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At a meeting of the school teachers of Douglas Country, Kansas, lately, there was “an animated debate” upon the following question:- {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 105.1}

In the provision made in the Constitution, for the separation of Church and State, does the word Church mean or include Christianity? {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 105.2}

This seems to imply that the Constitution which they had in mind makes use of the word Church; but neither the United States Constitution nor the Constitution of Kansas uses the word in any such connection. But whatever the teachers meant it was finally concluded by them that “the word Church does not mean or include Christianity.” We should like those teachers to tell us what Christianity is, or amounts to in this world, without the Church of Christ. There may be a church without Christianity, but it is impossible to have Christianity without a church. Those teachers need to be taught before they discuss such a question again. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 105.3}

The *Christian Nation* wants a “Protestant university” at Washington, and what is more, it wants the Government to build it, or at least contribute liberally toward the enterprise. In its issue of March 19 that paper says:- {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 105.4}

Since the Catholics made a successful venture in founding a University at Washington, various projects for a great national university under Protestant auspices have been suggested and discussed. Every one seems ready to admit that the national capital is an ideal strategic point for the location of such an institution, and every one is in favor of it. But it requires something more than good wishes to endow a university, and while Uncle Sam has millions of surplus stored away in his great money vaults, it is not an easy matter to get their doors opened by those who have the power to do so, namely our legislators. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 105.5}

“Straws,” it is said, “show which way the wind blows,” and this item shows just as plainly the direction which the National Reform mind is taking. It would require only the adoption of the Blair Educational amendment to make a “Protestant university” at Washington, endowed with Uncle Sam’s surplus millions a possibility. But desirable as a great university may be at the national capital, we hope never to see a dollar of Government money appropriated either to a Protestant university or to a Catholic university. The revenues of the country are for quite another purpose than that of endowing denominational institutions of learning, whether Protestant or Papal. The Government should know no Protestants and no Catholics, but only citizens. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 105.6}
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When so much is said *pro* and *con* about a union of Church and State, it is fitting that we know exactly what is meant by “the Church.” Many people erroneously suppose that the term refers to some particular denomination, as the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian. But this is not the case. To use the term in that sense would be manifestly unfair. If, in speaking of “the Church,” we should refer to some special denomination, we would hereby imply that no other denomination could be a part of “the Church.” With the exception of the Catholic, nobody uses the term “the Church” with reference to any particular sect. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.1}

In the Bible “the Church” is declared to be the body of Christ. In one place Paul says of Christ that “he is the head of the body, the Church” (Colossians 1:18); and again he says that God “hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body” (Ephesians 1:22, 23). Baptism is universally recognized as the entrance to the Church, as Paul says, “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body,” and that this body is Christ, is shown by the words, “As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.2}

“The Church,” then, in the strict sense of the word, is composed of those who are “in Christ,” who have been converted, “born again,” and are consequently “new creatures.” From this it is very evident that, strictly speaking, no one religious sect, nor all of them together, can be called “the Church.” Everybody is willing to admit that in every denomination there are those who are really members of “the Church,” because they are united to Christ; but nobody will claim that all of any denomination are truly Christian. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.3}

Since we cannot always distinguish the true professor from the false one, it is evident that the extent of the Church is known only to him who can read the heart; but it is not convenient always to make this fine distinction in our conversation, neither is it possible; and therefore we speak of all who profess the religion of Jesus as members of his Church. Thus we assume, since we cannot decide, that each individual’s profession is an honest one. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.4}

Now mark this fact: the religion of Jesus, or the profession of that religion, is the distinguishing characteristic of the Church. It is that which makes the Church, and without that there is no Church. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.5}

With this matter clearly in mind, we are prepared to decide for ourselves whether nr not the Religious Amendment party is in favor of a union of the Church and State. And this decision shall be made from the published statements of that party. In the New York Convention of the National Reform Association, held in 1873, Dr. Jonathan Edwards, of Peoria, Ill., said:- {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.6}

“It is just possible that the outcry against Church and State may spring rather from hatred to revealed religion than from an intelligent patriotism. But where is the sign, the omen of such Church and State mischief coming upon us? Who will begin and who will finish this union of Church and State? If you think the Roman Catholic can do it in spite of the watchfulness of the Protestant, or that one Protestant sect can do it amid the jealousy of all the other sects; or that all these sects would combine to affect a joint union with the State, you have a notion of human nature and of church nature different from what I have. Church and State in union, then, are forever impossible here, and, were it never so easy, we all repudiate it on principle. There are enduring and ever valid reasons against it. But religion and State is another thing. That is possible. This is a good thing-and that is what we aim to make a feature in our institutions.” {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.7}

Exactly, and right here do we see the omen of a union of Church and State. We do not expect that in this country the Catholic Church will be the State Church, nor that any one of the Protestant sects will be honored by an alliance with the State. Neither do we look for all the sects to combine and sink their individual names and thus form a union with the State. But we do look for a desperate effort to unite Church and State, and we claim that this effort will be made by the so-called National Reform Party. And further, we claim that Dr. Edwards has admitted, even while denying it, that such union is the avowed object of that party. We leave it to the candid reader if the short argument at the beginning of this article, defining “the church,” taken in connection with Dr. Edwards’s positive declaration, does not prove that a union of Church and State is the grand object sought by the Amendmentists. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.8}

“But,” says one, “do you not teach that a man should carry his religion into his business? Why then should you object to religion in the State?” We do believe that if a man *has* religion he should manifest it in his business transactions as well as in church; but if he has it not, we would not have him simulate it. So likewise we believe in religion among individuals everywhere, for only individuals can be religious. No man can be religious for another, neither can one man or any number of men make any man religious. And therefore we are not in favor of upholding religion by the laws of the State. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.9}

Perhaps it may be made a little plainer that religion in the State is Church and State united. We say that the possession of true religion marks one as a real Christian-a member of the church of Christ. The association together of a body of people professing religion constitutes, outwardly at least, a branch of the church of Christ. And so likewise the profession of religion by the State, constitutes a State church. It is all the union of Church and State that has ever existed. And when such a union shall have been affected, what will be the result? Just this: Religion and patriotism will be identical. No matter how pure some of the principles upheld by the laws may be, they can have no vitalizing, spiritual effect on the hearts of the people, because they will stand on the same level as the law defining who are eligible to office, and regulating the length of the presidential term. In short, the incorporation of religion into the laws of the State, marks the decline of religion in the hearts of the people. And this is what the Religious Amendment Party is pledged to bring about. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.10}

