**“The Blair Education Amendment Bill” American Sentinel 4, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

We promised some time ago to comment on Senator Blair’s remarks on this bill, but since then other matter which seemed more important has crowded it out. Now, although the bill has been twice printed in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we propose to print it again in connection with Mr. Blair’s remarks in the Senate, and to make such comments on both as will enable all to see just what is involved in the proposed amendment. The largely increased, circulation of the SENTINEL, since the bill was last printed, warrants and even makes necessary this repetition. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.1}

Before proceeding to the consideration of the bill, it may be well to read what some of the most prominent men in the United States think of the Constitution as it is. The New York *Independent*, without any reference to the Blair amendment, sent out letters asking the following question: “Has there been such advance in political science, and such development of this Nation, during the past hundred years, as to demand any considerable modification in our Constitution? If so, in what lines should it be made?” To this the following answers, which appeared in the *Independent*, January 10, 1889, were received from men who certainly need no instruction in the United States Constitution. We first quote the closing paragraph of a long reply by Francis Wharton, LL.D.:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.2}

“The Constitution itself requires no amendment; but what is required is the removal from it of the patches impairing its symmetry, its comprehensiveness, its elasticity, its durability, which have been imposed on it by the judiciary.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.3}

Hon. George Bancroft, the historian, who is as familiar with the Constitution as ordinary people are with the alphabet, said:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.4}

“I have your letter asking what changes had better be made in the Constitution. I know of none; if any change is needed, it is in ourselves, that we may more and more respect that body of primal law.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.5}

This is to the point, and we commend it to the careful consideration of National Reformers. It is they that need amendment; not the Constitution of the United States. The remaining answers are from judges of the United States Supreme Court, whose special business it is to be familiar with the Constitution. Justice Bradley wrote, “I would have no change” and then added:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.6}

“I think it is a most happy arrangement that sudden whiffs and gusts of popular feeling are not always able to execute and carry out the rash purposes with which they are inspired.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.7}

To the same intent is the following from Justice Gray:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.8}

“I am so old-fashioned as to think that the Constitution, administered according to its letter and spirit, is well enough as it is. And I am of the opinion of the late Governor Andrew, that it is not desirable to Mexicanize our Government by proposing constitutional amendments as often as there is supposed to be a disturbance in its practical working.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.9}

If the so-called Educational Amendment should be adopted, the flood-gates of religious legislation would be opened, and the Constitution of the United States would in time become little more than a church creed. This is not empty assertion, as will presently appear. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.10}

Justice Blatchford’s letter to the *Independent*, which we quote in full, is as follows:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.11}

“I am satisfied with the Constitution as it is. It cannot be bettered. Constitution tinkers are in a poor business. If there are ills, it is better to bear them than fly to others that we know not of.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.12}

There you have the opinion of men whose business it is to make a special study of the Constitution of the United States. Surely it should be entitled to some weight. Reason should teach men that there cannot be any serious defect in a Constitution under which this Government has grown to an extent and with a rapidity unprecedented in the history of Nations. But we come now to the proposed amendment, which reads as follows:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.13}

“*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.14}

**ARTICLE—**

“SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.15}

“SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools, adequate for the instruction of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character, or such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonial, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 49.16}

“Sec: 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve Governments republican in form, and in substance, the United States shall guarantee to every State, and to the people of every State, and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.1}

“SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.2}

This joint resolution was introduced into the Senate on the 25th of May, 1888, and after being read twice, was ordered to lie on the table. It remained there until December 22, 1888, when Mr. Blair, having obtained the consent of the Senate, called it up, and had it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.3}

The Charleston News and Courier has printed quite a number of letters from Southern college presidents and professors, concerning this bill, most of them favoring it on the ground that it would be a help to the Southern States. None of them look at the religious features of the bill, but only to the material help which it promises. It is this which will lead many to overlook the very objectionable clause in it; yet even this is condemned by some who are in the South, where the greatest benefit would be received in this line. Thus, Prof. C. F. Smith, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, says:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.4}

