

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, APRIL 23, 1903

NO. 17



*It requires but a slight knowledge of history to know that the act of 1794 was passed in deference to the religious convictions of a majority of the people of this Commonwealth at that time. Not only the religious convictions, but the customs and habits based upon those convictions, were the moving cause for the enactment of the Sunday law. Essentially, therefore, the statute was a recognition of the religious tenets of one part of the community as a reason for placing an interdict upon the occupations and habits of another part of the community. It is true the act is prohibitive merely. It does not oblige the minority to adopt the religious customs and beliefs of the majority, but it does prohibit the minority from performing acts otherwise innocuous, and often salutary and beneficial, out of deference to the religious sensibilities of the majority. If this can be done—if the minority can be prohibited from doing something in itself lawful as a deference to the religious views of others—it is but a single step, and a very short one, to the position that they may be commanded to do something for the same reason. . . . IF A PROHIBITION MAY BE ENACTED UPON SUCH GROUNDS, A COMMAND MAY BE ENACTED ALSO, AND IF A COMMAND, THEN A STATUTE REQUIRING RELIGIOUS CONFORMITY.*

*—From argument of Ex-Judge James G. Gordon at Philadelphia on March 23.*

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO., 11 West 20th St., New York City  
 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA      SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA      KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Entered January 2, 1903, at New York, N. Y., as second-class matter, under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

Set for the defense of human rights, especially the rights of conscience. The only periodical in the United States especially devoted to the maintenance of the Christian and American principle of complete separation of church and state. The Sentinel is not a periodical of abstractions and speculation; it discusses live issues that deeply concern every individual.

JOHN D. BRADLEY, Editor.

Editorial Contributors:

A. T. JONES, A. G. DANIELLS, M. C. WILCOX,  
L. A. SMITH, C. P. BOLLMAN.

We believe in the religion taught and lived by Jesus Christ.

We believe in temperance, and regard the liquor traffic as a curse to society.

We believe in supporting civil government and submitting to its authority.

We believe that human rights are sacred, and that they indissolubly inhere in the moral nature of the individual.

We deny the right of any human authority to invade and violate these inalienable rights in any individual.

Therefore we deny the right of any civil government to legislate on matters of religion and conscience.

We believe it is the right, and should be the privilege, of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, free from all dictation, interference, or control on the part of civil government or any other external authority; or not to worship at all if he so chooses.

We also believe it to be our duty, and no less the duty of all others, to oppose religious legislation and all movements tending toward the same, to the end that all the people may freely enjoy the inestimable blessing of liberty, which is theirs by virtue of the unbounded wisdom and beneficence of the Author of their being.

### TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION

Single copy, per year.....	\$1.00
"    six months.....	.50
"    three months.....	.25
To foreign countries in Postal Union, one year.....	1.50

### CLUBBING RATE.

5 or more copies to one address, one year.....	.70
Club rate for three and six months in proportion.	
Special terms to agents. Sample copies gratis. Correspondence solicited.	

Any one receiving THE SENTINEL OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY without having ordered it, may know that it is sent by some friend. Those who have not ordered the magazine need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

### TO OUR PATRONS

Please be careful to write all names of persons and places plainly.

Remit by P. O. Money Order, Express Money Order or by Bank Draft on New York.

Make all Orders and Drafts payable to Pacific Press Publishing Company.

We will receive Postage Stamps in small quantities, and any kind of good money. Paper money or silver should be sent in a Registered Letter.

The address on the wrapper will always indicate the time to which your subscription is paid. In case of non-receipt of the magazine, or other irregularity, please notify us immediately.

When requesting change of address, be sure to give both old and new address.

Rates for advertising can be had on application.

Address all communications of a business nature, to

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,**

11 West 20th Street, New York City

A LETTER mailed to us from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on April 6, is without signature, and so we are unable to give attention to the same. If the one who wrote the letter sees this notice, we would be glad to have him make his identity known.

We learn that the March number of the *Advocate of Christian Education* had a circulation of about 40,000 among public-school teachers. While each issue of the *Advocate* teaches the principles of Christian education, this particular number is especially fine. Any one who has not seen this number would be well paid by sending five cents to the *Advocate*, Berrien Springs, Mich., for a copy.

THE April *Life Boat* is a special "Prisoners' Number." There are a number of extracts from personal experiences which make the magazine very interesting. The reading of these will give hope to fallen men. The *Life Boat* certainly deserves much encouragement in its work for this class of individuals. Its publishers would be pleased to correspond with any one who would like to help in the work for prisoners. Address *Life Boat*, 28 Thirty-third Place, Chicago, Ill.

Two little quarterly publications—the *Bible Students' Library* and the *Apples of Gold Library*, both published by the Pacific Press Publishing Company, Oakland, Cal.—are received regularly at our office. These treat upon a variety of different Biblical truths in such a clear, rational manner, that we take pleasure in recommending them. The price of both Libraries is but 35 cents per year. If you do not receive them regularly you could not spend 35 cents better than by sending for a year's subscription to them.

# The Sentinel

## OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1903

No. 17

The state has no right to interfere with people for doing on Sunday what it would not interfere with them for doing on other days.



Government exists for the purpose of giving *equal* protection to the rights of all; not for the purpose of restricting the rights of some in obedience to the selfish or needless demands of others.



The very same principle is involved when a saloon-keeper is arrested and fined for selling on Sunday as is involved when a merchant or shopman is arrested and fined for selling on Sunday.



