

The Christian Union

"Saving the Family Saves the Nation."

Vol. 41.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1890.

No. 6.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL STATEMENT OF THE PROVIDENT SAVINGS

Life Assurance Society

OF NEW YORK,

For the Year ending December 31st, 1889.

INCOME.		
Net Assets, January 1st, 1889.....		\$541,222 55
Premiums.....	\$1,343,630 31	
Interest.....	17,184 16	1,360,814 47
Total Income.....		\$1,902,037 02
DISBURSEMENTS.		
Paid Claims by Death.....	\$550,103 78	
Dividends to Policy-holders.....	372,469 64	
Surrendered Policies.....	2,072 52	
Annuitants.....	100 00	
Total to Policy-holders.....		\$924,745 94
Commissions and Traveling Expenses.....	\$176,689 91	
Commissions Commuted.....	56,972 92	
Salaries and Medical Fees.....	59,133 45	
Taxes.....	14,949 83	
Rents.....	17,508 95	
Advertising, Printing, Postage, etc.....	42,262 60	
Furniture.....	2,294 21	
Total Expenses.....		\$369,811 87
Total Disbursements.....		\$1,294,557 81
Net Assets, December 31st, 1889.....		\$607,479 21
INVESTED AS FOLLOWS:		
State and City Bonds.....	\$190,340 67	
Bonds and Mortgages.....	125,800 00	
Railroad Bonds.....	144,290 00	
Real Estate.....	35,449 32	
Loans on Collaterals (market value \$33,670).....	27,500 00	
Cash on hand and in banks.....	70,105 11	
Loans on Policies.....	3,500 00	
Agents' ledger balances (secured).....	10,494 11	
Total net or invested assets.....		\$607,479 21
Add:		
Net Preferred and Unpaid Premiums.....	\$94,363 74	
Interest accrued.....	8,485 41	
Market value of Bonds and Stocks over cost.....	5,317 50	108,166 65
Gross Assets, January 1st, 1890.....		\$715,645 86
TOTAL LIABILITIES.		
Actuaries 4 per cent. Valuation by New York Insurance Dep't.....		\$346,747 13
Surplus Actuaries 4 per cent.....		368,898 73
Policies issued in 1889.....	Number. Amount.	
" in force, December 31st, 1889.....	5,404 \$19,172,197 00	
	15,752 60,954,208 00	

NOTE.—On basis of American Experience 4½ per cent. Table, the surplus would be \$392,690 73.

WM. E. STEVENS, Secretary. SHEPPARD HOMANS, President and Act'y.
FRANK S. GRANT, M.D., Med. Officer. JOSEPH H. PARSONS, Vice-President.
STANLEY, CLARK & SMITH, Counsel. CHARLES E. WILLARD, Man. Agency Dep't.

SALESMEN WANTED AT ONCE.—A few good men to sell our goods by sample to the wholesale and retail trade. We are the largest manufacturers in our line in the world. Liberal salary paid. Permanent position. Money advanced for wages, advertising, etc. For full terms address, Centennial Mfg. Co., Chicago, Ill., or Cincinnati, O.

S. S. SINGING BOOKS.

"BEAUTIFUL SONGS:" Our latest, is being received with the most marked favor. Usually when tested with a dozen other books it is selected.

"LIVING FOUNTAIN:" New and very popular. Hundreds of the best schools have adopted it and praise it in unstinted measure.

"MORNING LIGHT:"—STANDARD. THOUSANDS of schools find just what they want in it. People who prefer noble, warm, Christian sentiment to mere rattling rhymes, and want substantial, stirring and lasting tunes, find their choice in these books. 35 cents each—one sample copy for examination, only 20 cents.

Send for specimen pages of best singing books for Choir, Singing School, Day School.

S. W. STRAUB & CO., Publishers,
243 State St., Chicago, Ill.

Pleasure and Profit.

A copy of "How to make Photographs," with descriptive catalogue sent without charge to all interested.



AMATEUR OUTFITS Supplied from \$2.50 upwards, with which PICTURES of the highest excellence can be made.

THE SCOVILL & ADAMS CO.
423 Broome St., New York.

WANTED! A Christian gentleman or lady in every township as agent for "THE HOME BEYOND," or "Views of Heaven," by BISHOP FALLOWS. The choicest commendations from leading clergymen and religious papers. Address NATIONAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, 163 STATE STREET, CHICAGO. Name this paper every time you write.

