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ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, ESQ., M.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed and the HON. SECRETARY announced the election of the following gentlemen since the last meeting:—As a Member, Avery W. Holmes-Forbes, Esq. and as Associates, the Rev. P. B. Fraser, M.A., the Rev. J. M. Pollock, M.A., and J. H. Clifford Johnston, Esq.

The Chairman then called on the Rev. F. F. Horton, D.D., to introduce the Discussion on Sunday Observance.

DISCUSSION ON SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

Introducing Dr. Horton to the meeting, the Chairman said:—
We are pleased to welcome here Dr. Horton, who is a man with a special knowledge of the subject before us this afternoon. It is to be hoped that this Institute will be able to voice an utterance on the subject of Sunday Observance that may influence some of those around us, and the leaders of thought in this Metropolis.

The Rev. Dr. Horton said:—Dr. Schofield, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I shall approach the question this afternoon not from the standpoint of religious ordinance or dogmatic rule, but entirely from the standpoint of practical utility as experience has demonstrated it. In fact, my own view is that the ordinance of the Sabbath by the Jewish law is strictly practical; that it was enjoined upon the people on hygienic grounds, and that the ordinance of the Sabbath day was for the good of men. Our Lord said, "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath."

It is generally conceded that an interval of rest is necessary to all efficient work. It has been proved by long experience that the interval should be about one day in seven, and wherever that idea has been violated the first experience has been to return to the institution of the seventh day.

During the war, you remember, an effort was made to continue the making of munitions during a seven-day week, but it was suspended entirely on the ground that the munitions were not produced so well as when there was a seventh day of rest. And perhaps a more significant thing was the experience of the French Revolution, when in the hatred of dogmatic institutions the Revolution abolished the Sabbath, and yet found it necessary to have
a day of rest upon the tenth day. And that had to be surrendered because it was found by experience that the tenth day of rest did not accomplish the object accomplished by the seventh day of rest.

I believe it is not only for human beings and the physical frame that this rest is necessary. It is a law that runs all through nature. Not only the animals require rest, but the very machines require rest, and if a machine is used incessantly without a pause it gets out of gear. I am told that that happens with even so rigid a metal as iron—that iron requires rest, and that unless you allow it to rest it gets out of order and disintegrates for the rest which is its due. So we are face to face with a great law which shows that if work is to be done there must be rest. Rest is good, and in the case of man the rest is to be in some such proportion as one day to seven. But there is something which applies to man which does not apply to material. Man is not a machine. The machinery of his body is but a small part of it. Man is a creature who requires something more than the rest of the physical system if he is really to live. There is in man that spiritual element which is easily crushed and trodden down by the rudeness and pressure of the world; and it is absolutely essential and vital to man that this spiritual side of him should recover, and that the shattered personality—shattered perpetually by the strain and toil of life—should have a chance of peace, recovery, of reforming its proper shape, aspect and quality. And as the spiritual part of man is undoubtedly the real man, and as the mere physical side of man is only transitory, this consideration of the spiritual recovery is vital to him; whenever a man forgets he is a spiritual being, and neglects the cultivation and preservation of his spiritual nature, he very rapidly declines.

Therefore, the Sunday Observance we are discussing to-day is not only a law of nature. It is because man is a spiritual being that it is also necessary that he should have a day of rest and worship. Man needs it because he is a man. To get his spiritual faculties restored, to keep them at an efficient level, is part of his life and a most essential part of his life. If it fails, man fails, and the human being degenerates. It is this essential need which suggests the discussion as to how the day of rest is to be used, and preserved when it is in danger, as it is to-day. It also raises the question of the part the State or the Government can take in the preservation of what is really an asset of human life and what may be called one of the great heirlooms of the British people. We must all recognise the peculiar effect upon us of a Sunday morning in Britain. It is, unfortunately, something that you cannot get in any other country, and we miss it when we are abroad. We welcome it with surprise and gratitude when we get
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home. What is it? The effect upon the mind is that somehow the wheels of life have been stopped for the moment and we are allowed to look at things as they are.

