**“Sunday Closing and Temperance in England” American Sentinel 12, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

Speaking recently of the Sunday-closing Bill, which is now the chief object of “temperance” zeal, the Bishop of Norwich, while favoring it, did not think that at present it is practicable, in that it is “one-sided and partial legislation,” applying only to the poor, and leaving the rich free to drink as much as they please. He said, moreover, that his personal experience taught him that “no person would more heartily welcome a very great restriction on Sunday opening-say to quite a short period in the middle of the day-than the great bulk of honest and right-thinking publicans themselves.” {AMS November 11, 1897, p. 695.1}

But nobody ever yet heard of a publican of any kind who was in favor of a diminution in the drink traffic, any more than of a clothing merchant who was in favor of people wearing less clothing and a less expensive sort. So the very fact that publicans can be cited as favoring the Sunday closing of public-houses, shows that it is in no sense whatever a temperance measure. {AMS November 11, 1897, p. 695.2}

Instead of being a temperance measure, the Sunday-closing effort is in reality an attempt to build up Sunday observance at the expense of temperance reform. The whole tendency of the agitation is to teach people that there is nothing inherently wrong in the liquor traffic, but that the evil consists in carrying it on on Sundays. To illustrate: A mother sees her little boy playing ball on Sunday, and being a devout Sunday observer, says, “John, you must not play ball to-day; it is Sunday.” John understands perfectly well that his mother has no objection to ball-playing in itself, but only to Sunday play. But suppose John were worrying a kitten, and his mother should say, “You ought not to worry that kitten to-day, my boy, it is Sunday;” could he think anything else than that it was perfectly allowable to worry kittens on other days than Sunday? {AMS November 11, 1897, p. 695.3}

It may be urged that if the public can be educated up to the point of accepting the restriction of the liquor traffic to the last six days of the week, it will be a long step towards getting them to see that it should be suppressed altogether. If this were true, then it would apply to all other business. No; all that can be won by the Sunday-closing agitation is more homage to the Sunday. If there were in it any real recognition of the evil of the liquor traffic, then the man who saw the point would he opposed to the traffic every day. Sin is sin, no matter on what day of the week it is committed. If a man commits a murder, the sin is not enhanced by the fact that the deed was done on the Sabbath. It is a fact that many things are lawful on the six working days of the week, which are not lawful on the Sabbath day, and many of those who believe that Sunday is the Sabbath are laboring hard to put liquor-selling in that list. If they wish to teach the stricter observance of Sunday, they have that right, but let them not delude themselves with the idea that they are furthering the cause of temperance. *London, Eng.* {AMS November 11, 1897, p. 695.4}

**“A Sign of the Times” American Sentinel 12, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Present Truth.) London, Eng**

“One of the most notable signs of the times,” says the current *Review of Reviews*, was the action at the Zurich Socialist Labor Congress in favor of making Sunday the universal compulsory day of rest. {AMS November 18, 1897, p. 711.1}

“There were two propositions before the Congress, both insisting on one day’s rest in seven, but the English Socialists objected to stipulating that this day must be Sunday. Their Continental brethren-owing largely to the influence and numbers of the Catholic Socialists-would have no other day but Sunday, and after an animated debate voted down the English opposition by a large majority.” {AMS November 18, 1897, p. 711.2}

The Catholics were only standing by the papal principle of enforced religious observances, by the institution which Rome in all her teaching claims as the mark of her authority. She boasts of having substituted Sunday for the Sabbath without Bible authority, and whatever builds up her substitute adds to her prestige. {AMS November 18, 1897, p. 711.3}

Mr. Stead thus commends these Catholics for outvoting the English delegates, who seem to have stood for that freedom of choice which even God will not take from them:- {AMS November 18, 1897, p. 711.4}

“This was well don’t! If the rest day is to be generally observed, there must be a general agreement as to what day it shall be. That is why, from the general humanitarian point of view, the Seventh-day Adventists, etc., have always seemed to me to be among the most pernicious of Protestant sects.” {AMS November 18, 1897, p. 711.5}

If so, it is because they are the most Protestant, and the more scripturally Protestant and Christian a movement is the more pernicious will it be considered by any who stand for the papal principle of state-enforced religion of human invention. This issue is of tremendous importance to humanity. {AMS November 18, 1897, p. 711.6}

What is humanity’s need?-It is salvation from sin. God only has power to save men from the greed and selfishness and oppression eating into the vitals of society. He only can save men from lawlessness by writing his law in their hearts. But when would-be social reformers shut away his power from men, and teach the world to reject his word and commands, they are shutting away the only hope and Saviour of humanity. And God declares that his Sabbath is the sign of his power to save and sanctify. It is a question of loyalty to God, in which way alone is there hope for men. {AMS November 18, 1897, p. 711.7}