"THE GLADSTONE" LAMP



is the finest lamp in the world. It gives a pure, soft, brilliant white light of 85 candle power. Purer and brighter than gaslight; softer than electric light—more cheerful than either. A *Marvelous Light from ordinary kerosene oil!*

Seeing is Believing.

A "wonderful lamp" it is indeed. Never needs trimming, never smokes nor breaks chimneys, never "smells of the oil," no sputtering, no climbing of the flame, no annoyance of any kind, and cannot explode. And, besides all, it gives a clear, white light, 10 to 20 times the size and brilliancy of any ordinary house lamp! Finished in either Brass, Nickel, Gold, or Antique Bronze. Also



THE GLADSTONE EXTENSION STUDY LAMP,

for Clergymen, Editors, College Students, Teachers, Professors, Physicians, and other professional men.

The Gladstone Banquet Lamps.
The Gladstone Piano Lamps.

Single Lamps at Wholesale Prices, boxed and sent by express. Get our Prices. "Seeing is Believing."

SEND FOR PRICE-LIST.

GLADSTONE LAMP CO.,

73 Park Place, - - - - - New York.

CHICAGO, UNION PACIFIC & NORTHWESTERN LINE

Through Car Service.
CHANGE OF TIME.

ON December 29th, and thereafter, a train over the Chicago & Northwestern Railway will leave daily at 11:30 P.M., carrying a through Palace Sleeper for San Francisco, a through Palace Sleeper for Portland, Oregon. The Palace Sleepers for San Francisco and Portland, Oregon, will go forward from Council Bluffs upon the Limited Fast Mail over the Union Pacific Railway, thereby providing the quickest and best available through car service between Chicago and the Pacific Coast. Accommodations in these cars and information in full detail can be secured upon application to agents of connecting lines, or to agents of the Chicago & Northwestern or Union Pacific Railways.

E. P. WILSON. E. L. LOMAX,
G. P. A. C. & N.-W. R'y. G. P. A. Union Pacific R'y.
CHICAGO, ILL. OMAHA, NEB.

Those answering an Advertisement will confer a favor upon the Advertiser and Publisher by stating that they saw the Advertisement in The Christian Union.

WASTE Embroidery Silks.

Factory Ends at half price; one ounce in a box. All good silk and good colors. Sent by mail on receipt of 40 cents; 100 crazy stitches in each package. Latest and best book on Art Needlework, only 10 cents. A beautiful assortment chenille and arrasene; 15 new shades in each for 50 cents. Send postal note or stamps to THE BRAINERD & ARMSTRONG SPOOL SILK CO., 625 Broadway, New York, or 621 Market St., Philadelphia, Pa. For the names and addresses of 10 ladies interested in Art Needlework we will send one book free.

GOOD COOKING.

All who desire good cooking in their houses should use

LIEBIG COMPANY'S

EXTRACT OF MEAT.

A slight addition gives great strength and flavor to Soups, Sauces, and Made Dishes.

One pound is equal to forty pounds of lean beef, of the value of about \$7.50.

Genuine only with fac-simile of J. von Liebig's signature in blue ink across the label.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION.

Vol. 41.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1890.

No. 6

For Table of Contents, Terms, etc., see opposite page.

Each copy of The Christian Union is accompanied by an eight-page extra, containing the Home, the Young Folks, and the Sunday Afternoon.

In order to emphasize the importance which The Christian Union attaches to direct religious teaching, we print the Sermon this week in a more prominent place, and during the weeks to come we shall give our readers a series of sermons from many of the foremost leaders of religious thought in this country. The Christian Union aims to print only those sermons which bear the stamp of conviction, simplicity, and spirituality. In this department, as in every other, it will aim to supply its readers with the inspiration and stimulus which help men to bear the burdens of life, to comprehend its mysteries, and to perform its work.

THE OUTLOOK.