Employment is arrested. To some extent amusement is arrested, and we are in another atmosphere. That atmosphere of the English Sunday strikes some people as dull. But it does not strike us as dull. On the contrary, it is like new life to us. We feel when the Sunday comes round that the mere fact that we have thrown off the week is a recovery of ourselves. The atmosphere of the day and the prevailing sentiment in the community come to us as one of our best possessions. This day that is given to us—the impression of which is so familiar to us. I never can forget the feeling I had when I embarked on the boat to return from India, after three months in India. It really seemed like Heaven. I was on a P. and O. boat and the first day on the vessel was a Sunday. Being on that boat, with the silence and reverence that pervaded it, seemed an introduction into another world; and though the service on a steamship is not always very inspiring and original—on that occasion the officiating person was the Captain, who did not seem to take much interest in it—yet I hardly ever went into a service which impressed me so much. Certain of the hymns and the reading of the prayers impressed me for the reason that I had been in a country where Sunday was not. The first point about Sunday is that it is for rest. That is the original institution as it came down to us from Judaism. Therefore, what we want to secure in the use of it is that we shall not be called upon to do anything which disturbs the sense of rest. It is that rest which is the condition of religious life. Therefore, from the purely human point of view, whoever or whatever deprives us of our rest is an enemy of society—an unconscious enemy it may be, but an enemy whose faults should be brought home to him that he may repent. You have to-day a terrible violation of the great idea. Every centre of population pours out its people on the day of rest in char-a-bancs and other motors. They tear down the public roads, rush through the quiet villages, and disturb the peaceful prayers of men and women in the countryside. They turn the country into the restlessness of the city. It is a disturbance of our national life which, if we were wise, we should try to prevent. In the life of Burne Jones, the painter, who in a true sense was a religious man—at any rate it was his great point that he should die in the faith, but, unhappily, he belonged to a type of Christianity which knows nothing of Sunday—there is an account of the way he usually spent his Sunday. William Morris would arrive at breakfast and the breakfast would be made an intellectual strain. Then he and Burne Jones would go into the studio. Then friends would come in. Then there was talk—recreation as they thought it was.
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Then Lady Burne Jones makes this curious remark—"with the result that Edward on Monday morning was generally more tired than on the Sunday morning." The day of rest had gone. Although it was called recreation, pleasure and art, it was ruinous to the spiritual man. He lost rest.

There is another use of the day which we may plead. It is the opportunity for social intercourse. A great many people have little opportunities during the week of meeting their fellows in any reasonable sense. That is very difficult to get, and it is the day of rest which gives people a chance of knowing their relatives. I always think a family circle round the fire on Sunday is one of the great elements of life. That social life of the day should not be depreciated, because we are greatly starved if we cannot get into touch with our fellow creatures. It is in intercourse, in vital touch with others, that our life is really restored.

But after all, the distinctive use of the day is for worship and for service to God and man. Service to God and man is, to my mind, by far the most important. Those people who seem to have no ability for worship and no call to the service of their fellow man do not value the day on that account, and their indifference to it is one of the dangers of our time. It seems as if a large proportion of men in this country are unable to worship, unconscious of any cause for service to God and man, than ever before. Those numerous people who have no room and concern for either worship or service should, I think, be effectively compelled to observe the day, if not for themselves, yet for the uses which they do not appreciate in others. I think we have not as a rule appealed sufficiently to the public to realise what it is that is demanded. Would you find, for example, any reasonable person in this country who would be comfortable if he knew that throughout the length and breadth of the land there was no worship on that day? Putting it only externally, are there any people who would be pleased to know that all the churches and Heaven-pointing spires were pulled down, and that all the great places of historic memory, where worship has been held for centuries, were wiped out. Would that be acceptable to them? And it is a curious fact that in the vast neglect of public worship to-day you never find anyone who is not a little uneasy about his own neglect, who does not adopt unconsciously an apologetic tone in speaking about it. There is a Scotch story about going to church. One Scotsman asked another, "Which church do you belong to?" The reply was, "Well, I cannot rightly say that I belong to any kirk, but it's the established kirk I keep away from." And that is the attitude of the great majority of men and women in this country. They do not worship, but they
are quite conscious of the obligation. They know they are losing something because they do not worship. The real justification of the rest day is that it is a day for worship. The other days are for work; this is for worship. The other days are to serve our country in other ways; but here is a day in which we serve our country by serving our God, and we bless men by being blessed in approach to God. That seems to me a justification of it.