Ought not all lovers of pure Christianity to enter a hearty and continued protest against such a proceeding? {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 107.11}

E. J. W.
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The day following the defeat of his Educational bill, Senator Blair moved a reconsideration. His motion was promptly tabled. The next day Mr. Blair re-introduced the bill, and it is again on the calendar as a portentious piece of unfinished business for next year. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.1}

In a recent article in the *Christian Nation*, Rev. J. M. Foster gives a new version of the fable of the goose which laid the golden egg. He says: “To take the Sabbath for popular temperance meetings is killing the hen which lays the golden egg, as the foolish woman did in the fable story.” We presume that he must have read the “fable story” of this remarkable hen and of the foolish woman, in the same book out of which Dr. Stacy obtained his information regarding the “bounding kangaroo,” which he described as “springing from his lair” and drawing the life-blood from his victim. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.2}

The statement is made in the *Pearl of Days* of March 21, that a man has just been fined twenty dollars in Washington City for violation of the Sunday law. How does this correspond with the statement so confidently made only a few weeks since by the friends of the Breckinridge Sunday bill that the District of Columbia had no Sunday law? As was plainly shown in the SENTINEL recently, the District has a very rigid Sunday law, and the purpose of the Breckinridge bill is not to supply such a law where none now exists but to get Congress to take the first step in religious legislation. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.3}

A conference is called to meet in Dayton, Ohio, May 21, 22. The call is to those “who sincerely desire a real and visible union of all true followers of Christ;” and the object is to express “the growing conviction that the existing divisions into sects and denominations is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Gospel, the primitive order of the Church, and the prayer of Christ himself, and is a great hindrance to the world’s conversion.” The union here desired can never be effected by conventions, conferences, or comparisons of errors. It can be accomplished only by the genuine influence of the Spirit of Christ calling together those that are his. And when it is done the world will not be converted. “The world’s conversion” is a will-o’-the-wisp that deludes most of the churches and distracts them from the real sober work of God, to the mechanism of conventions, legislative enactments, and constitutional amendments. This world will never be converted. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.4}

A gentleman wishes space in this paper to prove that Jehovah, the God of the Jews, is not the same Being whom Jesus worshiped. We know that such a proposition cannot be maintained from the Scriptures; and as we recognize no other authority on such questions we cannot consent that our columns shall be used in any such way. The Bible, by which we mean the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, reveals but one God, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” To attempt to make it teach anything else would be worse than useless. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.5}

Senator Blair feels considerably put out about the failure of his Educational bill. He blames the Republican party for its defeat, and therefore serves the following notice:- {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.6}

I place it on record that there is an end of its political supremacy in this country, and there ought to be. I owe no allegiance to a party that lies in its platform to a Nation, and which chooses to go now and henceforth to its doom as a falsifier. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.7}

We do not know whether the Republican party is thus responsible or not; but accepting it as true, the defeat of that bill was one of the most meritorious acts that a party ever performed. It is to the honor of every senator who voted against it that he did so vote; and it may be spoken to his honor by his children and his children’s children. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.8}

Secretary Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, so-called, is about to start upon another transcontinental lecture tour in the interests of compulsory Sunday observance. The dates are not positively fixed, but are proposed as follows:- {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.9}

April 6, Annapolis or Frederick, Md.; April 7, Hagerstown or Cumberland, Md.; April 8, Parkersburgh, W. Va.; April 9, Portsmouth, or some other city in southern Ohio; April 10, Evansville, or some other town in southern Indiana; April 11, Cairo, or some city in southern Illinois; April 13-16, Arkansas, (Little Rock, Fort Smith, etc.); April 17,Vinita, Ind. Ter.; April 18, Carthage, Mo., or Parsons, Kan.; April 20, 21, two of the following Kansas cities-Lawrence, Leavenworth, Atchison, Topeka, Emporia; April 22, Salina, Kan.; April 23, Newton or Winfield, or Arkansas City or Anthony, all in Kan.; April 24, Hutchinson or Great Bend, both in Kan.; April 25, Trinidad or La Junta, both Col.; April 27, Los Vegas, N. M.; April 28, Santa Fe, N. M.; April 29, Albuqurque, N. M.; Los Angeles, Cal. The return from California will be in June, through Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, the two Dakotas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and northern Ohio. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.10}

We will as soon as possible publish the definite appointments. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.11}

The Houston *Post* asks: “When will these good Sabbatarians learn that in attacking the Sunday paper they are barking up the wrong tree; that it is the Monday paper which [it is supposed] collides with the Decalogue?” And the Galveston *News* responds: “Just as soon as they discover that it is the Monday paper which causes people to stay at home and read all day instead of going to Church.” This answer is undoubtedly the truth, for it has more than once been publicly stated in Sunday-law meetings and conventions that the greatest evil of the Sunday paper is not the work which it causes to be done upon that day, but the fact that it keeps people away from church and destroys their interest in spiritual things. This may be true, but it does not follow that the State ought to abolish the Sunday paper any more than it should abolish infidel papers and prohibit all men from speaking against the religion of the majority. {AMS April 3, 1890, p. 112.12}
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The *Pearl of Days* demands the closing of Castle Garden upon Sunday, and gives seven reason why, in the opinion of the American Sabbath Union, the landing of immigrants should be suspended upon that day. The reasons are of course “civil,” as are all the considerations urged by the Union and its friends in behalf of Sunday laws. But notwithstanding the “civil” gloss with which they seek to cover their demands for governmental recognition of Sunday sacredness, the covering is not thick enough to conceal the fact that the real ground of their demand is that the landing of immigrants involves “secular work” upon a religious day. It would seem to the ordinary mind that it would be a work of mercy if not of necessity to release from the crowded steerage the women and children who have been cooped up there for a week or more. But these self-constituted censors of the Government and of everybody else, say, No. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 113.1}