IN the somewhat confused issue presented by the entangled condition of the House of Representatives, aggravated by the partisan shouts of men on both sides, more clamorous than argumentative, it is no wonder that some readers of the daily papers are misled as to the question at issue, and others are confused and therefore practically indifferent respecting it. More light and less heat appears to us desirable, and we endeavor here in two or three paragraphs to state the question at issue and our judgment upon it, in a quiet undisturbed by party passion and outcry. A majority of the House is necessary to constitute a quorum, and a quorum is necessary to transact business. It is true that laws may be and often are passed without a quorum present; but this is only by universal consent, and because the House is not supposed to know that there is no quorum. The fact that a quorum is present is made to appear on the record by the number of votes cast. If the number of votes cast does not constitute a quorum, any one present may object, and the bill or resolution fails—for want of a quorum. This is the principle on which the United States House of Representatives has always acted, and we believe that it is the principle under which substantially all American legislative bodies have acted. It has happened frequently, in the past history of the House, that a minority present have prevented legislation by simply sitting still in their seats and refusing to vote; that the Speaker has been importuned to recognize officially the presence of non-voting members and enter their names on the record; and that he has uniformly refused so to do. This refusal has been made by no less an authority than Mr. Blaine when he was Speaker; and the refusal has been sustained by Mr. Garfield, Mr. Reed himself, Mr. Carlisle, and by, in short, the best parliamentarians on both sides of the House. There is practically no question as to what is the American custom in this respect. The Republicans have a majority in the present House; but enough Republicans are absent to prevent them from having a quorum. The absences are due to sickness. The majority desire to bring up certain contested election cases before the House has adopted Rules for its government; the Democrats are filibustering to prevent them from doing so. Speaker Reed, in

order to defeat the filibustering and make possible the decision of the contested election cases, has overruled the precedents of the past, has ordered the names of Democrats present but not voting to be entered on the rolls, and declared a quorum present when no quorum had voted.

* * *

In this statement of the facts the first thought of common sense, which aims generally at immediate results and is not particular about methods, is that Speaker Reed is right and tradition is wrong. It seems absurd that, when in fact not over fourteen or fifteen members of the House are out of their seats, the business of legislation should be stopped because a minority of those present refuse to vote at all. If they absent themselves from the House, the Sergeant-at-Arms can compel their attendance; but no power can coerce them to vote. If the real issue was, what to many it seems to be, whether a quorum necessary for the transaction of business should be constituted by those voting or by those present whether voting or not, we have no question that common sense would accept the latter alternative. But this is not the real issue; certainly not, in our judgment, the more important one. Each House, on organization, creates its own Rules and elects its own officers. It is an entirely new body, having no vital connection with the departed House. It is usual to adopt without question the Rules of the old House until new ones can be framed, to amend them from time to time, but not to frame new ones; so that in fact, though not in law, the Rules descend from one political generation to another. The Rules have, however, so carefully guarded the rights of the minority as to give the majority no rights; and in the last House it was demonstrated that a mere handful of resolute men, led by an experienced parliamentarian, could block all legislation. The House and the country grew weary of this despotism of the minority. And when the present House was organized, instead of adopting the Rules of the last House, the House resolved to live without any Rules until new ones could be formed. Under these circumstances it seems to us that it was clearly the duty of the Speaker to administer his office in accordance with those general parliamentary principles which are the unwritten law of all American legislative bodies. The House must transact its business lawfully. To do this it must either have written Rules or it must regard the unwritten rules which universal precedent has set. To put both aside and allow the Speaker to create new rules of his own for its government is to substitute autocracy for democracy at the very heart and center of our government—the organization of its popular assembly.

* * *

Does the partisan reader ask what we would have had done? The answer appears to us as self-evident as it is simple. The Republican party was right in refusing to adopt the Rules of the old House. To have done so would have been to tie itself hand and foot, and agree beforehand to do nothing to which the consent or at least the acquiescence of the Democratic minority could not have been secured. But in proceeding without written Rules the majority should have erred, if at all, on the side of conservatism. It should have scrupulously respected the unwritten and traditional rules of American parliamentary bodies until the new Rules could be prepared. It should have attempted no partisan legislation during this condition of imperfect and inchoate organization. When the new Rules were prepared, the fullest opportunity should have been given to the minority to debate, object, amend. When this debate had come to its legitimate close,

the Rules should have been put on their passage. If the Democratic minority had then attempted to filibuster against their enactment, it would have been wholly in the wrong; and if that filibustering could not have been defeated without a departure from the traditions of the past, the Speaker would have been justified in inaugurating the departure on the simple principle that a revolution by a minority may, if necessary, be defeated by revolutionary methods on the part of the majority. But for a narrow majority to attempt to increase its power, by unseating one of the minority and putting one of the majority in his place, before any written Rules have been adopted, and by methods in violation of the unwritten rules of American legislative bodies, enforced in the House by the autocratic decrees of the Speaker, appears to us to be saved from being a serious menace to the integrity of representative government only because it is likely, as its true significance comes to be understood, to be condemned by the sober judgment and conservative instincts of the great majority of judicially-minded and non-partisan Americans.

