

and exhaustion it entails—shall not the service be omitted altogether then? That would solve the problem instantly, and nobody, seemingly, would be seriously disturbed or sadly disappointed. Strange as it seems, though this service is so poorly supported and so indifferently regarded, yet any suggestion of this sort would be likely to meet in most quarters with immediate and intense opposition. Few members would be either prepared or disposed to take this position; few church boards could be induced to sanction it; and our ministers generally, despite the drag and drain and discouragement occasioned by this service, would seriously hesitate to lend it their indorsement, or to be either directly or indirectly a party to its adoption.

All this is well. It indicates a favorable sentiment. It points us in the right direction. The moral effect of such a course upon the community, all other considerations aside, would be lamentable. An open church door is always a silent sermon. Better, far better, that a church should seem to be cold than seem to be dead. In these days of Sunday concerts, Sunday balls, and Sunday saloons, many of them in operation within a stone's throw of some of our churches, we cannot in good conscience put out our lights and shut our doors. The fact that a service is being held by the Lord's people in the Lord's house is itself to every by-passer and on-going pleasure-seeker a protest, an argument, and an appeal. No one can behold the light which streams through the windows of the sanctuary, or hear the sacred sounds that float through its doorways out into the world, without receiving consciously or unconsciously some impression for good.

The omission of this service would be a wrong against a large part of our parishes and the world at large. There are many people who cannot and many people who will not attend the morning service. Mothers tied down by the cares of the household, men and women at service and unable to leave their post except at night, clerks and accountants whose late hours during the week and particularly on Saturday night make it difficult if not wrong for them to break their sleep in time to prepare for morning worship—all these classes would be shut out from church altogether if the second service were to be dispensed with. Then there is always a large body of young men and maidens at the sentimental age, of religious tramps, of sojourners and visitors and semi-adherents who will attend service in the after part of the day, but would never enter a church if its altars were closed except in the morning. Moral obligation, then, if nothing more, forces the doors of our churches open a second time on the Sabbath.

But this is only one side of the question. What about our regular church people—our members and pew-holders? They may not like to go to church twice a day, but are their likes to be always respected and honored? We are not in the habit of preaching exactly as they want us to, are we? Do they not *need* a second service, and, if so, ought not we to give it to them, and to insist (the insistence does little