The National Reform Association is making a strong effort now to get Congress to commit itself by legislation the sacredness of Sunday, by the World’s Fair bill a provision that will not allow the fair to be open on that day. The Secretary of the Association has interviewed some members of the committee, and other members of the House upon the question, but he gets little satisfaction, and it is to be hoped that whatever efforts they make in this direction may meet with much less satisfactory returns. Sunday is the very day when thousands upon thousands could visit the fair who could not visit it on other days; but that consideration is of little consequence compared to the immense consequences that would follow to the Nation if Congress is once committed to the guardianship of the sacredness of Sunday. That step once taken would be made the precedent for crowding upon the Government further recognition in the same way, and introducing other religious observances and practices to be enforced by the national power. We hope Congress will show even less favor to this than has been shown to any of the Sunday measures that have yet been brought to its attention. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 113.2}
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In the previous numbers of the SENTINEL we have shown the fallacy of the idea that civil government may enforce any portion of the moral law, and we have also shown the evil consequences which would necessarily result from an attempt to put such a fallacious idea into practice. We are glad to present in this number a corroboration of our views by a minister of the gospel. And we are the more glad because the argument which we shall quote was made in a Sunday convention, in the second annual meeting of the Sabbath Association of Iowa, which was held in Des Moines, November 12 and 13, 1889. Rev. J. K. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, gave an address on “The Basis of the Civil Sabbath,” which was printed in full in the Iowa State Register, of November 13, from which we quote. Speaking of the laws already existing, and of the Sunday laws which the association is seeking to make, he said:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.1}

If these laws are right, why are they right? There needs to be a clearing up on this point. The ideas of many are vague and faulty as to the genius and intent of these Sunday regulations prescribe in the Church and out imagine that they prescribe a precept of the Christian religion; that they are simply a transcript of the fourth commandment to our statute-books. More than that, many ardent defenders of the Sabbath, justify them on that ground. They say, God has enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, and the State should do the same. But God has demanded that we be good stewards of his bounty, and give liberally to him. Is the State therefore to command this? God has commanded that we be given to hospitality. Is the State to see to it that this be accomplished? God has commanded that we honor one another and in honor prefer one another. Shall the State undertake the enforcement of these divine laws? It is time we had done arguing for Sabbath legislation before Congress or other legislative bodies on plea of its divine authority institution and scriptural authority. It is utterly untenable according to the spirit of our charters of government. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.2}

In this paragraph the question is fairly stated, and the statement in the closing sentence is correct. After referring to certain judicial decisions on certain laws against crime, the speaker continued as follows:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.3}

The civil law forbids these, not as offenses against God, but as crimes against man. The law has to do with the relations of men to each other, and not with the relations of men to God. To base these Sunday laws thus upon a divine command, as the civil ground, is to that extent to join Church and State, and to violate the fundamental principles of the State and federal governments. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.4}

In the above paragraph we have a just distinction made between sin and crime. Sin is the violation of the moral law. Crime is a violation of human law. We wish the reader to notice the latter part of the paragraph just quoted. In agreement with arguments we have before presented, he shows that for the State to base its law upon divine command, or to attempt to enforce any one of the divine commands, is the union of Church and State. This was wholesome truth to present before a Sunday convention. We wish every Sunday convention could listen to similar talk. Mr. Fowler continued as follows, concerning the idea that the State could enact a Sunday law on the basis of the divine commandment:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.5}

But such a basis of the Sunday law is not only illegal, but it may be even unscriptural. The Bible itself does not warrant us in inscribing upon the civil statute-books whatever we find to be the mind of the Lord. The Bible does give us a divine standard of moral duty, by which we may discriminate between right and wrong. But it also gives a divine model of wise legislation. It shows there are some things reasonable and some unreasonable to under-take by the civil statute, that statutory law is not to be framed always into exact correspondence with the criterion of individual duty. And this scriptural lesson is one of the very first importance for a Christian citizen of a republic like ours to learn. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.6}

We wish every citizen of this republic might learn this scriptural lesson. The fact that the great body of the National Reformers desire to have the State attempt to re-enact and enforce the law of God, shows, according to Rev. Mr. Fowler, of Cedar Rapids, that they are very deficient in scriptural knowledge; and in this we agree with him. Again Mr. Fowler said:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.7}

If our zealous, well-meaning, but deluded friends of the Sabbath, desire to defeat the very ends they aim at, they want to push to the front, and press upon the law makers this scriptural command for the basis of Sunday laws, until a furor of public’ feeling like that of 1826 again sweeps the country and takes with it every vestige of Sabbath legislation. Many good people, even in these boasted days of religious liberty, fail to understand that the State is not competent to enact divine precepts because they are divine. The law against murder is not on the civil statute-books because it is in the decalogue, but because society could not exist without such a law. The law against stealing is not in the civil code because it was found essential to maintain the rights of property. Government exists to secure to men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to maintain a peaceful and orderly, a mutual, helpful condition of society. Hence its laws simply aim at these ends. They are passed because of some supposed public need, because it is believed the general good requires them. We are bound thus in the matter of the Sunday laws to stand outside of the Bible and argue for them on the same line as all the other laws, because the public need and advantage require them. If we cannot indicate them on these grounds, then they can claim and deserve no place on the statute-books. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.8}

With this also we heartily agree; only one statement might have been made a little stronger, and that is, that laws passed to secure men life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, are passed on account of some supposed public need. There can be no supposition about it. If there is to be any public at all, it is an actual necessity that life and liberty be preserved. But in all these paragraphs which we have quoted the speaker has shown a clear perception of the limitations of human government, and we would that all could read his argument and see the force of it, and agree with him that, if Sunday laws are made to stand, it must be because the public good requires them. The next and closing paragraph of this speech shows how impossible it is to make it appear that the public good requires a Sunday law, and that the Sunday should be enforced for the same reason that laws are enacted against stealing. Said he:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.9}

