

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, AUGUST 13, 1903

NO. 33



“Think no man the better, no man the worse, for the church he belongs to. Try him by his fruits. Expel from your breast the demon of sectarianism, narrowness, bigotry, intolerance. Shun it as from hell. Look with undiminished joy on goodness, though it shine forth from the most adverse sect. Set up nothing above the virtue of the heart and the life. Goodness, purity, virtue—let these be supreme. To imagine that God regards anything but this, that He looks at anything but the heart, is to dishonor Him, to be mournfully insensible to His character. To confine His love or His good Spirit to any party, sect, or name is to sin against the fundamental law of His kingdom. . . . What is the grand error of Roman Catholicism?—It is its narrow church-spirit, its blind sectarianism, its condemnation and exclusion from God’s favor of virtuous, pious men because they do not conform to certain rites and accept certain doctrines.” Let not those who oppose Roman Catholicism have their attitude toward its adherents, from the lowest to the highest, influenced and determined by that for which it is chiefly to be abhorred.

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.

per copy.
 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.

Address all communications of a business nature, to

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.,
 11 West 20th Street, New York City

"Am Delighted With It"

says the

SENATE POSTMASTER

of a western State

Speaking of the—

Webster Dictionary and
 Complete Vest-Pocket Library

Five Books in One

- 1 A Dictionary
- 2 A Gazetteer
- 3 A Parliamentary Manual
- 4 An Expert Calculator
- 5 Literary Guide

45,800 WORDS

PRICES:

Morocco Bound, with stamp holder, 60c
 Leather " " " " " " " " 50c
 Cloth " " " " " " " " 25c

PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
 11 West 20th St., N. Y. City.

Easy Washing

We have a preparation that will remove dirt and stains from clothes with very little work. Practically no rubbing, and POSITIVELY without injury to the finest fabric. It is far ahead of washing powders or any other preparation.

We will send you postpaid

Sufficient for THREE WASHINGS FOR 10c
 Stamps or silver.

WE WANT AGENTS in every town. Full time or spare moments. Send at once for our liberal terms.

We have sold most of the 2½ gross of Tablets and am afraid we shall be out of them before we can get another lot at the rate they have gone the past few days. Quite a number who have had one bar before have liked it so well that they have taken a dollar's worth this week. Enclosed find Postal Order for another 2½ gross.

We have sixty or more regular customers here and I have not had time to do much with the Tablets either.

Address

ALFRED MALLETT,
 NYACK, - - - - N. Y.

Mrs. C. W. P., Lewiston, Maine.

The Sentinel

OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

VOL. XVIII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 1903

No. 33

**A Pope as a Man
Must be Judged by
His Own Personal
Character**

It is not our intention to ignore the many things of great significance and concern to those who recognize that the Papacy is a system of intolerance and despotism inimical alike to pure religion and human freedom that the ending of the life and pontificate of Leo XIII. has called forth or served to emphasize. When we have digested the mass of matter pertaining to the Papacy and the Pope that has appeared in the last few weeks full and appropriate notice and comment will appear in THE SENTINEL. We regret that it has not already appeared, and especially that such matter as we should have liked to have had accompany it was not presented in connection with the picture of the late Pope two weeks ago. It will be understood, we trust, that our purpose in presenting that picture was not to join in the almost universal exaltation of the Pope, though we trust that we should be the last to deny to the Pope any credit or esteem to which he may be justly entitled. Some correspondents have taken us to task for a portion of a statement made on this page four weeks ago in speaking of the Pope, or rather of the man officially known as Leo XIII. The criticism seems to be based upon the idea that because the Papacy is a very bad institution a Pope must be a very bad man—that since the Papacy is “the mystery of iniquity” a Pope must necessarily be of iniquitous character personally. The writer of this may not be able to explain why, but he

cannot hold to any such idea. He believes as firmly as any one that the Papacy in its principles and workings is evil and iniquitous, but he does not believe that a human being who happens to be placed at the head of this institution for a few years is necessarily a “man of sin” and iniquity personally. He does not believe that the personal character of an adherent and representative of the Papacy, even though he be Pope, is identical with that of the institution and is to be condemned because the institution is condemned. Those who see in the Papacy “the mystery of iniquity” should reflect that none may be more deceived as to its evil character than those who are most closely connected with it and are used in their day to further its ends. Is that man a man of iniquity personally who does what he believes is God’s will and for the good of his fellows, even though it be spreading Catholicism and seeking to bring the world into subjection to the Papacy? We are not disposed to regard the late Pope as a saint by any means, and neither are we disposed to take the position that the almost universal and no doubt greatly exaggerated praise of his personality is without some warrant in reality and truth. Regarding his work as Pope and the merit of the same, together with much else of significance and importance respecting the Papacy and her place to-day in the affairs of the nations that is connected with his death and the accession of his successor, we will write later.

