

of oppression. There is light and there is liberty ahead.

THAT ELOPEMENT.

WE HAVE looked for some criticism of the conduct of young Aubrey, of Chicago, who lately eloped with the daughter of Chief Justice Fuller. We have looked in vain. The youthful and mad-brained couple have been lionized, and give every indication that they rather enjoy the notoriety to which they have attained. They evidently take kindly to the detailed descriptions given by the public journals of their personal appearance, and probably feel as if they were a genuine hero and heroine, such as Mrs. Aubrey had doubtless read about in the abundance of her leisure in a luxurious parental home. At present her situation perhaps appears to her like a realization of many a fantastic day-dream. Doubtless, however, she will reach, before long, a rude awakening.

It ought to occur to the principals in this romantic affair—if not to the general public—after the glamor of novelty has worn off, that there is nothing of the heroic about their course, unless that quality can attach to ungentlemanly and unladylike conduct. After-thought should bring what forethought failed to present to their minds—that their doings have been unmitigatedly selfish as well as decidedly immodest. The male actor in this domestic drama has invaded the domain of parental rights, by stealing away a member of a family circle of minor age without the consent or approval of her natural guardians. The female principal in this elopement scandal has shown an utter disregard for the feelings and wishes of her parents. In both instances there are no indications of noble or heroic traits. Neither do they show, on the one hand, qualities that go to constitute a good husband, or on the other the make-up of a good and devoted wife.

That the fruits of such an erratic union will be peace and unbroken conjugal felicity we are not inclined to believe. When one sows briars, he need not expect to reap wheat, for he will get no such crop; every seed sown will bring forth its kind. This match has been planted in the soil of disregard of the rights of interested parties, and the result will be the manifestation of the same disposition respecting the

rights of each other. This is almost inevitable.

The position of the press upon such subjects is not generally wholesome. The fulsome flattery it often engages in when such events as the elopement in question take place is nauseating to thoughtful people. Journalistic scribblers go into ecstasies over the personal charms of the heroine of the escapade, dwelling with idiotic delight upon her "luxuriant brown hair" making "a handsome frame to a pretty face," and other trash of the same character. There are silly girls all over the world who would be ready to elope at a moment's notice to have just such absurd nothings said about them in the public prints.

Instead of this couple being praised and flattered, they ought to be rebuked for causing the domestic affairs of a highly respectable family to be rudely thrust before the gaze of the world at large. Some of the impertinent interviewers who have pestered the family of the wayward girl, who has acted with such manifest indiscretion, would only have got their deserts if they had been hoisted down the front door steps at the business end of a stout boot.

SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

IN another column will be found an article on "Religious Legislation in Arkansas," which shows the tendency of some minds at the present juncture in the direction of intolerance.

This is a matter of grave importance. The power of the State in reference to the Church, or the line between law and religion, ought to be distinctly defined and permanently established. Under the form of government set up in the United States, no Church has the right to dominate the State, or to so influence its affairs that the rights and liberties, civil or religious, of the members of any other Church are infringed. On the other hand the State has not the right to establish any particular form of religion, to favor one sect at the expense of another, to discriminate in matters of faith and worship, or to prohibit the free exercise of religion of any kind which does not interfere with the proper powers of the State or the legal liberties of the citizen.

A movement is on foot to bring a pressure to bear upon the National Government in favor of Sunday legislation. There is danger in it.

The promoters of the movement mean well, no doubt. They desire to see the day of rest protected and preserved by law. They would have neither buying nor selling, traveling nor trading, newspaper reading nor secular employment of any kind on the first day of the week. A Puritan Sabbath is what they wish to establish and maintain, no matter at what cost to the country or at what violence to some of its fundamental institutions.

We believe in the religious observance of the Sabbath; that is, the setting apart of one day out of seven for rest from toil, and religious worship. We believe it is in consonance with the Divine command and in accordance with the laws of nature. In our opinion everybody would be the better for a regular restful Sunday, in which all trades, occupations and unnecessary travel and traffic would be suspended. The body would be the better for it. People would live longer and have happier and healthier lives if it were observed. The religious sentiment would be fostered by it and the spirit of devotion and peace would have wider sway in the world. Those influences which soften and refine, and improve the condition of mankind and promote harmony and concord, would have greater opportunity for their beneficent sway. And all things would have a tendency upward and onward to that perfection of the race which is our goal, and which the prophetic minds of all ages and nations have discerned afar off.

But we do not think this will be promoted by the stringent legislation that some sectaries are working for. The sentiment of the majority in any State or community should be respected according to its volume. Anything which interferes with its free exercise may doubtless be restrained, perhaps suppressed. Minorities have their rights and these should be protected, but majorities also have their's and the balance of power as well, and they may consistently take measures to preserve those rights as against the disturbance thereof by any opposing faction. But so long as the minority do not attempt to abridge those rights, or to violate prevailing public sentiment in an obtrusive and obstructive and offensive manner, their views and individual freedom should not be restricted because might rests with the greater number.

The danger about Sunday legis-