That a law-guarded rest-day is one of these agencies will hardly be questioned by any reasonable man. On that day peace of God settles down over Sabbath-keeping land. The din of labor ceases, and the din of strife and merry-making, and a few quiet hours are given in which the most engrossed and toil-burdened soul may at least have the opportunity, if it will, to worship God and learn of truths that bear upon a right life. Remember that the law makes no attempt to enforce religion, or even religious observance, on Sunday. It simply institutes a weekly civil holiday, and surrounds it with safe-guards such as subserve the interests of morality and make as favorable as possible. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.10}

In this last paragraph the speaker went against all he had so clearly stated before. His attempt to show that society requires such a law, by stating that on Sunday, if enforced by law, peace settles down over the land, and a few quiet hours are given in which all may have the opportunity to learn of God and truths that bear upon a right life, shows that such laws are at least an attempt to enforce morality. There is not the slightest ground on which a so-called civil Sunday law can be based consistently with justice. If it is said that man needs one day in seven for rest, then we will point to the thousands who are observing the seventh day of the week, and to the scores of thousands who are observing the first day of the week, without any law compelling rest. That is sufficient evidence that no such law is needed. If the law is asked only in order that man may have one day in the week to rest, why is it that many who have strictly and quietly rested on the seventh day have been persecuted for not resting on the first day? They have surely rested one-seventh of the time, and nobody can claim that resting upon the first day of the week will do a man more good than resting upon the seventh. Of course it will be said that the seventh day is not the day that the law recognizes; that the great body of Christians recognize the first day, and therefore the law should demand rest on that day. So then the whole question of the civil Sunday law is given up, and it is admitted that the basis of the law is some supposed superiority of Sunday over other days. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.11}

It needs no argument to show that all the physical good that may be gained by resting on Sunday is gained to an equal extent by resting on Saturday, and as to the good of society we challenge anyone to demonstrate that a society observing the seventh day is not outwardly, to say the least, as good as one which observes the first. But in spite of Mr. Fowler’s little defection at the close of his speech, we think it is a good one, and commend it to the careful perusal of all our readers. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 115.12}

E. J. W.
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We are not the only ones who are curious to know how the American Secular Union is going to get a Manual of the purest principles of morals, without inculcating religious doctrines. One of their own number, Mr. Edward S. Stark, of this city, published an article in the *Truth Seeker*, of February 22, in which he said:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.1}

In its invitation to the contest for an Agnostic Manual of Morality, the Secular Union leaves us in the dark as to whether Agnosticism is meant in its narrow sense, as merely rejecting the religious belief, or that it applies also to the scientific field, in the sense of its purity from prejudices and obscurantism. Science, namely, is apt to produce objectionable consequences the same as religion, if it is not purified from superstitions, servility, and the worshiping of spurious authorities. Without such a purification it may bring about very deplorable results, particularly in such a delicate and entangled question as that of morality, which, while losing its transcendental foundation in religion, is bound to look for a basis elsewhere, and may obtain from the science such a shaky one that the whole structure would not be able to stand on it for a moment... The principal points at issue are: 1. Shall the manual adopt the unscientific hypothesis of a separate soul, existing person, and, under certain aspects, completely independent of the body? Those who may think that it is a question of psychology and not of morals, and that therefore it can be easily avoided, will soon change their mind about it if they try to write upon ethics. This or that hypothesis will, against their wish, transpire through the wording of every sentence. The author will find himself under the necessity of speaking about some sort of immaterial entity underlying moral actions, their righteousness or viciousness. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.2}

These points are well taken. Morals must have a basis. If it is proposed to remove ethics from a religious basis, some other basis must as certainly be supplied; and when any other basis is found, as Mr. Stark says, it will be such a shaky one that the whole structure would not be able to stand on it for a minute. Mr. Stark truly says, the author of such a scheme “will find himself under the necessity of speaking about some sort of material entity underlying moral actions their righteousness or viciousness,” and just as soon as the subject of righteousness is touched, the realm of religion is entered. The fact is, as we proved in our article before on this subject, it is an utter impossibility to inculcate morality without at the same time, inculcating religious doctrine. Morality has no basis other than the religious. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.3}

As time goes on we become more and more curious to see that Manual. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.4}
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March 5 “An act to secure the better observance of the Lord’s day, commonly called Sunday,” was introduced into the Dominion Parliament, and read once. On the following day it passed a second reading, and is in a fair way to become a law. The provisions of this bill are as follows:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.5}

Whoever on the Lord’s day, shall either labor, himself, or shall compel his apprentice, servant, or other person under his control or charge, to labor, or perform any other work than the household offices of daily necessity, or other works of necessity or charity, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.6}

Whoever on the Lord’s day sells, or publicly shows forth or exposes or offers for sale, or purchases, any goods, chattels, or other personal property, or any real estate whatsoever, or does any work or business of his ordinary calling, works of necessity and charity only excepted, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.7}

8. Whoever shall on the Lord’s day, be guilty of promoting, directing, or causing horse-racing, foot-racing, cock-fighting, or dog-fighting, or shall engage in any noisy public game whereby the peace and quiet of the Lord’s day is disturbed, and manual labor made necessary in preparing for and conducting the same, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.8}

4. Whoever shall on the Lord’s day, tipple in any inn, tavern, or house of public entertainment, or shall allow or permit tippling in any such inn, tavern, or house of public entertainment, or shall revel or publicly exhibit himself in a state of intoxication, or shall brawl or use profane language in the public streets or open air, so as to create any riot or disturbance or annoyance to Her Majesty’s peaceable subjects, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.9}

5. Whoever shall on the Lord’s day, hunt, shoot, or pursue or take or kill any game or any Wild bird or animal, or shall discharge firearms, except in the just defense of person or property, or in the performance of military or police duty, or shall use dogs, net, trap; or other appliance for the above-mentioned purposes, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.10}

6. Whoever shall on the Lord’s day, go out fishing, or shall take, kill, or destroy any fish, or use any gun, fishing-rod, net, or other appliance for that purpose, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.11}

7. Whoever shall on the Lord’s day, either as proprietor, publisher, or manager, engage in the printing, publication, and delivery of a newspaper, journal, or periodical; and whoever shall, on the Lord’s day, engage in. the sale, distribution, or circulation of any newspaper, journal, or periodical published on that day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.12}

