



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

VOLUME 9.

NEW YORK, MAY 24, 1894.

NUMBER 21.

American Sentinel.

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

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

"How shall a man be just with God?"

THIS has been the great inquiry of men ever since the days of the man of Uz, and long before.

IN fact this has been the great inquiry of all men in all ages; it is the great inquiry still; and is yet to be a far more absorbing topic than it is now.

AT each of the three great religious epochs of the world's history—the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage; the Apostolic Age; and the Era of the Reformation—this has been the one great question at issue; and in our day it is again to be the great question at issue in the great controversy which is to be the culmination of all questions and of all earthly ages.

"How shall a man be just with God?" is and always has been the one single question at issue between Christianity and the papacy. And, as we have abundantly shown in these columns that it is now the avowed aim of the papacy to dominate this nation, and even "all mankind," and "all mankind" through this nation, it is evident that this nation is the pivot of the aim of the papacy. "The saviour from the Vatican" is now proposed as the saviour of this nation and of all the others. And as Christianity is ever uncompromisingly opposed to the papacy; and as the one great question that is ever at issue between Christianity and the papacy is "How shall a man be just with God?" it follows plainly enough that in our day this is to be the great question, not only in this nation, but in all the world.

How then are men made righteous—justified, saved from sin—according to the way of the papacy?—It is by penance. Proof?—Here it is: "Penance, by which the sins that we commit after baptism are

forgiven." "The sacrament of penance, in which the forgiveness of sins is granted to the penitent."—*Catholic Belief*, pp. 80, 366. One of these says that penance is the means by which the sins that we commit "after baptism" are forgiven. It is, therefore, important to know when, according to that system, baptism is to be administered; and by this to know how many sins can be committed before baptism. Here is the authoritative statement on that point:—

From what has been said, you may well judge how reprehensible is the conduct of Catholic parents who neglect to have their children baptized at the earliest possible moment, thereby risking their own souls, as well as the souls of their innocent offspring.—*Faith of our Fathers*, p. 313.

Well then, as baptism is to be administered to the child at the earliest possible moment, it were literally impossible for such person ever to commit any sins except after his baptism. And as penance is the means of obtaining the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism, it follows plumply, and as plainly as that two and two make four, that, according to the papacy, penance is the way of forgiveness of all sin, is the way of justification, of salvation. There is no escaping this conclusion from these premises. And indeed the papacy has no desire to escape this conclusion, for this is her specific doctrine. In his discussion of "The Sacrament of Penance," in his book, "The Faith of Our Fathers," which was written for the enlightenment of his "separated brethren," Cardinal Gibbons deals altogether with "forgiveness of sins" and "justification." This in itself is conclusive evidence that, in the papal system, penance and forgiveness of sins, are one and the same thing. This is "the remedy for sin" and "the means for the justification of the sinner."

PENANCE being the means of justification, the way of salvation from sin, what then is penance? Here is the authoritative answer:—

In the case of those who have fallen into mortal sin after baptism, when the guilt of such sin and the everlasting punishment due to it are forgiven, there still very often remains a debt of temporal punishment, to be paid by the sinner. This debt remains, not from any imperfection in the power of absolution in the sacrament of penance, nor from any want of efficacy in the atonement of Jesus Christ; but because by God's will, chastisement for past sins helps us to

compensate for the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction.—*Catholic Belief*, p. 191.

Now when the guilt of the sin, and the everlasting punishment due to it, are both forgiven and so have passed from the sinner, and yet he is not saved until a debt of temporal punishment has been paid by himself; then upon what does his salvation turn? and who is his saviour?—Plainly his salvation turns altogether upon the punishment; and as this debt of punishment is to be paid by the sinner himself, it just as certainly follows that the sinner is his own saviour. And thus penance, punishment, is the papal way of salvation. Nor is this all—but the Lord himself is made responsible for it, so that it is literally set forth as the divine way of salvation and the divine means of justification. For it is plainly said that this debt of punishment, to be paid by the guiltless sinner remains "because by God's will chastisement for past sins helps us to compensate [to pay for] the imperfection in our repentance, and serves as a correction." As the Lord forgives both the guilt and the everlasting punishment of the sin, and yet by his own will has fixed it that the sinner must still pay a debt of punishment in order to be justified and saved, then it is certain that, according to the papal system, God has made punishment, which is penance, the means of justification and the way of salvation.

AND indeed this is also further stated by this same authority, as follows:—

From this we see that . . . He has not dispensed us from doing with the help of his grace what we can to punish ourselves for the offenses and outrages we have offered to God. Good sense tells us that this is both right and just.—*Id.* p. 192.

Everybody who will think on the subject can easily enough see that instead of its being good sense, it is an utter lack of every element of sound sense that tells a man that it is in any sense either right or just that he should punish himself to save himself from himself. Yet as punishment is the only way of salvation known to the papacy, and as self is its own saviour, even this thing of a man's punishing of himself to save himself from himself is logical enough. And so essentially is punishment—penance—the papal way of salvation that even the dying thief, whom the Lord Jesus himself pardoned on the

cross, is made to do penance. Here are the words:—

The pardon granted to the penitent thief in the saving words: "Amen, I say to thee, this day thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (St. Luke 23:43), cannot be taken as proof that we are dispensed by God from doing works of penance. That was a wonderful and special grace granted under extraordinary circumstances; namely, when the blood of redemption was actually being shed upon the cross; moreover, the dying thief, besides bearing testimony to the divinity of Jesus Christ, confessed his guilt, and, *in the spirit of penance*, suffered the torment of his crucifixion, and the cruel breaking of his limbs, as penalties justly due to his sins.—*Id.* p. 193.

ALL this doctrine that men must punish themselves to save themselves from themselves springs from the utterly false, even heathenish, idea that God is harsh, stern, forbidding, and exacting, instead of gentle, loving, winning, and merciful. It looks upon him as so ill-tempered and stern that he has to be "moved" by men's doing so well that they get him into a good humor, and by punishment making themselves such pitiable objects that he can finally be persuaded by the pope, or somebody else, to yield and "save" them. And here is that thought authoritatively expressed:—

We stand in continual need of actual graces to perform good acts, both before and after being justified. . . . The good acts, however, done by the help of grace before justification, are not, strictly speaking, meritorious, but serve to smooth the way to justification, to move God.—*Id.* pp. 76, 77.

Thus by her own showing, the god of the papacy is of such a disposition and character that it is necessary for men, wicked men, to do "good acts" in order to move him; and then, after they have thus moved him, it is still essential that they shall pay "a debt of temporal punishment" in order to induce him to allow them the justification which they have so hardly earned. To such a god as that it is no wonder that the Inquisition is the most pleasing tribute.

BUT such is not the God of the Bible. Such is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Such is not his way of justifying men. Such is not his way of salvation. Here is his own announcement of his name, which is simply the proclamation of his character and his disposition toward all mankind: "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee. . . . And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed: The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." This is the true God.

"Merciful"—full of the disposition to treat people better than they deserve. Mercy is not to treat people as they deserve. It is not merely to treat people better than they deserve, in an outward way. It is not to wait till one is "moved" by good deeds and punishments to grant what has been thus already earned. No, no. It is the *disposition*, the very heart's core of the being, to treat all persons better than they deserve. This is the Lord, the true God. "He doth not afflict from the heart, nor grieve the children of men." Lam. 3:33, margin. "He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children,

so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust." Ps. 103:10-14. His mercy is great above the greatness of the heavens. Ps. 108:4.

