

that, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." All such legislation will ultimately culminate in religious persecution.

I was pleased to notice your recognition of the fact that the fining and imprisoning of our brethren for having observed the seventh day, and laboring on Sunday as savoring of persecution. In this you are more candid than some of your religious contemporaries. We were sorry indeed that you departed from this line of fairness, in your dealings with the question itself, at issue—the Sabbath; but attribute this more to a lack of time to give the subject thorough study than to a lack of candor. You say that "The Seventh-day Adventists maintain that Saturday is both the Sabbath and the Lord's day, a proposition for which they can find no Scriptural proof whatever." We assert, and believe, that Adventists are abundantly able to prove from the Scriptures that the seventh day of the week is both the Sabbath and the Lord's day.

Your statement that the Sabbath of the Old dispensation was Saturday, and that Christ and His first followers kept that day in obedience to the "Law" is a correct one. It is very evident to the Bible student that Jesus Christ kept the seventh day as Sabbath, and as far as the Bible is concerned we do not know that He ever mentioned the first day of the week, to say nothing about His designating it by the title of the Lord's day. He kept the seventh day as Sabbath according to the commandment, and not according to the ideas of the Pharisee, who had heaped upon it their vain traditions until the true design of the Sabbath was hidden from view.

In Mark 2: 27, 28, Jesus says:

"The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath: Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." The Sabbath was made "for" man, not "against" him: The "Son of Man," Jesus Christ, is Lord of the Sabbath: Then the Sabbath is His day. If, then, it is His day, it certainly is the Lord's day. See also Exodus 20, 8-11; Isa. 58:13. The Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ is the author and defender of the seventh day as Sabbath. He is the Lord; see Psalm 110:1, Mark 12:35-37, Hebrew 1: 8-10. He is also the Creator and Maker of all things, John 1: 1-3, 14; Col. 1: 15-17; Eph. 3:9, etc. The Sabbath was "made," made by Christ; How? He employed six days in creation, on the seventh he rested, and then blessed and sanctified it. Thus the Sabbath was made by Him who "made all things," and is pre-eminently His, the Lord's day. Jesus himself kept the Sabbath (John 15: 10; Luke 4: 16) and enjoined its observance upon His disciples (Matthew 5: 17-20; Matthew 24: 20, etc.) The Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke, demonstrates very clearly that Paul respected the Sabbath of Jesus Christ; (Acts 16: 12-13; 17: 1-3 etc.) It is very evident from the New Testament writings that none of the Apostles knew anything about the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first day of the week, by Jesus Christ. Why? Because such never occurred.

Daniel speaks of an anti-Christian power that would "Think to change

times and laws;" (Dan. 7: 25.) and Paul says it was at work in his day (2 Thess. 2: 3-12; Acts 20: 28-31.) So we are not at all surprised that there has been a departure from the commandments of God. But now an invitation is sent out to all men to return to the "commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." (Rev. 14: 9-14)

Your quotation from Justin's Apology reminds us of Martin Luther's terse statement concerning the Latin fathers. He says "When God's Word is by the fathers expounded, construed and glossed, then, in my judgment, it is even as when one strains milk through a coal sack, which must needs spoil and make the milk black. God's word of itself is pure, clean, bright and clear; but through the doctrines, books and writings of the Fathers, it is darkened, falsified and spoiled." The Protestant platform is the Bible and the Bible only as a rule of faith and doctrine. Let us remain on the platform of Protestantism.

Dear Editor, you omitted the Scriptural proof for calling Sunday the "Lord's day." It would have been more satisfactory to the interested reader if you had cited the passages in which you find authority for calling it by this sacred title. In the closing paragraph of your article you say: "When all the facts connected with the subject are considered, it is impossible to find any reasonable answer to the origin of the consecration of Sunday as a Christian Sabbath, except this, that it was done by the Apostles of our Lord, and probably in accordance with the teaching He gave them during the forty days between His resurrection and ascension, or else as a result of revelation given afterwards." Thus you admit there is no Scriptural authority for the change; it rests on a probability. Statements of this kind may satisfy some, but all the elements of Bible proof are lacking. If it becomes necessary we can furnish historical facts relative to the origin of the practice of Sunday keeping.