Sections 8, 9, 10, and 11 deal with traffic on the canals and railways, which is limited to cases of necessity and carriage of perish-able goods, under restrictions. The clause in regard to Sunday excursions is as follows:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.13}

Excursions on the Lord’s day by steamboats plying for hire, or by railway, or part by steamboat and part by railway, and having for their only principal object the carriage of passengers for amusement or pleasure, and to go and return the same day by the steamboat or railway or any other owned by the steamboat or railway or any other owned by the same person or company, shall not be deemed a lawful conveyance of passengers within the meaning of this act; and the owner or corporation, superintendent, or person by virtue of whose authority and direction such excursion is permitted or order on the Lord’s day, shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.14}

The penalties are defined as follows:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.15}

12. Any person convicted before a justice of the peace of any offense declared in sections 1 to 7 of this act, inclusive, to be a misdemeanor, upon the oath of one or more than one credible witness, or upon view had of the said offense by the justice himself, shall for every offense be fined a sum not exceeding fifty dollars, nor less than one dollar, together with the costs and charges attending the proceedings and conviction, and such prosecution shall be commenced within one month of the commission of such offense and not afterwards; and shall be laid and tried in the county or municipality where the offense was committed. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.16}

13. The penalty for any offense committed under sections ten and eleven of the act shall be the imposition of a fine not exceeding four hundred dollars for each offense, to be recovered in any court having jurisdiction in civil cases to that amount, to be recovered by any person suing for the same under this section and for the purpose! {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.17}

14. All sums of money awarded or imposed as fines or penalties by virtue of this act shall be paid, one moiety to the party charging and prosecuting the offense, and the other moiety to the treasurer of the county or city wherein the offense was committed. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.18}

It is further provided that “a conviction under this act shall not be quashed for want of form; nor shall any warrant of commitment be held void by reason of any defect therein.” Persons accused of felony may still have the benefit of all doubts and errors, but violators of the Sunday law, should this bill pass, will not be permitted to escape through any error, no matter how glaring. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.19}

The bill provides no exemptions for any class except Indians, and for no work except “works of necessity and charity.” And no pretense is made that it is a “civil” measure. On the contrary, its author urges its passage because it is demanded by certain religious bodies. Nobody pretends to deny that it is religious legislation, and that it is designed to promote the religious observance of a religious institution. But such a law is no more religious in Canada than are similar measures in this country. And the motive underlying the demand for such legislation is a spirit of intolerance, wherever found. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 116.20}
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We will in our next number give our readers some account of the late National Reform Convention in Washington City. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.1}

Romanism is said to be making considerable headway in Japan, being favored by the emperor because of “its important influence on the civilization of the nation over which he rules.” {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.2}

The Rome correspondent of the *Catholic Review* states that South America is soon to have a Plenary Council of all its Catholic prelates. This simply means that Rome, warned by recent events in Brazil, is about to tighten her grip upon the entire continent. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.3}

It seems that strict Sunday observance under stress of civil law is not the sum of all virtues, nor even a virtue at all; for in Scotland, the country in which they have the strictest Sunday laws, the most rigidly enforced, illegitimacy is greater than in any other civilized country. This shows that something more than civil law is required to make people moral. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.4}

It is announced by Mr. Crafts in the *Christian Statesman* of March 20, that:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.5}

The fight against the mighty evils in this country seems to many of us an unfinished Waterloo. Reinforcements from the religious press must come, or “night.” {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.6}

It is to be hoped that that which comes to this fight of the American Sabbath Union, may be “night,” and everlasting night at that. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.7}

The *Union Signal* speaks of President Harrison as “the ruler of forty-four States.” He is no such thing. He is the servant of the people of forty-four States. The people are the rulers here, and no countenance should ever be given to those people who, imbued with foreign ideas, want to teach that those are rulers, who are only chosen to execute the will of the people. This is sound American doctrine. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.8}

The National Reform position is that Christ is the ruler of nations and that the moral law is the law of nations. But as nations are ruled by men, it follows that men must exercise authority in the name of Christ and interpret and administer the divine law. And as that law is spiritual, it follows that of necessity men must rule in spiritual things. And that is putting men in the place of God, which is the essential principle of the Papacy. Hence the principle of National Reform is identical with that of the Papacy. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.9}

An attorney-at-law in Grand Rapids, Michigan, says:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.10}

“Some friend of mine is sending me the SENTINEL, and I wish to thank him for it. You are laboring in the right direction, for it is all nonsense, this trying to compel people to observe Sunday as a rest-day. Have not we, as a Nation, outgrown such nonsense? Do not the laboring people know when they are tired and need rest, without the appointment of the Nation as a guardian to tell them when they should rest?” {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.11}

In the Methodist ministers’ meeting in Chicago, on the 31st ult., there was a lively discussion on the question of “The Attitude of Rome toward Our System of Education.” Rev. D. R. Shepard, professor of political economy in the Northwestern University, attacked the parochial-school system and said that it appeared to be the design of the Catholic Church to incorporate into the very systems of the children its dogmas and beliefs. He denounced the Romish system of education as “mediæval, inadequate, and weak.” He thought, however, that there was little danger from the fact that the American Catholics are not in hearty sympathy with their own system. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.12}

Rev. Mr. Foster took a different view of the matter and asked: “Does the gentleman mean to say that there is no danger when we see $12,000,000 poured into the coffers of the Roman hierarchy in the city of New York alone, to carry on the work and the policy of that church?” He thought the danger a grave one. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.13}

Dr. W. C. Bennett, professor of the Methodist Institute at Evanston, Indiana, defended the Catholic Church and declared that it did not differ so much from the Methodist Church. He said:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.14}

The Catholic Church has been criticised for having a supreme head, but the Methodist Church and every other church which is not bound to disintegrate, must have a supreme authority, as well as the Catholic Church, and it is nonsense to deny it. The only difference between our church and the Catholic Church on that head is, that the Catholic clergy keep their pledges of obedience to their supreme head better than ours do. There are some things, brethren, from which we might derive useful lessons, in the Catholic Church. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.15}