* * *

Senator Chandler's crusade against what is termed the "naval lobby" has caused Secretary Tracy to appoint a court of inquiry. The facts upon which Mr. Chandler's action is based are generally familiar. There has never been any attempt to conceal the existence of organizations of line and of staff officers intended to protect their interests. The need of some system of mutual support may not be apparent to every one, but this need is illustrated in the case of suits which have been necessary to determine the exact construction of the law. For example, officers on duty at the training ship "New Hampshire" at Newport received only shore pay, although they were obliged to perform regular service on the ship, and to maintain a mess, even though they might be obliged to maintain additional quarters on shore. The case was taken to the Supreme Court, which decided that, under the law, officers assigned to this service were entitled to full sea pay. It is evident that an organization which undertakes to make test cases in matters of this kind, and aims to protect the interests of officers legitimately, may have a proper field of action. The danger of demoralization lies in attempts to influence legislation. It is stated that an ex-Congressman and others have sent circulars to officers asking subscriptions to help in securing a general advance of pay. There are, of course, two ways of regarding this matter. It is a fact that the pay of naval officers is very small compared with their education, experience, general ability, and actual service. The captain last upon the list entered the service in 1856, and, after thirty-four years in the service, he can count upon an income of only \$2,800 when on leave, or \$4,500 when at sea. The lieutenant first upon the list was commissioned as midshipman in 1864. He receives \$1,800 when on waiting orders, and \$2,600 when at sea. In view of the expenses entailed upon an officer, and also of some other considerations, these salaries are certainly pitifully small. An increase can be obtained only by Congressional action, which must be preceded by argument and demonstration, and this means special action by officers or hired representatives. It would be hard to deny the service the privilege of openly presenting a case to a Congressional committee. But as to the employment of lobbyists or their methods, there cannot be two opinions among laymen, or, as we believe, among the majority of the officers of our navy. Senator Chandler's aggressive resolution reads as if charges

his own prophecies fulfilled and his faith realized. For example, in 1858 he purchased a Mazarin Bible, the first book printed with movable type, for £595; in 1888 he sold one for £3,900! His linguistic, philological, and knowledge of special branches of learning is so remarkable that he has long been in communication with all the learned men and institutions in Europe and America, as well as having agents in all the large cities of the world.

The chief interest to Americans, at this present time, in him and his doings is from the fact that his son has just arrived in this country with a selection from his vast stock, to give an exhibition in the principal cities of America. This consists, in the main, of books never seen by those who have not been away from our own country, and embraces unique bindings, missals, early printed books, manuscripts beautifully illuminated, rare Americana, etc.

The briefest mention of these examples must suffice. The books are arranged under the caption of Artistic and Literary. The former include "Illuminated MSS., typographical monuments, books with woodcuts, printed Books of Hours and prayer-books, artistic and sculptured bindings, etc.," while under the latter are included "English and Scottish writers from Wycliff to Burns, noteworthy editions of the English Bible, and Americana." To fully appreciate this feast one must visit the Albemarle Hotel, where it is spread between the hours of ten and five, and not be contented with merely consulting the *menu*.

The MSS. range, in the date of their execution, from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries. The most important is an Imperial Codex, "The Golden Gospels of Henry VIII.," written in letters of gold on purple vellum, made at Tours about 750 A.D., probably for Charlemagne immediately after his accession to the throne of the Frankish Kingdom, and presented to Henry VIII. "in token of gratitude for his defense of the Church against Luther." Examples of manuscripts of each century, with characteristic workmanship, are also shown, French, English, German, Italian, and Flemish being fully represented. The Mazarin Bible was printed under the partnership of Gutenberg, Fust, and Schoeffer, but, rare as this is, Mr. Quaritch has here a rarer book still, namely, the "Psalterium Cum Canticis Litanis," 1459—the second book printed with a date, of which only eight copies are known. This is the costliest volume ever sold—a rare recommendation—\$26,250 being the modest sum asked for it. Poor Gutenberg, like many another inventor, was squeezed out of the partnership, while Fust and Schoeffer continued the establishment. This volume is considered the finest example of ornamental typography ever produced, and that in the very infancy of the art. "The Catholicon," 1460, printed by Gutenberg after he recovered from his surprise, is also shown. First books printed in Italy, Switzerland, Paris, Lyons, etc., show how rapidly the new art spread, while here are actually five Caxtons (what would Dibdin say!), viz., "The Game of Chess," printed before Caxton came to England; Gower's "Confessio Amantis," 1483; Lydgate's "Lyf of Our Lady," the only perfect copy extant outside the Bodleian and British Museum. These are indeed "monuments of typography," but for gems one must turn to the fine specimens of the Aldus press—"Musæus" (the first book issued); "Virgil," the first book issued in Italic type, which is said to be in imitation of Petrarch's handwriting. Wood engraving in its cradle is represented by many fine specimens. The "Nürnberg Chronicle," three books illustrated by Dürer; Holbein's "Bible Prints," 1538, are the more important examples.