“At first I was favorably inclined to the bill, as I feared that most of the Southern States would not be able to bear the burden of illiteracy thrust upon them by the Civil War. I am now opposed to the bill on general principles. I do not believe that many of the Southern States really need this help. Granted, however, that in many, or even most of the Southern States, the immediate result would be good,—that is, that more men would, in the next few years, be able to read and write with this help than without it,—in the long run I fear we should be more injured than benefited. Unless States are different from individuals, the policy of helping them to do what, even with great effort, they might do for themselves, could only end in making them dependent.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.5}

President J. F. Crowell, of Trinity College, North Carolina, is in favor of the bill because of the material help which will be afforded to the States, although he acknowledges that it is defective as a measure of financial administration, and on constitutional grounds, admitting that it will “stretch the Constitution till it cracks.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.6}

Prof. E. C. Woodward, of South Carolina College, Columbia, says: “The South needs additional educational facilities, but this bill does not offer the educational aid most needed by our people.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.7}

President W. S. Candler, of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia, says:— {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.8}

“In view of the sore need or more and better educational facilities in the South, I am strongly tempted to indorse the bill, but my judgment, unbiased by such considerations, is that the bill is not to be approved. I do not believe that the general Government is authorized to make any such appropriation to the cause of education. As to its possible effect on the South I cannot speak so confidently, but I fear it would be disappointing as a method of popular education, and, besides, would teach our people a parental view of this Government which would be vicious in its results. We need something more than money to educate the people, and there are many evils we can endure with less danger than we can invite a revolutionary departure from the constitutional functions of the National Government.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.9}

From the quotations already made, all of which have been copied from *Public Opinion*, January 26, 1889, it appears that the amendment is not to be commended even aside from its religious features, to which we shall now give attention. The second section is the one which contains the real point at issue. That requires each State to “establish and maintain a system of free public schools, adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion.” {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.10}

It would seem that the most superficial observer could see that this section is in direct opposition to the first, which ways that “no State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;” for it does provide for the establishment of a State religion. Some apologists for the bill have sought to evade this, by saying that the amendment does not require the States to maintain an establishment of religion, but only to maintain schools adequate for the education of children in the principles of the Christian religion. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.11}

This is the thinnest kind of an evasion; for what would be the sense of maintaining schools adequate for the education of children in the principles of the Christian religion, if those principles were not taught? What is meant by “schools adequate for the education” of children in the principles of the Christian religion? Evidently, schools equipped with suitable text-books, and provided with teachers competent to give instruction in those principles. That would involve quite a change from our present school system, for our schools are not now capable of imparting such instruction. Now it is the height of folly to say that the Government would be at the expense of providing extra text-books and teachers, so as to make the schools adequate for the education of the children in the principles of religion, and yet not require any such instruction to be given. The very fact that the State is required to establish and maintain a system of schools adequate for the education of children in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion,” shows that they would be expected to teach those principles, just as much as the common branches of knowledge. {AMS March 6, 1889, p. 50.12}

E. J. W.

*(To be continued.)*

**“Only the Name, Not the Power” American Sentinel 4, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent of the *Carrier Dove* says:— {AMS March 13, 1889, p. 59.1}

“I say it in all seriousness, there is no name under heaven, the power of which we as a progressive people have greater reason to fear, than the name of Jesus, as used by religious people. It is the rallying-cry under which they are striving to unite Church and State; the claim is that he shall be the ruler of, not only this, but all Nations; the Sabbath bill is being backed by the power of Jesus’ name, and step by step we are thus being deprived of our liberties.” {AMS March 13, 1889, p. 59.2}

This is only one of the things that the National Reformers and their allies are responsible for; but this is enough to stamp their whole scheme as antichristian. While they profess that theirs is a Christian movement, there is nothing else in the world that is doing so much to bring Christianity into disrepute. Just as the false Christianity of the Roman Catholic Church, which was accepted as true Christianity, was responsible for the infidelity of Paine and Voltaire, so this professed National Reform, which will be taken by many as being just what it pretends to be,—an exhibition of real Christianity,—will disgust many with the very name of Christ and Christianity. {AMS March 13, 1889, p. 59.3}

