dip pen for 5,000 years to carry the ink to the paper.

Remember it is a combination of the BEST material, workmanship, and principle of operation.

Don't waste your time or shorten your life with any other. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

ROMANISM AND CIVIL LIBERTY

BY HON. WILLIAM JACKSON ARMSTRONG.

The above is the title of a recent issue of the Sentinel Library which contains a *verbatim* report of a powerful lecture delivered by this well-known speaker, in Oakland, California. Price, 4 cents. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE SENTINEL LIBRARY

A Semi-monthly Publication

Devoted to the defense of

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

And the **Preservation** of the

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AS IT IS.

TERMS, 75 CENTS PER YEAR.

Pacific Press Publishing Co.,
43 BOND STREET., NEW YORK.

GOOD HEALTH

Is a popular health magazine, published at Battle Creek, Mich., and conducted by

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Assisted by an able editorial staff.

It contains, each month, general articles on practical hygiene, and medical papers, besides a rich variety of other matter, pithy and practical, on popular questions, also representing the latest scientific thought, in combination with Dr. Kellogg's wide professional experience.

Established on Four Continents. No journal devoted to health or kindred topics has ever enjoyed so great a popularity as this journal has earned by its devotion to the interests of the people in the development and popularization of knowledge on all sanitary topics. It has been introduced into *nearly every part of the civilized world*, and enjoys a large circulation, not only in America, but in England, upon the continent of Europe, in South Africa, and in Australia. Among the

SPECIAL ATTRACTIONS

For 1890, the managers of this journal propose during the year to devote considerable space to the **Exposure of Medical Frauds.** They have, therefore, established a chemical laboratory, in charge of a competent chemist, for the purpose of carrying on a series of thorough-going investigations, the results of which will be published in the columns of this journal. **Price, $1.25 a Year.** Single numbers, 15 Cents. Send for specimen copy, and terms to agents.

GOOD HEALTH PUB. CO., Battle Creek, Mich.

TEN LECTURES
ON
NASAL CATARRH

Its Nature, Causes, Prevention, and Cure, and Diseases of the Throat, Eye, and Ear, due to Nasal Catarrh; with a chapter of

CHOICE PRESCRIPTIONS

BY J. H. KELLOGG, M. D.,

Medical Superintendent of the Largest Medical and Surgical Sanitarium in the World.

The work consists of 120 pages, and is embellished with a colored frontispiece and SIX BEAUTIFULLY COLORED PLATES, besides many illustrative cuts of the throat and nasal cavity in health and disease. This little work costs only 30 cents, and is in great demand.

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

NEW EDITIONS
CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION
IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN

By A. T. JONES,

One of the Editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL.

Scriptural, Logical, Plain, and Forcible.

THIS IMPORTANT WORK SHOWS CLEARLY THE RELATION THAT SHOULD EXIST BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE AT THE PRESENT TIME, AS PROVEN BY THE BIBLE AND HISTORY OF THE PAST TWENTY-FIVE CENTURIES.

CHAP. I outlines vividly the relation that existed between "Christianity and the Roman Empire."
CHAP. II distinguishes between "What is due to God and what to Cæsar."
CHAP. III shows for what purpose the "Powers that Be" are ordained.
CHAP. IV ably discusses "The Religious Attack upon the United States Constitution, and Those Who Are Making it."
CHAP. V unmasks "Religious Legislation," calling special attention to the Blair Sunday Bill now pending in Congress.
CHAP. VI is devoted to the "Sunday-Law Movement in the Fourth Century, and its Parallel in the Nineteenth."
CHAP. VII shows The Workings of Sunday Laws when they are enforced.

These chapters, with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States which are printed in Appendices C and D, make this treatise INDISPENSABLE TO EVERY LOVER OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION

Is a Pamphlet of 182 Large Octavo Pages, in English, Price 25 Cents; and in German, 228 Pages, Price, 35 Cents.

MILLIONS OF COPIES

Should be Placed in the Hands of Thinking People at once. It Clearly Defines what Position American Citizens should Sustain Toward the Effort now on Foot to Secure Religious Legislation. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK,
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

GOOD FOR ALL TIME!
THE NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS THE ARGUMENTS IN BEHALF OF THE RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS, AND IN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL, WHICH MR. JONES PRESENTED BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, DECEMBER 13, 1888.

Mr. Crafts has pronounced the report as published

"MIGHTY INTERESTING READING."

And Mr. Jones' comments make it more so. His argument is enlarged to what it would have been without Senator Blair's interruptions, objections, and counter-arguments, and is accompanied with answers to all of his objections and counter-arguments. As the Sunday question is now a living issue, this treatise will be interesting to all classes, especially Legislators, lawyers, judges, and other public men. The argument is based on Scripture and history, constitution and law, showing the limits of the civil power, the unconstitutionality of the Sunday bill, an analysis of the Sunday laws and other religious legislation of the different States, the

Sunday-Law Movement of the Fourth Century,
AND THE
Sunday-Law Movement of the Nineteenth Century.

