

as an undue interference with their just rights and an injury to society. The first Sabbath law passed by any Christian state, that of Constantine, made an exception in favour of agricultural labor. But that was probably because the rural population was still chiefly pagan ; and there seems to be no reason why it should not be prohibited as well.

And when such Sabbath laws are enacted, forbidding these things, it is the duty of the authorities and of all good citizens to see that they are enforced, and that the violators of the law are duly punished. It is, moreover, their duty to avoid any encouragement to willing Sabbath breakers, whether persons or corporations, by using their services, and to refrain from any temptation to unwilling ones by asking for these services or offering an extra reward. They should neither demand nor encourage Sunday mails, Sunday trains, or Sunday newspapers. More especially is it their duty to observe the law themselves, and to see that all who are regularly in their employment or under their authority, do likewise. It will avail them nothing that they themselves rest, if others are by their orders needlessly at work in the warehouse or the mill. It will be in vain that they worship, if they are directors or even shareholders of joint stock companies, which habitually transgress the spirit of the law on various pretexts, and rob their employees of Sabbath privileges. One of the chief dangers to the Sabbath, in fact, comes from large corporations in the carrying trade. Shareholders want dividends ; a portion of the public shortsighted, and caring little for the Sabbath, want accommodation ; directors are tempted to stretch their liberty even beyond what the letter of the law allows. The responsibility is divided, but every man who demands this traffic, profits by it or consents to it, is a partner in the wrong and must be held answerable for his share in the violation of the day. Only in so far as the law is sustained by public sentiment, and by the constant practice of the law abiding classes, is there any chance of the law being effectively carried out. The excuse for most of its serious violations is found in the thoughtlessness or occasional inconsistencies of the professors of religion.

II. We turn now to another aspect of this question not yet touched on, which demands careful attention, one as to which the differences of opinion are serious and the consequences of erroneous views likely to prove dangerous in the extreme. Thus far we have considered the day as a day of rest, and sought to determine how far it should be kept free from labour. We have now to look at it as a day of worship and consider how far it should be made sacred for this purpose.

There are two general views which have been historically held in the Christian Church on this point between which choice must be made. The one is that the whole available portion of the day is to be regarded as of a religious character sacred to spiritual uses only, and that no part