That leads me just to raise the question, which is very vital to us at the present moment, namely, How are we to preserve this day of rest? And I would make it open as a question of discussion whether it would be possible, or will ultimately be possible, to keep the day of rest unless it is kept for worship? Whether it is not at bottom that worship motive which makes the day what it is, and whether we are not, as people who believe in worship, and believe in the service of God, the only people who can keep this inestimable blessing, this heirloom of our race, for the generations that come after. I doubt whether you can keep this day unless the great bulk of men recognise that it is a day of God, a day for worship. I was, not long ago, in New York on Sunday, and it is an appalling experience. It is a great Anglo-Saxon city in a sense; it has drawn its inspiration from Europe, and especially even from this country. But what a desolating thing it is. There the idea of worship seems to have receded or shrunk to a very small point, and the whole great city seems to hand itself over to the expression of its passions and the practice of its vices. The noise is worse than ever. The tumult, the pushing, the crying make it an intolerable day; and that day which they still keep as a day of release from work is not a day of release from noise and toil; but becomes, if possible, worse than if they were all at work. I doubt if you can keep it unless the sense of worship and the sense of God makes you attach to that day a significance, a sacred meaning, and recognise in it a divine claim. Now I close by saying that the part which the State can take in the preservation of this day of rest is quite limited. We could not possibly tolerate the idea that the State should dictate to us how we should use the day of rest. It seems almost incredible that three centuries ago—four centuries it is now nearly—it was possible to enforce a law to fine every man who did not appear in his parish church on Sunday. It seems incredible that was done. The State can, expressing the general conscience of the community, impose certain restrictions on the actions of citizens which cannot be imposed by agreement, and if the State acts according to the will of the whole people, it can prevent trading on Sunday. It can limit locomotion on Sunday. It can correct or even destroy every form of noisy and disturbing amusement on Sunday. Not on any religious ground at all, but simply on the hygienic principle that for the life of a great
and busy community, a day of rest, a day of silence, a day of peace is an absolute necessity; and though the State cannot in the least determine how we shall use the day in a religious sense, it can on a social ground and in a hygienic sense secure the day as a possibility for all those who wish to use it well. But, after all, this day is not given to us by the State. It is given to us by the higher spiritual principle of our humanity. It is not secured by law; it is secured by a gospel which is the gift to us not of regulations that man has made, but of regulations that God Himself has imprinted on our very nature in making us spiritual beings. (Applause.)

The Chairman: Ladies and Gentlemen, it is my pleasing duty to ask you to give a hearty vote of thanks by acclamation to our distinguished lecturer; who has voiced, to my mind, the broadest and highest principles on which Sunday Observance stands. I am sure we have all enjoyed his remarks exceedingly, and, as we listened to them, their weight must have impressed itself on our minds. I am glad to feel such perfect harmony with the speaker, and before asking you to give this hearty vote, I should like to say a word or two myself upon the subject. That the Sabbath was made for man is a truth of which the simplicity of the language conceals the profundity of the thought. You can hardly limit the extent to which the Sabbath was made for man. And by the Sabbath we do not mean the Jewish Sabbath, but we mean the Sabbath of creation—that in creation it was found necessary to have a distinct thought for man in making a Sabbath, an arbitrary elevation of the seventh daily period of his existence for a different purpose from that of the other six, and this is as old as Genesis. As the lecturer has so beautifully shown you, the law is well nigh universal. The law of systole and diastole, or of work and rest. He has shown, and has most fully supported by science, that metals themselves one and all require rest, and that the law of rest extends down to the mineral kingdom. Of course, it extends throughout the whole of the animal kingdom. He has also pointed out another subtle matter which has escaped until recently the attention of many of our leading hygienic reformers. They used to preach that change of work is rest. I had it forcibly brought before me at the Alexandra House by the side of our great hall. There I was told that when it was established the large gymnasium was added to it in order, by change of work, to give the girls who lived there rest from their clerkly labours during the remainder of the day—the theory being that a fresh set of nerve centres were employed in swinging over horizontal bars from what were required to write précis and do typewriting and shorthand. But there was a fallacy that lurked there, that showed that work and play are not correlative with work and rest—that play in itself is work of a sort, and that rest means rest.
and does not mean other sorts of work. There can be no doubt of the truth that working a fresh set of nerve centres is a great relief to those that are overworked, but it is not the same relief as a complete rest of all of them. Therefore, rest must ever remain rest. Now this rest is of a many-sided character. All through each day we have continual little rests from our labour in our meal times and the pauses in our work. We have a rest every twelve hours in the alternation of day and night. Those who turn night into day, and try and work the twenty-four hours, do far less work than those who follow the law of systole and diastole appointed by day and night. Then there is this weekly rest, which cannot be altered, though man in his superior wisdom to this eternal law has thought fit to try to do so. One day in ten does not seem enough. To do without it altogether is to commit slow suicide. For some inscrutable reason which, I think, we have not at all as yet fathomed, one day in seven seems to be the right amount of rest required by our being. Then there is the annual rest of holidays, and so on, which used to be so entirely ignored. The physician I succeeded boasted very much that he had not taken a holiday for thirty years. That would now be considered a matter for concealment rather than approbation. In the war, as Dr. Horton has pointed out, desperate efforts were made to do away with the essential principle of Sunday Observance, by proving that men could work advantageously seven days a week. It was found to be an absolute fallacy and an impossible plan to carry out. Most men could hardly have a greater change on Sunday than finding themselves inside a church, chapel or mission hall—or wherever they may be—to worship God; for there is not much room for that practice in the week. So that at any rate it involves a change. Then there can be no doubt that in the week they are almost entirely employed with mundane matters, and affairs of time and sense. What, therefore, can be a greater change than to be occupied with spiritual matters on Sunday? I am purposely putting this, not on spiritual grounds, but on medical grounds; I am purposely putting it on grounds which the man in the street is able to appreciate without spiritual instinct or insight. There are higher grounds, but these may not be for all; therefore, I put it on the lowest grounds. You may have a mind, you may be clothed with a body, but the spirit is yourself. Now, I think this law of change, of spiritual nourishment, is a law that can be based on physical and medical grounds. But we, as the Victoria Institute, who believe in the divine authority of Scripture, can appeal at once, of course, to the direct authority of God for our meeting here this afternoon in support of Sunday Observance. And Christians, of course, value this day beyond expression in words, as giving them an opportunity for that communion with the Divine, and with things unseen, that is
the very strength of their daily life. I now ask you to give by
acclamation your support of the paper we have heard.