We can tell our neighbor that although the name of Jesus is used very often by these would-be reformers, “the power of Jesus’ name” is altogether wanting. It matters not how much they may claim that he is to be king of this Nation, he himself has declared, “My kingdom is not of this world.” The *power* of Jesus’ name has never been exercised except for the benefit of the human race; but the mere name, the sound, has been used to back up crimes that would almost make a demon blush. It was the *power* of his name that healed the sick and raised the dead, in the days of the apostles. When, however, the sons of one Sceva, a Jew, thought to accomplish the same wonders that the apostle did, by calling the name of Jesus over one possessed with a devil, the demon overcame them, and drove them from the house naked and wounded, proving to them that the name of Jesus without the power could accomplish nothing towards diminishing the woes of the world. National Reformers should learn a lesson from the seven sons of Sceva. {AMS March 13, 1889, p. 59.4}

The “power of Jesus’ name” has done more than to raise the dead; it has enabled men to resist the strivings of appetite and passion, has delivered them from the bondage of vice and sin, so that they have stood free men, pure and clean, changed so greatly as scarcely to be able to recognize themselves. The power of the name of Jesus can and does diminish sin; but nobody can apply that power but Jesus himself. When men attempt to diminish sin by law, using the name of Jesus, they will find that they only increase it. Jesus does not have any vicegerents in this world, and his reign is a reign of love. National Reform Christianity is of the kind described by the apostle Paul, when he says that in the last days men shall be “lovers of their own selves,” etc., “having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.” From such we are exhorted to “turn away.” {AMS March 13, 1889, p. 59.5}

E. J. W.

**“The Blair Educational Amendment Bill. (Concluded.)” American Sentinel 4, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

*(Concluded.)*

3. It is utterly useless to talk about teaching the principles of the Christian’ religion as one would teach the principles of arithmetic and geography. Such a thing cannot be. Those sciences are fixed. There is no chance for a difference of opinion in regard to them. They are the same in every nation and among all classes of religionists and men of no religion at all. An infidel could not possibly teach any different principles of arithmetic than a Christian would. But it is not so with religion. Even though it had been decided by vote of a council, what the principles of the Christian religion are, that, as already shown, would not change anybody’s mind, and every teacher of the Bible would give his teaching the bias of his own conception of truth. It could not be otherwise. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.1}

4. To obviate this, it is evident that, the principles of the Christian religion having been settled by the council of the churches, the State would have to embody them in a text-book, which all would be required to use. Mr. Blair has already seen the necessity for this, and has planned for it, as appears from the following extract from a letter which he wrote to the secretary of the National Reform Association:— {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.2}

“I believe that a text-book of instruction in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the pubic schools by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian church, both Protestant and Catholic.” {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.3}

First, of giving the Catholic Church the controlling voice in determing what religious instruction should be given in the public schools, so that very many, if not the majority, of the public schools would virtually be only Roman Catholic parochial schools. Second, it would necessarily result in withholding the Bible from the people. For even though the principles laid down in the text-books or catechisms were in harmony with the Bible, it would not do to let the teachers have free access to the Bible, or else they would be imbibing doctrines that would be heretical, according to the religion of the State, and would be teaching them to the children. Within four hundred years men have been burned at the stake for doing just such things as that, and punishment of some kind would certainly follow in this country. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.4}

So we see that from whatever side we approach this amendment, it provides only for a union of Church and State, and that union on the Catholic model. We have not indulged in any fanciful speculation. History repeats itself; because human nature is ever the same. The reason which led to the prohibiting of the Bible in the Middle Ages, will do the same thing now. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.5}

