

American Presbyterian.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1866.

CONTENTS OF INSIDE PAGES.

SECOND PAGE—FAMILY CIRCLE: Psalm VI.—Ralph Norton (Concluded)—Thoughtfulness—Reynolds as a Painter of Children—The Wren's Nest—Table Manners; or, How to Deal with Unruly Children—False Teaching—Freddie's Triumph—Be Honest; an Incident at a Recent Fire—Losing the Happy out of the Heart—Drinking by the Ace.

upon them and thoroughly restored to activity all the old rebel spirit of proscriptio and hate. There was now no Presbyterian minister in Nashville to bestow on him the common civilities of a gentleman, to say nothing of those due from one minister to another; and no church but his own where he would be allowed to officiate. To a union man, Nashville was never a more intolerable place of residence than now; and the serpent hiss of rebel woe never more keen than now. Our last hope, he said, is now in your impending action. Your doings for the next few days will almost determine the question whether it will be safe for me to return—whether, in fact, the incorruptible loyal people now in Nashville will not be compelled to emigrate.

News of our Churches.

LETTER OF THANKS.—A grateful congregation, whose prosperity is now and prospectively of great importance to our cause in its region, sends us the following:—

LAWRENCE, KANSAS. EDITOR AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN.—Dear Sir:—I desire to say through your columns, for the information of our friends in the East, that we have succeeded in furnishing our chapel for the First Presbyterian Church (N. S.) of this city, and our church and Society are now in a most prosperous condition. Rev. Michael Hummer has been greatly instrumental in bringing about this happy result. He acted as our agent, for a time, at the East, and immediately on his return gave us a full and most satisfactory report of his agency, giving us in detail the names of churches and individuals who have so kindly assisted us and relieved our little church of embarrassments.

In behalf of our society, I desire to tender our unfeigned thanks. Respectfully, W. P. MONTGOMERY, Treas. Board of Trustees of the First Pres. Church, Lawrence, Kansas.

IOWA CITY PRESBYTERY.—The Action of Iowa City Presbytery as to the Schism of the First Constitutional Presbytery of Iowa City, and the Agency therein of Rev. George D. A. Hebard and Rev. Benjamin Talbot.

Extracts from the records of Presbytery in session at Marengo, Sept. 12, 1866. The committee to whom was referred the matters appertaining to the schism of the First Constitutional Presbytery of Iowa City, after careful deliberation and consideration, as fully as time would permit, report to Presbytery as follows: 1. That the action of the Session, Trustees, and a majority of the members of the Constitutional Presbytery of Iowa City, being without advice or authority of Presbytery, was irregular and disorderly.

Resolved, That the Constitutional Presbytery of Iowa City were justified in electing James Cavanagh, Joseph Love, and Nicholas Oakes, as Trustees, for the preservation of their property.

Extracts from the minutes of the Presbytery in session at Iowa City, September 27, 1866. The special committee to whom was referred the report of the committee of investigation in regard to certain general rumors respecting certain members of this body, in relation to the division of the First Constitutional Presbytery of Iowa City, report that Presbytery has heretofore declared, that the proceedings of the Session, Trustees, and a majority of the Church, as it was before the disruption, were irregular and disorderly; and now find in a session at Iowa City, that the Rev. Geo. D. A. Hebard, stated supply of said Church at the time, and the Rev. Benj. Talbot, a Trustee and supporter of said Church, both members of Iowa City Presbytery, have had an active agency in bringing about this result.

But, upon their acknowledgement of their errors in acting, without authority or counsel of the Presbytery, in promoting this unhappy division, the Presbytery grant the ministers aforesaid letters of dismission to the Grinnell Association, according to their request. (Signed.) F. L. ARNOLD, } Com. A. DANSKIN, } Com. E. B. TALBOT, } Com.

The majority of the same committee further report the following resolution, which was adopted. Resolved, That Presbytery regard the right of the minority, being the present Presbyterian Church, to hold all the real and personal property, and all moneys raised for Church purposes and not expended prior to the division of the church; and cannot at this time recommend the discontinuance of the Constitutional Presbytery of Iowa City, but would recommend a committee empowered to advise with the First Constitutional Presbytery of Iowa City, and that this committee be, Alexander Porter and Samuel Storms Howe, Ministers, and Almon Barnes, Elder.

(Signed.) F. L. ARNOLD, } Com. A. DANSKIN, } Com. E. B. TALBOT, } Com. Published by order of the Presbytery of Iowa City. A true copy of the minutes. SAMUEL STORMS HOWE, Stated Clerk.