The Rev. J. B. Coles: It is a very happy thing, as Dr. Schofield
has just said, when we see that we agree, and that this authority
comes from God. I would ask you then, just for a moment or two,
to think of the past, the present and the future of this question.
It was appointed by God for man. As to the present time we are
pretty well agreed, I trust, from the very able arguments used by
the lecturer; but now as to the future. It is of great interest
to us, that remarkable passage, which some have applied rightly
but perhaps not interpreted as clearly. There remaineth therefore
a rest, a Sabbath keeping, for the people of God. It is to be for
the people hereafter on this earth. In the future. The Hebrew
prophets, Isaiah and Ezekiel, show very explicitly that there will
be this keeping of this Sabbath, in connection, of course, with
Israel's return to the land and the righteous law which shall go
forth throughout the world. So that in the past we have the
covenant, the patriarchal enjoyment, and here we should perhaps
be wise in disentangling the argument about Sunday from its more
Jewish or Mosaic aspect. It was before the law, just as the Lord
himself said, it was not of Moses but of the fathers, the
patriarchs. So, of course, the institution of Sunday was. In the
case of the covenant of Noah, it is well to remember that one of
our most important enactments, which is not derived from the
Mosaic law, is capital punishment—Whoso sheddeth man's
blood, by man shall his blood be shed. That goes back to the
covenant of Noah. Are not the people, quite apart from what
their religious feeling may be nowadays—are not they indebted to
God for His mercy at the time of which we are reminded by the
rainbow? The seasons as they come and go, is it not in God's
long-suffering goodness that this Noachian covenant persists to
this day? It affects, therefore, all the people, whether they are
Christians or not. I venture to think it takes a wider view of the
matter. If we take past, present and future we see that Scrip­
ture in every way upholds the wise and very alert and careful
arguments of our able lecturer.