Copper engravings come forward for their share of praise, Laborde's "Chants et Chansons," 1773, at Paris, and Behan's choice collection of prints being the representatives.

Original drawings by William Blake, the weird poet-artist, are decidedly of interest.

To many people the artistic bindings of the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries are unknown. Mr. Quaritch, nothing daunted by the presence here of the Grolier Club, brings exquisite specimens of early English work; while Grolier, Nicolas Eve, Le Gascon, Boyer, Padeloup, Dérôme, books from the libraries of De Thou, Henry II., and old Italian bindings, complete the procession.

The English literature exhibited does appeal to us all, and one feels a little like the man who asked, at a very elaborate dinner, in a whisper to the waiter, "if he had any roast beef." Here are first editions of "The Visions of Pierce Ploughman," "Chaucer," 1492; "The Golden Legend," translated by Cax-

ton (printers in those days were more than simply printers); Barclay's "Shyp of Follys," 1509, printed by Pynson; Froissart's "Chronicles," 1523-25; Fraunce's "Lawiers Logike," 1588—the one from which Shakespeare learned his; Milton's "Lycidas," 1638, printed at Cambridge; "Burns," the famous Kilmarnock edition, 1786, for which is asked \$420; the first printed English Bible, Miles Coverdale's, 1535; Tyndale's "Newe Testament," 1536-49.

In Americana the most noted are Vespucci's "Voyages," 1507; Hakluyt's, 1598-1600; Smith's "Map of Virginia," 1612; Purchas "His Pilgrimes," 5 volumes, 1625-26.

FEDERATION OF CHURCHES TO SECURE THAT THE GOSPEL BE PREACHED TO EVERY CREATURE.

By JAMES MCCOSH,

Ex-President of Princeton College.

I AM much gratified to learn that the attention of the editor of The Christian Union has been directed to some scattered remarks that I have made on a Federation of Churches, and that he has asked me to write out my views more fully.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." This command was given by our Lord to the Eleven, between his resurrection and ascension, when he was giving instructions to his Apostles as to the institution of the Church he was establishing. This command is binding on the Church as a Church, on every individual church, and on every professing Christian. Nearly nineteen centuries have run their course, and yet this command has not been fulfilled. All this precious time has been allowed, and there are hundreds of millions of responsible creatures to whom the message has not been delivered. I am not in this paper to speak of heathen countries, but of the thousands in every great city and the hundreds in many of our rural districts in this Christian country who have no Bible, no Sabbath, and no one to care for their souls. A heavy responsibility lies on all of us for this state of things.

Multitudes of earnest people are asking, How are we to meet the evil? The common answer is, Let every church do its duty, let every Christian do his duty. This is a right, but it is not a sufficient answer. All evangelical churches are at present active, but the work is not done. No one individual, no one church, has done the work; no one church can do the whole work. There is need of mutual understanding, of fraternal conferences, and of hearty co-operation.

The expressed wish and hope of most Christians is to have this work done by the union of all the evangelical churches. "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John xvii. 21). There is a sense, and a high sense, in which the Church is now one and has always been one—it is one in Christ. "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all" (Eph. iv., 4-6). But the churches are not visibly one, so as to lead men to believe in Christ being sent, and they do not co-operate.

It was my privilege, some years ago, to start a movement in Philadelphia which, by the active co-operation of people in Europe and America, has culminated in an alliance of all the Presbyterian churches in England, Scotland, and Ireland, on the Continent of Europe, in Australia and the British Colonies, in the United States and Canada. I have been asked once and again whether I would join in an effort to bring all our evangelical churches into a visible unity. I declared my anxiety to have such a measure carried, but have declined taking any active steps to further it, as I see that the churches are in no way prepared to sanction it. I do not inquire which of the churches is to blame for this state of feeling, or whether all of them are, so far, to blame. Certainly all are to blame which are not prepared to unite on a footing of equality and which insist on all others being absorbed into their own body.