We endorse your statement as to how the seventh-day people should be treated in this matter, namely, "Prove to them their mistake."

Our object in writing this response is simply to let the readers of your paper know a few of the proofs for our unpopular practice of keeping the seventh day of the week according to the commandment and the example of Christ and His apostles.

J. M. WILLOUGHBY, Pastor.

PRACTICAL FRUIT-GROWING.

MOAB, Grand Co., Utah, Feb. 16.

I see an article on pruning in your paper of February 8th, by Thomas E. Viesting. Now Mr. V., we should be careful of what we write; let it be such as we know by experience. I will have to differ with you on some of your suggestions. It does very well to rub off buds if they are apt to grow where not wanted; but as for pinching off buds so as to have any pruning to do, it is a mistaken idea. For instance, suppose you see a limb that you think is long enough, so you pinch off the center bud; what is the result of that act? The limb will put out several and make a bush at the end of the limb which is

not desired by any one who wishes to keep his orchard in good shape. If a limb has a bush on the end there will be a cluster of fruit out on the end of the limb and one apple or peach will be more weight there than half a dozen would down near the trunk of the tree. You should always try and grow as much fruit near the large limb as you can.

I never have seen any bad effect from summer pruning where you cut off the last year's growth; I very often cut off the end of limbs where there is too much fruit on the limb; yet I do not approve of summer pruning; although if you have a tree that will not fruit, if you will prune early in July it will sometimes cause it to fruit better.

We have a great deal of land in Utah that has become mineral. Such land can be reclaimed. Where there is seepage from land that is irrigated above, it will injure the land below if there is any mineral in the land, which there is, more or less, in all of our land. I have land that was as dry as any land could be when I settled on it. It became wet and the lucern that was growing on it became thin and short, would not yield half a crop. I cut two drains through the land—at the upper end the ditches were five to six feet deep; then I hauled rock from the creek and filled in the bottom about two feet; in putting in the rock place them so as to leave a culvert; if sandy, place rock in the bottom, then build the culvert so there will be rocks under; there is danger of wasting if there is much fall; after having filled in the rock, put on top of the rock straw or some other covering, then take a horse and plow and fill the ditch up. I have two streams of water running out of my ditches, which, if it was not able to run out, would make the land so wet it would be worthless. I did not keep account of the expenses, but the amount will not be more than \$1.50 to \$2 per rod.

But I have left fruits and gone to draining land. Now to return to fruit—will it pay? I will give some figures of what has been done. You must remember that the man who is the farthest from market is the man that has nothing to sell. Now, if we could load trains of cars with fruit there would be a better market than there is today. Fruit should not be a luxury, but should be on every family's table, and then there would not be so much need of those appendages called doctors.

In 1898 R. A. Orr, Colorado, raised on 15 acres:

300 bushels apples, 1,500 pounds, at 40c.	\$ 600 00
100 boxes pears, 2,500 pounds, at 60c.	150 00
2,000 boxes peaches, at 80c per box.	1,600 00
1,500 pounds cherries, at 130c.	195 00
150 boxes plums, at 80c per box.	120 00
200 pounds apricots, at 80c.	16 00
75 boxes grapes, 1,000 pounds, at 100c.	160 00
50 boxes crab apples, at 50c.	50 00
700 quarts gooseberries, at 70c.	49 00
1,200 quarts strawberries, at 15c.	180 00
100 cases raspberries, 24 pints each.	240 00
150 cases currants, \$2.75 per case.	412 50
6 cases blackberries.	12 00
Total.	\$3,800 00.

Besides 2,000 pounds of peas, and 4,000 pounds of other truck grown in the same ground. California shipped raisins, 29,000,000 pounds, in 1894, and the United States and Canada shipped to Great Britain in 1892, 1,250,000 barrels of apples. The same year California shipped east 4,500 cars of assorted fruits.

O. W. WARNER.