

It is to press this threefold use of the Sunday, as urgently needed, that this tract is sent abroad, with a devout prayer for its usefulness.

Many, we believe, from merely forgetting that there are three uses of Sunday, are only giving themselves, perhaps, one or two of these uses, without completing it with the third.

If a laborer duly gives up common work that day, and lounges about idle, with nothing to do, or lies in bed, or sits over a newspaper, or takes any passing amusement he can find, or goes off on a trip or excursion, he has, no doubt had rest for his body, and found the benefit of the *first use* of the Sunday. But what has become of the *second* and *third uses*? He has perhaps forgotten them altogether.

They are, however, as necessary for his real good, and are as binding in duty as the first use.

For God, who said for the *first use*; "Six days shalt thou labor and do all that thou hast to do; but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt do no manner of work";—said also of the *second use*: "Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near." "Now is the accepted time, now is the day of Salvation"; "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." While also of the *third use*, God has further enjoined, "This is the day the Lord hath made, let us rejoice and be glad in it"; "Oh, enter then His gates with thanksgiving," and "Come, let us worship and kneel down before Him"; "I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the House of the Lord"; "Give unto the Lord the Glory due unto His name."

Again, if a person takes a rest to his body, and then stays in his own room for private devotion and reading, he has taken the *first* and *second uses* of the Sunday; but if he is able to join in the public honoring of God at Church, and does not do so, he has failed in the *third use* and duty.

If a person gives rest to the body; and also goes to church, joining in the public worship of God; but still takes no time for private reading, devotion, or spiritual improvement to his own soul personally; then he may have taken the *first* and *third uses*; but has failed in the *second use*.

Each then of these three great purposes for Sunday must be carefully and separately provided for, if the full benefit of it is to be reaped. A failing in any of them implies a neglect of duty towards the Good God, who has given us a day of rest.

If this consideration were more generally attended to, what happy results would follow. It would at once set at rest many a debated point.

For instance; some may say, can it be wrong to go for a walk or excursion on Sunday? The answer is;—that depends on whether it interferes with the *second* and *third uses* of Sunday. If the excursion is so lengthened, that it prevents attendance at the public honoring of God in Church; or if the company is irreverent, the amusements frivolous or sensual; preventing spiritual thoughts, and checking all wish for Christian improvement; then the excursion is interfering with the *second* and *third uses* of the Sunday, even if it has been a rest to the body.

Can it be wrong, some may ask, to visit one's friends on Sunday? This again, simply depends on how much it can consist with fulfilling the *three purposes* of the day of rest.

If the friendly visit is quiet; helping, not preventing, spiritual improvement; and arranged so as not to interfere with the hours of public worship; it may be safely done. But not, if it leads to neglect or disinclination for private devotions, or absence from God's House.

Can it be wrong, some may ask, for a public man to do public business on Sunday? This must be decided by the question, is it neces-

sary absolutely; so that it could not with public safety be put off to another day? Very frequently it could. But alas! how often have state officers sacrificed Sunday systematically, for mere convenience, or wish to crowd as much into a week as possible.

Can it be wrong, some may ask, to read letters, look at accounts, or such matters on Sunday? The answer is, how does it affect your mind towards the *three uses* for Sunday, already required by God. If the mind is distracted or wandering to ordinary news, taken up with monetary cares, or eager in ordinary political or social subjects, very difficult it will be to keep a devout attention to personal improvement in holy things, or heartily to join in public ordinances of religion.

Can it be wrong, some may ask, to join in games, go to public amusements, places of exhibition, &c., on Sunday? Here we must apply again the rules. Will this interfere with real rest to mind and body; help on, or stop private attention to the soul's highest interests; or take the place of humbly presenting ourselves at God's footstool in the assembly of the Church?

Such are some of the applications that may be made of the *three great intentions of God for our day of rest*.