TEMPERANCE—SYNODICAL ACTION.—The Synod of Western Pennsylvania, at its meeting in Meadville, Sept. 28th, adopted the following paper on Temperance:—

- 1. In the great increase and extensive prevalence of intemperance, we recognize a great danger to our country and approach to the Christian Church. 2. We hail, as one of the most encouraging signs of the times, the revival of the cause of temperance throughout our land; and especially that this cause is now more directly identified with the Christian Church than ever before. 3. It is the duty of every church member to set himself actively against the practice of moderate drinking, because it is the nursery of drunkenness.

4. We commend to the consideration of the churches, the action of our late General Assembly, which asserts that the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage, however moderately, is contrary to the word of God.

5. We recommend that this cause be made much more prominent in all our Sabbath-schools.

6. It is ordered that this testimony be prepared for publication in the following papers:—New York Evangelist, American Presbyterian and Christian Herald; and also that it be read in all the pulpits of our Synod on the first Sabbath in November, or as soon thereafter as may be.

By order of Synod. Com. P. S. DAVIES, } JOSEPH DIXSON, } MEADVILLE, Oct. 1st, 1866.

SYNOD OF IOWA.—At the late session of this Synod, held in Marshalltown, an important and energetic move was made for the advance of the Home Missionary work within its bounds. It appears that the Synod's Committee on this subject had applied to the Assembly's Permanent Committee for the appointment of a minister whom they had found qualified and willing for the service, as a Synodical Missionary, but that the Permanent Committee had been compelled, by the state of its treasury, to withhold the appointment. In view of this state of things, the members of the Synod, by a unanimous vote, pledged themselves to labor at least to double the amount of their respective Home Missionary collections, and to make that pledge the basis of a renewal of the application for a Synodical Missionary. The resolution speaks of the necessity for such a laborer as extreme. The statistical report showed that the Synod has fifty-four ministers, fifty-nine churches two thousand three hundred and fifty-four communicants, two licentiates, and four candidates for the ministry. There has been, during the year, an increase of three ministers, two licentiates, three churches, and two hundred and sixty-eight communicants.

PRESBYTERY OF HURON.—This Presbytery, at its stated meeting held last month, found the reports on the state of religion more than commonly interesting, showing that God's blessing has attended the labors of his servants in an unwonted degree. Eight of the churches have, during the year, been specially refreshed with religious influence, among which those of Milan, Plymouth and Monroeville have had the largest accessions. The two former have received upwards of fifty each, and the latter thirty, by profession. Much rest was manifested in the Presbytery for its home work, and it was resolved that it be recommended to the churches to give up one sermon each month, if necessary, in order that the pastors may take the time for ministering in destitute neighborhoods.

KINGSTON, TENN., PRESBYTERY.—Messrs. Editors.—I am instructed to send you the following report for publication:—

The Home Missionary work of the N. S. Presbyterian Church has manifestly assumed, during the present year, a magnitude and importance greater than in any previous period of her history. New, inviting and extensive fields of labor have been opened; and from almost every section of the vast American Continent she hears the Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us." The Church must not neglect to fill these fields with efficient laborers; she must not turn a deaf ear to this important cry. The call for men and money to meet the demands of the work, is loud and imperative, and the appeal to the liberality of all our people is unanswerable. They cannot fail to elicit a prompt and hearty response.

The Minutes of the General Assembly, as well as the history of the Church, demonstrate the fact that those branches of the Church which practice the largest benevolence have been most abundantly blessed and prospered—that the reflex influence of benevolence is powerful for good upon the churches that practice it. And it is hoped, for the improvement of our own field in East Tennessee, that ministers and churches will devise and adopt some plan of systematic benevolence in this time of need. Therefore, Resolved, 1st. That the ministers of Kingston Presbytery, appreciating the demands and difficulties of the Home Missionary work, be enjoined to present its claims at the earliest practicable period to their respective churches, and to make a united effort, on the first Sabbath in October, to raise contributions for the use of the Presbyterian Home Missionary Committee. 2d. That the ministers of our respective churches urge their people to hold monthly concerts of prayer for the conversion of the world; and that it is hereby suggested that the contributions raised at these concerts be equally divided between the Home and Foreign fields.