Lt.-Col. Biddulph, D.S.O.: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentle­
men, there are just one or two little remarks which I wish to
make—for I heartily endorse all that Dr. Horton has said this
afternoon—and to take two or three little every-day axioms which
may bring it home to the man in the street, so to speak. Take
the first, the human element; people training for any great
event in athletics, and so on, if they don't rest from time to time
they get what is called "stale." That is, the whole system needs
readjustment. Secondly, here is an example from the animal
kingdom. We know that when the omnibuses were horsed, as
they were a few years ago, the omnibus companies were very par-
ticular to give every horse in their service one day's rest in seven. We may be quite sure that was not done from a sentimental regard for Sunday, but because the companies found they could get the best value out of the horses that way. So many horses rested every day; they were distributed through the whole service; they got one day in seven. Then, as mentioned by Dr. Schofield and Dr. Horton, there is a danger of our thinking that change only is required; but if we do that we shall soon get to an absolute neglect of the Sabbath as a rest. We remember, too, that in the old days, when the Sabbath was strictly enjoined on the Israelites, they used to find the manna every day when they went out. There was none on the seventh day, but they were told—and this was to reward them for their obedience to what was God's command—that they should get a double quantity on the sixth day; and that was found to be the case. So there was no loss. Many people tell you, "We cannot afford to give it up; we must work on Sunday." We have an idea of looking on many of the laws of God as being arbitrary, just like things which are merely given in order to hedge us in and annoy us. That is a mistaken opinion. If we understood the laws we should find they were given us for our good. When we tell the child not to go near the fire, it is not to spoil his amusement, but to prevent him from tumbling in and burning himself. I have noticed, since I was a young man, a great decadence in England on the observance of Sunday. I remember when I joined the service, thirty-six years ago, it was considered bad form in an officer's mess to play cards on Sunday. We did not use the billiard room either. We did not play lawn tennis, or enter into any sports or games on Sunday. There was really no conscientious feeling against it on the part of the majority of officers in those days, but it was not considered good form to do those things on Sunday. There has been a change in the feeling about it. France and the Continent generally, which are always looked upon by us as rather leading us in this direction, seem now to be coming round the other way. I read in the "Morning Post," I think three days ago—I have the cutting here—that there was the annual meeting in Paris of the Cardinals and Archbishops of France, and amongst other things the Assembly protested against the degeneracy of public morality caused by the theatres, cinemas and dancing, and insisted that Catholics should do all in their power to ensure the keeping of Sunday as a day of rest.

Mr. Sidney Collett: In the limited time one has to be very brief, but in considering the subject we have to bear in mind the three aspects of the Day of God. There is the Sabbath of Creation, there is the Sabbath under the Law, and there is the Sabbath under grace. With regard to the Sabbath of Creation, it has its divine side and its human side. I believe the divine
side is first of all in that it contains God's demand upon man. God made man. God is man's Creator, and He claims one-seventh of our time whether we are Christians or not. I let a house and say to the man, "You may live in the house, but must pay a rent"; and God demands one-seventh of man's time. Then it also deals with God's desire—God's desire is that man should be like God. God rests one day, and He desires man to rest one day in seven; and I believe in that measure in which we recognise that, we too shall grow like God. But then there is the human side of Creation in that it meets man's spiritual need first: "God knew how busy man would be, how seldom from this world set free; and so He gave one day in seven, that man might think of God and heaven." Then it meets man's temporal need of rest; we have heard a great deal about that; I need not enlarge on it. We come to the Sabbath under Law. Many people make the mistake of thinking that the Sabbath was introduced at Sinai; it was not. It was re-enacted there, in beautiful keeping with the dispensation teaching of the Word of God. If we had time I would suggest that you should study the composition of the Ten Commandments; and you would find how wonderfully it is arranged. The Fourth Commandment, dealing with the Sabbath Day, is not numerically the centre, but doctrinally it is the centre. You will find this wonderful fact about the Ten Commandments; the first three are all relating to God, and three is God's number. The last six are all in relation to man; six is the number of man; that is why Anti-Christ's number is 666. The Sabbath Commandment in the centre looks both ways; God claims it from man; man needs it for himself and his fellow creatures as well. It is a most wonderful system of arrangement, and that it is not merely Jewish is clearly shown by the fact that the Sixth Commandment begins with the word "Remember." Why call it a Jewish command? Why pick out one of ten? What about the others, are they Jewish? What about, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not bear false witness? You don't call them Jewish. It is a re-enactment of an original law applied in the Word of God in perfect keeping with the dispensational teaching of that Word. We come to the Sabbath under grace. There is no doubt the day was altered in New Testament times; but it was only going back to the original law of grace. Adam was made on the sixth day, and the first morning he woke up was the day of rest. The first day he lived was the rest day, and in the New Testament idea of the Sabbath as being the first day, we go back to the original. There are four sides enclosing this consideration: In the first place it seems clear that the Apostles did rest and recognise the First Day; secondly, they would never have thought of it themselves; thirdly, they would never have dared to make such an alteration. Therefore, it must have been introduced by our Lord Himself—no one
of those Apostles would have dared to take one of the Ten Commandments and alter it. God further marked out the day by raising Jesus Christ, and further still by sending the Holy Spirit on the early Church on that day; and our Lord, after His resurrection, met His disciples again and again on that same day.