How often an undecided course would be settled by honest application of these tests. Many things may be quite harmless in themselves, indeed commendable on other days; yet may tend to rub off the bloom from the spiritual attractiveness of holy duties, on the day set apart for them. There should be a very nice discrimination in the conscience of what is helpful in spiritual interests. Far better to keep on the safe side if there is a doubt; and give up any pursuit or occupation that clouds the soul, or hides Heaven from our thoughts.

The effect of our conduct on others is a point that must also be carefully considered. Do any of our ways of employing our time on Sunday prevent others from getting the good of it, in any one of these three great uses?

Here come in a number of delicate considerations, which require decided principles to settle them.

Can it be right to have our ordinary letters sent by post, if we know that thereby many post office servants must be deprived of their Sunday's use in one way or another? Better far to have a little inconvenience, (real inconvenience seldom occurs) than, in order to accommodate ourselves, bring loss upon others in most important interests for all eternity.

Can it be right to go by an excursion train on Sunday for mere pleasure, when we know that this involves railway officials being kept from the proper employment, of the only day they have a chance of being able to use, for spiritual occupations? Whether they would employ it rightly or not, is no question for us to decide; they ought to have the opportunity as well as others.

Can it be right to open places of public exhibition on Sunday, when this would keep those in charge from being able to attend to the three great uses of Sunday? Far better to do without, than be the cause of a grievance to others in matters all important. But enough has been said to show the practical application of the principles here urged.

Each person may easily test other points as they arise, by the clear light of these truths. We must have rest for the body; spiritual improvement for the soul; and open giving of honor to God; or else the purpose of the Sunday is defeated; and duty remains unfulfilled.

We must arrange everything for those dependent on us, so as to secure them time for their own Sunday duties.

We should not require, except for works of real necessity or mercy, that any one else should be prevented enjoying the opportunity of using their Sunday time aright.

Were all these uses of Sunday rightly ob-

served throughout the world, what a heaven upon earth it would become, compared with what it is now?

How few really get its full benefit, or profit by it as they might; compared with the multitudes even in most Christian lands, who spend it in ways that can leave no blessing behind.

For the poor, especially, without Sunday, there is no chance of getting proper time for their soul's welfare.

Hence, it is their interest most particularly to preserve clearly each one of these uses, and by "a threefold cord, which is not quickly broken," let Sunday bind them to God, and prepare them for that better "Rest which remaineth for the people of God" in Heaven.

SCHISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Probably no word in the English language is used as little by Protestants as the word *schism*. It is a word that they well might avoid, for they are greatly to blame for a divided Christendom, that is a shame and disgrace to Christians and a cause for unjust criticism at the hands of unbelievers. Now, Protestants generally profess great reverence for the Bible. We wonder if many of them know what that Book says about schism?

'That they all may be one, as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee' (St. John 17, 21).

'Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment' (Cor. 1, 10).

'I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences * * * and avoid them' (Rom. 16, 17).

'Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling' (Eph. 4: 3, 4).

'Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity' (Psalm 133: 1).

'Every house divided against itself shall not stand' (Matt. 12: 25).

'Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation' (Matt. 12: 25).

'There should be no schism in the body' (1 Cor. 12: 25).

'Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught' (2 Thess. 2: 15).

'We command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh * * * not after the tradition which he received of us' (2 Thess. 3: 6).

We have no hesitation in saying that the divisions of Christians are the weakness of the Gospel, and that they cause Christianity to be attacked on all sides by the skeptic and infidel. A bundle of sticks can easily be broken one by one, but not if tied together. An old adage runs: 'In union, there is strength.' This union was meant to be by our Lord when He established His Church. But how do Christians of the nineteenth century follow and obey His commands? By refusing to join His Church, protesting against it, and calling its members all sorts of names, and dividing and splitting up among themselves into as many sects as the brain of man can imagine. We hear of the Wesleyans, the Calvinist, the Lutherans, the Cumminites, the Glassites, the Swedenborgians, the monnons, Seven-day Baptists, Sandemanians, Second Adventists, Irvingites, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Cambellites, and a hundred more. Is this right? Is it according to the teaching of the Bible? Is Christ divided? Many reasons are given for these divisions, but these excuses do not alter the fact that Holy