

the great soul-winners. They have a deep and clear knowledge of Him. They tell about Him. They study Him. They tell how others have found Him. But always, always, their talk is of Christ. Their lives are Christocentric. Unwise men sometimes speak slightly of these soul-winners, but that is because the ill-speakers do not know. Christ Himself, in His last agony, lifted up tenderly to His Father's consideration a people who He said did not know.

All we are stumbling sorely in our attempts at soul-winning because we do not take the trouble to know Him to Whom we would win men. We talk about Him glibly, until the keen-witted neighbor sees for himself that we do not know, and he shrinks from following in our lead. What good will urging do in such a case?

Let every one of us lay this charge fairly home. If men to whom we bring the invitation to follow Christ hold back and waver, and are away like a puff of casual air, we may be sure that what they need from us is not urging and forcing, but clear knowledge of Christ Himself.—*Philip E. Howard, in S.S. Times.*

SUNDAY REST.

Rest takers will do well to give rest. To a very great extent holiday tourists may, in this particular, "live and let live." A small amount of self-sacrifice and kindly consideration will enable lodging-house keepers and servants to enjoy a portion, at least, of Sunday rest during the holiday season.

The same principle of mutual consideration would also soon lessen the strain of railway traffic, which at present deprives so many of the weekly rest needed by all alike. It is worthy of note that, whilst different opinions obtain on the Sunday question, no one, we believe, has yet been found with courage, or rather folly, sufficient to argue for the total abolition of the Day of Rest. On the contrary, each has vied with his neighbor in expressing in the strongest possible way his high estimate of the physical and intellectual benefits conferred on the individual and the community by the present arrange-

ment. Not one has contended for that day being degraded into an ordinary working season. Their premises might logically be regarded as leading them to such a conclusion, but they have repudiated the idea beforehand. Equally general seems to be the consensus of opinion as to the propriety of doing what is to be done, not by overriding the law, but by having it modified to what is deemed the right extent and in the right direction. It is here that the Babel of conflicting opinions comes in. A certain amount of Sunday labor is necessary, is therefore perfectly legitimate, and the old, ever-recurring question has to be faced, Where and how is the line to be drawn? There may be a certain tract of what is to be called "debatable ground," but beyond that there is a wide range about which apparently there is no debate whatever; just as there may be a certain amount of difficulty in determining when the light begins in the morning, when the darkness ends, but none at all about its being broad daylight at noon, and unquestionable darkness at midnight. About certain kinds of work there may be more or less debate, and it may be difficult to settle whether or not these are to be ranged in the category of what is necessary or the reverse. But the universal feeling is evidently in favor of ordinary work being as much circumscribed as possible, and the more so the better.

As a general rule, "doing to others as we would have them do to us," would solve most of the difficulties referred to. As to railway travelling, it certainly might be restrained far more than it is. The rapidity of modern travel *ought* to be a plea for the extension, or at least the enforcement, of the weekly pause in the whirl of business. If we can now travel so fast on other days, the Sunday trains are, for that reason, the less needful.

If people would only be frank and say that they don't want *any* Sunday rest or any break in the regular toil of the working classes, it would be something. It would indicate the courage of conviction at any rate, though it would not lessen the folly of unreasonableness.

The enjoyment of one class, which is purchased by the oppression and degradation of others, cannot be worth much. Hence comes in the argument against by far the largest portion of Sunday travel, whether by land or sea. Notoriously there are literally thousands of railway officials who have never had a weekly rest of anything like twenty-four hours' duration for years, and never expect to have it again till they are either in their dotage or their grave. It is all very well to talk of the "off-day" for those who have Sunday labor. That may look beautiful in theory, and at the start it may for a short time be practised, but only for a short time. Ask the mass of railway men in Britain what they know about it, and the matter will assume quite a different aspect.

The high pressure at which life is being driven makes the weekly rest only the more indispensable, while the telephones, the telegraphs, and the "lightning expresses" ought to make such a rest only the easier and the more attractive. But, like the horse-leech, greed never says it has enough, and the weekly pause of twenty-four hours is more and more encroached on, till, before one knows, the whole will be gone.

Bianconi, the great Irish mail coach contractor, as a mere matter of business, insisted on every one of his horses having twenty-four hours each week of uninterrupted rest in addition to its daily period of repose. He insisted on this as a matter of money. He could not give them all the same twenty-four hours, but during the week all had their share. It was physically profitable to the horse, and pecuniarily profitable to the man. What was and is true of horses will be found equally true of men; and that man, therefore, is neither an enlightened patriot nor a far-seeing man of business who would do anything to weaken the obligation or lower the sacredness of the day of rest.

This obligation could easily be put on higher grounds, but the mere secular one of physical well-being and pecuniary profit is sufficiently strong; and every one who recognizes its strength ought to do his best to reduce the necessity to a minimum, which evidently might