A New Pope, but the
Same Papacy

Giuseppe Sarto has succeeded Giacchino Pecci as head of the Papacy and pretended "vicegerent of God" on earth. He was elected by the conclave of cardinals on August 4, after three days of balloting, and his coronation took place on August 9. He chose as his title "Pius X." His election, like that of his predecessor, was a compromise, the leading candidates having to retire in favor of one upon whom the factions could unite. And it happens that he is the same age as was Leo XIII. when he became Pope, sixty-eight. He is a Venetian, and it is said to have been of quite humble parentage. For ten years he has been a cardinal and chief prelate of Venice, in which capacity he bore the title of "Patriarch of Venice." He "is noted for his amiability, learning and liberal views," and is evidently well qualified to enter into and to carry forward the policy of "conciliation" inaugurated by his predecessor, and by means of which the prestige of the Papacy among the nations has been so greatly enhanced. And it is predicted that he will bring about something that Leo scarcely attempted—the healing of the breach between "the Church" and the Italian government. He is not only "a liberal" but "a patriot," who "as Patriarch of Venice showed by many acts that he favored reconciliation between the Italian government and the Church," and as Pope "is now expected to establish a *modus vivendi* with the Italian government, the principal members of which are his personal friends." He was installed as "Patriarch of Venice" with the consent of the Italian government through Premier Crispi, who was no friend of the Papacy, and "had not been in office more than a year before he publicly declared for a union between church and state, speaking in no uncertain way." Later he "publicly announced his joy

when there was a strong probability of a union between church and state." But "the influence of the Ultramontanes on one side and of the Radicals on the other" defeated his plan. "The Church desired too much, and the state would grant too little." But "now that he, a man who is known to be heart and soul in favor of peace, has ascended the papal throne, those who wish well to both Church and state feel that the splendid dream of the past will be realized," and that "the solution of the Roman question, so long unsolved and so long a cause of dissension over all Italy, to say nothing of its bearing upon other countries, is near at hand." And thus even rebellious Italy is to be gathered to the bosom of the Papacy again, along with the other nations. And this may prepare the way for an achievement upon which Leo had his heart set and strove to accomplish—the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican. It will remove an objection to this that seems to have been considered by some persons in this country who have assumed to speak for the government the principal objection—the danger of offending the Italian government. This was broached in dispatches immediately following the election of the Pope. And the new Pope it seems is to continue Leo's policy of "loving" America and Americans. On the day of his election he is said to have exclaimed on seeing two American flags, "Cara, cara America, dear America." And the next day a company of "Americans enjoyed being the first to pay homage" to him, and to them he said: "I love Americans, who are the blooming youth of Catholicism. Convey to all of them how gladly I impart my apostolic blessing to the whole country." The *New York Times* says that "it may be safely said that Pius X. regards this country as one of the most promising fields in the world for the ad-

vancement of the power of the Church." There will be no reaction from the policy of Leo by this Pope of whom it is said that "on all sides it is agreed that no better man could have been selected by the conclave to fill the place in the popular mind occupied by the late illustrious pontiff." The new Pope is evidently just the man to carry forward the policy of his predecessor, which means in the end supremacy for the Papacy over the nations. We will present here in conclusion the following from the *Congregationalist and Christian World*, which is the best expression in connection with this whole matter of the Papacy's change of heads that we have seen in any prominent Protestant periodical:

The Papacy is always spectacular. It knows how to take advantage of every opportunity to bring itself to public notice. It has been unusually fortunate in the great age, unblemished character and amiable spirit of Leo XIII. His courageous fight for life held the attention and awakened the sympathy of the world, and brought out utterances from many non-Roman Catholic quarters. The picturesque traditions which surround the funeral of the Pope and the election of his successor, the official pronouncement of death, the lying in state, the walling up of the place of election and the recognition of a theory of democracy which might call any man to the papal chair—all these will be made the most of to hold the attention of the world.

With all this we have no legitimate quarrel. The rulers of the Roman Church believe that they have a claim on the allegiance of all men, and we must expect them to assert and enforce it by every means of glamor, splendor and advertisement which they can control. But it may be well just now, while public interest and curiosity are centered on the doings of the cardinals, to remind the thoughtless that in the Roman Catholic world the Papacy is everything and the individual Pope has little room for self-assertion and none for essential change. He may be learned, kindly, estimable, as Leo was, but he cannot alter the fixed principles of life which have made the Papacy what it is. "In our day," says the *London Spectator*, "even a great Pope must always be a Gulliver tied down by a thousand

scarcely visible threads." We shall see a new man on the throne, but in essentials there can be no new policy.

The call to surrender the conscience to the authority of men, to accept a fixed dogmatic scheme of thought, to abjure the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free, to enslave ourselves to ancient restrictions and traditions, to put a thousand mediators in the place of Christ, to indorse the never withdrawn or apologized-for principles of control of opinion through the secular arm which resulted in the Inquisition and St. Bartholomew—this is still the claim and the call of the papal Church. . . . As free churchmen it has no thought for us except as rebels who must be won, and it will offer no terms but unconditional surrender. . . . The theory of the Papacy has not changed. Whether we have a liberal Pope in the Vatican or a reactionary Pope, either will be bound by precedents and hampered by a bureaucratic system which he cannot change. In the words of Döllinger, there may be a new Pope, but there is the old Papacy, for which the claim of infallibility has made the acknowledgement of error in the past or the discovery of saving truth outside its bounds a sin against the Holy Spirit.