Next to having her representatives run governmental affairs the Papacy would have governmental representatives take a hand in ecclesiastical affairs, if it is done under her auspices. She knows the latter to be a very good method for bringing about the former.



The attempt of government to "protect" and "preserve" Sunday as "holy time" seems to have resulted in making it the most unholy day of all the week. What else could be expected? Government has no power to make or keep anything holy, and an attempt on its part to do such a thing can only result in a miserable failure.



A "Lord's day" law, with its exemp-

tion clause for seventh-day observers, establishes first-day observance as the creed of the state; partially tolerates seventh-day observance; and proscribes the observance of all other days. Those who do not hold to either the first or the seventh day as holy are obliged, whether or no, to observe one of these days.



The trouble with the Sunday-closing laws that exist and that are being advocated at the present time is that, instead of being measures for protecting rights, as is alleged, they are in reality measures which *deny* rights. They invade the just rights of some in order to extend undue privileges to others. Such legislative coddling of some at the expense of the rights of others is utterly unjust and uncalled for, in whatever light it may be considered.



Since saloon-keepers are not molested for selling liquor on other days it is evident that when they are arrested and fined for selling *on Sunday* it is not for selling the liquor or for any injurious effects that such sale has upon the community, but in order to compel a recognition of and deference to the day—the religious observance. But saloon-keepers have as much right to be free from compulsion with respect to religious institutions and observances as have other people.

Roman Catholics in Trenton, N. J., have begun an organized effort to have Painter's "misnamed 'History of Education' crossed off the list of Trenton public school books." The work is used as a text-book in the city training school for teachers, and because of certain passages in it that speak plainly of the character and corruptions of "representatives of the Church, even those in the highest station," at the period just preceding the beginning of the Reformation, it is characterized as "a vile text-book," and its use as a text-book is declared to be using the public schools for "the dissemination of bigotry." It is declared that "the board of education should long ago have been called to account for allowing such a book to be used in an institution largely supported by Catholic taxpayers." If the book misrepresents history it should be "crossed off the list," but if it does not this demand should not be heeded. The rule that should govern in such a matter is not as to what is pleasing or displeasing to a religious body, but as to what is the historical truth. There should be no falsification of history and no distortion of historical teaching to suit any religionists, never mind how much of the taxes they may pay for the support of the public schools. There is reason to believe that Roman Catholics in this country would like, and are seeking, to have everything eliminated from schools and libraries that is not favorable to the Catholic Church. This may be proper enough from their standpoint, but nobody who cares anything for the truths of history can look with favor upon such an attitude.



In 1899 a "weekly wage" law was enacted in Indiana. In a case in which the State factory inspector had brought suit under the law to compel a certain corporation to pay its employees their wages weekly instead of bi-weekly as was its

custom, the supreme court of the State on April 8 pronounced the law to be "in conflict with the bill of rights and also with the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution." In passing upon the question the court declared:

The statute places the wage earners of the State under quasi-guardianship. It classes them with minors and other persons under legal disability by making their contracts void at the pleasure of a public officer. It tends to degrade them as citizens by impeaching their ability to take care of themselves. It is paternalism pure and simple, in violent contrast with the liberty and equality theory of our institutions.

An exact parallel to a "weekly wage" law is a "weekly rest-day" law. When the law undertakes to "provide" and enforce a "weekly rest-day" for working people it just as verily places them "under quasi-guardianship" and "classes them with minors and other persons under legal disability" as when it undertakes to determine for them when and how they shall be compensated for their labor. In one case just as much as in the other the law "tends to degrade them as citizens by impeaching their ability to take care of themselves." Therefore we may say in the language of the supreme court of Indiana that a "rest-day" law, even a "civil" "rest-day" law, "is paternalism pure and simple," and is "in violent contrast with the liberty and equality theory of our institutions."



On March 28 a hearing was held before a committee of the Massachusetts legislature on a bill "to have city employees of Boston paid overtime for Sunday and night work." The author of the bill, Representative Bradley of Boston, explained that occasionally, as in the case of snow shoveling, employees of the city were called upon to work on Sunday, and that at present the city paid for this extra work at the same rate as it paid for work on other days, where-

as private concerns paid extra for Sunday work. The object of the bill was "to secure proper compensation for the man who is called upon to work overtime for the city." Messrs. Kneeland and Bottsford and other representatives of the New England Sabbath (Sunday) Protective League were present and objected to the bill on the ground that "to put such a law upon the statute books would be to partly sanction such Sabbath labor," and "would be an incentive to workmen to try and secure Sunday work." This is another instance which throws light upon the pretension of the champions of Sunday legislation and enforcement that their chief concern in the matter is for the "poor working-man," and which also illustrates the vigilance with which they guard the legal "protection" of that which is the real object of their concern.

At a meeting of the association of Congregational ministers of Chicago on April 6 several speakers "deplored" the action of the two mayoralty candidates in the late campaign in "making political speeches and soliciting votes on Sunday." There was "hearty applause" when Rev. D. F. Fox, of the California Avenue Congregational Church, declared: "Friends, electioneering on the Sabbath is wrong and should not be. It has a wrong tendency—a tendency to destroy the sacredness of the day rather than to upbuild it." Perhaps Messrs. Harrison and Stewart thought it would be perfectly proper to use the "civil sabbath" for civil purposes. When brought to the test the friends of the "civil sabbath" never fail to exhibit the fact that it is "the sacredness of the day" about which they are concerned—that it is a religious and not a civil institution that they are seeking "to upbuild."