But meanwhile I am pained and perplexed more than I can tell to find that, in consequence, to a large extent, of the separation of the churches, the Lord's command has not been carried out, and the Gospel preached to every creature. I feel as if at the judgment day some one might stand up and plead against us: "It is not my fault that I am

not in your company, or on the right hand of the throne of God, for while there were churches and ministers all around me enjoying the rich consolations of religion, no one ever told me that the Son of the Highest came into the world to save sinners."

So I have been anxiously pondering the question whether, prior to our reaching a full union of the churches, there might not be a practical means of bringing them to such a union as to have our Lord's command obeyed. If we cannot yet have an *Incorporation*, let us have a *Federation*. We have a model to guide us in the Constitution of the United States, which was founded, I think, so far on the Constitution of the Church, and from which we may borrow some things in drawing out a plan of church co-operation.

It may turn out that Christian co-operation is the best, is in fact the appointed, means of consummating church union. "If any will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God" (John vii., 17). In doing the will of God, in preaching the Gospel everywhere, Christians and churches will be brought into a unity of faith and doctrine. The churches in working together will come to know each other better and love each other more. The blessed issue will be that by this shall all men know that we are His disciples, by our love one toward another. In this, rather than in any external forms, the unity of the Church consists. This visible love is to be one main means of leading the world to believe that God hath in love sent his Son into the world to save sinners.

The plan which I propose does not interfere with the arrangements of any church. It does not profess to be a church organization; it is simply a provision by which each church, adhering to its own constitution, may carry out the will of the Master. The Episcopal clergyman is still under his bishop, the Presbyterian minister is still under his presbytery or classis, and the Congregational pastor has the benefit of the advice of a council. While this paper is passing through the press I am happy to find that in the Presbyterian Church the Committee of Conference with the Protestant Episcopal Commission on Church Union have "unanimously determined to recommend that the Assembly declare its desire for a Federation of the Evangelical Churches of the land, and invite the other church organizations to arrange for a conference at which such a measure shall be considered and, if practicable, consummated."

It is in thorough accordance with the history of Christianity. It is well known that when the Church was becoming widely spread it divided the country into districts or parishes, and appointed a person to take an oversight of each. It can be shown that this was one of the means by which Christianity became diffused through every city, town, village, and rural district of Europe. The system continues to this day, and when the church is left free and the minister is faithful, it has many advantages. I can say so from experience, as I was a parish minister for sixteen years. In one of my parishes I had a colleague and upwards of fourteen hundred communicants, and there were several dissenting ministers in the town. Every man, woman, and child in a parish of six thousand was carefully looked after, and there were not a dozen people who did not attend the house of God on the Sabbath.

In the United States we have a different state of things. There the parochial system has very much disappeared. The minister feels that his charge is mainly over those who attend his church, wherever they may reside. Some feel as if they have no responsibility beyond their own people, and think that they do enough when they minister faithfully to them. There are others who do evangelistic or missionary work, but as all do not, and there is no system, there are many and large districts, both in town and country, which are neglected and allowed to sink into heathenism and vice.

Now the Federation, such as I suggest, is adapted to this state of things. It allows every pastor to attend specially to his own people, and to do good wherever he can. But meanwhile it allots a district, say of five hundred, or one thousand or two thousand, to every evangelical minister who is willing to undertake it. His business is to secure that the glad tidings are made known to all, to young and old. The minister may do this himself, or more frequently he will do it with the help of others. He should have lay assistants, male and female, elders, deacons, deaconesses, Sabbath-school teachers; and large congregations should have competent paid assistants. The advantage of this system is that, without infringing on the rights of any church or

individual, we secure that Christ's command is obeyed, the glad tidings of salvation are made known to every creature even in our poorest and most out-cast districts. Christians are bound to find a way by which this end may be secured, and I have sought in vain for any other plan by which the end is sure to be accomplished.

I do not claim any merit in this scheme. There is no originality in it. Some such method has occurred to hundreds—only it has not been carried out. But I have to insist on one provision being made in the scheme, and it is the only peculiarity that I claim for it. As so long a parish minister, I know and have felt the aversion of those who have parochial charges to allow other laborers to enter their district. In this advanced age all such restrictions must be removed. There is to be a minister to take the oversight of a parish, but he is not to hinder another minister from visiting his people in that district or otherwise doing good in it—say, setting up a Sunday-school or even building a church in it. This is an essential part of the measure I propose. I can conceive that good may arise from such a stimulus. Even in the Romish Church the monk was encouraged to enter the parish of the lazy priest and do good. In the European countries the dissenters stir up the parish ministers. There must be full liberty to every man to do good where he can. While all this is allowed, people generally will be disposed to help rather than hinder the parish minister, who will find an abundant field of usefulness. At all events, this liberty must be allowed in the plan if it is to be successful. Without this it will not be listened to for a moment.