An "Interference" with
"Religious Liberty"

The Sunday legislation of New York State professes to deal with "crimes against religious liberty and conscience," and at last some one has bethought himself in calling for Sunday enforcement to base his complaint upon the ground that his "religious liberty" has been interfered with. This affidavit and complaint, said to be the first of its kind ever made to the police authorities of that city, was filed with Police Clerk Bechtold in Rochester, N. Y., on July 23:

Edwin Hoellrigl, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he resides at 61 Hall Street in the city of Rochester, N. Y., and during all the times hereinafter mentioned has resided at such place. That Samuel Beckler is a tailor and conducts a tailoring establishment in the rear of 423 Clinton Avenue north, in the city of Rochester and within a distance of three or four feet from the residence of this deponent. That within a radius of 300 feet reside

a large number of people, all of whom are devoted to the Christian religion.

Upon information and belief deponent further says that the aforesaid Beckler is of the Hebrew religion, and that within the past two weeks and each and every day thereof, inclusive of Saturdays and Sundays of each week, the aforesaid Beckler has been doing business at his establishment at the place aforesaid. That the operation of said establishment on the first days of said weeks, commonly called Sunday, is not a work of necessity. That there are a large number of sewing machines used in said establishment and they are operated and were operated on said days, particularly on the Sundays of said weeks, with loud noise; and interfered with the repose and religious liberty of this deponent and of the community wherein said factory is located, and against the peace and dignity of the people.

Deponent further says that the aforesaid Beckler has been requested by the deponent and others to cease active operations of said factory and cease the clanging and noise of said operations on the first day of the week, but has refused to do so; and by reason of the operations upon the aforesaid Sundays the repose and religious liberty of the deponent and the community are interfered with.

Wherefore, this deponent prays that a warrant issue against the aforesaid Beckler in the form of the statute in such case made and provided.

A warrant was issued, and was to be served on Beckler. It would be interesting to have an explanation of just how the religious liberty of the deponent and the community was interfered with by the work complained of. The fact that it was noisy and not "a work of necessity" does not show that it was an interference with anybody's religious liberty. The running of freight and passenger trains (which is a common thing in New York State on Sundays) is a noisy proceeding and scarcely more deserves to be called a work of necessity than does the manufacture of clothing; but nobody ever complains that this interferes with their religious liberty. The fact is that nobody has the right to make any such complaint to the civil authorities. The business of

the civil law is to protect the civil, social liberty of the citizens, not their *religious* liberty. Its business is to protect citizens in their rights as between man and man, and they have no right to expect anything more. If Beckler has not interfered with some civil right of those who complain against him, then the only interference with religious liberty in this case is the interference of parties "devoted to the Christian religion" with the social and civil right to work and engage in honest industry of an adherent "of the Hebrew religion" because he does not observe an institution of their religion. It is just this sort of interference with religious liberty—interference with social, civil rights at the behest of religious zeal and bigotry—that it is the business of the law to prevent. But it is New York's "religious liberty" legislation that makes this interference legally possible. It would be well if New York would wipe out its legislation dealing with "crimes against religious liberty and conscience," and attend to its proper work of protecting the civil, natural, human rights of its citizens, the exercise of which, on Sunday the same as at other times, is no interference with any right that it is the business of organized society to guard.

✦

Justice Gaynor of the Supreme Court of New York has recently declared that the enforcement of the Sunday laws is made the occasion of the exercise of unwarranted power by the police. He says that most of the Sunday-law violations are offenses for which the offender should merely be cited by the officer to appear in court, instead of being arrested and hauled off to the police station, and sometimes imprisoned. He says that the law does not warrant this common procedure with regard to such offenses, and that it is an outrage upon the legal rights of the accused. He was led to make this declaration by a recent instance in

New York where a policeman arrested a man for remarking to him as he was arresting a small grocer for making some petty sale on Sunday, that it was a shame to arrest a man for such a trivial cause. Justice Gaynor says that the treatment of the grocer as if he had committed some serious criminal offense was as unwarranted, illegal, and despotic as was the arrest of the bystander. And this is the sort of thing that is being promoted everywhere throughout the country by clergymen who set themselves up as champions of "law and order"! In their enforcement of Sunday laws they are really in many cases trampling upon some of the most vital principles of the law.



The Mormon Eastern States Mission, with headquarters in Brooklyn, recently applied to Mayor Low of New York for ten street preachers' permits. The mayor replied that he saw "no sufficient basis for granting the application," but that he would grant one permit "lest a failure to do so would seem to imply that the civil authorities can pass upon such applications from the religious point of view." The mayor protested too much in this matter, and has implied just what he did not wish to seem to imply. His action seems to have been dictated by a desire to restrict and prevent the preaching of Mormons because they are Mormons, and reluctance to have it *seem* that he was acting from such desire. The *New York Christian Advocate* says that the mayor's action was "practically a passing upon the application from the religious point of view." There has been in the last year or two much complaint from religious sources over the preaching and work of the Mormons in and about New York, and it is very probable that this has something to do with their failure to secure permits to preach on the streets.