A dispatch from Baltimore which appeared in the newspapers on the 15th conveyed the information that "President Roosevelt has sent to Cardinal Gibbons and His Eminence has forwarded by special messenger to Pope Leo XIII. a gift to be presented to the Holy Father on the celebration of his jubilee." The messenger, "a clergyman," "sailed from New York for Naples" on the 14th. The gift consisted of "ten handsomely bound volumes containing all the messages and official documents of the Presidents of the United States from Washington to Roosevelt," and accompanying it were sent "autograph letters from the President and Cardinal Gibbons to His Holiness." Thus we have another item in the growing and significant intimacy between the United States Government and the Papacy.

A member of the New York legislature is reported to have declared: "I am against every bill which, if enacted, would break down the 'American Sabbath.'" The New York *World* observes that "if by the 'American Sabbath' is meant the old Puritan Sunday—a day on which all labor and pleasure were forbidden—there is no such thing left in any of our large cities." Those who have so much to say about the "American Sabbath" are fighting the "American Sabbath" of to-day and trying to preserve and enforce the "American Sabbath" of two or three hundred years ago. They will learn some day that the "American Sabbath" is a changeable institution.

"It is not hard to believe that Pius IX. was a Christian, and it is easy to believe that Leo XIII. is a saint," said Rev. Charles Wood, D.D., pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, in a sermon preached on the evening of March 8. His subject was "The Roman Catholic Church," and the sermon was

regarded by the leading Catholic paper of Philadelphia as an attack upon "the Church." Such "attacks" evidence the fact that Romanism has an exceedingly week-kneed opposition to face to-day.



In an agitation on a short time ago in Red Bluff, Cal., an advocate of Sunday closing disavowed any religious motive, saying that the demand was "for a corporeal rest-day," and that "religious feeling should not be lugged into the agitation." But he soon demonstrated that the religious feature could not be eliminated from the matter by proceeding to argue that "Sunday has been selected as the one day of the week for rest *for the reason that it is the day observed for religious devotion* by a great majority of the American people."



It was reported from Syracuse, N. Y., late in March that the retail clerks' association of that city was "using every effort to have the bill of Assemblyman Finch, of New York, prohibiting the opening of stores and the sale of goods on Sunday, passed." One of the things it proposed to do was to send "a copy of the bill to every labor organization in the State, with the request that it be endorsed." Sunday enforcement is more and more enlisting in its support the power of organized labor.



Rev. Harry Knowles, a Methodist clergyman of Duluth, Minn., who gained considerable notoriety last summer as an opponent of Sunday baseball playing, is out with the declaration that "professional games on Sunday will not be tolerated" in and near that city during the coming season. If this threat is made good the enforcement of a religious observance will be tolerated instead. In the choice between the two wise people will much prefer to "tolerate" Sunday ball playing.

"President Roosevelt is a stickler for observing the Sabbath, and will spend the day most quietly in this city," said the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) *Leader* of March 24 in correcting a previous statement to the effect that "the President during his visit to Sioux Falls would address the school children at the auditorium on Sunday afternoon." It was hoped that the President could speak to the children before his departure on Monday. It would seem that the President has become more particular with regard to Sunday observance than he was last summer at Oyster Bay or in the fall at Chattanooga. But perhaps he regards business of state and politics and the reviewing of troops on Sunday as in keeping with the proper observance of the day, even though talking to children may not be.



We learn from the *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register* of New York that "Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore, and Rev. Dr. D. J. Stafford, of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, called on President Roosevelt on March 19 by appointment. Cardinal Gibbons said the President desired to talk to him concerning some matters which he was not at liberty to disclose."



One of the papal orators at one of the recent "jubilee" celebrations in this country declared that Leo XIII. was "one in whose veins ran the blood of the famous Rienzi, the last of the tribunes, the dreamer of a Roman republic." This is by no means the extent of the Papacy's connection with the former Rome. The Papacy is old Rome in another form.



"The growth of the Roman Church in the United States is one of the most striking facts in history," says Dr. S. D. McConnell in the *Booklover's Magazine* for March.

# The Supremacy of the Papacy

By Alonzo T. Jones

## XV

### *High and Shrewd Playing for a Great Stake*

WE have seen somewhat of the substantial gains that the Papacy has made, through the Philippine entanglement of the United States, in getting a firm hold upon the United States government itself. We have seen somewhat of the machinery and its workings that she is employing to the furtherance of this great and far-reaching purpose.

It is proper that more of this should be as widely as possible known; for it is such a great stake for which she is playing in this game that she is willing to go to fairly desperate lengths to gain her points. And the lengths to which she has already gone are almost surprising even to those who are best acquainted with her disposition, and with her purposes, through the United States, concerning Europe and all humanity.

At one stage of the proceedings last summer in Rome the Papacy went so far as to propose that if a certain course were taken President Roosevelt might name to the Papacy the persons to be appointed "apostolic delegates" at Washington and at Manila. This was an enormous bid on the part of the Papacy; but what would have been gained by it had it been accepted was worth all that was bid. For, had the bid been accepted, the naming by the President of the United States of the persons to be appointed by the Pope to the positions of "apostolic delegate" at Washington and Manila would have been nothing else than the President taking an official part in the work of the Church of Rome as such, and would have been a direct uniting of the United States government with the Papacy in the ecclesiastical work of the Papacy; and so would have been a direct union

of the United States and the Papacy in promoting the work of the Papacy, the United States government becoming the servant of the Papacy.