Mr. W. Hoste: I am so glad that the opener of the discussion based his general arguments on the very strong basis of experience—experience of what is necessary and essential. Now that is true, but I believe it is weak to base the argument to-day on direct Scriptural teaching—which I fear is not really valid because it is not applicable directly to us. I cannot agree with some previous speakers who based their argument on the assertion that the Sabbath dates from Creation; I believe it is a misreading of the Genesis passage. It is nowhere said there that God commanded Adam to keep the Sabbath; it merely states that God sanctified it for Himself, and He rested on that day. Mark you, those words occur in the text. I am one of those who firmly believe in the inspiration and absolute historical truth of the first chapters of Genesis, and I am thankful to affirm it—but those words do not occur as part of God's exhortation to Adam. He told him to do some things, but He did not tell him to keep the Sabbath; and were it otherwise it would be very strange that there is not a single occurrence from Creation to Sinai of any patriarch resting on the Sabbath Day. Surely we should have had some instances of this.

Mr. Sidney Collett: What about the manna, Mr. Hoste? That was before Sinai.

Mr. Hoste: That was given on the eve of Sinai. So I do not think it is right to go back to Genesis. In Exodus, Jehovah says, "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily My Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between Me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you"; and again in Ezekiel He reminds His people, "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctified them." So that the Sabbath, to my mind, was clearly given as a sign; just as the rainbow was given for the Noachian Covenant, and circumcision for the Abrahamic Covenant, so the Sabbath was given for the Sinaitic Covenant. But now, how about the non-observance of the Lord's Day? I think it is a straw that shows where a man is. A man who can neglect God all through the seven days is a man going, I am afraid, in the wrong direction; and a man needs to repent, and to know that if he does not recognise God he will not be recognised by God. (Hear, hear.) Just in closing, what is this day? I do not think there is any thought of it having been changed from the Sabbath, a sort of modified Sabbath. People who talk like
that make the Sabbath what they like. I never heard one of these friends say, "I won't take milk in; I won't light a fire." I think it is a wrong application. In the early days the Sabbath and the first day of the week, I believe, went on together. A great deal more light was given, and the Christians were shown that they were not on Jewish ground at all. With reference to what Mr. Collett said about the Sabbath, I would point this out. All the other Commandments are reiterated in the New Testament—in the Epistles—and the only one which is not reiterated is the fourth; and the only occasion in which it is mentioned, besides the spiritual one in Hebrews, is in the second of Colossians, where we are warned specially against it. "Don't put yourself under the Sabbath law" is the principal for all Christians. If it is not the Jews' day, as the Sabbath was, is it my day? No, even less. It is the Lord's Day, the day set apart by the resurrection of Christ, in which I may specially turn my mind to Him whose day it is; and that is the only principle I know for the Lord's people. It is not a legal principle, but is a great privilege for them to recognise that it is the Lord's Day.

Mr. Theodore Roberts: Dr. Schofield, Ladies and Gentlemen, I do not find myself altogether in agreement with many of the speakers. I cannot myself see that there is any command to mankind generally to observe the Sabbath Day, and I think that in seeking to make it out people have strained the text of Scripture. I think we must agree with what Mr. Hoste has brought before us, that it was distinctly a Jewish ordinance. But, then, I would put it in this way, the Jews were taken up by God as His special people, to be the recipients of a most wonderful communication of His mind, and thus what He said to them may be very well taken as a model for mankind generally; not in the letter of it, but in the spirit of it; and if He found in His wisdom that His particular people required one day in seven for rest, we may be quite sure that mankind everywhere requires one day in seven. Might I recall an incident of a friend of mine, a banker, who was travelling by train, when some sportsmen got into the carriage and filled it up. They were young men of wealth who were spending the whole of their time in going from one race meeting or athletic meeting to another; and, talking of their engagements that were crowding on them in the week to come, one of them said to the other, "What a mercy that Sunday does come once in the week." They were making a business of pleasure and were glad to have one day's rest from the business of their pleasure. (Hear, hear.) The change from Saturday to Sunday, brought about as it was by Christian practice, and nothing else, is one of the most convincing proofs of the historical fact of the resurrection of Christ that can be found. For if He did not rise on the first day of the week, how came it that a Christian community should take that day
instead of the day to which they had been accustomed up till that moment? Very often a Christian does more work on the first day of the week than on any other day. I agree with what has been said here to-day, that change of occupation is the very greatest form of recreation; and to change from our earthly and mundane concerns, whatever they may be, to an occupation that is spiritual—even if it is taxing and hard—is such a change that I believe it revives the whole man. I would only say, in conclusion, that I think it is very important for all of us who seek to commend the Gospel that we believe, that we should never allow men to think we are in any way contributing to the work that is done on the first day of the week—that we recognise for men around us that God's ordinance for Israel, while not of binding effect, yet has that effect of example and experience that we do well to show men that we think it should be observed by them. Therefore I am thoroughly at one with all that has been said to-day as to our duty, each in our measure and sphere, to see that this one day in seven—not the Sabbath, but the first day of the week—is observed by the whole nation, so far as we are able.