3d. That as the necessities of our Zion require, and as prosperity always attends the churches that disperse benevolence; and as God's unerring Word assures us, "It is more blessed to give than receive;" we would therefore earnestly recommend to our ministers, church sessions, Sabbath-school superintendents and teachers, to devise and put into execution some measure of systematic benevolence, in order that the habit of giving may be cultivated, and that the treasury of the Lord may be filled. 4th. That the funds raised in our several churches in October next, be forwarded to the Committee of Home Missions, New York, Rev. H. Kendall, D. D. Secretary.

5th. That as the Presbyterian Monthly, published at Philadelphia, is a valuable organ to aid in diffusing missionary intelligence and to promote benevolence, we recommend the introduction of it into all the churches within our bounds. A true extract from the minutes. Wm. B. BROWN, Stated Clerk of Presb. of Kingston, CLEVELAND, TENN., Sept. 15, 1866.

SALEM, IND. PRESBYTERY.—At the recent meeting of this Presbytery, the Church of Mt. Zion asked and obtained leave to employ Rev. Henry W. Fisk, of Vincennes Presbytery, (O. S.), as stated supply. The Christian Herald says that he enters upon this field in conjunction with a near Old School church, under very pleasant prospects, and with the hearty good wishes of the Presbytery. At the same meeting, a subject which meets the most serious consideration was taken up, and the following resolution concerning it adopted, viz: "That it be enjoined on all of our pastors and stated supplies to labor and develop the spiritual life and working power of their Sessions in the respective churches; and to this end, that the sessions be requested to hold, at least, monthly meetings."

NORTHERN NEW YORK.—The Presbytery of Champlain has given a pastor to the church in Essex, a pleasant little town on the west shore of Lake Champlain. Mr. C. N. Wilder was ordained and installed in the pastorate there on the 11th ult., Rev. E. Cutter, D. D., of Worcester, Mass., preaching the sermon, and Rev. Messrs. H. E. Butler and A. D. Barber giving the charges.

MINISTRIAL.—The Presbytery of Montrose, on the 12th ult., ordained Mr. William A. Dumming to the work of the Gospel ministry. Mr. D. is ministering as Stated Supply to the church in Hawley, Wayne Co., Pa.—Rev. German H. Chatterton, a recent graduate of the Auburn Seminary, has taken charge of the church in Janesville, Iowa.—Rev. S. B. Bell, D. D., formerly of California, is about to be installed at Lyons, N. Y.—Rev. J. S. Bingham has transferred his relation from the Genesee River Presbytery, Old School, to the Genesee Valley Presbytery, N. S., and is preaching at Belmont, N. Y.—Rev. S. H. Moore has become Stated Supply of the church at Susquehanna, N. Y.

SAN FRANCISCO.—The correspondent of The Evangelist says that Dr. Scudder's popularity suffers no abatement, his house being crowded at every service. In a little over a year, which covers the time of his residence here, he has received 120 additions to his church, a large proportion of the number being on profession of faith. This is a larger increase than has ever characterized any communion here covering the same time. The new house of worship erected for his church is expected to be ready for occupancy before the year closes. It is well located, and will seat about 1200 persons.

SUNDAY CAR QUESTION.

ARGUMENT FOR THE COMPLAINANTS, In the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Oct. 3d and 5th, Judge Strong upon the Bench.

ARGUMENT OF MR. PATTERSON.

O. Stuart Patterson, on behalf of the complainants, opened the argument. Mr. Patterson said:—There are to be argued to-day two motions for a special injunction to restrain the Union Passenger Railway Company from running its cars on Sunday; one, at the suit of a stockholder in the company; the other, at the suit of sixteen citizens of Philadelphia, six of whom occupy houses on the line of the road over which the Company runs its cars, and ten of whom are pewholders in churches, also on that line. I will, in the first place, consider the stockholder's bill. The right of the owner of one or more shares of stock in a corporation, to the interposition of a court of law, to restrain the corporation from action "ultra vires" is well settled; so well settled, indeed, that it has been held in some cases, (of which Sandford vs. The R. R. Co., 12 Har. 378, is one), that even if the complaining stockholder is setting in the interest of a rival corporation, and has but lately purchased his stock, and that for the very purpose of asking the court to enjoin, he shall, notwithstanding, have the relief prayed, if the action sought to be restrained be really "ultra vires." That the action here sought to be restrained, the running of a car on Sunday, is not within the corporate power of the Company defendant, will appear from the following considerations: The Act of April 22d, 1794, forbids "worldly employment or business on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday." The judicial construction of that Act has been settled by a long series of cases, of which the most important is The Commonwealth vs. Jeandelle, 2 Grant's Rep., in which Judge Thompson expressly decided that the running of street cars on Sunday was within the prohibition of that Act. If that be the law, as I believe it is, it is unlawful for this Company to run its cars on Sunday, unless it can show some special power enabling it so to do. Its charter contains no express power to that effect. Implied power there cannot be, for a corporation can only exercise the powers expressly granted to it, and such implied powers as are incident to all corporations, or essential to the powers granted. The power to run cars on Sunday is neither incident to corporations in general, nor necessary to the exercise of the power of running those cars on the days of the week. But it is contended for the defendants, that their mail contract gives them the needed power. To this we answer, that the contract with the Post-office Department is invalid for want of power on the part of the corporation to enter into it. They were chartered by the Act of April 8th, 1864, the 4th section of which expresses the legislative intent that they shall transport passengers, and that they shall not carry any mail, and it is declared that the Company hereby incorporated, "shall be subject to the ordinances of the city of Philadelphia, regulating the running of passenger railways;" one of those ordinances, that of April 1st, 1859, declares in express terms, "that no passenger railway shall, at any time, be used for any other purpose than passenger travel."