Having raised a "disturbing question" with regard to the title to church buildings which they claim, but never owned, the Roman Catholic Church authorities in Porto Rico are succeeding in having it settled as they want it settled. All the municipal rights to the church buildings at Guayama, Arroyo, and Salinas were recently ceded by the municipal authorities to the Catholic Church. Although under the old régime the Spanish government owned the buildings and the municipalities maintained them, so that there could seem to be no question that they were the property of the civil authority, "the question of their ownership has been disputed ever since the United States took over the island." It is said that the action in these three places "follows the lines recommended by Governor Hunt, and it is believed that the same policy will prevail throughout the island, thus settling this disturbing question." It is gratifying to know that while the Catholic Church is obtaining title to property that does not belong to her, she will not be able any longer to sponge upon the civil authority for its maintenance.



In an opinion upon the recent decision of the Privy Council regarding Ontario's "Lord's Day" legislation, Deputy Attorney-General Cartwright says "the effect will be to wipe out those sections in the general act which were passed since confederation," but that "the ordinary transactions of bargain and sale will be still prohibited as they were in the original act." This will "cover a wide field."



The bishop of the Russian Church at Kishineff, the scene of the Jewish massacre, has instructed the clergy under him to seek by sermons in the churches and admonitions elsewhere to eradicate the religious hatred against the Jews. Such instruction should have been given long ago.

The Individual Responsible Only to God in Religion

By W. A. Colcord

IN religious things Christ is lord. While recognizing the rightful province of Cæsar in this world, and enjoining obedience to Cæsar in civil things, in the realm of religion Christ proclaims himself lord and master. To his followers he says: "Call no man father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called master; for one is your Master, even Christ." So Paul writes, "The head of every man is Christ."

If in religious things Christ is master, then in religious things men are rightfully his servants, and for their religious faith and conduct they are responsible to him and must give account to him. And so say the Scriptures: "We labor...that we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that which he hath done, whether it be good or bad." "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God."

If in religious things every one is responsible to God, and every one is to give account of himself to God, then in religious things every one has the right to judge for himself what he will believe, profess and practise. This must be self-evident. And if every one has the right to thus judge for himself in religious things as to what he will believe, profess and practise, it must also be evident that he also has the right to freedom to exercise this right so long as in doing so he conducts himself as a good citizen and does not interfere with the equal rights of others. The one right would be valueless without the other. Anything, therefore, which interferes with the freedom of the individual to thus judge and act for himself in religious things is an inter-

ference with the individual and inalienable rights of man.

Furthermore, Christ being our master in religious things, and we being his servants in these things, any attempt on the part of men to rule over men in religious matters is both a usurpation of Christ's right to control his servants and an interference with the servant's responsibility to his master. And so the Scriptures teach: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth."

These scriptures clearly set forth the principle, and make plain the fact, that in religious things every man is accountable alone to God, and that for any power on earth to assume to dictate to men in religious things is for it to put itself in the place of God. This is that evil thing which the Scriptures call "the mystery of iniquity," and which, in the early centuries of the Christian era, developed into the Papacy—that "man of sin," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

When the state makes religious laws and requires obedience to them it makes men accountable to it in religious things, and thereby puts itself in the place of God. And when the leaders of a church, or of any combination of churches, gain control of the state, and through it seek to enforce upon men religious institutions or observances, they ignore the individual's responsibility to God, make men accountable to them in things pertaining only to God, and thereby put themselves in the place of God. They form a papacy, or a likeness to it. Assuming the place of master, they require men to be their servants. But for men to serve men in

religious things is directly forbidden by the Word of God. "Ye are bought with a price; *be not ye the servants of men.*"

Christ has redeemed men with his own precious blood. To him, therefore, and to the Father, who in love to the world gave him a ransom for it, we owe our salvation. It is but a reasonable service that we present ourselves to God a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto Him. "Ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."

But of man it is written: "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give a ransom for him." Since, then, man cannot redeem his fellowman, nor give a ransom for his soul, it is a direct usurpation of the position and power of God for men to treat their fellowmen as responsible to them in religious things. And yet how often this has been done. In all ages of the world, and in every nation under heaven, men have placed themselves upon the judgment seat of God and presumed to legislate and to rule for Him, or in His stead, in religious things. History's pages are black and blood-stained with the records of this high crime. In Egypt, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome the story has been repeated over and over again.

It is contrary to the will and order of God that man should be subject to man in that which pertains to eternal life. Subjection in spiritual things is a real worship, and should be rendered only to the Creator. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

No man, therefore, has a right to domineer over another in religious things. No man has a right to dictate to his wife what her religious faith and practise shall be. There are a great many husbands—popish husbands—who assume the right to control the faith of their wives, and

who make themselves very disagreeable if they choose to believe and act differently from them in religious things. Fathers and mothers sometimes act similarly towards their children after they have reached the years of accountability; where reason only should be used they seek to compel the conscience. Such husbands and such parents have gotten quite out of their place. They little realize that they are standing directly between the soul and God, stifling conscientious convictions and thus suppressing the voice of God in the soul.

While in the home life the husband is the head of the wife, and while, as becomes her station, and as nature itself teaches, she should reverence her husband and be subject to him, the marriage institution was by no means intended to destroy the individuality of the wife, nor to give the husband the right to ignore and trample upon the equal rights of the wife. Her rights are as many and as sacred as his. There is no sex in religious rights. All, both male and female, stand upon an equality before God. All are alike accountable to Him. In Christ "there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Therefore a husband has no more right to say what the wife shall believe than the wife what the husband shall believe. Many husbands seem to forget that the same scripture which counsels wives to subject themselves unto their husbands also says: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it... Let every one of you in particular so love his wife *even as himself.*" No man who obeys this injunction will ever tyrannize over his wife in either her domestic or her religious life.

