

employment or business whatsoever on the Lord's day. The same Act punished profane cursing or swearing "by the name of God, Christ Jesus or the Holy Ghost."

The decisions present an unbroken front.

In *Stansbury vs. Marks*, 2 Dall., 213, (1793,) Jonas Phillips, Esq., a Jew, was fined for refusing to be sworn on Saturday—his Sabbath.

In *Comm. vs. Wolf*, 3 S. & R., 48, (1817,) the defendant, although professing the Jewish religion, was fined under the Sunday Act of April 22, 1794.

In *Phillips vs. Gratz*, 2 Penrose and Watts, 412, (1831,) it was held that the conscientious scruple of a Jew to appear in Court on Saturday was no ground for the continuance of his cause.

In *Specht vs. Comm.*, 8 Barr., 312, the principle of *Comm. vs. Wolf* was applied to the Seventh day Baptists.

In *Omit vs. Comm.*, 9 Harris, 426, (1858,) the *Act of 1794* was enforced against an inn-keeper.

In these last cases the principle of *Updegraph vs. The Comm.* was sustained.

In *Mohney vs. Cook*, 2 Casey, 342, (1855,) it was directly affirmed.

LOWRIE, J., said :—

"The declaration that Christianity is part of the law of the land is a summary description of an existing and very obvious condition of our institutions. We are a Christian people in so far as we have entered into the spirit of Christian institutions, and become imbued with the sentiments and principles of Christianity; and we cannot be imbued with them, and yet prevent them from entering into and influencing more or less, all our social institutions, customs and relations, as well as all our individual modes of thinking and acting. It is involved in our social nature, that even those