But even if the company could enter into the contract, that contract could not authorize the company to carry passengers in violation of the municipal law of the State, for the reason that the company can fulfill its contract to the very letter, without carrying a passenger; indeed, without running a car. They can carry the mail by private messengers, on foot, on horseback, or in wagons. Whatever the nature of that mail contract, however great the privileges it confers, the carrying of passengers for hire, in defiance of the law of the State, cannot be a necessary incident to it, but must be regarded as a dis-

tinct business, and as such, not to be protected by the mail contract. Lastly, with regard to this stockholder's bill, it is to be remarked, that he asks the aid of equity to restrict corporate action within legal corporate limits, and does not seek to restrain it in one lawful act, nor to deprive it of one legitimate source of profit.

I contend, therefore, that the complainant is entitled to the relief he asks, and that the injunction should be granted, because the "ultra vires" is a breach of the contract of partnership, to which the complainant is an interested party, and endangers the loss of his stock by imperiling the corporate franchise.

In the second place, the citizens' bill: It is well settled that a private individual may maintain a bill for an injunction in a case of public nuisance, when he suffers a particular injury therefrom. In this case, there is, first, the injury to the citizens at large, in the use of the public streets, on a Sunday without authority of law; and, second, the injury to the complainants, in noise caused by the running of the cars, which disturbs the quiet of the Sabbath, interferes with the complainants' enjoyment of their property in their houses and pews in churches; and, in the opinion of many witnesses, has seriously diminished the value of those homes and churches. If the law authorized the cars to run on Sunday, and the complainants asked the court to enjoin, it might then be proper to ask if the damage to them was irreparable; but in this case, the acts which disturb and annoy are forbidden by law, and in order to secure the aid of chancery, it is only necessary to show a substantial injury; the amount of that injury is immaterial; for it has been often decided that a corporation will be kept within the limits of its legal powers, and that when it oversteps the bounds of law and infringes upon the right of individuals, a court of equity will enjoin.

One word as to the penalty imposed by the act of 1794 for the commission of acts forbidden by it. It will be argued upon the other side, that in the execution of that penalty is our only remedy. That cannot be; for it would convert the penalty into a license; and it has been decided in a late English case, that a court will enjoin the commission of acts, upon which commission a penalty de die in diem has been imposed by law. I have but a few more words to say. I have not adverted to the question of the abstract right of the companies to run their cars on Sunday—not from any want of firm conviction as to the wrongfulness of so doing, but because I have felt that it was not directly in issue in this case, and that my duty did not permit me to diverge from the main point in the case for the discussion of any topics, however interesting in themselves, or however important as bearing collaterally on the main question. I conclude, in the hope that your Honor will grant to the complainants the relief they ask, and, in so doing, will confirm to them, in common with all the citizens of Philadelphia, the undisturbed enjoyment of the Sabbath day.

I conclude, in the hope that your Honor will grant to the complainants the relief they ask, and, in so doing, will confirm to them, in common with all the citizens of Philadelphia, the undisturbed enjoyment of the Sabbath day.

I conclude, in the hope that your Honor will grant to the complainants the relief they ask, and, in so doing, will confirm to them, in common with all the citizens of Philadelphia, the undisturbed enjoyment of the Sabbath day.

ARGUMENT OF MR. McELROY.