Satan's methods ever tend to one end—to make men the slaves of men. And when this is done, when one man's mind is ruled by another man's mind, the human

agent is separated from God and exposed to errors, temptations, and sin, and as a result confusion and distrust, jealousies and evil surmising, superstition and ungodliness abound. Such a course destroys man's faith in God, and subjects him all his lifetime to bondage. Human, bodily slavery is bad enough in all truth, but spiritual tyranny is infinitely worse.

Anything, therefore, which tends to

break down man's sense of individual responsibility to God, and to make him the slave of men, belongs to the mystery of iniquity. That which establishes in man a sense of his personal responsibility to God, and frees him from the fear of man and from human servitude, is the gospel; for that teaches men to fear God, and proclaims liberty throughout all the world to all the inhabitants thereof.

A Manifesto from Ontario's Sunday-Law Champions

By G. B. Thompson

(Hamilton Ontario)

THE "Lord's Day" Alliance has issued the following manifesto through the press concerning the present status of Sunday legislation in Ontario, and outlining the intentions of the Alliance for the future:

We of the Lord's Day Alliance, as well as the general public, are indebted to the press for the excellent reports given of the Privy Council's decision *re* the Lord's Day Act of Ontario. They have been full and reliable. To the general reader, however, the headlines, and indeed the words of judgment itself, are likely to convey a seriously misleading idea of the situation resulting, unduly discouraging to the friends, and likely to embolden the enemies, of our Canadian Sabbath.

It is perfectly true that the whole Lord's Day Act as it is found in R. S. O., 1897, chap. 246, has been declared *ultra vires*. But that, happily, does not mean that we have not left any legal protection against the inroads upon the integrity of the Lord's Day that greed and selfishness and ungodliness are ever ready and eager to make.

1. The ante-confederation Sunday law of Upper Canada remains in force. This was the act of 1845, whose provisions will be read with the more interest since they include the law "that remains and cannot be shaken" by any Privy Council decision. The Dominion parliament alone has power to tamper with its prohibitions. It states that it is unlawful for any merchant, tradesman, artificer, mechanic,

workman, laborer or other person whatsoever, to sell or to publicly show forth or expose or offer for sale, or to purchase any wares, merchandise, goods, chattels or personal property or any real estate whatsoever on the Lord's Day, or to do or exercise any worldly labor, business or work of their respective ordinary callings upon that day, except conveying travelers or the mails by land or water, selling drugs, medicines and such other work of necessity; also works of charity. It is unlawful also, in the terms of this act, on that day, for any-one to "tipple or permit tipping in any inn, tavern, grocery or house of entertainment, to revel or to publicly exhibit oneself in a state of intoxication, to brawl, or use profane language, in the public streets or open air, to create a riot, disturbance or annoyance to her majesty's peaceable subjects." It is, moreover, unlawful to "hold, convene or attend any public, political meeting on the Lord's Day." Then it is unlawful for anyone on the Lord's Day to "play at skittles, ball, football, rackets or any other noisy game, or to gamble, or to run races on foot or on horseback, or in vehicles of any sort." "Bathing in public places, hunting, shooting and fishing" are also unlawful, and all sales and agreements made on Sunday are to be void. The penalty for contravention of the act is the same as that imposed in the Ontario act just disallowed, not more than \$40 nor less than \$1, and in default of payment, imprisonment for not more than three months.

The only important portions of the Ontario

Lord's Day Act that do not in substance remain to us are sections 7 and 8, dealing with excursions and electric railways. The excursions for the most part will be prevented by the standing order of the Minister of Customs refusing clearance to excursion-carrying vessels. The radial railway act, under which all radial electric railways chartered by the Province operate, is outside the invalidated Lord's Day Act, and it prohibits the operation on Sunday of these systems or the opening on that day of parks owned by such roads.

2. Besides the above, the shops regulations act prohibits bakers and barbers from working or keeping open shops on Sunday under severe penalties. This law, we understand, as well as the radial railway act, will not be affected by the Privy Council's decision.

With the exception, therefore, of the door partially opened for Sunday excursions and electric cars we have still substantially all we had before. We had hoped to gain a good deal by the decision. We are glad we have lost so little.

Of course all this applies only to Ontario. Each of the Provinces will be affected differently by the decision, which is a complete reversal of what has always heretofore been quite generally accepted on the question of jurisdiction. Such eminent authorities as Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thomson, Sir Oliver Mowat, Hon. David Mills and Sir Wilfrid Laurier have ever taken the view that the Provinces had full power to deal with Sunday legislation. However, they were or are not members of the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

It is now "on to Ottawa" for legislation in defense of the priceless heritage of our Canadian and Christian Sabbath. There can be no doubt that all the churches—Roman Catholic and Protestant—and all labor organizations will stand with the L. D. A. in seeking such legislation as is needed. It is not probable that there will be any disposition on the part of any of the M. P.'s and senators but a few irreconcilables to refuse the reasonable measures which alone will be applied for. Application will not be made until next session of parliament. Meantime, the friends of the Lord's Day, whether they viek the matter from the religious or from the humanitarian, industrial or national viewpoint, will bend every energy toward arousing public opinion to a sense of the possibilities and perils of the new crisis we have to face.