And this is the attitude of very many Protestants. They are learning of Rome. There is danger in Romanism in this country, but it is more in the fact that Protestants are adopting Romish methods than in the aggressions of the Roman Catholic Church itself. Rome has ever appealed to the civil power for the help which she should have sought from the great Head of the Church, and the tide is setting very strongly in the same direction among American Protestants. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.16}

The Pennsylvania *Miners’ Journal* has the following excellent item:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.17}

The man who believes in the thorough separation of Church and State, cannot approve of reading the Bible in the public schools. Thy are essentially a part of the State institution. The Bible is even more a part of our religious structure. These facts render the two incompatible under the spirit of our Constitution, and make it possible for even our most sincere Christians to consider all religious exercises in school, out of pIace. Religion should be taught in the Church and at home, not in the schools. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of religious faith to all, and we hope the day will never come when that guarantee is nullified even in the slightest degree. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.18}

It is not alone the fact that the giving of religious instruction by the State is incompatible with our institutions by that should cause Christians to consider it “out of place.” Every Christian should oppose even the slightest State interference in things religious because such interference is an infringement of the rights of conscience. The moment we concede the right of the State to require the reading of the Scriptures in the public schools, we admit its right to introduce any other religious instruction which the majority may wish to impose upon the minority. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.19}

*The Better Day* is a new temperance paper published by Funk & Wagnalls, of this city. In introducing to the public this new journal its publishers say:- {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.20}

We offer you something new in the history of the world. Temperance papers of every style are happily numerous, and many of the highest ability. But never yet has one appeared devoted directly to the great work of temperance education, which more than all else holds the future. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.21}

The temperance cause has reached a point where systematic study of its vast and rich literature is imperatively demanded. We propose a course of study which shall do for temperance what the Chautauqua course has done for literature and science. This plan is not partisan nor political, but simply an attempt to form an intelligent, public sentiment on the subject, on the importance of which all friends of temperance are absolutely agreed. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.22}

We are most happy that a paper of this kind has been started. Such a publication is much needed, and if properly conducted ought to command a good support. We wish *The Better Day* success in its educational temperance work. And we trust that it will succeed in avoiding the fate of all other so-called temperance papers, namely, that of becoming the mere adjunct of a political party, or the organ of an association or society. {AMS April 10, 1890, p. 120.23}
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The organ of the American Sabbath Union say:- {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 121.1}

Judge Hutchins, acting police magistrate, Cleveland, Ohio, recently discharged Barber Charles Schuler, one of the Weddell House men arrested in January for violating the State law against common labor on Sunday, on the ground that Sunday shaving is a work *of* necessity. It is expected that all the hotel barber shops, and most of the others whose proprietors do not favor Sunday closing, will be thrown open Sunday, as the barbers are satisfied that no convictions can follow their arrest for violating either the State or city ordinance upon the subject. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 121.2}

This is a little more liberal than the decisions of some of the southern courts. In Tennessee and several other southern States quiet, inoffensive men have been fined and imprisoned for no other offense than that of working upon Sunday for the support of their families, and that after having conscientiously kept the seventh day according to the strict letter of the divine law. If shaving is a work of necessity in Ohio, certainly the cutting of wood ought to be a work of necessity in Georgia, and plowing corn ought not to be a punishable offense in Tennessee. The whole thing goes to show the injustice of treating as a crime on Sunday that which would be considered perfectly proper and even commendable upon any other day. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 121.3}
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The *Colorado Graphic* remarks that “fortunately for the dignity, intelligence, and discretion of Denver’s Christian clerical force, only a minority has taken active part in the Sunday-legislation movement.” {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.1}

The report is being circulated to some extent that some of the judges on the Supreme Bench of Wisconsin are Roman Catholics, and hence the late decision on the question of the Bible in the schools. We have it upon good authority, and direct, that not one of the members of that court is a Roman Catholic. The decision would be just and right, however, even if every one of them were a Roman Catholic. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.2}

The report of the Treasurer of the National Reform Association, at its recent annual meeting, shows that the receipts of the society for the past year were $7,179.13. Of this amount $5,374.61 had been expended, mostly in salaries to District Secretaries. The work of the society is not however represented by this sum, for a good deal has been accomplished by special secretaries who work without remuneration. Secretary Weir reported that he had preached one hundred sermons on National Reform topics to audiences aggregating twenty-one thousand persons. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.3}

The following paragraph, in a private letter from Baltimore, Maryland, is evidence of the rapid tendency toward strict formality in Sunday observance, and the readiness of municipal authorities to undertake its enforcement by city ordinances:- {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.4}

The ringing of milkmen’s bells, and street-car bells has not been stopped in the city of Baltimore, on Sunday, as yet. But there is a city ordinance pending (introduced at the last sitting of the city council) which does call for the bells on horses attached to street-cars, to be removed on Sunday. Also, that milkmen’s bells are not to be rung on Sunday. This ordinance has had its first reading, and been referred to a committee. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.5}

The city Comptroller furnishes this information, and gives it as his opinion, that the ordinance will pass, in due time. He also informed me, that this was in accordance with the best wishes of the Protestant ministers and their congregations of the city of Baltimore. By request of the ministers of the city in the form of a petition to street-car managers, nearly all the street-car bells have been left off the horses on Sunday, voluntarily, but not by city ordinances, as yet. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.6}

It seems, at first thought, peculiarly inapt, that Baltimore, the earliest home of knightly aristocracy, should be the first, in this millennial dawn of the new era of municipal religion, to undertake the enforcement of a Puritan Sunday. That such should be the case, is food for thought. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.7}

Had the “wise man” lived in this age, he might have added to the four things which were too wonderful for him, a fifth,-“the way of a politician with the Church.” {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.8}

Rev. R. M. Somerville, of New York, an ardent National Reformer, likens Christ when excluded from civil government to a captain at sea, having a vessel and a crew, but being prohibited from entering any harbor. He does not explain wherein the likeness consists, but as a vessel in such a condition would be liable to be wrecked, Mr. Somerville must regard the Lord as in imminent danger of losing his craft (the Church) because civil governments deny him the aid of their puny strength. This is only to say that without the aid of the civil power, Christ’s mission must fail. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.9}

In a speech in Congress a few days since, Representative Dorsey, of Nebraska, said that the only opposition to the admission of Idaho was on the part of Mormons, who objected to the provision in the Constitution disfranchising them. This is not strictly correct. The National Reformers also object to the admission of Idaho, but for a different reason, namely: because the Constitution under which the State is seeking admission forbids religious instruction in the schools. The hope was expressed in the Washington convention that Congress would not admit Idaho with such a constitutional provision. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.10}

The *Weekly Witness,* a religious paper of this city, remarks that {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.11}

As a meddler in politics the Church of Rome is always and everywhere an unmitigated curse; just as any Protestant church would be which should insist on being reckoned with, as a church, in all matters of administration, and especially in the dispensing of public moneys. We are very decidedly opposed to the religious teachings of the Church of Rome, but in so far as it limits its teaching and claims to matters of religion we are prepared to treat it with respect as an institution which has as good a right to exist as any Protestant Church. When it steps out of its proper sphere, however, to make money out of politics, then it is time for Protestants of all denominations and of all parties to unite in opposition to it. If any Protestant Church should take a similar position it should meet with the same condemnation. But no Protestant Church would dare to do so, or could obtain the support of its own members if it did. The Roman Catholic Church is different from all others in this country, except the Mormon Church, in that it is essentially a political institution; always has been so and always must be, because it claims absolute and universal sovereignty as the authorized representative of Christ the true King and Ruler of the world. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.12}

This criticism is certainly just, as applied to the Romish Church. Any political church is a curse whether it be Rome everywhere or the Mormon Church in Utah. And yet this is just the position National Reformers and are determined that the Protestant Church as a whole shall assume. They demand that the several Protestant bodies shall make common cause and insist on being reckoned with as churches in all matters of administration. If the Protestant churches shall do this, as they seem inclined to do, will they not then be just as much of a curse as the Papal Church, and for the very same reason? The question admits of but one answer. Does it not follow that the real friends of Protestantism are those who desire that the Protestant churches shall have nothing to do with politics”? {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.13}

The true spirit of National Reform, though carefully concealed in the Washington Convention by most of the speakers, cropped out in President Sylvester S. Scovel’s address on the “Limitations of Liberty.” Referring to our foreign population he said that if necessary they should “be educated with the bludgeon, and if the offense was repeated, with the blunderbuss.” It was formerly considered necessary to kill people in order to save them, but that method of preaching the gospel has not been much in vogue for some time. It is evident however that the National Reformers hope to be able to revive it. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.14}

*The Associated Press of Reforms* is the name of a new quarterly publication which the “Reform Syndicate” of this city has just launched upon the treacherous sea of polemic journalism. The whilom field secretary of the American Sabbath Union is the manager of the syndicate, and as the new paper is a “special publication for publishers and editors of periodicals,” and as the matter which it contains is secured by copyright, and as the copyright articles are to be released for re-publication for twelve dollars per year, or furnished in plates at very reasonable rates, it seems that the principle object of the syndicate is to get their “reform” matter into country papers which are printed largely from plates, Mr. Crafts is, it must be admitted, fertile in expedients. {AMS April 17, 1890, p. 128.15}
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The decision of the Wisconsin Supreme Court against the Bible in the public schools is called a victory for the Catholics. Strictly speaking this is not true. It is a victory for everybody who loves justice and the rights of men. Yet in a certain sense it is a victory for the Catholics, that is, in the sense that they are the ones who had the courage to fight the battle by which the victory was won. In this sense it is a victory for the Catholics. It is an honorable one too and they are justly entitled to the credit of it. But it is a shame to the Protestantism of Wisconsin, that the fighting of such a battle and the winning of such a victory had to be by Roman Catholics. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 129.1}

The Emperor of Germany, when getting up his labor conference, appointed a Roman Catholic Bishop as one of the German delegates and at the same time announced to the Pope that he relied upon the support of the Catholic clergy in settling the questions involved, and the Pope, in reply said that this question “would be best solved by the application of Sunday rest and religious education.” Thus, as the Sunday-rest movement spreads, the Pope comes more and more into prominence in the matter; and when that movement becomes universal, as these international efforts will make it, the Pope will be, in that matter, again the recognized universal head. This is very becoming. Universal Sunday laws before were synonymous with the Papal headship of the world, and when they become universal again, the same thing will be again. The two belong together. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 129.2}
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To those people who are making such strenuous efforts to have a general religion “a broad Christianity,” adopted by the United States Government, we have a proposition to make, which, if accepted and carried out, will demonstrate the virtue of their professions. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 129.3}

There is just now considerable talk about the establishing of a National University. The Roman Catholics have established a university at the national capital. Now it would do no good, even if it could be accomplished, for each one of the different Protestant denominations to establish a university also at Washington; therefore, what we propose is this: Let all the Protestant denominations, those broad Christians, those who think that religion and sectarianism are distinct and separate things,-let these unite in that blessed harmony which they advocate, and go to Cardinal Gibbons, and his associate authorities in this country, and, by a general consensus of opinion, reach a harmonious view of God and religion and morals. Then by generous contributions let them secure proportionate shares in the property of the university al-ready established; and make it indeed a national one, in which they can set before the Nation a living actual illustration of that all-absorbing charity and unity in Christian graces, principles, and methods, which they profess. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 129.4}

This is a fair proposition. The way is open for them to show that their professions are genuine; that their views of the relations between State and religion are sound, and that it is the easy task which they profess, to make it a success. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 129.5}

Or, if it be too great a task for Protestants thus to unite with Roman Catholics at the very first effort, then we submit this proposition-that they establish for themselves: a national Protestant university at Washington city. Let them decide just what principles shall be taught there, as the principles of genuine Christianity. Let them agree upon the true basis of morals; let them choose a board, settle the faculty, and illustrate upon a national plane the virtues of that broad Christianity, that unsectarian religion, and that standard of general morality which they profess and advocate, and which they claim it would be so easy for the State to adopt and enforce. If they will do this to their own satisfaction, and to the satisfaction of the people of the Nation, then their movement to have the State do likewise would have so much, at least, in its favor, that they could point to the actual facts in the case, and show that agreement in these things were possible. But until some such effort as this shall have been made, some attempt at least to do or show that that can be done, which they demand the State shall do, their professions and their pretensions that such a thing can be done will lack that force by which alone arguments can ever be made to carry conviction. Will they try it? {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 129.6}
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It is a standing reproach to the sober sense of the American people that there have been found amongst them 330,000 persons who would buy Edward Bellamy’s nonsensical book “Looking Backward.” {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.1}

Says the *Union Signal: “* Time was when a large proportion of the Christian world would have looked upon any marked observance of Lent as a relic of Popery, and while we gazed with interest upon Easter ceremonies, we nevertheless regarded them as spectacular and unnecessary.” Yes, that is so. It would be a good thing if that time would come again and continue indefinitely. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.2}

Miss Willard announces that “there is to be a party that will combine the farmer and the wage earner, that will make its force felt in the next campaign, and the Prohibition Party will form the nucleus. When that time comes, we will side with it and will take the consequences.” If she means indeed “the consequences,” then if that party wins, we pity her. It would be worse consequences than we should ever wish to see befall a human being. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.3}

Of the Nationalistic theories set forth by Edward Bellamy the *Voice* says: “The millennium lies somewhere in the direction this movement is heading.” As to whereabouts in this direction the millennium probably lies, the *Voice* allows that “it may be ten thousand years distant.” That is a very safe estimate. It is certainly not any nearer than that, and how much further off it is does not materially concern either the present or the rising generation. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.4}

The Presbyterian Synod of New York has, for several years, been working in behalf of religion in the public schools. A committee is appointed each year to have charge of the matter. This year again this committee on religion and public education has been appointed to confer with other denominations and seek their co-operation in the effort to introduce in the public schools some positive religious teaching as an essential part of the curriculum. Amongst the members appointed to confer with the several conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we find the name of Dr. Howard Crosby. That is a very appropriate appointment. We hope all the others are of the same kind, because Dr. Crosby is openly and decidedly opposed to any religious instruction what-ever in the public schools. We are not acquainted with the position of any of the other persons named, but we hope they are all of the same mould of thought and opinion on this subject as is Dr. Crosby. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.5}

If the Sunday newspaper is such an outrageously wicked, such an all-polluting thing, and if it is such a heinous sin to read it, it is a query with us how in the world all the Sunday-law preachers know so much about it? Although they warn everybody against it under penalty of the imputation of a great sin, yet they them-selves seem to know all about it; they can tell exactly how many columns of gossip, how much scandal, etc., different editions of the Sunday paper contain. How can these things be? {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.6}

A statement that is quite often made, and which seems to be considered of much weight, by the workers for religious legislation is that “your rights end where mine begin.” This statement has not a particle of truth in it. It is simply another form of expressing their arrogant assumption of all rights. For if your rights end where mine begin, then it is for me to decide where mine do begin, and wherever that may be, there your rights must end. Don’t you see? In other words, all the rights that you have are just such as I choose to allow. The truth of the matter is that rights are perfectly equal. Your rights begin where mine begin; and end only where mine end. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.7}

That Wisconsin decision has caused wide-spread discussion, but none too wide. It is interesting to see the course that the discussion takes. The great majority of the secular papers indorse it. In fact, we have found but one that does not indorse it, and that is the *Inter-Ocean.* On the other hand, the religious papers and preachers, especially the Methodist, strongly disapprove. The New York *Independent* unqualifiedly indorses it. The *Christian Advocate* is the representative journal of all Methodism in the United States. It decidedly disapproves of the decision. It says:- {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.8}

It seems very odd that the Bible should be gravely pronounced a sectarian book by the chief tribunal of one of the States of this eminently Christian country and so does the argument by which the court sustains that pronouncement. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.9}

This position of the Protestant preachers and religious papers only goes further to show what the wide-spread demand for religious legislation had already made manifest, that in what passes for Protestantism, there is no disposition to recognize any such principle as equality of rights before men. And just as surely as that Protestantism should ever secure control of the civil power, it would be as cruel and unrelenting as ever a religious despotism was. That which professes to-day to be representative Protestantism has forgotten both what Protestantism is and what Christianity is. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.10}

The *Union Signal* of April 3, announces Senator Blair’s re-introduction of his educational bill, and says:- {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.11}

Now let every white ribboner bestir herself writing letters on behalf of our local unions to the Senators of the respective States, urging the adoption of this bill, and let us set at work, and in this difficult emergency, having done all, stand. Mrs. Mary H. Hunt is in Washington to foward the new movement, and will wisely direct our forces as heretofore Mrs. Bittenbender will also work unceasingly for the measure. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.12}

Yes, Senator Blair’s theory of government and the purposes of his legislation are directly in the line of things of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. As we have shown in the SENTINEL, the theory of government contemplated in that legislation is directly the reverse of that of the United States Government, and it is directly opposed to Christian principles, and, in short, aims at the subversion of Christianity itself. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.13}

There is opposition also in Canada against the Dominion Sunday Law that is proposed for enactment. A correspondent of the Moncton *Times* says:- {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.14}

A reaction has set in against Charlton’s Sabbath observance bill and petitions against its passage headed, “A Plea for Religious Liberty,” and praying the Commons not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of Sabbath or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution, or to favor the adoption of any legislation to conflict with the rights of conscience, were presented to-day from Westmoreland, Scots’ Bay, Tiverton, Digby, French Village, Hallfax, Dartmouth, Indian Harbor, Moncton and Truro. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.15}

That is right. Let the good work go on. Call the attention of legislators to the essential evil that belongs with such legislation. Our friends in Canada have not the constitutional basis for their opposition that we have in this country, but they have all the basis of inalienable civil and religious rights that we have in this country, or that people have anywhere else, and that is the strongest basis that any argument can have. This proposed legislation gives to the friends of liberty of conscience an excellent opportunity to make known to the people of Canada what are the sound principles of Christianity upon the separation between religion and the State. We hope they will employ the opportunity for all that it is worth. {AMS April 24, 1890, p. 136.16}