Wm. J. McElroy, Esq., continued the argument on behalf of the complainants. After remarking upon the great importance of the case, and the gravity of the subject to be discussed and the rights involved, he said:—There is one thing to be mentioned here, at the outset of the cause, and to be steadily borne in mind throughout it—for I regard it as the thread running through the labyrinth—and this is, that the defendants stand here to-day violators of the law, while the complainants are here as its supporters, asking for its enforcement; they are seeking to shield themselves from the result of an infraction of law—we to protect ourselves and the community in which we live, may, even to protect the defendants themselves and all the witnesses they have produced in their behalf, from the evil consequences which have flowed and will flow, as they must always be expected to flow from transgression of the law.

Both of the bills filed allege that the defendants are violating a particular law. What is this law? It is one of the most venerable, and at the same time, one of the most useful laws that has ever been placed upon our statute books. For one hundred and eighty-four years it has remained in terms, but never been altered in spirit. The modifications that have been made, have been to extend and enlarge its operation; and has been willingly rendered to it throughout our State, is no slight evidence of the high estimation with which it has been regarded by the people.

In a case like this, it will not be regarded as at all improper to refer to the history of this Sunday law. By doing so, we shall learn something of its origin and spirit, which will assist us in giving it a proper application. The charter granted to William Penn by Charles II., on the 4th of March, 1681, gave him power to govern and to make laws, "by and with the assent and approbation of the freemen of the country or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies." The spirit in which he received this charter, is manifested in a letter written by him on the next day, to his friend Robert Turner, in which he uses this language:—"It is a clear and just thing, and my God, that has given it to me through many difficulties, will, I believe, bless and make it the seed of nation. I shall have a tender care to the government, that it will be well laid out first."

Penn remained in England, corresponding with his deputies in regard to the well being of the settlement, and while still there, published his Frame of Government, or, as he called it, the Charter of Liberties of the Province. This paper is dated April 25, 1682, and in it, after providing for the Provincial Council of seventy-two persons, the General Assembly not exceeding two hundred persons, the erection of free schools, the reward of authors of useful sciences and inventions, the establishments of courts, the conduct of all elections by ballot, he recognizes the sanctity of the Sabbath by declaring that no official business should be performed by any department of the Government on the Lord's day. The Charter of Liberties was followed on the 5th of May, 1682, by the "Laws agreed upon in England." By the first of these, the fundamental law of the Province, so that it was in fact, the first Constitution of Pennsylvania. Religious liberty, and the observance of the Lord's day, were also provided for by these laws.

In September, 1682, Penn left England and arrived at Chester, about the 1st of December. Here, on the 4th of December, 1682, the first General Assembly met, and in a short session of three days, passed three great and important laws,—the act of union, the act of settlement, and the act with which we are more immediately concerned, "The Great Law, or the body of Laws of the Province of Pennsylvania." Regarding this, as it really was, as the foundation of all subsequent enactments, I quote its preamble and first section in full:—"Whereas, the glory of Almighty God, and the good of mankind, is the reason and end of government, and therefore government in itself, is a venerable ordinance of God; and forasmuch as it is principally desired and intended by the proprietary and governor, and the freemen of the province of Pennsylvania, and territories thereunto belonging, to make and establish such laws as shall best preserve true Christian and civil liberty, in opposition to all unchristian, licentious, and unjust practices, whereby God may have his due, Caesar his due, and the people their due, from tyranny and oppression of the one side, and insolence and licentiousness of the other, so that the best and firmest foundation may be laid for the present and future happiness of both the governor and people of this province and territories aforesaid, and their posterity. "Be it therefore enacted, etc., that these following chapters and paragraphs shall be the laws of Pennsylvania and the territories thereof: "1. Almighty God being only Lord of conscience, father of lights and spirits, and the author and bestower of all divine knowledge, faith and worship, who can enlighten the mind, and persuade and convince the understanding of the people in due reverence to his sovereignty over the souls of mankind. It is enacted by the authority aforesaid, that no person, now or at any time hereafter living in this province, who shall confess and acknowledge one Almighty God to be the creator, upholder, and ruler of the world, and that professeth him or herself obliged in conscience to live peaceably and justly with all mankind, shall in any wise be molested or persecuted for his or her conscientious persuasion or practice, nor shall he or she at any time, be compelled to any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever, contrary to his or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his or her Christian liberty in that respect, without any interruption or reflection; and if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion and practice in matters of religion, such shall be looked upon as a disturber of the peace, and be punished accordingly. But to the end that looseness, impiety and atheism, may not creep in under pretence of conscience in this province, be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that according to the good example of the primitive Christians, and for the ease of the creation, every first day of the week, called the Lord's day, people shall abstain from their common toil and labor, that whether masters, parents, children or servants, they may the better dispose themselves to read the Scriptures of truth at home, or to frequent such meetings of religious worship abroad as may best suit their respective persuasions. It will be observed that this enactment requires the people to abstain from their "common toil and labor." In this it follows the English statute of 29 Charles, 2d, which restrained persons from following their "ordinary callings" on the Lord's day. I said that our law, while retaining all its spirit, had been extended in its operation, and so it will be found that in 1705, the Legislature of this State passed an Act providing that the people should abstain from toil and labor and any worldly business on that day. This was followed by the Act of 1786, forbidding "any worldly employment or business whatsoever." The subject has since been passed to continue that of 1786, and is substantially the same in terms, but the remarkable and significant difference between these and the former act, is observable, that while the Act of 1705 was called "An Act to restrain people from labor on the first day of the week," the title of these was "An Act for the prevention of vice and immorality, and to restrain dissipation;" a clear indication of the reasons which actuated the legislature, and the purpose which they intended to accomplish by the passage of these laws.