The bid was not accepted. The consequences were so apparent that even at Washington they could be seen as too much to be assumed as yet. But that the Papacy should be ready to make such a bid demonstrates her estimate of the magnitude of the stake for which she is playing, and her willingness to bid accordingly.

When this bid was declined or evaded at Washington, the Papacy later in the negotiations in Rome inserted the same thing in a different shape. For in reply to Governor Taft's of July 3, the Papacy, July 10, proposed as a basis of negotiations in the affairs of the Philippines a contract of twelve articles to be "signed by both parties." Article *four* of these twelve provided for the "establishment of a tribunal of arbitration to be composed of five members, two of whom are to be chosen by the Vatican, two by the Philippine government, and the fifth by the other four." *And if these four should not agree upon that fifth member, then, the article proceeds: "In case of disagreement as to the fifth member, he shall be chosen in common accord by Pope Leo and President Roosevelt"!!*

This "contract" proposed by the Papacy was not able to get any further, for Governor Taft surprised the papal court by suddenly breaking off the negotiations in Rome and transferring everything to Manila for whatever further must be done. But if the proposed "contract" had been accepted, and its twelve articles had thus become the law between the

parties, does anybody believe that the "four" arbitrators would ever have agreed on the fifth member when the alternative was nothing less than the union of the United States and the Papacy in this working in "common accord" of "Pope Leo and President Roosevelt"?

Governor Taft withdrew from Rome and carries on in Manila within his own sphere of government whatever more must be done. But with the utmost good intention and integrity to American principles of separation of church and state, especially in the matter of education, which he undoubtedly holds and will insist on, how can it be expected that he shall make headway at all against the papal tide there when that tide is industriously fed not only from Rome but from Washington itself, as in the appointment of papal Commissioner Smith to be a "member of the Philippine Commission and Secretary of Public Instruction in the government of the Philippine Islands"?

But whatever Governor Taft may be able to accomplish in stemming the papal tide in the Philippines and through that

upon the United States itself, this can be only a question of time. For some day there will have to be a successor to Governor Taft. Indeed it is understood now that Governor Taft will before very long return to the United States. And when there comes the time for the appointment of his successor in the Philippine government, if the appointee shall not be dictated by the Papacy itself, it is certain that he will have to be a person entirely acceptable to the Papacy.

And then when she shall have there a governor entirely acceptable to her, if not her very own, as in the case of Attorney Smith; and has already there her very own as Secretary of Public Instruction; and upon the Supreme Court decision insists that the Constitution does not apply in the Philippines—what then can there be to hinder her from carrying on there exactly her own idea of things? especially when she is backed up by "the demand of fifteen millions of American Catholics," as "a guarantee which no administration dare ignore"? Assuredly she holds the lead in the game.

## *Sunday Laws of England*

*By W. A. Colcord*

ENGLAND is well provided with Sunday laws, having no less than twenty-four, all of which are in force at the present time. Of these eleven refer to manufactory and trading, eleven to the sale of liquor, five to amusements, five to traveling, two to the employment of young persons and women, and one to elections. The first was enacted in 1354; the last in 1887. The effort to guard the day by law seems to have increased of later years, no less than sixteen of the foregoing having been enacted during the reign of Victoria alone.

The first law, that passed in 1354

during the reign of Edward III., prohibits the showing of wool on Sunday. The next, passed in 1448, forbids all manner of fairs and markets "on the principal feasts, and Sundays, and Good Fridays." Ten others also include the principal feasts of the church, six of which were enacted during Victoria's reign. In this they are consistent, as the Sunday and the other church festivals all stand on the same foundation, namely, the authority of the Roman Catholic Church.

A law passed in 1780, under George III., and called, "An act for preventing



certain abuses and profanations on the Lord's day, called Sunday," complains that whereas "certain houses . . . have of late frequently been opened . . . under pretext of enquiring into religious doctrines and explaining texts of Holy Scripture, debates have frequently been held on the evening of the Lord's day concerning divers texts of Holy Scripture by persons unlearned and incompetent to explain the same, to the corruption of good morals, and to the encouragement of irreligion and profaneness," therefore it enacts that the keeper of such room be fined £200 for every day such room or house is open. The chairman of the meeting is also to forfeit £100 to any one who sues for it, and the doorkeeper to pay £50, or a total fine of £350, or \$1,750, for each offense!

But the Sunday law that is most known and respected is that of 29 Charles II., passed in 1676, and entitled "An act for the better observation of the Lord's day, called Sunday." Section 1 enacts that "all the laws in force concerning the observation of the Lord's day, and repairing to the church thereon, shall be carefully put in execution." This illustrates the ineffectiveness of such laws in general. As soon as one is made, another has to be made to enforce the first one. This in itself proves that there is no vital power in a civil law to make men keep a religious institution religiously.

This law not only forbids "worldly labor," but also enjoins "repairing to the church," and requires that "all persons shall, on every Lord's day, apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately." To enforce this requirement as it reads would necessitate the revival of the Inquisition; for while dragging a man to church and compelling him to sit in a pew during church

service might satisfy those enforcing the law of the *public* exercises of his religious duties, nothing but the rack or thumb-screws could force from him a disclosure of what he had or had not done *privately*.