But here the question is raised—and it is a difficult, indeed the only difficult, one—With whom is the division into parishes and the appointment of the ministers for the district to be made? This is a subject on which there is need of careful consideration, kind conference, and discussion.

Much of the work might be done spontaneously by pastors. Feeling the work to be beyond their individual strength, they will be ready to call in others to act with them. One says, I will take this district and you will take that. Much may be done in this way without any authoritative superintendence. It has occurred to me that, when ministers over-jealous for their denomination cannot agree, pious laymen, accustomed to contribute to the schemes of the churches, might say, We cannot give to every sectarian scheme; let us agree upon a distribution of the work, and let all fall in with it.

But if nothing more than this is done, I fear that there will be gaps, and regions between the parishes abandoned to heathenism. If it can be done, it is desirable to have an advisory (not an authoritative) power, to divide the city or rural district, or, if possible, the whole country, into parishes, and allot the agents to each.

The Evangelical Alliance might surely aid in this work, might so far guide (not control) it. It has sometimes been objected to the Alliance that it is a talking and not a working body. I do not join in that objection, but if it can be induced to take a part in the practical work proposed the objection will be felt no longer. The President of the American Branch of the Alliance, as an individual, favors the proposed scheme. I cherish the hope that the whole body may countenance it, in entire consonance with its fundamental principle of not interfering with the churches. The American branch might appoint a commission or committee to organize this work, and combine the ministers in conducting it. The local branches would each have a work here in which they might do unbounded good, and have unbounded pleasure in doing it.

I fear that all churches and all ministers will not agree to participate in this movement, and this because of denominational zeal, insisting that the world must be converted by their own sect. But if all will not join, I hope a number may. If so, let them begin the work in some city or country district, all the while inviting and alluring others to join them. If there be a denomination which cannot get others to join it, let it proceed to divide the district into parishes and ask one of its own ministers to take charge of each. If there be a branch of the Church which will not join with any other, I should grieve over the narrowness, but I would say to it, Divide the country for yourselves, and as you do so you may find the work of preaching the Gospel to every creature to be too great, and you may be led to call in others. If the plan cannot be carried out at once in every part of the country, let it be commenced at once in a district where the Christian ministers are prepared for it.

It will be a recommendation of the measure, in the view of many ministers, that when they visit in these parishes the people will be more likely to come to their church than to any other. There is to be no compulsion, but there is a moral suasion here which is allowable, and may be very effective.

As so long a parish minister, I might give many details as to the practicability of the plan. But enough for the present.

FOUR YEARS IN JOURNALISM.

BY TOM MASSON.

ONE autumn night, eight years ago, I mailed with trembling hands an article to The Christian Union, entitled "Looking for a Place." It was the truthful recital of the trials of a country boy of fifteen in his first efforts to get work in the metropolis. Four years after it was followed by another called "My First Four Years in Business." Having, therefore, fallen into the habit of writing for The Christian Union every four years, allow me to introduce myself once more.

In common with the majority of boys who start out early in life to seek their fortunes, I had a great desire to enter the ranks of journalism. To my youthful eyes a reporter was a creature to look upon with awe, and I never contemplated an editor for an instant without feeling my pulse quicken.

My success in business had not been phenomenal. Although my employers had always expressed themselves satisfied with me, for a long time, like a cork which floats uneasily on the surface of the water, I felt myself impelled toward the journalistic whirlpool. There was one paper for which I had conceived a great admiration, and I concluded to call on the editor. One afternoon, after waiting a few moments at the door to pull myself together, I mounted the stairs, and made my first appearance in the editorial rooms of a daily newspaper. An office boy asked me what I wanted.

"Is the managing editor in?" I asked.

"Nop," said the boy. "Want ter see the city editor?"

"Yes," said I.

"What name?" asked the boy.

I produced a card on which I had carefully written my name, and the boy took it over to a sober-looking individual who sat engrossed in a paper. He glanced at the card curiously for an instant, and then I heard him tell the boy to show me in. He looked up from his paper as I approached, and said:

"Well, sir?"

"I am very anxious to become a journalist. Is there any chance?"

For a moment the city editor gazed off into space without replying. Unconsciously his hand went out and grasped a pair of well-worn scissors, which he thumbed abstractedly. A faint smile curled his lip—it was a smile of pity—and then he looked up and said:

"What do you want to be a newspaper man for?"