The Methods Used in Securing Indorsements to the Petition for the Blair Bill, and the Workings of Such Sunday Laws as are Proposed for the United States.

The Work Contains 192 Pages and will be Sent Post-paid on Receipt of 25c.

Send for it! Read it! Send it to Your Friends!

Address all Orders to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

THE BEST

DUPLICATING INKS

FOR USE WITH

"CYCLOSTYLE," "MIMEOGRAPH," "COPYGRAPH."

Or any Duplicating Process in which a Stencil is used, are the

Celebrated "Redding Inks."

They Dry Fast, will not Blur nor Clog the stencil, Dry or Harden on Roller or Pallet, and are in every way

A SUPERIOR ARTICLE.

Send for Price Lists and Samples of Work Done with these Inks.

REDDING INK CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

SAFETY PENCIL POCKET

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

PRICES.

No. 1. Russia leather, for 2 pens . . . 10c.
No. 2. Russia leather for, 3 pens . . . 15c.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. We guarantee these pockets superior in every particular to similar styles formerly sold and still offered at much higher prices. Address,

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
OR OAKLAND, CAL.

FORTUNE!

Florida Phosphate Facts Freely Furnished.

Knowing that very many people have erroneous ideas about Florida, her climate, resources, etc., and wishing to add 100,000 new names to our subscription list, we offer to send the *Florida Home-Seeker* till 1891, for only 50 cents, to everyone answering this advertisement. The *Home-Seeker* tells the truth, and nothing but the truth about Florida. Address,

FLORIDA HOME-SEEKER.
Apr. 24-3m GAINESVILLE, FLA.

ARGUMENTS
ON THE
Breckinridge Sunday Bill.

Verbatim report of the speeches of Eld. J. O. Corliss, of Washington, Alonzo T. Jones, of New York, Editor *American Sentinel*, and Millard F. Hobbs, District Master Workman of District Assembly 66, Knights of Labor, together with a brief submitted by Prof. W. H. McKee, Secretary of the National Religious Liberty Association,

All Against the Breckinridge Sunday Bill.

An important and telling document against all Sunday legislation, giving the basis of such legislation, together with the object and price of exemption clauses. Issued as No. 29 of the *Sentinel Library*. Price 10 cents. Address,

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

CALIFORNIA TOURISTS

Should have a Copy of the Grand Book

"In the Heart of the Sierras."

It Pictures the World-renowned Yo Semite Valley, the Big Tree Groves of California, the Glaciers, Gold Mines, and Caverns of this Wonderful Region. It is a

Complete Guide to the Yo Semite Valley,

Giving routes of travel, number of miles by rail and stage; describes points of interest en route; gives map of the Valley, and contains *160 Illustrations*, 28 of which are *Beautiful Full-Page Artotypes*, and which portray the wonderful Cataracts, Mountains, and Precipices with all the REALITY OF A PHOTOGRAPH. Bound in five styles. Copy in cloth, embossed in jet and gold, gold edges, sent postpaid where we have no agent for $3.50.

CHEAPER EDITION.

We have just issued a special TOURISTS' EDITION of this book, containing all the matter of the other edition, printed on thinner paper, without artotypes, bound in flexible cloth covers. Copies sent postpaid anywhere for $1.50.

Address *PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,*
Or 43 Bond St., New York. *Oakland, Cal.*

NEW YORK, JULY 10, 1890.

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

SPEAKING of the Non-Partisan Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the *Independent* of this city says: "We most heartily commend it to those who want to do temperance work without complication with political parties." And so do we; and not only so, but we suggest that every Christian ought to want to do temperance work in just that way.

THE *Mail and Express* heads the following dispatch, "Americanism in the West":—

Chicago, June 13. One hundred delegates from lodges of the Patriotic Sons of America throughout the State met last evening at the Grand Pacific Hotel to devise means of creating a public sentiment in favor of the suppression of German public schools. The meeting was enthusiastic and unanimous.

Let us hear no more about Russian and German despotism in forcing the Russian and German languages upon conquered provinces.

A SPRINGFIELD, Ohio, dispatch says:—

Canton and Springfield played the first Sunday game of ball, on Sunday, before 3,000 people, notwithstanding the ministers' vigorous protest. Monday morning, by pre-arrangement of the baseball management, Constable Parsons arrested managers and players. In Squire Miller's court they pleaded guilty, and each was fined twenty-five cents and costs. The latter will be thrown off. Church-going people are kicking over the fines imposed by the Justice, and there is likely to be some fun later.

That seems strange. We are confidently assured by very many people that Sunday laws are not religious, but police regulations for the health of the people. If that were true it would seem that boards of health, and not the church people, should do the "kicking" when Sunday laws are violated.

JUNE 2, Joseph Keeter and Joseph Barnett, of Indianapolis, were fined by Mayor Sullivan for taking photographs on Sunday. The former, with costs, paid $19.50 and the latter paid $13.25. Both were amateurs engaged in taking landscapes. George Wilson and Ruth Keeter were arrested for the same offense, but their cases were continued. Laws that make such things possible ought to be promptly abolished. We suppose, however, that the Indiana Sunday law is simply a "civil regulation" to "preserve the health of the people" by keeping them from working too hard. It might not occur to many that amateur photography is necessarily either very hurtful physically or morally, but they forget that this was done on Sunday.