The Chairman: With regard to what Mr. Roberts has just said about the clergy and ministers, it may not be generally known that they are, the wise ones among them, not all, the most scrupulous observers of one day's rest in seven; but owing to their work it does not happen to be Sunday. It is another day which I will not name, lest you should call upon them on that day. Those that are not wise, are continually in my hands.

Dr. Withers Green: For the sake of discussion I would like to say that I think the Sunday is a day for work. My view of worship is that it is very hard work, much harder than an ordinary day's business work. The priests of old had double work to do on the Sabbath, not only to kill one lamb morning and evening, but two lambs. They were made to do more work. I suppose the worship was to be more intense, and all the worshippers in all Israel were to do a thorough day's hard work in worship, in harmony with those two lambs. There are some kinds of work we must not do on Sunday, it is quite plain, just as there are some we must do. We must not do servile work. We are to do all the work that is necessary for what man must eat. That includes a great deal, as the ladies know. But our Lord Himself was careful to work on Sunday. We have it figured plainly, the withered arm and other instances point to working on Sunday. My view of Sunday travelling is this; it is not to be done for selfishness or material gain, but for the Lord's work. The best way to better one's fellow men is to preach the Gospel to them. On those grounds I ride on Sunday. When I was younger I remember walking eight miles from the City to Wimbledon to preach the Gospel in the evening. I got to Wimbledon rather fagged. The
good lady of the house took care to refresh me, but I do not think I did the work so well. When we have to do the Lord's work we ought to travel and keep ourselves in the best condition, so that when we preach we may preach well and not in a lazy or tired way. To me the great day of rest is a day for honouring God. We are priests and priestesses unto God. I love the quiet of the Sunday morning, when there is no noise, but I enjoy the Sunday for the sake of the work. (Applause.)

Captain Higgens: We must remember this, in the New Testament, St. Paul certainly laid it down that you are not to judge a man concerning his keeping of the Sabbath day. I think I can discuss this impartially because my theory and practice are quite different. In the first place, so far as theory is concerned, it seems to me, looking at the New Testament, that if a man will worship God in the early part of the day, it is perfectly right that he should amuse himself in a reasonable way the latter part of the day. I do not agree with the last speaker about travelling on Sunday—I mean as far as practical work is concerned—because you are keeping someone else, the 'bus conductor, from his day of rest. I never do it. But servile work, he said, you should not carry out. In the Anglo-Saxon laws of Ida, if a man made his slave work on Sunday the slave could claim his freedom. So, apparently, the Church objected to servile work; and I think very rightly. But I quite agree that the way in which nowadays Sunday is entirely neglected is really a very serious thing for the country. I know years ago I was churchwarden of a church for many years, and we used to have it crowded with young people. Now the church is practically empty. Cycling came along, and they went out cycling. On theory it seems perfectly right, if the people went to church the first part of the day, and then went out to amuse themselves, you could not raise an objection. During the war I had a military job, and had to work on Sundays; but was very fortunate in being near two churches. One had service at 6 in the morning, the other at 7; I could go to church and then go to work. But to go out, as people have got into the habit of doing, without going to worship, is a most serious thing. One practical thing. I am an officer of a local authority in London now. If you people could get your local representatives to see that the workmen are not made to work on Sunday, you would be doing a very good thing. In some places they send out far too many men, and spoil their Sunday entirely.