"Because," I replied, "I think I am fitted for it. Of course I may be mistaken, but I propose to try it."

The city editor smiled again.

"Young man," said he, "don't do it. There is no chance here."

If I had wanted to be a newspaper man before, now I had a double incentive. As I went along I made up my mind to get even with that city editor. "What do you want to be a newspaper man for?" I kept repeating to myself. "Umph! perhaps you'll know some day," and I pictured a time in the glorious future, when, sitting in my editorial palace, the head of a big metropolitan journal, I would have an opportunity of spurning this poor, miserable wretch of a city editor!

My next endeavor was of a more conservative nature. I got a friend to introduce me to the managing editor of an evening paper. He explained to me the methods employed by the different papers—how one wanted facts, another sensation, another flippancy, and so on. He showed me how, if I meant to succeed, I would have to pit myself, an inexperienced outsider, against men trained in their calling and known in their profession. "If," he said, "you are bound to try it, select some paper, study its style and requirements, and keep sending in matter without getting discouraged, always bearing in mind that you must, to succeed, furnish matter better than anything else that the paper receives."

I slept under this wet blanket for a long time, but gradually my former enthusiasm returned.

Before calling upon another editor, and especially upon another city editor—for my sensitive soul had not yet recovered from the shock of my former interview—I wisely determined to first get an article accepted. Once more one of my friends came to my rescue. He related an incident which had happened to himself, and it struck me with so much force that I concluded to write it up. I sat up over it until two o'clock in the morning, and then so anxious was I to try my luck that I mailed it immediately to the first paper I thought of, scarcely giving myself time to read it over. For two or three mornings I scanned the columns of the paper, but my story did not appear. Finally my impatience got the better of me. I called and asked to see the managing editor. He was busy, but his assistant, a dapper-looking young man with side whiskers, and an air as if he considered it a special favor to allow me to occupy the same hemisphere with him, said that the article had just been returned.

"It may do for some papers," said he, "but it's no use to us."

That night I sat up over my article again, and revised it. I noticed at once that it contained several errors, and saw that I had been too hasty. This is the great fault that most editors complain of—a lack of painstaking and a disregard for truth. I have heard that Charles A. Dana once declared that the best reporter he ever had was a man who was scarcely able to write a sentence of the English language correctly, but who knew how to tell the truth.

After I had made my article as nearly perfect as possible, I mailed it to the paper whose city editor I had concluded to get even with. For two days I waited. On the third morning there it was on the editorial page! and I could scarcely contain my delight to see myself in print.

The next day I called to get my money. This time I bounded up the stairs. The managing editor not having arrived, I asked for my old friend the city editor. He did not recognize his visitor of a few months before, but when I told him that I would like to get the money for that article of mine which appeared "in yesterday's paper," he smiled (it was the same old smile), and said it wasn't the custom to pay until Saturday.

"However," said he, "I will give you an order if you are hard up" (he was evidently used to seeing people who were hard up), and he looked over the file, measured my story, and wrote out an order on the cashier for \$3.50.

"Isn't that very little for such an article?" I asked.

"That's as much as we pay any one for such stuff," he answered (another smile), and I was wise enough to depart in peace. The term "stuff," by the way, is the newspaper parlance for manuscript, and its use is by no means intended as a reproach.

Shortly after that I sent in another article, and, after waiting in vain for its appearance, at length followed it in person. This time the managing editor was in. I found him to be a thorough gentleman, quiet and genial in his manner.

"We are obliged to return your article," he said, "but don't get discouraged. Anything you pick up and which you think appropriate for us, send it in, and remember that there may be a hundred reasons why a good article is returned."

This encouragement was all I needed, and for weeks I flooded the paper with contributions, all of which were promptly returned. Once more my courage began to ooze out, when one day I had a visit from one of the Muses. My caller from Helicon Hill did not stay long, and she certainly might have served me better. But with her aid I evolved some verses, which, if they could not be termed poetry, had the merit of being funny, and this is why they were eventually published. My impression is that I got the idea from an article which I had read some time before. It was nothing more or less than a receipt for writing newspaper verse. "Make it pathetic," said the writer, "up to the last line or so: then destroy the illusion." He gave as an example a fine description, in English heroic, of a deserted house. The tears almost came to my eyes as I read the pathetic story of the dilapidated mansion—until I reached the last few lines, when the dog came out and the writer fled.

My piece of verse was built on the same plan, and so much elated was I with my success that I mailed it at once to the "Century Magazine." How the city editor would have smiled could he have seen me as I read the postal card I received in