"Gracious"—extending favor. And that without measure; for it is written: "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Eph. 4:7. And the measure of the gift of Christ, is but the measure of "all the fullness of the godhead bodily." And this is the measure of the full and free favor that God has extended to every soul on this earth, just where he is and just as he is. And this boundless grace to every one, brings salvation to every one in the same measure as is given the grace, which is the measure of the gift of Christ. For again it is written: "The grace of God which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men." Titus 2:11. As the grace, the favor, of God is full and free to every one; and as this grace brings salvation; so the salvation of God is a full and free gift to every one. Though it is freely given, he will compel no one to take it. As it is freely given, it must be freely received. And the receiving of the free gift of God is the exercise of the faith which he has also freely given to every man. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Eph. 2:8. "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed." Rom. 4:16.

THIS is God's way of justification: by grace, through faith; and of faith that it might be by grace. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Rom. 3:24, 25. Justification is the free gift of God through the righteousness of Jesus Christ who is altogether the free gift of God. For "as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men to justification of life." Rom. 5:18. And the receiving of this gift of justification, this gift of righteousness, as the free gift of God which it is, this is the exercise of the faith which God has given. And this is justification, this is righteousness, *by faith*. "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference." Rom. 3:22. The faith being the gift of God, the righteousness which it brings and which is wrought by it is the righteousness of God. And this is righteousness, justification, *by faith alone* of which by her own boast the Catholic Church knows nothing; and in so boasting advertises her utter lack of Christianity.

TRUE, men are to repent, and they will repent when they find God as he is in truth, as he is revealed in Jesus Christ. For "it is the goodness of God" that leads men to repentance; and repentance itself is the gift of God. Rom. 2:4; Acts 5:31. True repentance being the gift of God, is perfect in itself, and needs no punishing of ourselves to compensate for the imperfection in it. But when the repentance is of ourselves, it has no merit that can bring to us any good, and all the punish-

ment of ourselves that could ever be inflicted by ourselves or in ten thousand purgatories never could compensate for the imperfection of it. For it is simply impossible for any man to save himself by punishment or in any other way.

THE salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by Christianity is altogether of God by faith. The salvation, the justification, offered to mankind by the papacy is altogether of self by penance. The salvation offered by Christianity saves to the uttermost all who will receive it. The salvation offered by the papacy brings to utter destruction all who follow after it. And yet the professed Protestantism of to-day recognizes "Christianity" in the papacy! Than this, nothing could possibly show more plainly how completely apostate such Protestantism is, not only from true Protestantism, but also from true Christianity. A. T. J.

The A. P. A. and Parochial Schools.

SOME months since in pointing out what seemed to him to be dangerous features in the American Protective Association, the writer said:—

"The Catholics, plotting to secure public money for the support of their denominational schools, are a menace to our free institutions. But is it any better for the A. P. A. to invoke the power of the State to compel the Catholics to educate their children in the State secular schools instead of in the parochial religious schools?" And again: "The A. P. A. scheme, which proposes to subordinate the Church to the State, would make it possible for the State to forbid the individual to render to God the things due him. The Catholic regards it as a religious duty—a service due to God—to educate his child in the parochial school; the A. P. A. would have the State say: You shall not educate your child in this way, but you shall send him to the public school in order that the State may have his first and best affections, and the Church and Him whom the Church represents, the second place in his heart." Our conclusion was: "The A. P. A. should see to it that in its efforts to preserve civil and religious liberty, it does not destroy both."

For these utterances the writer was taken severely to task by certain correspondents who denied that the A. P. A. advocated any such scheme, and who asserted that so far as the A. P. A. was concerned the papist might educate his child where he pleased; and we were challenged to either retract the offensive statement or else furnish proof to sustain it. The former we would not do because we believed our statement true; the latter we could not do because the A. P. A. being a secret organization it is difficult to prove just what its purposes are. Moreover, while having seen from A. P. A. sources, declarations which to our mind fully justified our statement, we could not at the time lay our hands upon them. But recently there has come to hand an article which was first published in the *New Era*, an A. P. A. paper, and subsequently republished, without comment, in the *American Standard* (May 5, 1894), another A. P. A. organ, which fully justifies all that we said, and shows that zeal for a good cause (the preservation of American institutions) is leading the A. P. A., or at least certain A. P. A. papers, into the advocacy of principles as utterly ruinous to both civil and religious liberty as are the principles of the papacy itself. The article in question is as follows, the italics only being introduced to call attention to the salient points:—

American Logic.

The handful of Italians who are running the papacy, have shown great skill in prolonging the contest, and

after three centuries of constant warfare it can show a great army of ignorant and superstitious dupes to do its bidding. The world is asking: What is the destiny of the papacy? Will she again send us to school to muttering monks? Consign to hell all who dispute her authority? We answer no! a thousand times, no! We cannot let her teach loyalty to Rome, and disloyalty to our Republic. The schoolmaster must be reinforced by the strong arm of the State. We must profit by the example of papal States who have rebelled against priestcraft. *We must drive her dupes from our schools, where employed as teachers, compel her youth to attend the State schools, make it felony for a papal priest to in any way interfere in keeping a child from the State schools; if they demur, object, tell them to get out of this land dedicated to civil and religious liberty, and return to their Italian masters who have neither power nor respect for the country they ruled and plundered for ten centuries.*

We leave it to the candid reader if this does not bear out the statement that it is proposed to deny to Catholics the right to educate their children in their own schools; and if it does not justify the caution given months ago by the writer, namely, that the A. P. A. should have a care lest in its efforts to preserve liberty it does not destroy it.

C. P. B.

Some Signs of the Times.

FOR years the people of this country have been familiar with various forms of labor agitation, but neither in this nor in any other country can an exact parallel be found to the so-called "Coxey Movement," called by its originator "The Commonwealth of Christ."

It is true that in other countries and in other ages men have marched in bodies to the seat of government, there to demand, in one form or another, redress of real or imaginary grievances; but never has anything of this kind been done on a scale so large and so suggestive of widespread discontent as in this country in this the closing decade of the nineteenth century.

Speaking in the United States Senate, on May 10, Senator Gordon, of Georgia, said:—

Mr. President. Looking at this Coxey movement from a Southern standpoint, it appears to me to have in it and in the facts about it a lesson which we might wisely and gravely ponder. This movement had its inspiration doubtless in what we call paternalism, a theory of government which tends to enlarge the brood of such movements in the future, and to intensify the demands of that class of people upon Congress for relief. Strangely enough this movement had its origin in one of the great central, populous, progressive States of the Union, among a people justly noted for their intelligence, their loyalty to law and order, and for their well-considered enterprise and well-directed energy. Its divisions and corps are moving upon this Capitol from every quarter of the compass save one. From every section of this Union save that one section they are coming, and we are confronted with the marvelous spectacle of portions of the people in every section except in one turning a listening ear to the appeals of Mr. Coxey and his lieutenants. The section in which the commonweal army, as it is called, has received few or no recruits is the South. This fact is marvelous, I repeat, by reason of its isolation, and monumental by reason of the political lesson which it presents.

The same day and in the course of the same discussion, Senator Teller said:—

Mr. President, I myself am of the opinion that the present distressed condition of the country, which is unusual; that the present distressed condition of the world, which is unusual, is the result of positive legislation. . . . The present condition ought at least to make the American legislator stop and reflect. . . . Our attention has been attracted to the discontent and dissatisfaction everywhere, and it will not do for senators to say this is only a small sprinkling, only a few of the people of the country who are discontented. Go to Omaha, go to Council Bluffs, where these unfortunate people are making their way from the extreme West to this city. They had the support and sympathy of the entire laboring population of those two cities. I think I may say here, without contradiction, that wherever they have gone in the towns in the rural districts, everywhere they have had the sympathy and the support of the people of those communities.