The penalty attached to this masterpiece of English Sunday legislation is five shillings' fine for each offense, or, in default, two hours in the stocks. There can be no question as to its character and object. Plainly it is religious and designed to increase church attendance. Though still in force generally throughout British dominions, it is seldom at the present day enforced. If it were, there would be millions fined, and millions more sitting in the stocks.

This law has been fittingly memorialized in the following poem by "Oriel," which appeared in the Melbourne (Australia) *Argus*, of May 12, 1894, on the occasion of its being put into execution against two observers of the seventh-day who had worked on their farms on Sunday:

#### In the Stocks

In the days when Charles the Second ruled  
the glorious British nation,

It is said from paths of virtue he habitually  
swerved;

That he spent his whole existence in repulsive  
dissipation—

But at last he took precaution that the Sab-  
bath was observed.

He was prone, perhaps, to covet the posses-  
sions of his neighbor,

Or his neighbor's wife or daughter, or his  
servant, or his ox;

But he held decided views upon the point of  
Sunday labor,

And he punished all transgressors by con-  
finement in the stocks.

Let us cherish the remembrance of a prince  
so truly pious,

And condone his little pleasures as the fol-  
lies of a king;

Close our eyelids to his vices, let them pass  
unheeded by us,

Though in ordinary mortals it would be a  
different thing.

Let us recognize his claim to take a prominent position

In the calendar devoted to the saintly orthodox,

And insert a special heading in the Sunday-school petition,

"May God bless Charles the Second, and may Heaven preserve the stocks."

Let us all become detectives, down on Sabbath desecration,

Let us catch the bold offenders in the very act of crime,

That the stocks may never suffer from lack of occupation,

And the prison and the pillory be going all the time.

And when'er we find a citizen who tries the Sunday watering

Of his twenty-feet of grass plot or his bed of hollyhocks—

Well, we can't resort to hanging, or to drawing, or to quartering,

But all praise to Charles the Second, we can put him in the stocks.

## *The "Jerome Bill" and the Opposition to It*

We have had opportunity thus far to barely more than refer to the matter of the "Jerome Sunday-opening bill" which was introduced in the New York legislature in January, and which has occasioned no little discussion. This bill, which so altered the present Sunday law with regard to the liquor business as to legalize the opening of saloons and the sale of liquor on Sunday in New York City from one o'clock in the afternoon to eleven in the evening, did not of course directly raise the issue of Sunday legislation itself, but by the sort of opposition it aroused it served to show very clearly to those who would observe what the principle of Sunday legislation is and what sort of sentiment it is that supports it. Because of this fact we give attention to the matter. Two legislative hearings were given on the bill. The first was held on February 17, when "a crowd of clergymen appeared against the bill." Among those who spoke in opposition to the measure were these:

Dr. I. W. Hathaway, representing the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union and "several other Sabbath observance associations"; Rev. Dr. W. S. Hubbell, representing the New York Sabbath (Sunday) Committee; Mr. John I. Platt, representing the Sabbath Committee of the Presbyterian Church; Rev. F. E. Inglehardt, representing the Methodist Preachers' Meeting of New York City; Rev.

Henry Wood, representing the Baptist organizations of the State; Rev. F. E. Shearer, treasurer of the Presbytery of New York; Mr. Robert Graham, representing the Church (Episcopal) Temperance Society; Rev. Dr. Chas. Mead, representing the Sons of Temperance; Dr. Howard Russell, representing the Anti-Saloon League; Dr. Johnson, representing the Independent Order of Good Templars; Mrs. Ella A. Boole, president of the State W. C. T. U.; and Rev. I. H. Funk of New York, and Rev. Dr. Freeman of Yonkers.

This list indicates better than anything we can say just what element it is that is aroused by the proposal to modify the Sunday law, and just what sentiment it is that opposes such modification. With but two exceptions, every one of the above speakers was a clergyman, and of course one of the persons for whom exception is made was a woman. And it should not be forgotten that the temperance societies named are virtually religious and church organizations, or that at least in this matter they act as religious and church organizations. The representative of the Methodist Preachers' Meeting of New York declared the very obvious fact that "nearly every minister is opposed to the opening of the saloons on the Sabbath." He thought Sunday closing "makes for good government and is good politics as well." Another very obvious fact of the same

tenor was declared by Mr. Hubbell, who "cited the fact that all religious denominations, including the Roman Catholic, were a unit in opposing Sunday opening." In trying to make this attitude of the Catholic Church as effective as possible in this particular fight "for the Sabbath," Mr. Hubbell declared that "the majority of saloon-keepers and patrons of saloons were Roman Catholics," and that "the appeal which comes from them for Sunday opening is in direct contradiction to the teachings of that church, which is full of noble men and women." This got him into a little unexpected difficulty, for Senator Foley at once took exception to the statement that the majority of saloon-keepers and patrons of saloons were Roman Catholics, but on being assured that what had been said was "without any intention to reflect in any way on the Catholic Church," he allowed the matter to pass. The clergymen had the entire hearing to themselves, for, much to their disgust, District Attorney Jerome did not put in an appearance, but sent a telegram saying he understood there was to be another hearing a week later and that he would appear then to speak in favor of the bill. It had not been the purpose of the committee of legislators having the matter in charge to have another hearing, but to accommodate Mr. Jerome it was decided to have a final hearing on the matter on the 24th. The clergymen regarded this as "an imposition," as it would necessitate their making the trip to the capital and doing their speaking all over again, or else leaving Mr. Jerome and the supporters of the bill to have their own way at the final hearing. They must have concluded that the latter alternative was unsafe, for a number of them were present and again spoke in opposition to the bill. This second hearing was held in the senate chamber before a committee from each branch of the legislature, and drew a