One other point in Senator Blair’s remarks should be noticed. That is, that it is of the greatest importance that a child should possess a knowledge of the principles of the Christian religion, even if he does not apply those principles in his personal conduct. We most heartily dissent. We don’t believe that the knowledge which Judas had of the principles of the Christian religion, and he must have had an intimate knowledge of them, made his traitorous act one whit better. The principles of the Christian religion are of no account whatever unless they are applied to the personal conduct. Indeed they are worse than useless if not applied to the personal conduct, since they make the individual satisfied with a mere form of religion. And so again we charge this amendment with providing for a State religion which will be utterly destitute of the power of vital godliness, and of planning the education of children in this form, so that they will become conceited formalists, sunk in carnal security. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.6}

If anybody says that there is no danger that the amendment will ever be adopted, we warn him against indulging in any such delusion. The National Reform Association is to a man in favor of it. The *Christian Statesman*, of said:— {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.7}

“Senator Blair’s proposed amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people.” {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.8}

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6, 1888, Mr. John Alexander, the father and first president of the National Reform Association, congratulated the association on the introduction of the Blair amendment, and said: “The National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption.” And in the issue of December 27, 1888, the same paper spoke most enthusiastically of both of Mr. Blair’s religious bills, and said: “Both of these measures involve the principle of National Christianity,” thus showing that we are not taking a partisan view when we says that its adoption will make the union of Church and State. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.9}

The National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, at its annual convention in New York in October, 1888, formally indorsed the Educational Amendment bill. See the report of Resolution Committee, in *Daily Union Signal*, October 24, 1888. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 66.10}

Besides this, the American Sunday Union, which was organized to push the Sunday-Rest bill and similar measures, is in favor of it. In fact, where the Sunday-Rest bill would find one supporter, the Educational Amendment bill would probably find a dozen; because so many are carried away by the glittering promises in the last part of section two, that they cannot see the danger in the other part. While plucking the rose, they will be stung by the serpent, unless they are warned. Will not the reader of this join us in sounding the alarm? {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 67.1}

E. J. W.

**“The State to Enforce Church Discipline” American Sentinel 4, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *National Presbyterian*, January, 1889, in an editorial entitled, “The Church and the Sunday Newspaper,” said:— {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.1}

“The responsibility of the church for the continued existence of the Sunday newspaper, is beginning to attract the attention of thoughtful men. It is a fact which it is idle to attempt to conceal, that it is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers. The responsibility, then, of this great and growing evil is with the church.” {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.2}

Similar statements are very often made. That the churches are the greatest Sunday breakers is quite generally admitted. It is a fact that the first Sunday excursion train was run at the request of ministers and church people. In *Our Day*, January, 1889, there is an article by Prof. W. G. Ballantine, of Oberlin, Ohio, which is wholly devoted to a statement of how members of churches in the East disregard the Sunday when they are on pleasure excursions in the West. In that he makes it apparent that professed Sunday-keeping Christians are responsible for a large part of the business that is done on Sunday. He says:— {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.3}

“There can never be a Sabbath in Colorado until Eastern Christians have more conscience. They give the lie, when they go there, to the teachings of the home missionaries whom they support there.” {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.4}

These testimonies might be duplicated many times over, but they are sufficient for the purpose of our argument. Read them again carefully before you go further. Mark well the statement of the *National Presbyterian*, that the Sunday newspaper, which is regarded as a synonym for the rankest kind of Sunday desecration, “is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers.” {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.5}

It is to stop just such things as this that Sunday laws are wanted. Everybody knows that whenever a speech is made urging the necessity for a Sunday law, the Sunday excursion and the Sunday newspaper are set forth as equal to the saloon in desecrating the day. Now take particular note of this point:— {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.6}

1. Since, by the admission of the representatives of the churches, it is church members who are responsible for the greater part of the Sunday desecration, it is evident that if church members kept Sunday strictly, the amount of Sunday business and pleasure would be reduced to a minimum. 2. Since these church members do by the very act of becoming church members pledge them-selves to observe Sunday as a rest day, it is evident that in violating Sunday they are violating a rule of the church, and are proper subjects for church discipline. The *National Presbyterian* makes this very emphatic. 3. Therefore it is evident, further, that when these churches call for State and National laws to enforce Sunday observance, they are simply asking the civil power to enforce the rules of the church, and to execute church discipline. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.7}