J. G. SHEARER, Secretary L. D. A. of Canada.

T. ALBERT MOORE, Secretary Ontario L. D. A.

In this work let it be noted that the Alliance leaders, all Protestant clergymen, are willing to clasp hands with Roman Catholics in the effort to secure such laws as are wanted to protect Sunday from "greed and selfishness and ungodliness." Having failed so far as the provincial legislatures are concerned, they are now "on to Ottawa" to lobby in the Dominion parliament for more Sunday laws.

The above manifesto of the Alliance was printed in the *Hamilton Spectator* of August 1, which paper made the following pertinent statements editorially:

In its manifesto—to be found elsewhere in this number of the *Spectator*—the Lord's Day Alliance makes a mistake when it speaks of protecting Sunday against the inroads "that greed and selfishness and ungodliness are ever ready to make." That is simply saying that those who do not look upon the first day of the week through the spectacles of the Alliance are ungodly. Had the Christians kept to the observance of the Sabbath established by the Lord—Saturday—there might have been reason to charge those who failed to obey the Mosaic law with being ungodly. And, aside from the fact that Sunday is not the Sabbath appointed by the Lord, good men differ in their views of how the Sabbath ought to be observed. The Lord's Day Alliance people arrogate to themselves the privilege of deciding not only how they shall observe the so-called Sabbath themselves, but they insist upon the government compelling all people—no matter what their honest views may be—to observe the Sunday according to the instructions of the Lord's Day Alliance. The manifesto says: "There can be no doubt that all the churches—Roman Catholic and Protestant—...will stand with the L. D. A. in seeking such legislation as is needed." If that means that each church will seek such legislation as it thinks is needed, the statement may be correct; but if it means that all Christian churches will back the demands of the Lord's Day Alliance, the statement is quite too optimistic.

It is true, as the *Spectator* says, that Sunday is not the Lord's Sabbath; and it is no doubt due to the absence of divine

authority for the observance of the day that governments are petitioned to enact laws to enforce its observance. And it is perfectly plain in all this that all such legislation is in the interests of religion, and consequently a union of church and state. All such union in the past has been

attended by persecution, and an interference by the majority with the conscientious convictions of the humble minority. Let the evil work of the "Lord's Day" Alliance bear its fruit, as it will at no distant day, and the fires of religious oppression will once more be rekindled.

SUNDAY ENFORCEMENT

This department is designed to record what is being done throughout the United States and elsewhere in the way of Sunday enforcement. Necessarily the items in most instances must be a bare recital of the facts. The principles involved are discussed elsewhere in the paper.

The authorities of Wadena, Minn., were recently reported to be "strictly enforcing the Sunday-closing law."



At Bordentown, N. J., on July 20 "the law and order league attempted to enforce the laws requiring the closing on Sunday of cigar stores, candy shops, butcher shops, and other places of business."



It was recently reported from Medford, Wis., that "the city council has undertaken the work of a strict enforcement of the Sunday-closing laws of the State, and all stores of every kind and nature will have to close."



"Some little discussion over the infraction of the Sunday ordinances" took place recently at Brownsville, Tenn. "The specific violations found were for the sale of cigars on Sunday." Most of the parties "submitted their cases and were given a nominal fine," but "J. C. Wharton appealed his case so that the matter might be tested in the circuit court."



In Meriden, Conn., on July 19 "not a fruit store was open during the day until after sundown," owing to "the enforcement of a blue-law Sunday" upon the fruit dealers. These dealers felt that

"an improper discrimination had been made against them by the authorities," and were "determined that if the law is to be enforced against them, it will be enforced against every business to which it may apply." It seems that the authorities have compromised matters by making the law apply only from sunrise to sunset, in harmony with what the law was many years ago.



The ministerial association of Butler, Pa., recently "framed a petition to Mayor Wm. M. Kennedy, asking that he enforce the Sunday-closing law, especially toward confectionery and cigar stores and soda fountains." In a communication to the association the mayor declined to do so, saying that he did not care to do something that would "lead the outside world to think I am a fossil or belong to a past generation." He told the clergymen that "if action must be taken on the Sunday question, and that action be the closing of the soda-water stores," they would have to go to the district attorney "for aid in the cause."



The council of Mountain Lake, Minn., has passed an ordinance which declares that "no person shall participate in the playing of baseball or any other game within the village limits on the Sabbath day," and that any person violating this

prohibition "shall be punished by a fine not exceeding the sum of fifty dollars and costs of prosecution, and may be imprisoned in the county jail of Cottonwood County, Minn., until such fine is paid, not exceeding, however, the term of ninety days." It is further provided that it shall be no defense in a prosecution for a violation of the ordinance "that such game or games are being played upon property owned by said village or by any other party or parties or corporation."