large crowd. Mr. Jerome spoke for more than an hour in favor of his bill. He said that there were in New York City to-day 12,546 licensed places for the sale of liquor, and that careful inquiry had convinced him that more than 8,000 of these places were open and doing business every Sunday; that every saloon in New York could be closed for a few Sundays, but not permanently; that a majority of the people did not regard the sale of liquor on Sunday as a crime or even as an evil, and that any administration which undertook to enforce the law would "go out of office as surely as the election is held." He thought the present policy of "liberal interpretation and enforcement" was wrong and demoralizing, and that it was "better to modify the law than to wink at its violation." He declared that to the law was largely due the fact that "blackmail and corruption exist under the purity and holiness of the Low administration." If he could of his own will prohibit the sale of liquor (on Sunday) he would do so, but he objected "to the existence of an unenforceable law which brings with it unlimited corruption and blackmail." He said his bill was not a Sunday-opening bill, but a Sunday-closing bill, in that it would limit the traffic which now goes on all day by the permission of the police to a portion of the day; the liquor dealers' associations of the city had pledged themselves that if the bill became a law no selling would be done on Sunday except during the hours specified. He said that one-tenth of the misdemeanors in New York are excise violations, but that such was public sentiment that it was practically impossible to get juries to convict for Sunday selling. In 2,000 arrests made in New York for Sunday selling "200 are held and barely fifty convicted." He declared that when the law permits such institutions as the "Raines-law hotels" (which he said had been brought

into existence by the present law and "constitute one of the very worst evils that we have") to run on Sunday it could not be expected that ordinary saloons would be closed. In conclusion Mr. Jerome read letters of endorsement for his bill from Bishop Potter, Dr. W. S. Rainsford, Mr. Wm. H. Baldwin, Jr., and President Butler of Columbia University, and declared that he wished to serve notice that "this is a finish fight," and that whatever disposition might be made of the matter at this session of the legislature "this question will never be settled until we have an excise law that can be enforced." Following Mr. Jerome two representatives of liquor dealers associations spoke in favor of the bill, and promised that it would be strictly observed if passed. Then the representatives already named of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union, the Methodist Preachers' Meeting of New York, the New York Presbytery, the Anti-Saloon League, and the State W. C. T. U., spoke again in opposition to the bill, devoting much of their time to attacks upon Mr. Jerome for his alleged "unholy alliance" with the liquor interests to secure the repeal of the Sunday-closing law. Two days after the hearing the February grand jury for New York County, following the example of the January grand jury, filed a presentment in which it was declared that "in our opinion the best interests of the city of New York would be served by such a bill becoming law." It was further said:

Our experience as grand jurors and our observation as citizens have satisfied us that the provisions of the present liquor-tax law in regard to the sale of liquors on Sunday . . . has fostered intemperance rather than promoted temperance; . . . has encouraged bribery and perjury on the part of the police and the liquor dealers, and is one of the chief causes of that system of blackmail which has debauched our police force. The law is now widely violated every Sunday, and seemingly

without any disapprobation from the citizens of this city. We believe that such a law cannot in such a city as New York be permanently enforced, and that its existence unenforced works great evil in cultivating a lack of respect for all laws.

Most of the newspapers of the city take the same view of the matter, but see little prospect for an early change. The *Evening Post* says Mr. Jerome "spoke absolute truth on a matter of vital importance to the city," but that he was "addressing an audience thoroughly committed to the administrative lie" by which "our sham morality is bound up with our real shame." It says, however, that for the present nothing can be done to break up "this unholy alliance between enthusiastic good women and good men and the worst elements in the city" but to agitate and "educate the mistaken moralizer, and the lawmakers who make it their care to please him, until they see that to impose the standards of a class as the laws of a community is to make themselves the allies of the briber and the grafter." The *Commercial Advertiser* considers Mr. Jerome's bill "an excellent measure, and should like to see it become law," but says "it has about as much chance of doing so as would a law providing for the abolition of all churches or their conversion into theatres and beer gardens." The reason why this is so is because of the strength of the sort of sentiment that is exhibited in the following, which we quote from a statement issued by the board of managers of the American Sabbath (Sunday) Union early in February:

We affirm that the proposed legislation would interfere with *religious services* both in the afternoon and evening. . . . The American Sabbath Union is confident that Sunday opening during any part of the day legally recognized as the day of rest is calculated to *break down all the barriers standing in defense of what is known as the "American Sabbath."* . . . As the representative of the millions of moral and *Christian and Sabbath-loving* people of

this State and nation, the American Sabbath Union stands irrevocably opposed to all such legislation.