Mr. A. W. Oke: I have been listening to what has been said about the Ten Commandments. That one about the Sabbath. It seems to me that no State can be carried on without the observance of all those Commandments, and knowing that they were promulgated at Mount Sinai, one cannot help feeling that they were part of the moral law from the creation. We may not have
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them laid down in express words in Genesis, but there is that one word "Remember." Dr. Horton has spoken about the negative influence of Government. It seems to me that what we want is a modification of the law. We want to restrain the enormous number of railways and steam-boats and facilities on Sunday. Now that the working people have so much more leisure in the week there is no need to make Sunday the great day for excursions. Let the cheap trains be on the week-days, and don't put the temptation to poor people, and well-to-do people, too, to take the opportunity of going down to the seaside on Sunday because it is the only day that is at a reasonable rate. One does feel that restraint could be put on the public amusement. There was an attempt to open museums on Sunday. Was it for the sake of museums? Was it not rather to open wide the door so that we should have a Continental Sunday? One was pleased, visiting France just before the war, that there were distinct signs of a return to a more peaceful Sunday. Let us within our power influence Members of Parliament, and Members of District Councils in different places, to see that there shall be a limitation put to these facilities for keeping the Sunday in a way that is really, as had been shown by the speakers to-day, harmful rather than restful for all.

Lt.-Col. Molony: In 1885 a railway was being made from Suakim towards Berber. As it was war time, they decided to work on Sunday. The first Sunday they laid one mile, but it was very badly laid; it was called the Sunday mile, it was so jolty. It gave rise to a good deal of discussion, and the general opinion was that it does not pay to work on Sunday. That was the general opinion in South Africa. Most officers, as the war went on, steadily reduced Sunday work. Not only on our side, but on the Boers' side. Joubert did his best to keep Sunday. It was the same thing in the Great War. It was generally ordered that although groups of offices must keep open to deal with anything urgent, as many people as possible should be given a rest; and towards the end of that war it was laid down that the Pay Offices should be shut entirely. The Scotch feel that there is some difficulty in getting one's mind into the correct attitude for worship, and the best thing is on Sunday morning, not to allow the mind to dwell on the weekly things which are likely to fill your thoughts and prevent you doing justice to worship. I have been asked to move a vote of thanks to our Chairman, Dr. Schofield. I am sorry to say that he says he will not be able to come amongst us so much in the future as he has done in the past, as he is going to live in the Isle of Wight. We are all very sorry for this. Dr. Schofield's knowledge of the work of this Institute has, I believe, always kept us straight. He has done much to further the work, and his savoir faire has been most useful.
Dr. Horton: If the Chairman calls on me to say a word or two, it would be simply to express the great interest that this discussion has given to me. I am very well rewarded for coming. If you usually have discussions of this sort I should like to be a member of the Institute, but I doubt if you keep up to this level. Of the many things that have been said, there was one I wanted, as it were, to correct. Two speakers spoke of the work of the Minister or Clergyman on Sunday being work, and being a necessary violation of the great principle of rest. In fact, our friend on the right seemed to glory in the fact that Sunday was a day of work. Now my experience is rather opposed to that. It is true that I have to take service on Sunday, and that sometimes I have a sense of physical exhaustion at the close of the day. But all through my long work to this very day, Sunday has always seemed to me a day of very great rest; and it stands out in my memory as week by week a new experience of the mysterious law that where you lose yourself in God, and His works, there is a rest unspeakable; and I think it is one of the great blessings of being a Minister of the Gospel that you are not only allowed, but you are equipped to lose yourself in Him, that your preaching and teaching are of no value unless you have gone and He is there, and it is in that sense that I feel, and have experienced, all through this curious reality of the day of rest in what appears to be a day of work. You, Mr. Chairman, say that if we do not take a day in the week we shall come into your hands, and that you have to deal with those unwise preachers of the Gospel who neglect this law. Well, for more than thirty years I never took a day in the week. I took the six days of work and the Sunday for rest—resting consisting of perpetual preaching and teaching, but none the less perfect rest; and when I began about thirty years to take Monday as my day of rest and recreation, I did it from the advice of people of the medical profession; but it is a perfect nuisance to this day; and I feel with an old man that I was talking to last night. He has been fifty years in one place as minister. He said to me last night that he always felt when Sunday was over a miserable regret it was gone, and he began to long for the next Sunday; and that Sunday of his—in one place, remember—for fifty years—has meant for him health and strength, and he shows no sign to-day of any decline; because he has rested his soul in the Lord by preaching His Gospel, and by winning people to Himself. Therefore, I just take a little exception to what has been said. The Minister of the Gospel of Christ, if he is true to his function, will find that God quite knows that he has to work from one point of view on the day of rest; but God also takes good care that the work done for Him shall be rest to his soul and to his body.