After "a stormy meeting" of representatives of the journeymen and boss barbers' associations of Davenport, Iowa, on July 23 it was announced in the papers that "the journeymen would have two weeks longer to make good their promise to the bosses to close up every shop in Davenport on Sundays." Six shops had been open on July 19, one more than on the preceding Sunday. Almost immediately following the above meeting and announcement this agreement or announcement was signed by twenty-three of the boss barbers, whose example it was expected would be followed by the others:

We, the undersigned barbers of the city of Davenport, will open our shops Sunday, July 26, 1903, and will keep them open every Sunday thereafter.

The journeymen at once decided that they "must take radical action," and "invoke the Sunday-closing law against the shops that persist in remaining open on Sunday." They "feel that they have not been treated right by the authorities," who have seemed loth "to take up the cases and compel the revolting barbers to observe the Sunday-closing law."



There were 125 arrests for Sunday liquor selling in Greater New York on August 2, and 106 on the preceding Sunday.—Five saloonkeepers at Bird Island, Minn., were recently "arrested and fined \$30 each for keeping their saloons open

on Sunday."—At Waukegan, Ill., recently Rev. L. C. Talmage, Congregational, had twenty saloonkeepers arrested "for not observing the Sunday law." In retaliation, it is said, the mayor of the city "ordered the free water shut off from the Congregational church."—At Moorhead, Minn., on July 27 the proprietor of the Columbia Hotel was arrested "for violating the law by selling liquor on Sunday."—The saloonkeepers of Wakefield, Mich., have been "notified that all sale of liquor on Sundays must stop." "Several arrests have been made."—It was recently reported from Hartford, Conn., that "the authorities are determined to stop the sale of drinks on Sunday."—At a meeting of the anti-saloon league in St. Paul's M. E. Church in Oyster Bay, L. I., on July 13, "the secretary was instructed to notify all saloonkeepers that they must observe the law on Sundays or they would be prosecuted." "The church people" were "thoroughly aroused over the matter."—The village board of Loup City, Neb., has "forced the saloons to obey the Sunday-closing law."



Crystal Beach, Ontario, was "in the clutches of the Canadian blue laws" on July 19. "When the boat arrived with the Sunday papers a squad of constables were on the dock with orders to stop the sale of all newspapers." "The papers were taken off, but not a single one was sold." The constables next "informed the bath and boat house proprietors that there must be no bathing or renting of boats the next day." A later report indicates that "the clutches" of the "blue laws" have become tighter. The place is a favorite resort for Buffalo people, and the Buffalo *Courier* of August 3 thus described the state of affairs as to Sunday enforcement on the preceding day:

Crystal Beach was in a turmoil of excite-

ment yesterday. Bewhiskered constables strutted about with blank pieces of paper in their pockets. They would slide up to an unsuspecting seller and hand him a piece of paper. It was a warrant charging him with selling on Sunday, and commanding him to appear at Ridgeway this morning at nine o'clock to answer to the terrible charge of selling on Sunday. Some of the sausage men stopped selling. Others went right on and earned the plaudits of the liberal-minded cottagers at the resort. Then the constables in turn visited the boathouse men, the newsboys, the restaurant-keepers, the bathhouse proprietors, the peanut vendors, the man who operates the merry-go-rounds and the man who sells sand pails to family parties, and handed each the deadly piece of paper commanding each and all to appear at Ridgeway at nine o'clock this morning to answer "in the name of the King" to the various offenses with which they are charged. It did not take long for the news of the wholesale arrests to spread. The cottagers, mostly Buffalo folk, were loud in their condemnation of what had occurred. All promised their financial and moral support to those who had been served with warrants. The feeling ran so high that every person who had been served with a warrant immediately re-opened and did business all day. The Canadian constables, noting the high tension of the people, did not attempt to further molest those doing business at the resort. Yesterday's events were the climax of several previous abortive attempts to enforce the so-called laws.



At Bowling Green, Ohio, on July 14 "the case of the State of Ohio against William Black *et al.*, arrested for an alleged violation of the statute against the playing of baseball on Sunday, was called in Justice Callin's court in the presence of an overflowing gathering of spectators." Somewhat of a sensation was created by the positive declaration of the bondsmen that the document calling for the appearance of the accused in court had been altered since they signed it. They said when their signatures were attached it contained the name of William Black only, but as read it contained the names of three other persons and called for the appearance in court of "fifteen

other persons whose names are not known." The justice denied that the bond had been altered, and declared "the recognizances of those failing to appear forfeited." The defense "moved the discharge of the defendants on the ground that jurisdiction was lacking because of a previous arrest and fine for the same offense, and introduced a transcript of the proceedings in the mayor's court of Portage showing that fines and costs amounting to \$43.14 had been paid upon conviction for the same charge." The case continued so long that it was necessary to take a recess, after which "a much larger number of interested spectators congregated." We are not informed as to the result of the trial.—It was recently reported from Jacksonville, Fla., that in order "not to be outdone by the enforcement of the Sunday laws relative to playing baseball on the Sabbath, the local teams have agreed to admit every one desirous of seeing the games free of charge on Sunday afternoons." "The State laws prohibit the playing of baseball or any amusement on the Sabbath when an admission fee is charged."—At Niagara Falls, N. Y., on July 18, the chief of police "issued orders to the effect that there must be no more ball playing in the city on Sundays in the future." "In case any games are attempted the ball players will be arrested and arraigned in the police court." Preceding this action the chief received a communication, "signed by every minister in the city," requesting him to prevent Sunday games in the future, and informing him that a similar request had been sent to the mayor and to the sheriff of the county.—In response to "a deluge of complaints from the people who want Sunday used for a day of church-going," the prosecuting attorney of Cass County, Mich., has issued an order against Sunday ball playing, and a deputy sheriff "is attending to its en-

forcement."—Business men of Faribault, Minn., have been "asked to sign a petition to the authorities requesting them

to put a stop to Sunday baseball."—The authorities of Lanesboro, Minn., have forbidden Sunday ball playing.