It will be observed that this enactment requires the people to abstain from their "common toil and labor." In this it follows the English statute of 29 Charles, 2d, which restrained persons from following their "ordinary callings" on the Lord's day. I said that our law, while retaining all its spirit, had been extended in its operation, and so it will be found that in 1705, the Legislature of this State passed an Act providing that the people should abstain from toil and labor and any worldly business on that day. This was followed by the Act of 1786, forbidding "any worldly employment or business whatsoever." The subject has since been passed to continue that of 1786, and is substantially the same in terms, but the remarkable and significant difference between these and the former act, is observable, that while the Act of 1705 was called "An Act to restrain people from labor on the first day of the week," the title of these was "An Act for the prevention of vice and immorality, and to restrain dissipation;" a clear indication of the reasons which actuated the legislature, and the purpose which they intended to accomplish by the passage of these laws.

This history, this subject, in reference to this subject, shows clearly the reason and spirit of the law, and the great and important objects sought to be attained by it; that I need make no comment here upon them. Are the defendants violating this law? If it be intended to argue here to-day that they are not, then I answer that this court has repeatedly decided that just such acts as those complained of in this case are direct violations of the law. I shall refer to only three of the more recent decisions.

It may be set up that as the charter does not limit this company in the exercise of its powers to six days of the week, it has implied right to run its cars every day. Against this position, I cite the case of *Omni vs. The Commonwealth*, 9 Harris 424. This was the case of an innkeeper, who claimed that his license authorized him to pursue his occupation on every day of the week, and therefore he was not amenable for an infraction of the Sunday law. The court thought otherwise. They say in their opinion, "Will not six days' enjoyment, in each week, of the licensed monopoly suffice to provide strangers with that measure of accommodation which the community is bound to furnish? It is essential to religious freedom, as well as to physical health and strength. It is an institution deeply seated in the religious affections of the community, and one of the foundations of public morals, and of our political fabric."

If it be asserted for the defendants, that the running of these cars on Sunday, is a work of necessity or charity, and therefore within the exception of the statute, then look at the case of *Johnston vs. The Commonwealth*, 10 Harris 109. This was the appeal of the driver of one of a line of omnibuses between Pittsburgh and Lawrenceville, who sought to evade the operation of the statute on this very ground. Judge Woodward, delivering the opinion of the court, said:—"Not a circumstance is suggested on the record to distinguish the work of the defendant on Sunday from what it was on any other day of the week. As it is not pretended to have been a work of charity or necessity on other days, it could not have been on Sunday. Running omnibuses is a mere secular employment, established and maintained for private gain; ministering and intended to minister, not to the absolute wants of our nature, but to the convenience of the public for a price. No reason can be assigned in favor of such an employment on Sunday, which might not be urged in behalf of every other form of productive industry. If on a day set apart by Divine command and human legislation, as a day of rest, proprietors and drivers of omnibuses may prosecute their business, why may not farmers and mechanics pursue their equally useful, though less lucrative, callings? These employments, like most other occupations, contribute more or less directly to the public convenience, and are followed on the same motive, pursued, which establishes and maintains omnibuses. If we construe the statute so as to license the one employment, we must not forbid the other, and throw open the tavern, the store, the work-shop and the market-house on Sunday. If we decide that necessity and charity