Sunday is a very peculiar day. It would no doubt be all right for the Mayor of Indianapolis to take his carriage and enjoy a drive on Sunday, or for any number of people to devote the day to feasting and visiting, but taking photographs of landscapes is not to be tolerated.

SENATOR BLAIR, in a letter to the *Mail and Express* some time since, said:—

I yet believe that instead of selecting a final toleration of so-called religions, the American people will, by constant and irresistible pressure gradually expel from our geographical boundaries every religion except the Christian in its varied forms. I do not expect to see the pagan and other forms existing side by side with the former, both peaceably acquiesced in, for any length of time. I do not think that experience will satisfy the American people that the inculcation of any positive religious belief hostile to the Christian faith, or the practice of the forms of any other worship, is conducive to the good order of society and the general welfare. There may not be any exhibition of bigotry in this. I believe that religious toleration will yet come to be considered to be an intelligent discrimination between the true and the false, and the selection of the former by such universal consent as shall exclude by general reprobation the recognition and practice of the latter. . . . The people are considering these subjects anew. They are questioning whether there be not some mistake in theories of religious liberty, which permit the inculcation of the most destructive errors in the name of toleration, and the spread of pestilences under the name of liberty which despises the quarantine.

This casts an important sidelight upon the legislation of which Mr. Blair is the author. It shows that the spirit of religious despotism and intolerance is ingrained in his very make-up, and that these measures in legislation are simply the means through which he would give vent to that which is in him and a host of others of his kind who are backing him up in his mediæval methods.

SOME time ago when everything possible was being done to secure from Congress some recognition of Sunday as the Sabbath, some action that would serve as a precedent for more extended and far-reaching legislation, the country was assured that the District of Columbia was without a Sunday law. THE SENTINEL published at that time an old Sunday law of the State of Maryland which has long been in force in the District, having never been repealed, but, even after it was published, the statement was still bandied about that the District had no Sunday law. This is now contradicted by the following from the Washington correspondent of the *Mail and Express*:—

There is a good deal of excitement in sporting circles here over the question of Sunday baseball games. The Sunday law in the District of Columbia is very strict. Not only are all saloons, cigar stores, and other shops closed, but the barber shops are shut up also, peddlers are not allowed to sell fruit on the street, and while newsboys are allowed to sell papers, they are not permitted to cry their wares. There is no city on the continent where Sunday observance is so strictly enforced, and no attempt has ever been made to resist or test the law.

The baseball managers hold that the game is a healthy amusement, and that there is no law to prohibit them from doing as they please within the inclosure which is leased by them. The grounds are in an isolated locality, and they claim that no one can be disturbed or interfered with in their observance of the Sabbath, by a game. They claim also that there is no law prohibiting baseball playing on Sunday. The District Commissioners, however, say that there is a law against Sunday desecration and they intend to enforce it.

Those who remember reading the Sunday law of the District of Columbia, published in THE SENTINEL of February 13, will readily agree that it is "very strict"; also that it is ample to prevent ball-playing or almost anything else of a secular nature on Sunday.

A MOST interesting book has found its way to our table. It is entitled, "From Eden to Eden," by the late J. H. Waggoner of Basel, Switzerland. This book is a brief examination of the more important historic and prophetic portions of the Scriptures. It is not a labored argument to prove the divine inspiration of the Bible. That is taken for granted. And yet the book presents incidentally the most irrefragable evidence of the divine origin of both the Old and New Testaments. The Scriptures themselves are their own best witness, and the author of this book well says:—

It is the office of the Scriptures themselves to convince of their own origin and authority. To those who read them reverently not a word is needed to prove that they are divine; while to those who do not read them, or who read them carelessly and without reverence, no manner or amount of proof can be given that can cause them to realize their divinity, their importance, or their beauty. To be appreciated, the Bible must be studied with an earnest desire to learn the truth.

The object of this book is to assist to just such a study as is here indicated, and the plan upon which it is written is most admirably adapted to that end. One important truth kept constantly in view by the author is the unity of the divine plan as revealed in the several parts of the Scriptures.

Though embracing only 264 pages, this work covers "the entire period of the world's history and the consummation of the plan of redemption, yet the important truths which enter into this plan are so connected in their presentation, that the thoughtful reader cannot fail to see the relation of each to the others, and to realize the necessity of each as a part of the whole—brevity being rather a help in this direction than otherwise."

This book is sold only by subscription. For prices and terms to agents, address the publishers, Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., or 43 Bond Street, New York.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

AN EIGHT-PAGE WEEKLY JOURNAL,

DEVOTED TO

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

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

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

In clubs of ten or more copies, per year, each, . . 75c.
To foreign countries, single subscription, post-paid. . 5s.

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 Bond Street, New York.