Although it holds that "secular instruction alone can be furnished by general taxation," and that "religious instruction in the public schools is prohibited by the constitution of the State of New York and can only be made possible by the amendment of that fundamental law," the *New York Sun* seems to be of the opinion that the public schools ought to, or at least do, inculcate Christianity, and are of such a character that they can be "dechristianized." An editorial printed on June 23, which seems to have been based on this idea, has called forth this very appropriate comment from an editorial writer on the *Chicago Israelite*:

The *New York Sun* recently indited an editorial styled "Dechristianizing the Public Schools." I wonder if the writer of this editorial ever stopped to think that our public schools never were Christian, so that they never could be dechristianized. If he did not, it is about time that he were beginning now to do a little thinking on this subject. Our public schools have nothing to do with religion, with Christianity, Buddhism, Mohammedanism or Judaism. It is perfectly neutral on this question. It takes the editorial writers of the *New York Sun* a long time to find this out. What the writer of the above-mentioned editorial meant when he spoke of the dechristianizing of the public schools was that the Jews were demanding their rights in urging the exclusion of everything Christian in the conduct of our public school system—this and nothing more. He says:

At the convention of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, on Sunday, it was reported that this movement to influence the school policy had been carried to the extent of objection to anything in the public instruction savoring of Christianity distinctively. It was complained that the by-laws for the opening of the schools with the reading of a few verses in the Bible had been interpreted in

some cases to allow the reading of verses from the New Testament. And, again, that among the songs taught the children were included Christian hymns, that at about the Christmas season more especially, plays, hymns, and other exercises of a distinctively Christian character are taught and recited.

Commenting on this the editor of the *Sun* says:

The report says that when these complaints were made to Superintendent Maxwell he assured the committee that the board of education would instruct teachers that it would not countenance the practise. That is, the old Christian demand that the secularization of education should not go to the extent of excluding the reading of the Bible in schools has been succeeded by Jewish demand for their dechristianization. New York can no longer be regarded as a Christian City.

Perhaps the editor of the *New York Sun* never knew that New York never was a Christian city. If its morality is taken into consideration, it certainly never was a Christian city, and when viewed from the public school question it never should have been, if it ever was. What the Orthodox Union demanded at this late date should have been demanded long ago. It was wholly in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution of these United States. It is simply acting as Washington, Jefferson, Madison and the rest of those lofty spirits would have had them act. "Religion is not within the purview of our government" said one of our great statesmen, and he knew what he was saying. If removing Christian hymns and other Christian exercises from the program of the public schools is a dechristianization of the public school system, then let the dechristianization go on. But it is not this. It is simply removing from the schools what have been wrongly foisted upon them.



At Scranton, Pa., on July 27 Roman Catholic Bishop Hoban "vigorously denounced Sunday excursions and commanded all Roman Catholic organizations to desist from conducting them in the future."

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.**

LEGAL SUNDAY

Sunday laws and their enforcement has become one of the leading questions of the day. The subject is one of absorbing interest and much has been written upon it. Much, too, has been said by the clergy, by the lawyers, by the legislatures and by the courts.

Until recently, however, there seems to have been no very careful inquiry into the merits of the case of the legal Sunday—no open challenge of its right to exist.

In **THE LEGAL SUNDAY: Its History and Character**, James T. Ringgold, a member of the Baltimore bar at his decease, challenges Sunday's legal right to an existence. This book is a clear, logical, forceful presentation of a subject which is of vital interest to every American citizen.

"Legal Sunday" contains 252 pages, is bound in paper covers, and costs the small sum of **25 cents**.

CHRISTIAN PATRIOTISM

A straightforward discussion of the relation of the Christian patriot to earthly governments, and of the principles which should govern him. An important subject, too, in these days when so many seem befogged and uncertain as to their duties and responsibilities in this respect. **CLOTH, 40 Cents.**

THE GREAT NATIONS OF TO-DAY

In this the author plainly shows that the great nations of to-day are clearly mentioned in the Bible, and their destiny foretold. A most interesting historical and prophetic study, proving incidentally the inspiration of the Bible.

PAPER COVERS, 25 Cents.

THE MARSHALING OF THE NATIONS

This little booklet shows conclusively that the five great Powers actually hold in their hands the *power* and a greater part of the *territory* of the world. But there is a significance to all this that but few understand. Read this pamphlet and the meaning will be plain. Has a double-page, four-color map of the world, showing how it is now partitioned among the various powers. **PAPER COVERS, 10 Cents.**

Address,

**PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING CO.
11 West 20th Street, New York City.**