Let the reader judge if this is not a legitimate conclusion. We know that it cannot be fairly disputed. And therefore the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws does mark the consummation of the union of Church and State. No different state of things from this ever existed in the middle ages. The church then declared who were heretical, and the civil power executed the penalty upon them. That is what the American Sunday Union is asking to-day, that the Government shall enforce one of the laws of the church. And so by the evidence which they themselves furnish, they are working to secure an exact re-production of the Papacy. No wonder they find Cardinal Gibbons willing to co-operate with them. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.8}

But they will say that many States have Sunday laws and have had them for a long time, and yet there have been no such terrible results as would naturally follow a union of Church and State. To this we reply: (1) That these laws have been largely inoperative. It is this very fact which makes the American Sunday Union call for a National Sunday law. They want a National law to give efficiency to the State laws. Therefore it is not to be expected that we should have seen the full effect of Sunday laws. (2) But even with the manifest disadvantage which the Union claims, of having no National law to give force to the State laws, we have seen such results from Sunday laws in some States, notably in Arkansas and Tennessee, that we have no desire to see the union of Church and State made any more complete. If State Sunday laws can get in such deadly work now, what would they not do with a National law back of them to make them “efficient”? We leave the reader to solve the problem. E. J. W. {AMS March 20, 1889, p. 68.9}

**“Civil Sunday and Civil Lent” American Sentinel 4, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received from a friend a long communication received by him from a friend who is a prominent and active member of the Prohibition party in Ohio. The letter was a defense of the Prohibition party against the charge of desiring religious legislation, but as it would fill about four pages of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we were forced to decline it. One paragraph, however, we preserved, and present it herewith:— {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 73.1}

“Nowhere has or does the Prohibition party ask that the Sabbath be preserved as a religious institution, but, on the contrary, asks it on purely civil grounds, and for purely civil reasons.” {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 73.2}

We are not disposed to deny that statement, and we are not aware that we have ever said anything to the contrary. It is admitted that the Prohibition party has asked for legislation in behalf of “the Sabbath,” and that is enough. We care not on what grounds such legislation is asked for; we have no more objection to Sunday legislation upon avowedly religious grounds than we have for Sunday legislation upon professedly civil grounds. Sunday legislation is Sunday legislation, no matter what reason is given for it. It can have but one effect, whether asked for in the interest of religion, of temperance, of the workingman, as a “police regulation,” or as a purely “sanitary arrangement,” for the cure of corns or some other of the numerous ills that flesh is heir to. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 73.3}

We have no doubt that very many people are sincere in their appeal for “civil Sunday laws.” They believe that religious legislation is a bad thing, and, without stopping to reason, they imagine that if they can only change the name, the evils will all vanish. Sunday is purely an institution of the church, and Sunday legislation cannot be anything else but religious legislation. This becomes specially apparent when its advocates talk about preserving “the Sabbath.” It makes no difference what day of the week men have in mind when they speak of the Sabbath, the fact is that “the Sabbath” is a religious institution. If its observance is enforced by civil law, that will not deprive it of its ecclesiastical character. If Sunday observance is enjoined for purely civil reasons, then we shall have religious legislation for civil reasons. Now it is not the reasons for the legislation that we object to, but the fact of the legislation. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 73.4}

The people who are active in the support of Sunday laws “for purely civil reasons,” have a great deal to say about the kind of men who are elected to official positions in the State. They say that an immoral, licentious man should not be elected to public office. But the friends of these immoral men might say, We do not want to put them in office on the basis of their private moral characters, but solely on intellectual grounds; he may be an immoral man, but we are electing him only in his civil and not in his moral aspect. Would the National Reformers accept any such reasoning? Not by any means. They would say that an immoral man would still be an immoral man, no matter on what grounds he was placed in office. Why is it that they cannot or will not see that the name that may be given to Sunday legislation does not change its character. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 73.5}

The State might as well, command the observance of Lent as to command the observance of Sunday. Both are institutions of the church, and both might be enforced from “purely civil grounds.” Certainly considerations of health demand that six weeks of the year should be spent in a mild mortification of the flesh. Thousands of people would have no intermission in their round of gaiety if it were not for the halt which Lent calls; yet there are other thousands who pay no attention to Lent, and who keep all sorts of amusements going, much to the discomfort of those who see them, and yet are deprived by the customs of their church from joining in them. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 73.6}

But when it comes to the interest of the workingman, then Lent is a long ways ahead of Sunday. Our National Reformers who have the good of the workingman so much at heart, have been neglectful of their opportunities, or they would have know that Lent was perpetuated solely in the interest of working people. Read the following from “The Puritans and Queen Elizabeth,” by Dr. Samuel Hopkins (Gould and Lincoln, 1860), Vol. 2, pp. 73-75:— {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 73.7}

“A remarkable English reason for observing fast-days, and particularly the Lent Fast, is forced upon our notice by an order of the Council to the Archbishop on the thirteenth day of December. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 74.1}

“It was a matter of State policy-and wise, being insular policy-that ‘the numbers of cattle should be increased, and that the abundance of fish which the sea yieldeth should be generally received. Besides, there should be great consideration had for the preservation of a navy and maintenance of convenient numbers of sea-faring men, both which would otherwise decay, if some means were not found whereby they might be increased.’ King Edward VI. and his Council were of this mind. By proclamation January 16, 1547-48, ‘the king allowed that men should on fast-days abstain from food of flesh to subdue the body unto the soul and spirit. And also for worldly and civil policy, to spare flesh and use fish for the benefits of the commonwealth where many be fishers, ... and that the nourishment of the land might be increased by saving flesh, and especially at the spring-time when Lent doth commonly fall, and when the most common and plenteous breeding of flesh is, ... and that divers of the king’s subjects have good livings and riches in uttering and selling such meat as the sea and waters do minister unto us.’ These reasons were so highly appreciated that the Parliament, which met in the next November, enacted a law for observing fasting-days, which contains the very reasons given in this proclamation. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 74.2}

“But the Puritan aversion to everything which savored of superstition and of slavery to Rome, had turned against ceremonial, periodical fastings; and thus the fish-days of the church had fallen into general disrepute and desuetude. The fishermen found their occupation on the wane, and prayed to the Council for help. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 74.3}

“The Council, therefore, interfered; and, in terms unusually clear, set forth their reasons. Addressing a letter to the Archbishop, they wrote: ‘The laws for the observation of Embring and Fifty Days are not so duly observed as they ought to be, and as is requisite in policy for the maintenance of mariners, fishermen, and the navy of the realm. Her Highness hath therefore given strait charge unto her own household for the observance of those days; and also, to the Lord Mayor of the City of London and other of her Majesty’s officers and loving subjects abroad, to the intent... the State might take such benefit by the laws as was at the time of making intended. Which, we can assure your Lordship is *the only cause* why at this time the observation of the days is so much urged... We have thought good to require your Lordship to give order within your province, that the ministers and preachers be commanded in their sermons to the people to instruct them to conform themselves and their families to the said laws; and further to declare unto them, that the same is not required for any liking of Popish ceremonies heretofore used (which are utterly detested), *but only to maintain the mariners and navy in this land, by setting men a fishing*.” {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 74.4}

If our Catholic and Episcopal friends wish to enforce the observance of Lent, there is an abundance of ground on which they can do so, aside from its ecclesiastical character. What does it matter if it did originate with the church? People generally eat too much anyway, and it would be for the benefit of their health if they would fast a little. So let our Sunday-law friends be consistent, and while they legislate in behalf of the workingman, let them not forget Lent. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 74.5}

E. J. W. {AMS March 27, 1889, p. 74.6}