Mr. President, there never has been an hour in

American history, in the great panics that preceded the panic of 1893, when there has been so much poverty, so much distress, so much danger to the Republic as there has been in the last year. It is growing worse and not better, and we have not put our hands to a single thing in this Congress that in my judgment is calculated to relieve the condition. . . . The outlook is not bright for the distressed; it is not bright for the American farmer and the American laborer, who compose nine-tenths of the American people. If we can not do anything else, if we can not help them in any other way, we can at least show some sympathy with them. I deny that Coxey represents the great mass of the people, but I insist that he represents a sentiment of dissatisfaction and discontent which is very prevalent and very general in this country. . . . I do not know myself absolutely that anything that we can do will bring prosperity to this country. I do not know that anything that we can do alone will lighten the burden of these people. I am of the opinion that we could accomplish it; but other people whose judgment is equally entitled to respect, and perhaps is better than mine, do not think we can. We can not agree, Mr. President, first, as to the trouble, and secondly, as to the remedy; but we could agree, it seems to me to say to these people, "We will look into your condition; we will take your case into consideration; and if we can find any way to grant you relief, we shall exercise our judgment and do our best."

Senator Stewart bore a like testimony, as follows:—

Mr. President, to my mind the situation of the country presents a condition which demands careful and serious consideration. There has been no time in the history of the United States when discontent was so general as now. The movement of the so-called Coxey's army has developed a sentiment of unrest to a marvelous extent. They are now forming home guards of the Coxey army and marching in many States. The senator from Oregon [Mr. Mitchell] told me yesterday that a few days ago 3,000 home guards of the Coxey army were marching in the city of Portland, in his State. So the papers are full of it every morning, showing the universal discontent, and they all attribute it to the same cause—hard times, want of employment. The evidence that such a state of things exists is multiplying day by day.

The outlook is indeed gloomy, the more so, because, as stated by Senator Teller, the present depressed condition is world-wide. Industrial stagnation has seized upon all nations, and the "boiling millions" everywhere feel the bony fingers of want clutching at their very vitals. And worst of all, statesmen, instead of supplying a remedy, confess their inability to even certainly point out the cause. There is "upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity;" and "men's hearts are failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth."

But it is not alone in peaceful marches to the Capital City that the discontent of the masses is manifesting itself. Strikes on every hand, almost universally accompanied with violence resulting in bloodshed and destruction of property, testify not only the dire distress of the people, but their determination not to suffer alone. The worst passions of men are being aroused; real wrongs are being supplemented in the minds of untold thousands by imaginary wrongs until to many the choice seems to lie between abject slavery with bare subsistence and open revolt with all its dire probabilities. Men are growing desperate and reckless of consequences.

As reported recently by the Washington Post, and referred to by us last week, "General" Coxey said, in a public speech the day of his conviction in the police court in Washington:—

This country is like a big bunch of straw, and all that is necessary to start it into a roaring blaze is the torch. Do you dream that in court to-day the torch was applied? We came here as an army of peace. God knows violence is the last wish of any member of this army, but I fear that the match has been applied, and that time alone will tell what is to be the outcome. If violence does follow the consequences will not be on our heads, for others were the cause of it. It now looks to me as though it would be useless to try and accomplish

anything more in the line of public reformation by peace.

Violence may not immediately follow the arbitrary action of the Washington police authorities, but the discontent and desperation has been largely increased. The confidence of the people in those entrusted with the Government has been rudely shaken. "General" Coxey's words may be set down as "only the utterance of a crank;" but crank though he be, in the words of Senator Teller, "he represents a sentiment of dissatisfaction and discontent which is very prevalent and general in this country." And whether justified or not, the general discontent is fast ripening into a sense of injustice and oppression. In the United States Senate, on May 10, as reported on pp. 5522 and 5523 of the *Congressional Record* of May 11, Senator Stewart said:—

The Coxey army tramped for hundreds of miles in a peaceable, orderly manner, which attracted the attention of the whole country. They came here poor, foot-sore, and hungry. They remained in line and obeyed orders, not one of them moving from the line. A most sad spectacle, calculated to excite the sympathies of all who saw them. They marched up the avenue to the other side of the Capitol and there stood in line. Many senators and representatives stood on the steps of the Capitol. I was among the number. I did not see what occurred further east at the end of the Capitol, but I saw Coxey coming up to the front and step upon the first steps of the east entrance of the Capitol, and I saw policemen meet him. There was a consultation. I did not hear it, but they motioned to him in the usual way to move back. He moved back and went to his carriage. They put him in his carriage, the vehicle he came in, and he ordered his men to march back, and without entering the Capitol grounds they marched back.

That he committed no offense against the law was apparent to every one who witnessed it. . . . Now he has been charged and convicted in the police court, of what? He has been charged and convicted of wearing a badge. . . . Then another charge was made by some. He was charged with stepping on the grass. I have read the evidence right along; it was very conflicting. I think the charge was not sustained, but perhaps it makes no difference whether it was. . . . Now I undertake to say that conviction was for no substantial offense. If the assembling of these masses of people and marching in the streets is a crime, then there ought to be some law to punish it. We had understood that it was not a crime; that everybody had the right to do it; but certainly, whether they have a right or not, the law authorizes them to do so, and it is well understood that they have this right. . . . Now, here is a man convicted of those things in a court of justice in a case that has attracted universal attention. All the people of the United States know that Mr. Coxey was convicted when he had committed no offense; that he was convicted under a pretense that he had committed an offense when he had not done so. . . . No, it will be construed by the whole country that this was an attempt to punish the movement by construing a harmless act into an offense. That will not do. We must have equal justice in this country. I do not think a more disgraceful exhibition of petty tyranny has ever been exhibited than the prosecution of Mr. Coxey. The others I did not see. I saw what he did with my own eyes. I saw him come and I saw him go. . . . He came quietly and went away quietly. That was perfectly obvious to the thousands who saw him. And he was convicted in the national capital for an offense that he did not commit. That is certain, and that will be the verdict of the American people. It looks like an attempt to punish a great movement by committing a judicial outrage. If we expect to govern a free people by law we must let them know and feel that the laws are just. The laws, when justly administered, are omnipotent, because all the people say they shall be thus administered.

Public opinion justifies the administration of law and supports the strong arm of Government and nothing else, and when thus administered according to the common sense of mankind, when justice is administered, all the American people say amen. But to exhibit here a conviction for no offense, or if an offense technically one so petty that it would be in any other place dismissed by the police magistrate without a word, the fact that they could get a jury in the national capital and a judge to perform such a service is a blow at the foundation of law and order.

It will be noticed that the senator does not justify the Coxey movement; nor do we; we give these facts only because they are facts which cannot be ignored. But

what must be the effect of such facts, and of their recognition and statement at the seat of Government, in the very halls of legislation? Men felt before, however mistakenly does not matter, that they were the victims of grave wrongs, that they had just cause of complaint and just grounds upon which to demand redress of grievances; but how must they feel now? when instead of being granted a hearing by their representatives they are treated as trespassers and criminals and are subjected to indignity and injustice? Are not the most serious consequences likely to ensue? Yea, unless conditions speedily change, must they not inevitably ensue? Is not our nation resting upon a volcano ready to break and overwhelm it in social and political ruin?

There is a grave danger in the Coxe movement in its entirety, but grave as it is a greater danger lurks in the paternal theory of Government which is responsible for it. Paternalism is a cause; Coxeism is only an effect.

Government is established only as a conservator of human rights. Government does not create wealth; its province is not to distribute wealth; it does not even possess wealth independently of the people, for all that it possesses comes from the people; hence what Government gives to one it must take from another. Coxe's demand for good roads to be constructed in the various States by the general Government, is only a demand that the general Government shall by taxation confiscate a portion of the property of one class of citizens to distribute in the form of wages among the members of another class. The scheme is chimerical and mischievous, but it is not our purpose to discuss it at this time. We wish simply to call attention to facts as they exist, and to connect them with the inspired declaration that "in the last days perilous times shall come." 2 Tim. 3:1. Such times have come. There is peril on every hand; peril to life and property, to civil society and to the Church of God, to the individual and to the body politic. There is peril on land and on sea. In storm and flood, in calamities by land and by sea the year 1893 was the most disastrous ever known, and 1894 threatens to be as prolific as its predecessor in those things which cause men to quail in terror as before superior forces. The *Mail and Express*, of May 10, has this in its editorial columns:—

Ten Thousand Victims.

When Matthew, the apostle, declared that "there shall be earthquakes in divers places" he added that "all these are the beginning of sorrows." That was long ago, but . . . to-day, as in the olden time, there are earthquakes in divers places. Last month these direst of nature's convulsions were shaking and rending Japan. Afterward historic Greece suffered from seismic shocks of the most appalling nature, which are perhaps not yet ended. On the day that the first of these calamities affrighted Greece a shock was felt at Colon and other places on the Isthmus of Panama.

To-day we have the news of the most appalling earthquake of the present year. Venezuela has been the scene of its work, and the cities of Merida, Lagunillas, Chiguara, and San Juan, in the northwestern portion of that country, are reported to have been wholly destroyed. More woful than the obliteration of these cities is the assertion that ten thousand people have lost their lives. The details of this greatest of calamities have not been received. All that is known is that the earthquake occurred at 11 o'clock at night. Probably nearly all the victims were asleep, and were precipitated from the slumber of rest into that which knows no terrestrial waking.

The human mind can conceive no more terrible occurrence than this. The unfortunate people were resting from their work of the day wrapped in slumber, all unconscious of danger. The subterranean forces of nature made one effort and these ten thousand men, women, and children passed from life to

death in the twinkling of an eye. The lot of the living friends and relatives is almost as lamentable. True they have life, but most of that which makes life valuable has gone. Some are the sole survivors of families. Others are suffering from grievous injuries. They live but are without means of livelihood. They appeal to the charity of the world, which must be quickly given to make it effective.

This calamity takes first place among the disasters of this woful year.

When Matthew, the apostle, wrote the words quoted, he was simply recording the declaration of our Lord. The disciples had asked Jesus two questions, namely, when should Jerusalem be destroyed, and what should be the sign of his second coming and of the end of the world. Among the signs given were those referred to by the *Mail and Express*. Luke gives additional particulars (21: 25, 26):—

There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken.

The signs in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars are in the past, and now we are witnessing the "distress of nations with perplexity;" the "sea and the waves roaring;" and "men's hearts failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." The next event in order is the coming of the Son of man "with power and great glory." But what saith the Scripture, of these signs:—

When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh. And he spake to them a parable; Behold the fig tree, and all the trees; when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily, I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled.

The generation that learns the parable of the fig tree will see the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. "Heaven and earth shall pass away," says our Lord, "but my words shall not pass away." And then he gives this warning:—

Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.

Shall we not heed his words?

C. P. B.

Infallibility and Bull-Fights.

THE greatest religious question in Spain just now is not the authorship of the Pentateuch nor the authenticity of the fourth Gospel, but the question as to whether or not Roman Catholic priests should attend bull-fights! So important in all its bearings is this momentous question that the pious priests were unable to decide it for themselves, and were compelled to have recourse to the illuminated counsel of the Holy See. The grave doubts which had been festering for some time in the consciences of the clergy were recently tabulated by the Bishop of Ciudad-Rodrigo, and submitted to his infallible holiness, Pope Leo. Let all Christianity blush, and nineteenth century enlightenment reel back into mediæval darkness as we listen to the answers received from the oracle at Rome! Translated from the Latin they are as follows:—

1. That a priest may not attend a bull-fight if he have the sacred oil with him.

2. That a priest may take the sacred oil to some private place near the scene of the sport, ready for

use in case of necessity, provided that he use caution so that his presence may not be taken as indicating approval of the spectacle.

3. That a priest may not (is not obliged to) attend a bull-fight, even though custom expects him to do so.

Such a compromise between good sense and absurdity is seldom to be found. One has only to attempt to imagine the presence of St. Paul, or any of the apostles at one of these disgraceful scenes, where bovine gore is mixed with the life-blood of a human being to delight the depraved taste of the cruelty-loving spectators, to see how far the Romish Church has departed, both in spirit and practice, from the primitive Church of Christ and its founders.—*British Canadian*.

Why Church Property Should Be Taxed.*

THE question of the taxation of church property in the United States is bound soon to become a question of great public concern, because it is already of grave importance.

The general theory of all just taxation is reciprocal service. Judge Cooley, in his "Law of Taxation," says:—

The protection of the government being the consideration for which taxes are demanded, all parties who receive or are entitled to that protection may be called upon to render the equivalent.

Making the State pay tribute to the Church, instead of the Church to the State, is a glaring self-contradiction in the United States. It theoretically, as well as practically, adopts the principle of the union of Church and State. The American people would rise up in rebellion against direct taxation for Church support; but what is exemption from taxation but an indirect State support of the Church, a virtual subsidy for its support and at the expense of the general public? The State reimburses itself by increasing the tax on the non-exempted property, and exemption is as clearly a gift as would be the amount of taxes the exempted property should pay if it were directly appropriated from the public treasury. The State avoids a deficiency in its revenues by transferring to other property increased taxation, not by the voluntary action of the taxpayers, but by the compulsion of law, all of which is out of consonance with our republican institutions.

True, the church yields no private income to the corporators. Neither do many other kinds of property. But the State cannot regulate its action by rule of income. Taxation would no doubt in some instances be a burden. But thousands of property owners now find it difficult to pay their taxes, and yet the State cannot afford to exempt them. Tax churches, and only those churches that are able to pay taxes would dare to be extravagant. With so much poverty and want in the community, our magnificent church edifices and massive buildings for alleged charitable purposes, on our most valuable sites, are a burlesque on both religion and charity.

Benjamin Franklin said:—

When a religion is good, I conceive that it will support itself; and when it cannot support itself and God does not care to support it, so its professors are obliged to call for help from the civil power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one.

In 1875 President Grant sent a message

* By Rev. Madison C. Peters, in the *Forum* for May. Mr. Peters is now pastor of the Bloomingdale Reformed Church in New York City. After his graduation in 1881, he entered the ministry of the German Reformed Church in Indiana, but subsequently united with the Presbyterian Church. After organizing churches in Terre Haute, Ind., and Ottawa, Ill., he was called to the Buttonwood Street Church in Philadelphia, where he remained for nearly six years.

to Congress on the subject of a total separation of Church and State, and the taxation of church property. This message would have been more appropriate for a governor's message addressed to the legislature of a State, for Congress has nothing to do with the question in the exercise of its taxing power. The whole spirit of the Constitution leaves this question to be determined by the respective States. But the President's sentiments were truly American. He said:—

In 1850, I believe, the church property of the United States which paid no tax, municipal or State, amounted to \$87,000,000. In 1860 the amount had doubled. In 1870 it was \$354,483,587. In 1900, without a check, it is safe to say, this property will reach a sum exceeding \$3,000,000,000. So vast a sum, receiving all the protection and benefits of government, without bearing its proportion of the burdens and expenses of the same, will not be looked upon acquiescently by those who have to pay the taxes. In a growing country, where real estate enhances so rapidly with time as in the United States, there is scarcely a limit to the wealth that may be acquired by corporations, religious or otherwise, if allowed to retain real estate without taxation. The contemplation of so vast a property as here alluded to, without taxation, may lead to sequestration without constitutional authority, and through bloodshed. I would suggest the taxation of all property equally.

President Garfield said:—

The divorce between Church and State ought to be so absolute that no church property anywhere, in any State, or in the nation, should be exempt from equal taxation; for if you exempt the property of any church organization, to that extent you impose a tax upon the whole community.

The census of 1890 has reported the alleged value of church edifices, the lots on which they stand, and their furnishings, as \$680,687,106. The following table shows in detail these values where the aggregate exceeds \$4,000,000:—

All Methodists.....	\$132,132,304
All Roman Catholics.....	118,342,366
All Presbyterians.....	94,869,097
All Baptists.....	83,334,272
All Episcopalians.....	82,774,018
Congregationalists.....	43,335,437
All Lutherans.....	35,060,354
All Reformed.....	18,744,242
Disciples of Christ.....	12,206,038
Unitarians.....	10,335,100
All Jewish congregations.....	9,754,275
Universalists.....	8,060,333
All United Brethren.....	4,937,983
Evangelical Association.....	4,785,680
German Evangelical Synod....	4,614,490
All Friends.....	4,541,334

This table does not include the value of parsonages, lots, monasteries, convents, schools, colleges, and the like; nor are these figures accurate, for a conservative estimate of the Roman Catholic "church property" alone is \$250,000,000, and of the property of all sects, in this country, \$2,000,000,000. Under the head of "church property" millions of dollars' worth of revenue-producing property evades taxation, such as large lots of valuable land upon which there are no buildings, and which are held for revenue, and thousands of mercantile buildings, schools, and even factories. Practically, the effect of exemption has been to encourage the church in buying vast tracts of land, which are daily growing in value. Dr. H. L. Wayland cites this instance:—

I am credibly told that on a recent occasion a bishop went to the owner of a valuable tract in a neighboring county, and said, "What is the price of such and such a piece of land?" "Sixty thousand dollars." "You have raised the price fifteen thousand dollars?" "Yes." "Very good; here is a check."

It was bought for the church simply as an investment.

The Protestant opposition to the taxation of church property comes almost wholly from the Episcopalian and Lutheran churches, which are more or less

related to State-supported churches in Europe. Yet there are many advocates of this taxation even among the Lutherans and Episcopalians. But the Roman Catholic Church is unanimously opposed to any taxation of its churches, schools, or other property. There are many reasons why its property should especially be taxed.

The property of the Roman Catholic Church should be taxed because it is held, not by the people, but by the individual ecclesiastics, and is therefore personal property exclusively under personal control. The anathemas of the Council of Trent are pronounced against all, even the clergy, who will not resist even the State itself, should the State attempt to give laymen, or anybody but priests and bishops, the control of church property. The sixteenth canon of the Council of Baltimore, held in 1852, shows how far a power emanating from Rome exercises influence over church property in this land. Instances could be cited where the curse of excommunication was pronounced against all Roman Catholics who would not give the bishop control of certain property, and the persons resisting the clerical usurpation were assaulted and driven by force upon the Sabbath from the very threshold of the church which they helped to build as a house for their own worship. The churches are held in the name of the bishops, and not in the name of the trustees. It is said that Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, holds more than \$50,000,000 worth of real estate in his own name.

There have been numerous transfers of property from trustees to M. A. Corrigan: not to M. A. Corrigan, archbishop, nor to M. A. Corrigan, as trustee for the Roman Catholic Church, but simply to M. A. Corrigan. Many of these parcels cover whole squares of land, and nearly all of them are of great value. The pope's nuncio, Bedini, came to America in 1855 to wrest the church property of Roman Catholics from the hands of the trustees and to place it in the hands of the bishops. It was because the title was vested in the bishop that the trustees of Roman Catholic churches in 1855 prayed the New York State legislature for redress, and the State answered that those who build the churches with their own money can govern the church temporalities as they please, and to-day the one-man power of the archbishop prevails over the sovereign law of the State of New York. Because the Roman Catholic bishops are the owners in fee simple of nearly all the church property within their respective ecclesiastical jurisdictions, and have the legal right to control, possess, and use it by assignment, by will, or otherwise, therefore their property should be taxed as personal property, or at least be deeded back to the worshippers.

Calvary Cemetery, though nominally under the name or title of the Trustees of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, is in reality Archbishop Corrigan's own property. It is unlawful and against the discipline of the archbishop to bury anywhere but in the archbishop's cemetery. Like a true monopolist he commands his own price and terms for lots, graves, tombstone fees, etc., for his own benefit; and I have been told by those who ought to know that the sums received have been at times as much as \$2,000 a day. It seems to me that the archbishop ought to pay a tax on the receipts.

The legitimate result of exemption has been the bestowment of public money upon

the Roman Catholic Church and its institutions. The money donated by the City of New York to the Roman Catholic Church (to say nothing of the five and a half blocks of land in the best parts of the city, now worth \$5,000,000), from 1869 to 1883 inclusive, was \$8,555,250.39; from 1884 to 1893 inclusive, \$5,526,733.34. Protestant denominations received during the ten years 1884 to 1893 inclusive, \$365,467.34. The New York State legislature for the year 1890 appropriated to sixteen institutions under Roman Catholic control \$1,079,986.07; to all other denominational institutions, numbering twenty-eight, \$946,649.67. The amount of public money granted from the United States Treasury for the Roman Catholic Indian Missions, compared with the niggardly amounts given to other denominations, deserves notice:—

	Total in 9 years.
Roman Catholic.....	\$2,738,571
Presbyterian.....	356,120
Congregational.....	217,269
Martinsburg, Pa.....	23,310
Alaska Training School.....	8,350
Episcopal.....	110,166
Friends.....	160,557
Mennonite.....	29,590
Middletown, Cal.....	1,523
Lutheran, Wittenberg, Wis.....	68,580
Unitarian.....	39,150
Methodist.....	33,345
Mrs. L. H. Daggett.....	6,480
Miss Howard.....	9,375
Lincoln Institution.....	300,600
Hampton Institute.....	180,360
Total.....	\$4,273,346

These appropriations are in violation of both the letter and the spirit of the First Amendment to the Constitution. It is earnestly hoped that all Protestant denominations will decline to receive further appropriations from the United States, so that they can consistently protest against the excessive grants to Roman Catholic schools. As an American I am opposed to this whole business, as recognizing the principle of a union of Church and State. Let each church support its own schools and charities, with its own money and not the money of others. The principle is wrong, for Protestant and Romanist alike, the latter sinning only more shamelessly than the former.

Wherever you look, Roman Catholic church property is rapidly multiplying; and where the Protestant churches get lots, the Roman Catholics get blocks,—entire squares,—and hold them against all comers. Taxation or confiscation is inevitable.

Indeed, from the earliest days of the Church, every chapter in its history teaches the lesson of the danger of its policy as a great property-holder with special privileges.

The church derived her right to hold property from the civil power. Constantine the Great, great only in his sins, received his title of Great because he provided by a civil law, still held sacred, that temporal power of the see of Rome, which made Dante sing: "O Constantine, how much evil originated, not from thy conversion, but from that grant from thee to the first pope whom thou madest rich." And in less than fifty years from that time the priests of Italy had gained one-third of the soil of that country. In 1857 one-third of the real estate in Mexico belonged to the church, besides more than \$300,000,000 of other property in that poor country, and its revenues were greater than those of the Mexican Government. When the property of the church was placed

upon the market, its actual value was sufficient to pay the national debt several times. In Chili the saints nominally hold property. St. Dominick has an income of more than a million dollars a year, for which he is not taxed one cent. In Catholic Guatemala the property of the church was confiscated in 1843; then there was a reaction led by the priests, but in 1873 all the church property of Guatemala passed into the hands of the government. In Catholic Costa Rica, Venezuela and Uruguay, the governments took the property away from the church, applied it to governmental purposes, and in some cases gave it to the people from whom the priests had stolen it.

In Canada, during the short time between the settlement by the French and the conquest by the English, the priests had gotten in their hands more than eight million acres of land. In the Province of Quebec, the exemption of church property from taxation has become a serious question. A careful writer, in speaking recently of the excommunication of certain outspoken French papers in Montreal, said:—

One of the great crimes committed by the excommunicated papers was that they spoke against the provision which exempts religious corporations from taxes. The city of Montreal is invaded by religious orders of every description, possessing immense properties. These orders buy up the most eligible sites and erect costly edifices for the propagation of their views. Often the property they buy brings a handsome revenue to the city in the shape of taxes. But as soon as this property is handed over to the Romish church, it becomes untaxable. The richer the church becomes, the poorer the city grows.

The great quantity of untaxed church property in Montreal is driving out the Protestant minority who pay three-fourths of the taxes. The English in that city own the enterprises without which the Province of Quebec, left to the absolute domination of ecclesiasticism, would be as backward as Ecuador. These English enterprises are taxed remorselessly. There is over \$100,000,000 worth of exempted ecclesiastical property in the province. The English have to pay for these exemptions by increased taxation. When the treasury is empty, the cry is, "Tax the English corporations." It is a hopeful sign that there is a growing and strong feeling among the liberal Catholics that all these rich religious corporations should pay taxes. Another writer, referring to the same province, says:—

There are municipalities where 50 per cent. of the whole assessed value is exempt, and others where the value of the property exempted actually exceeds that of the property taxed. Besides, we have to contribute to support religious orders, or see our stores and shops boycotted. The provincial treasurer is drawn on to provide for a great many of them. I might say that the church spends or oversees the spending of one-third of the whole provincial revenues, less the subsidies from Ottawa.

I have quoted thus at length from the Province of Quebec, because the principle there is the same as here, the Roman Catholic Church simply lacking the power to enforce its demands in the United States as it does in Quebec. Had church property been taxed, Quebec would not now be bankrupt, nor would the church have sunk that province into its present deplorable state.

Other denominations also are in danger of amassing wealth. Why should not the great estates of Trinity and the Collegiate churches of New York City, or Old South Church in Boston, held as investments for income instead of direct church uses, be taxed? The spirit of our laws is opposed to exemptions, and there needs to be made

out a very strong case to justify an exemption from taxation of property owned by corporations like these. Common honesty should lead them to bear their share of that taxation which provides a constant increase of value. All buildings rented for income, even though that income be devoted to religion and charity, should be taxed. R. J. Long, Esq., of Boston, says that in that city the churches hold \$40,000,000 of exempted property. The assessed value of New York City church property, exclusive of parsonages, parsons and priests, is \$51,217,525. Walk up Broadway from Rector Street and up Fifth Avenue, and from these streets alone you can see to what extent the church property in New York is underestimated. \$200,000,000 is less than the actual value of the church property of the metropolis, and when we remember that the assessed value of the real estate of New York City for 1894 is but \$1,618,853,135, it can easily be figured out how highly oppressive exemption becomes to the other taxpayers.

It is claimed that churches should be exempted because they improve the morals of the community, and raise the taxable value of the other property. That depends altogether on the church. But admit the fact that churches, as a rule, are a public benefit; so are private schools, picture-galleries, and factories, yet such property cannot be exempted without starving the State. Why, then, should churches enjoy this favor on the ground of benefits rendered; and other property, that can assign the same reason for the favor, be excluded therefrom? If the doctrine of benefits be given as a reason for exemption in behalf of religious corporations, it refutes itself by proving more than the State can admit. The New York City Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments, in their annual report for 1893, speaking of the injustice of this species of legislation, say:—

Corporations and associations avail themselves of these laws and decisions of the courts to escape taxation to such an extent that the public authorities must soon demand relief from the legislature.

Tax churches, and modest buildings will be erected where they are most needed, instead of building one great structure in a fashionable quarter. Churches are said to be public property. But the Roman Catholic churches charge an admission fee to the ordinary service. High money, high mass; low money, low mass; no money, no mass. In many Protestant churches the pew-rents are so high and the people so exclusive that the public feel that they are not wanted. I would tax all charitable institutions, hospitals and orphanages. Their work is not wholly philanthropic. They receive revenue. In New York City, orphanages are maintained at public expense. "The Foundling Asylum," under the charge of the Sisters of Charity, received during the years 1884 to 1893, inclusive, from the "Taxation and General Fund," \$2,641,998.02. During the same period and from the same fund the "New York Catholic Protectors" received \$2,462,500. Many of these so-called orphans have both parents living, and the church is maintaining them at the expense of the taxpayers, and making an enormous profit, the appropriations being five times in excess of the expense of providing for such "orphans." It is a sad sight to see a congregation, whose combined wealth is millions, pleading exemption for their orphanage. My mother was left a widow

with three little orphans to care for. Her little country home was taxed. If any orphanage should be exempt from taxation, such a one as that ought to be.

The taxation of church property is in the interest of American principles, and in harmony with the experience of nations. Taxing one man for the propagation of another man's religion is glaringly unjust. Moreover it is a relic of the principle of the union of Church and State inherited from the Old World, and not yet eliminated from our political system.

The Breckinridge-Morse District Sunday Bill.

[The following is a portion of a brief presented before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, by W. H. McKee, attorney for the Religious Liberty Association, on the occasion of the hearing on the Breckinridge Sunday bill for the District of Columbia, Jan. 6, 1891. It is just as applicable to the Morse Sunday bill for the District, now before the Commissioners for the District and the House Committee.]

THE legislation asked is unconstitutional and contrary to the spirit of American institutions.

Waiving the question of unconstitutionality, Sunday laws already exist, in force and enforceable, in the District of Columbia, and the measure is one of cumulative legislation.

Article First of the Amendments to the Constitution declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

House Bill 3854 embodies a measure which Congress is asked to adopt, as a law governing the District of Columbia, over which Congress has sole jurisdiction. Therefore, if this measure has in view the establishment of the observance of a religious dogma, or the enforcement of religious reverence for a particular day, because of the supposed divine origin of the observance required, or because a larger or smaller proportion of citizens observe the day religiously, it is a religious measure, outside the pale of civil legislation, and Congress is incompetent to entertain it.

Three points of internal evidence prove the bill to be religious in its inception, and in its intent:—

1. The word "secular," in the phrase "to perform any secular labor or business," betrays the reverential spirit in which the bill is framed. The incongruity of the word, in such a connection, in a purely civil statute, will be perfectly patent if applied to a supposed measure, "To prevent persons from being forced to labor on the 4th of July," or, "To prevent persons from being forced to labor on the 22nd of February." The various antonyms—regular, religious, monastic, spiritual, clerical—of the word "secular," show the character which this term gives to the bill, and unavoidably. No stronger circumstantial evidence could possibly be required than the unconscious testimony of this expression.

2. The words "except works of necessity or mercy" are subject, in a lesser degree, to the same construction. The character of phrases, as well as of human beings, may be determined by the company they keep, and this phrase is one which carries the mind immediately to the consideration of religious and biblical exceptions made to the strict application of the divine law for the Sabbath. That is the source of the expression, and its course may be followed through all the religious laws for "Sabbath observance," and the judicial

interpretation of them, which have been had. The effect of this phrase, in connection with the preceding word "secular," is conclusive.

3. The exemption clause contains the language, "Who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day." What has a purely civil statute to do with the conscience of man, as regards his conscientious belief in, and observance of, a day of rest? The moment the domain of conscience is touched, as such, from that instant the measure is no longer civil. And if, as this exemption shows, there be a class to whose conscience this bill would work a hardship, and to whose religious convictions it would stand opposed, then, *per contra*, there is another class the consciences of whom the measure is intended to favor. It is, therefore, not only legislation on matters of conscience, but class legislation as well.

More than this: What does an exemption clause presuppose? Is it not a civil or legal incapacity to meet the requirements of the law? If the incapacity arise within the domain of conscience, it is without the civil sphere, and the necessary conclusion is that the legislation is outside the jurisdiction of human law.

These three points might be elaborated further, but this statement of them is sufficient to show that the bill bears within itself conclusive evidence of its religious character; and, if religious, it is not within the purview of congressional legislation, as contemplated by the Constitution.

In measures, as in men, there is an ancestral spirit by which we may know them. What is the heredity of this bill?—Its progenitor in the Senate is the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, which, on its first introduction in the Senate of the Fiftieth Congress, was plainly entitled, "A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as *the Lord's day*, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship," and in the Fifty-first Congress it is called, "A bill to secure to the people the privileges of rest and of religious worship, free from disturbance by others, on the first day of the week." The body of the two bills is the same, except that the incongruous nomenclature in the first has been harmonized in the second, and "first day," "Lord's day," and "Sabbath," made to read, "first day" and "Sunday." Although in the last section of the former bill the expression "religious observance of the Sabbath day" is omitted, in the second, a neutrality clause, for it is nothing else, is inserted, which declares that "this act shall not be construed to prohibit or sanction labor on Sunday, by individuals who conscientiously believe in and keep any other day as *the Sabbath*," etc. It is the same bill resurrected, and attempts the mingling of incongruous elements which cannot be assimilated,—the Sabbath which is divine, and the Sunday which is human; Sabbath of the moral law, Sunday of the civil law; Sabbath of the Lord thy God, Sunday a religious day by the enactment of Constantine, and a *dies non*, in the statutory nomenclature of the civil law.

The very next branch of this family tree is entitled, "An act to punish blasphemers, swearers, drunkards, and Sabbath-breakers," which is openly a religious law. See "Laws of the District of Columbia, 1868," pp. 136-7-8. The family likeness of these three measures, the old Maryland law adopted into the statutes of the Dis-

trict, the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, and the Breckinridge local Sunday bill, is unmistakable, and, if the original from which the latter two are derived is a religious law, the two descendants certainly must be.

But in the bill before this committee there has been an attempt to separate the civil from the religious, and the claim is made that this measure is consistently for a "civil Sunday." In making good this claim, what is it necessary to show?—It is necessary to show that the legislative and public mind has been entirely divested of the popular idea that Sunday is a day to which a due religious observance is to be paid. Both those who make the law, and those who are subject to it, must be shown to have placed themselves exactly in the mental position of the civilian whose mind has never harbored the thought of the sacredness of one day above another. Then no other legislative restrictions would be attempted to be placed upon Sunday than could be enacted for Monday, or Tuesday, or any succeeding day of the week. But read this bill, 3854, and insert for the word Sunday the name of a different day of the week, and consider how quickly the sense of the people would reject it. Its propriety as a civil measure would be instantly denied. What should give it a different complexion when it contains the word "Sunday?" What is the magic "presto change" in that name?—It is the religious association; the fact that the consciences of many men for many generations have been trained to reverence Sunday as the holy day of God.

Sunday was first a holiday, dedicated as such to the sun and its worship. So that in its inception it was a day the observance of which was based upon a religious idea; in the accommodation of the forms and observances of the pagan and Christian churches, which, for the sake of temporal power and success, was brought about in the reign of Constantine, the Church found it politic, from the point of view which then prevailed, to adopt the pagan holiday, and did so, consecrating it anew, with all the sacredness of the religious forms and beliefs of the Church, transferring to it the awful sanctity involved in the commandment of God, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," and adding to that all the holy sentiment which can be invoked for a day commemorative of the resurrection of our Saviour.

Thus cumulatively religious is the history of this day. The religious idea has never been separated from it. No enforcement of its observance, distinctively from other days, can be divorced from that inbred religious idea, any more than the physical and moral characteristics of the father and mother can be eliminated from the child. This child of the Church and a religious holiday ("the venerable day of the sun") is, by birth, by inheritance, and by unbroken habit throughout its existence, a religious day—nothing else.

Congressmen are here to crystallize into law the highest expression of the will of the people. The expression of the civilian will must result in civil law. You are here to make civil law then, are you not, not moral law? Why can you not make moral law for the people?—Because you cannot exceed the powers which the people had to give you, who constituted you legislators. And as they had no power to make a rule of moral action one for the other, or for themselves, therefore they

had no authority to delegate such power to you.

If, then, you cannot, in your own minds, and in the minds of the people, both in theory and in fact, divorce completely—as utterly as though it had never existed—the religious idea from the concept Sunday, you have no right to legislate upon the use of that day as distinguished from any other day.

Those who are asking for the passage of this bill are urging the members to commit themselves to an unconstitutional act.

Sunday in Scranton, Pa.

SCRANTON, Pa., is agitated over the enforcement of the Sunday law of 1794 in that city. According to the *Scranton Tribune*, "a score or more of agents in the employ of the Pastor's Union, which is conducting the Sunday closing movement, were quietly circulating about the city," on Sunday, May 6. As stated by the *Tribune*, beer and similar drinks could be procured by those who knew how to get them, but "to the credit of the executive committee of the Pastor's Union, nearly all of the corner penny stands were closed, as well as a number of bakeries and candy stores." Sunday evening Rev. F. Dony, district secretary of the American Sabbath Union and president of the executive committee of the Pastor's Union of Scranton, said to a *Tribune* reporter: "We are perfectly satisfied with the way our work is progressing. I know that many places are open, but they will close because they must close."

Monday, May 7, the ministers held a meeting in the interests of the Sunday-closing movement which was addressed by one, Colonel Boise, who said:—

This local movement depends in a great measure upon prevailing popular sentiment which must emanate from the pastors. A former similar movement in this city was successful because it awakened the co-operation of the entire Christian community. In the same way only will this movement be successful.