The situation then, in brief, is this: Under the conditions that actually prevail the best interests of the city of New York require that there shall be a partial repeal of the law which requires the saloons to close on Sunday; or in other words, that in the regulation of the liquor traffic there shall be a partial withdrawal of the legal "recognition" of "the day of rest"—the so-called "American Sabbath"; or in other words still, that there shall be a partial disregard of the assumption of a religious class that a religious observance and institution to which they hold should be "recognized" and enforced by the law. Many of the city's best and most public-spirited citizens, who are devoting themselves to its civic and moral betterment and whose honesty and intelligence cannot be questioned, are thoroughly convinced of this, and the public generally evidently agrees with them. But what is for the best interests of the city in this

matter cannot be done for no other reason (or at least it is the chief reason) than that the religious class in the State which holds to Sunday observance and assumes that it is the business of the law to "protect" and enforce that observance, will not consent to any withdrawal of the support which the law now gives to their religious institution. And it happens that such is the state of affairs that they are able to have their way in the matter, even in spite of the desire of the majority of the citizens of the city. But nevertheless they are being compelled to bestir themselves, and will no doubt be compelled to bestir themselves in the matter yet more in the future. We should very much prefer that it were something else besides the liquor traffic in connection with which these people are and will be compelled to fight for the maintenance of the special favor and support that they have from the State in the matter of a religious observance, but nevertheless the thing is interesting, instructive, and worth while as it is.

In confirmation and illustration of the fact that it is *not* consideration for the interests and welfare of the masses that moves those who are most insistent for legal "protection" of the "American Sabbath," we recently called attention to something that has taken place in New York this winter. We are very glad to note that a leading newspaper of the country, and one that approves Sunday legislation within certain bounds, has also called attention to the matter and given deserved prominence to the point in it that we emphasized. The following is from an editorial that appeared in the *Chicago Tribune* of March 29:

This last Sunday-observance incident in New York makes all previous Sunday-observance incidents seem reasonable and endurable. When the Long Parliament in the seventeenth cen-

tury forbade "vain and profane walking" on Sunday, there may have been room for complaint. When the Massachusetts legislature last year legalized the sale of ice-cream, soda-water, and confectionery by druggists and newsdealers on Sunday, and a conference of Congregational churches said that this action was "subversive of the worship of the Supreme Being, the great creator and preserver of the universe," there may have been room for remonstrance. But now complaint and remonstrance pass into a higher form of indignation when a group of Protestant ministers get together to oppose the Sunday opening of the public schools for educational and recreative purposes.

Jacob A. Riis and other persons acquainted with the social condition of the people near the schools concerned have said for a long time that to neglect to use the schools for lectures, concerts, entertainments, club meetings, and social gatherings on Sunday was to throw away one of the most civilizing agents in modern city life. Sunday is the only day when affairs

of the kind indicated are possible for working people. The school buildings are the only buildings quite free from the influences which Protestant ministers usually regard as immoral. Is there any escape from the conclusion implied in these last two statements?

But the Protestant ministers of the Sunday-observance committee seem to be *willing to sacrifice the best interests of their fellow-citizens* to an interpretation of the Fourth Commandment which did not hold during the earliest ages of the church and which reached its present outlines only with the climax of English Puritan dissent. Theologically, as well as morally, the position of the Sunday-observance committee is open to successful attack.

But putting theology aside and going back to morals, what does the Sunday-observance committee think that people who have worked

hard all the week are going to do on Sunday when they are deprived of reasonable recreation? Does it think that they will obey the Shakspearean command, "Be better employed and be naught awhile"? Rather will they be worse employed and be naughty awhile. But they will help the ministers in one way. By continuing to make Sunday a day of recreation—in the schools and elsewhere—they will furnish the ministers with further material for the periodical bewildered discussions of the question, "How can we reach the masses; or, why do the masses pass us up?" By studying the attitude of the Sunday-observance committee toward the Sunday opening of the schools and then by studying the attitude of working people toward the same proposition, the ministers will be able to see just *how far away they are from the popular mind and heart.*

On March 15 "the provisions of the mulct law [law regulating saloons] respecting Sunday closing" was put strictly in force in Council Bluffs, Iowa, by order of the new county attorney, who declared that this same order of things would obtain on "all subsequent Sundays." "The county attorney has the backing of the ministers of the various churches."

The butchers of Perry, N. Dak., have entered into an agreement which binds each of them under a penalty of a forfeiture of \$25 to keep his shop closed on Sunday. "The butcher who makes a single sale or delivery on Sunday" will lose the \$25 which he has deposited in the local bank according to the terms of the agreement.

It is reported from Bucyrus, Ohio, that "all the ministers of the city, backed by all the undertakers, have asked for a cessation of Sunday funerals on the ground that it interferes with religious labors." "The cemetery association is asked to act in the matter."

The Milwaukee *Sentinel* of March 31 reported that "a better observance of Sunday as a day of rest was the subject of discussion at the regular monthly meeting of the Methodist ministers' association held yesterday at the Y. M. C. A. building."

The St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* of April 4 reported that "union drivers of ice wagons and a committee representing the leading ice companies have agreed that no ice deliveries will be made on Sundays. The agreement takes effect at once."

An order requiring the Sunday closing of saloons was issued by the chief of police of St. Louis, Mo., on March 14. This is said to be "the first general Sunday-closing movement for nearly four years."

A petition "to abolish the collection of mails on Sunday afternoons from the various boxes," was recently caused to be circulated in Yonkers, N. Y., by the ministers of the place.

## EASY WASHING

NO RUBBING CLOTHES if you  
use E-Z WASH

You can do a washing in half the time  
with half the labor

Unlike other preparations, it will not injure  
the clothes or hands—POSITIVELY

DOES NOT ROT THE CLOTHES

Dear Sir: I received the Washing Tablets. I tried them last week, and to say I was pleased don't half express my delight. **It is the first time in my life that I have done a washing WITHOUT RUBBING.** and I am nearly fifty years old. You can put me down as an agent. Enclosed find Postal Order for 3 dozen.  
Mrs. J. W. T., Stevenson, Wash.

