

pended, while the plough lies in the furrow, while the exchange is silent, while no smoke ascends from the factory, a process is going on quite as important to the wealth of nations as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, the machine of machines, the machine compared with which all the contrivances of the Watts and Arkwrights are worthless, is repairing and winding up, so that he returns to his labors on Monday with clearer intellect, with livelier spirits, with renewed corporeal vigor."

The author's third point is very well stated, as follows:

"There is a third reason why, in our own country especially, the civil government should enforce a Sabbath law. A very large number of the best citizens consider it their religious duty to observe a Sabbath. They may differ widely in their views as to the manner of its observance, but they regard the Sabbath from an economical standpoint as an inalienable right, and its observance from a religious standpoint as a moral and religious duty which conscience requires them to perform. It is clear that government should protect them in the enjoyment of this right and in the performance of this duty, unless their manner of observing the Sabbath should become a nuisance to their neighbors. It seems also to be clear that *the only way in which the right of citizens in this regard*

can be protected is by some general law requiring a cessation of labor from all. If labor of every sort is to go on seven days in the week; if men at will may work and require others to work under penalty of loss of pay or patronage, how is it possible for those who desire to observe a Sabbath to do so? . . .

In other words, for the government to do nothing would be to leave a very large part of the best citizens unprotected in what they consider the highest of human interests. The government furnishes police to guard a Fourth of July procession, or a parade of school children, or a political convention, or any other matter that interests numerous citizens and does no public injury. Sabbath observance does no public injury, but is an economic benefit, and conducive to public morality. The fact that a large proportion of citizens believe it to be also service to God should not rule it out of State protection. That would be for the State to establish irreligion.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Political Preaching.

Is it legitimate? If legitimate, is it wise? or to take Paul's phrase, Is it lawful? If lawful, is it expedient?

The answer to the first part of the question is undoubted. It is legitimate; nay, more, it is helpful for the preacher to preach on any topic which affects the conscience of the hearers, and there are few topics connected with political action in these days that have not a direct relation to the conscience of citizens. Never has there been a time when the *moral* element in public life was so prominently brought into notice. Never a time when public men were brought more searchingly to the test of their own profession or the public demand. The time has gone by when, "it is politics," can be a sufficient excuse for immoral political action. The pulpit is the leader in morals as well

as in religion. It may, therefore, utter its voice in clear tones on all subjects of morals, and no man can say it nay.

Is it expedient? To this no definite answer can be given. Each man must decide and act for himself, simply laying down certain general principles.

1. He must be careful to preach *Bible* politics, not *partisan* politics, *i. e.*, he must make it clear, so clear that not even the weakest mind in his audience can fail to understand that his position is based on Bible teaching, that his motive is the salvation of souls, the building up of the church as the body of Christ. If he can so preach politics that every man who goes from the church door to cast his vote, shall go with the consciousness that the eye of God is on him, and that the vote he casts is the expression not merely of his