While I defend the Sabbath as a sacred day that should be exempt from worldly business, I do not believe in a Sabbath of needless exactions.

If we let the enemies of Sunday go on unhindered, Christianity will tremble. There is just as much necessity to enforce Sabbath observance as any other divine command.

The address closed with a round of applause.

The executive committee submitted a report, one paragraph of which is as follows:—

One arrest has been made of a person who defied the law and challenged its enforcement. Arrangements have been made for a considerable number of like cases to be proceeded against for yesterday's disregard of the law if in the judgment of the Pastors' Union it is advisable to continue the work.

"It was advisable," "in the judgment of the Pastors' Union," "to continue the work," and so the *Tribune*, of May 9, tells of the infliction of a fine of four dollars on one Mr. McGarrah, a druggist, who sold soda water, and closes with this remark:—

Fully a dozen prominent druggists and cigar dealers will be brought before Alderman Post this afternoon, and the chances are that each will receive the usual fine of \$4 and costs.

These druggists were so brought before the alderman, and each was fined four dollars and costs. On the 12th, which was the seventh day of the week, and according to the Scriptures the Sabbath of the Lord, still other fines were imposed in the interest of Sunday sacredness and to awe people into a more strict observance of the papal Sunday, the rival of the divinely appointed rest day, the memorial of creation, and consequently, of God's power to redeem.

C. P. B.



NEW YORK, MAY 24, 1894.

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

READ the article on another page, "Why Church Property Should Be Taxed," by Rev. Madison C. Peters.

THE Canadian canals are henceforth to be closed to traffic from twelve o'clock Saturday night until the same hour Sunday night.

A RECENT dispatch from Moscow to the London *Chronicle* says that one hundred German Baptists have left the Provinces of Kherson and Volhynia for America, to seek an asylum from Russian religious persecution.

GOVERNOR CROUNSE, of Nebraska, has been notified that the Lincoln branch of the Commonweal Army, organized under the command of "General" Duff, which left Omaha recently for the East, has among its members one man whose purpose when he reaches Washington is to assassinate President Cleveland.

THE *Philadelphia Record* contributes this bit of humor to the Sunday observance discussion:—

OLD LADY.—Now, I'll give you a quarter if you'll promise to become a Christian.

RAGSON TATTERS.—Well, ma'am, I'll promise yer never ter work on Sunday.

There is an acidity in this witticism which is not misplaced.

"It is hard to frame a tariff bill to suit everybody," remarks an exchange. The remark is occasioned by the fact that under the Wilson bill certain religious trappings of the Romish Church were dutiable. Cardinal Gibbons and other prominent Roman Catholic prelates are endeavoring to have this changed, so that regalia and statuary imported for their churches may come in free of duty.

APROPOS of the article on another page, "Some Signs of the Times," is the following paragraph from the *Review of Reviews*, for May:—

The European nations are beginning to droop and totter beneath the ever accumulating burden of military expenditure. There is hardly a country among them that is not at the present moment struggling desperately to choke the deficit which is staring it in the face. In England, Sir William Harcourt was five million pounds (\$25,000,000) short, which must be provided for by new taxation. The Indian Empire is proposing to tax all imports, except cotton, five per cent. *ad valorem*, to meet its deficit, besides adopting

other expedients unpopular but necessary. In France, there is a deficit of nearly \$30,000,000, about half of which it is proposed to cover by a refunding of loans at a lower rate of interest, and the remaining half is to be obtained by increased taxation on incomes and spirits, with taxes on succession duties. In Italy, the new finance minister frankly admits the existence of a deficit of about \$50,000,000, to be met no one knows how. The country cannot bear increased taxation, and the chances of any minister who ventured to propose serious retrenchment and the disbanding of surplus employés would be practically worthless. Everywhere the statesmen are seeking with feverish anxiety for new sources of revenue, but everywhere the insatiable maw of armaments demands more and ever more millions.

As we have before remarked, the recognition of impending ruin has become well-nigh universal.

DURING the consideration of a District bill in the House, on the 14th inst., some excitement was caused by a colored man in the public gallery. The man arose and addressed the speaker, saying that if the Coxe Good Roads bill was not passed, the White House, Treasury, and Capitol would be destroyed by thunder and lightning. Of course, the man is what is popularly known as a "crank," but so was Guiteau, and so was Valliant, who threw the bomb in the French Chamber of Deputies. "Crankism" is one of the signs of the times and is in the very air.

THE New York Catholic School Exhibit was formally opened by Archbishop Corrigan, before an audience of about two thousand people in the Grand Central Palace on the evening of the 15th inst. The main floor and the two galleries were densely packed with men, women, and children, while on the stage sat nearly two hundred of the clergy, together with a number of prominent laymen. Speeches were made by the archbishop, Mayor Gilroy, Congressman Bourke Cockran and others. Mayor Gilroy, said that one of the proudest aims of man or woman ought to be to teach the youth of the country how to exercise the rights of citizenship when they came to man's estate. "The parochial schools," he said "are doing this." The phenomenal success of Tammany proves that Mr. Gilroy knows whereof he affirms.

"A roar of applause," says the *Sun* (Tammany organ), "went up as Mgr. Farley announced Bourke Cockran. Mr. Cockran said that he was amazed that at this part of the nineteenth century it was found necessary to repel the charge that the Catholic Church was hostile to republican institutions. "To declare," said he, "that the Catholic Church is hostile to the Republic is to declare that the mother is hostile to her own offspring. The Catholic Church is the oldest republic in the world, and has been always favorable to such institutions." That we suppose will settle the matter with many people. Mr. Cockran, a member of Congress, has said so, and who can longer doubt it?

But once granted that the Catholic Church is mother of the Republic, must it not follow that the mother must control the child?

A FREETHOUGHT exchange, attempting to make a point on a note in our columns, asks: "Why should there be any mystery about righteousness?" Well, there should not be, but the fact remains that there is. There never would have been any such mystery had sin never entered the world; for God's will, which is perfect righteousness, would have been perfectly done in all created intelligences. But sin having once entered and all flesh being contaminated by sin, the mystery is the restoration of men to a condition of complete harmony with God. This change is wrought by the power of God. The apostle exhorts: "Be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God." Man's work is to desire the good; it is God's work to confer that good by the renewing of the mind, the transformation of the character, the formation of "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."

THE *Observer*, of this city, remarks that "men cannot be made either moral or religious by act of Parliament or Congress," and then immediately adds: "But legislative bodies may help, as they are disposed to make transgressors' ways more or less easy to enter." This is a most mischievous sentiment. Legislative bodies have no other duty than to provide for the conservation of natural rights; to guarantee to all "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." To go beyond this is inevitably to enter the domain of conscience and to trench upon sacred rights.

RECENT advices, from Rome, by way of London, state that "the congregation of the Propaganda has gathered all the necessary material for immediate and direct intervention between Ablegate Satolli and his opponents in the United States. It is probable that another national Synod of the American hierarchy will be ordered for the purpose of directing Catholicism in the United States. The opinions of religious orders now being obtained greatly favor the appointing of cathedral charters and a permanent legate in the United States."

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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

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

In clubs of	5 to 24	copies to one address, per year,	- - -	90c
"	25 to 50	" " " "	"	80c
"	100 to 249	" " " "	"	75c
"	250 to 499	" " " "	"	70c
"	500 to 999	" " " "	"	65c
"	1000 or more	" " " "	"	60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,				5 shillings

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