We will send you sufficient for  
—THREE WASHINGS FOR 10 CENTS—

LIBERAL TERMS TO AGENTS

—Address—

ALFRED MALLET,  
NYACK, - - NEW YORK

## "ROYAL MUSKOKA"

### HIGHLANDS OF ONTARIO

The romantic and beautiful situation of the new "Royal Muskoka" hotel, located in the heart of the most magnificent summer resort district in America, inspires anticipations of the most pleasant sort. Every comfort and luxury that modern civilization has given us is found in this great hotel, which can accommodate 350 people. Public and private baths on each floor. All rooms are outside, single or en suite; hot and cold water in each room; electric light and bells; open fire places, etc. Sanitation arrangements most modern. Cuisine of the highest order of excellence. Among the amusements are a beautiful Bathing Beach, Tennis Grounds, Golf, Bowling Alley, Croquet, Bowling Green, Recreation and Billiard rooms, and many enjoyable water trips. Direct telegraph service with the hotel. About six hours journey north of Toronto—excellent transportation service.

Illustrated descriptive literature giving all particulars regarding routes and rates, etc., can be had on application to

FRANK P. DWYER, E. P. Agent  
Grand Trunk Railway System  
290 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

## A Study of Principles

In Alonzo T. Jones' book entitled

### "THE TWO REPUBLICS"

is a comparative study of the underlying principles of the two greatest Republics—Rome and the United States.

"The principle of Rome in all its phases is that religion and government are inseparable. The principle of the government of the United States is that religion is essentially distinct and wholly separate from civil government, and entirely exempt from its cognizance.

"As it was Christianity that first and always antagonized this governmental principle of Rome, and established the governmental principle of the United States of America, the fundamental idea, the one thread-thought of the whole book, is to develop the principles of Christianity with reference to civil government, and to portray the mischievous results of the least departure from those principles."

Rome occupies one extreme and the United States the other. Which is right? The question interests every reader of THE SENTINEL, for in its solution and the correct application of the principles lies the salvation of individual as well as nation.

"Two Republics" contains 895 octavo pages and is substantially bound in cloth. Price, postpaid, \$1.75.

Complete catalog of publications mailed on request. Address

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
11 WEST 20th STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

"Rome is aiming to reestablish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. She is silently growing into power. All that she desires is vantage ground, and this is already being given her."

## READ THESE QUOTATIONS

In the name of Leo XIII., I salute the great American Republic. . . . To-day this is the duty of the Catholics: To bring into the world the fullness of supernatural truth and supernatural life. . . . There are the nations who have never separated from the Church, but who have neglected often to apply in full degree the lessons of the gospel. THERE ARE THE NATIONS WHO HAVE GONE OUT FROM THE CHURCH, bringing with them many of her treasures, and because of what they have brought, shedding partial light. BUT CUT OFF FROM THE SOURCE, UNLESS THAT SOURCE IS AGAIN BROUGHT INTO CLOSE CONTACT WITH THEM, THERE IS DANGER FOR THE FUTURE. . . . Bring your fellow-countrymen, BRING YOUR COUNTRY INTO IMMEDIATE CONTACT WITH THAT GREAT SECRET OF BLESSEDNESS—Christ and His CHURCH. . . . HERE IN AMERICA DO WE HAVE, more than elsewhere, THE KEY TO THE FUTURE. . . . Here you have a country WHICH WILL REPAY ALL EFFORTS, not merely tenfold, BUT AYE A HUNDREDFOLD. And this no one understands better than the immortal Leo.—"Apostolic Delegate" Satolli, at the Catholic Congress in Chicago, September 5, 1893.

"Amid my many trials AMERICA IS MY CONSOLATION." Thus spoke the wonderful old man who is to-day celebrating his jubilee. He was speaking to Archbishop Farley, then a bishop, making a visit to the Vatican. "In the United States," the Pontiff continued, "the Church enjoys liberty. There she is allowed to build her churches and schools unmolested. Here in Rome, I, Vicar of Christ, am a slave, deprived of free action. In Italy, in France, the Church is being persecuted by those who should defend her. THANK GOD FOR THE CONSOLATION THAT COMES FROM FREE AMERICA! . . . From the day when he began his long reign in the Vatican, AMERICA AND AMERICANS have received a large part of the thought bestowed by this wise and far-sighted Pope upon the millions of the faithful committed to his charge. AMERICANS, NOT ONLY THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE CHURCH, BUT PROTESTANTS AS WELL, have been welcome at the Vatican, and have been eagerly questioned by the pallid, withered old man, whose glowing eyes seemed to read the answers to his keen questions before they were spoken. He has always dismissed them with a few words which sent them back to their country full of confidence in his love for the freest and most enlightened of his people. To Bishop McDonnell, of Brooklyn, he said: "I am rejoiced at the continued manifestations of the fidelity of American Catholics AND AT THE PROGRESS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA. I now consider THE AMERICAN PEOPLE the BEST CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH."—James Montague in *New York Journal*, February 21, 1903.

And then read, and get others to read, from beginning to end the  
new series of articles

by

ALONZO T. JONES

on

## The Supremacy of the Papacy

now being printed in *THE SENTINEL*, and which began with  
the issue of March 19.

"Men are closing their eyes to the real character of Romanism, and the dangers to be apprehended from her supremacy. The people need to be aroused to resist the advances of this most dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty."