REFERS IT TO SCRIPTURE.

THE REV. DR. PARKHURST PREACHES ON THE "WOMAN QUESTION."

THE FACT THAT WOMEN DID NOT VOTE IN BIBLE TIMES IS NOT A GOOD ARGUMENT AGAINST THEIR VOTING NOW, HE SAYS—THEY SHOULD SEEK THE GUIDANCE OF THE BIBLE—SUPREME IN THE HOME.

The Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst preached yesterday morning at the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church upon what is called the "Woman Question." He did not say whether women should vote or not, but he did express himself emphatically in favor of deciding that question and all similar ones on strictly Scriptural lines. As the ballot box was not widely distributed in Bible times, the Doctor's sermon offered only an inferential decision of the suffrage question.

He had announced on the previous Sunday that his discourse yesterday would be for women, and therefore his church was crowded to the doors.

This was the sermon, in part:

I have made choice this morning of two texts, selected respectively from opposite ends of the Bible.

"And the Lord God said, it is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an helpmeet for him."—Genesis ii, 18.

"But speak then the things which become sound doctrine: That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed."—Titus ii, 1, 4, 5.

There is that in the present situation which, I believe, renders it obligatory upon the Christian pulpit to address itself to women. There is also at present that sharp antagonism of opinion and that fevered intensity of feeling which to a peculiar degree embarrass all such addresses to women; and the only hope that we can reasonably have that the handling of the woman question at this time will issue in beneficial results will be in holding ourselves distinctly upon Scriptural grounds. I have been repeatedly approached this last week with the request that I should use my pulpit as a means of exploiting one or the other side of the great question that is in these days under debate. Indeed I am not quite sure but that if I had evinced a tractable or mercenary spirit I could have received a retainer for the occasion. All such approaches and suggestions are to me excessively offensive; they are so directly counter to what I conceive to be the prophetic office of the Christian pulpit. The pulpit is certain to weaken itself when it undertakes to make itself an authority upon questions which it has no exceptional means of understanding and no exceptional genius for stating and elucidating. So that you are in the wrong church this morning, any one of you who is present for the purpose of listening to a forensic discussion of the woman suffrage matter. At the same time whatever concerns womanly function, womanly duty, womanly prerogative—name it as you like—knits into the previous question as to God's idea in having woman anyhow.

As to that matter there is no higher or more authoritative court of appeal than the Christian Scriptures. There is nothing that has done so much for woman as the Bible, and if she knows what is good for her she will stick by it. It would be ground for more hopeful expectations if in the discussion of such questions as are now agitating them, Christian women especially would spend a little more preliminary time in determining whether or no the Word of God has something to say about them; or at least whether there are not in that Word some principles enunciated and illustrated that have an evident bearing upon the questions pro or contra, and which a Christian cannot afford to ignore in her efforts to reach a safe and therefore a permanent conclusion. In all that I have heard and all that I have read upon the matter that has been lately under debate there is but a single instance in which I have encountered anything that looked like a disposition to inquire whether God had any interest in this matter or any mind upon it, or whether between the lids of the Bible there were any events described, any facts stated or any intimations given, in the light of which or at the suggestion of which, decisions could be reached that would therefore give promise of a divine validity. The Bible, it is true, is a very old book, and was composed by men who had no knowledge of our day, and no presentiment of the fertility and expansiveness of idea that would obtain in the closing decades of the nineteenth century; still it is not difficult to discover from the Bible in a general way what God's feeling is in regard to woman, and what construction he puts upon her, and as men and women who believe in the Bible as the word of God, that is the first thing for us to give attention to in every attempt to arrive at a safe determination as to her immunities, duties or prerogatives.

THE CONSUMMATION OF CREATION.

The first important suggestion that comes to us from the Bible record is that the production of woman was the consummating act of the creative week. In order to appreciate all that that means it needs to be diligently remembered that God's line of creative work was one of steady improvement in the quality of its product. Whatever opinion we may see our way clear to hold upon the doctrine of evolution, it remains a fact that the first two chapters of Genesis mark an orderly progress of creative sequence, each step in the history furnishing the platform upon which sustained itself a still higher and finer exercise of the Divine wisdom and power, so that each stage was the finish of what had preceded and the initiative of all that came after. It is in that character, then, that we are obliged to construe the final act of the creation week, and to find in the production of woman the climax of God's creative energy. When He had finished her He stopped, knowing of nothing better or higher that He could design. Or we could state it otherwise by saying that without her creation would have just missed being a success, and that she gave effect to all that had been previously achieved. The profound reading of the first two chapters of Genesis compels to the highest possible interpretation of womanhood, and disposes summarily of any such conception as that woman is an accident of history or ordained by Nature to a position of inferiority. And this is in accord with the impression that is yielded by the Scriptures in their entirety, that, while man is gifted with those propensities that make him a more overt and conspicuous figure in the history of God's people, so that the rollcall of the national agencies of Hebrew progress, as preserved in the eleventh chapter of the Hebrew Epistle, is composed almost to a unit of representatives of the brawnier sex—yet, that when it is a matter of personality carried to the highest and most delicate degree of organization and refinement, it is women upon which the Scriptures regularly put the stamp of Divine preferment. And the Scriptures have not been read for hundreds and thousands of years without that sentiment having become in a very whole degree an element in the general estimate. Not all, but a great deal of what is known as gallantry is a silent tribute which man yields to the queenliness of God's favorite sex. The same sentiment asserts itself, although in a manner not always understood, in the heavenly penalty which woman is publicly required to pay when she sacrifices her womanhood. It is easy to say that the sin is as much his as hers, and that social ostracism for her and social toleration for him is an injustice, and so in a way it is. At the same time, in that discrimination there is an unconscious tribute paid to woman, for the dishonor can be only as deep as the honor is high from which it has declined, and it is exactly the delicate grandeur of any temple that makes it so pathetic in its ruin. That estimate of woman, which is a distinctly Scriptural one, lies very deeply intrenched in the masculine Christian mind—and there is nothing more becoming to man than that he should continue to cherish that estimate, and nothing more to the advantage of woman than that she should carry herself in a way to encourage that estimate.

THE DISPARITY OF THE SEXES.

Another matter which lies deeply imbedded in the entire Scriptural record is the essential disparity of the two sexes. The physical type of each has its correlations in the mental and spiritual. "Male and female, He created them." That is the basal fact of the entire matter. Sex is not an accident of personality, but is an element that is constituent in every thread and fibre of it. If a man is a man the flavor of manhood will permeate him in his entirety. If a woman is a woman the flavor of womanhood will permeate her in her entirety. All of that is in the verse just quoted, "Male and female, created He them." That means that, to the mind of the Creator, each of these two stood for a distinct type of personal existence in all that goes to compose personal existence. The instant you commence to animalize the idea of sex and limit the distinction to disparity of physical organization you cut into the tissue of the deepest part of the entire matter, and unfortunately there is at present a very strong tendency in that direction. The intention of Scripture is clear from the method in which it handles representatives of the womanly sex. Those women upon whom it puts the stamp of divine distinction and approval are women, scarcely with an exception, whose womanhood is realized to be a pervasive ingredient entering into the constitution of all their capacities, faculties, experience and activity. And the finer the point of organization arrived at the more probable and all-suffusing this womanly element becomes. It reaches its acme in Mary, the mother of Jesus. She never made much noise in the world; she was never tumultuous nor aggressive, but there was not a fibre in her—body, mind or spirit—that was not woman, and when God wanted a little boy to be brought up in a way to fit him to be the Saviour of the world He gave Him to her to love and take care of; and in that fact you will find all the meaning that you have the womanly heart to find in it. The two sexes being thus discrepant by constitution, which is only another name for Divine appointment, the whole effect of nurture and discipline, so far as the nurture and discipline are legitimate, will be to make the differences between manhood and womanhood greater, not less. Development of beginnings that are essentially dissimilar always issues in divergence, not in convergence. Any civilization that transforms or tends to transform a woman into the female duplicate of a man is a false civilization. If you women want to keep the supremacy that belongs to your sex you will have to keep it by making more and more of your womanliness and not in trying to be mannish. If you succeed in convincing men by the quality of your ambitions and interests, by the mode of your training, by the character of your pursuits, that the only difference between you and men is an affair of physical structure, there is an end to your queenliness and to masculine respect for it.

THE SECRET OF WOMAN IS SUPREMACY.

I want to say this without at all going into the details of the matter—you can think it out as far as you like, but we will not phrase it—if you want to retain the supremacy that belongs to you as women, belongs to you because inherent in your sex, you have got to cherish your femininity with some considerable measure of caution. I understand the ground that I am on perfectly well. The secret of a woman's hold, the secret of a wife's hold upon her companion, is not that she is a female, but that she is a woman. If you do not detect my intention you can think it out later. I could keep you interested on that line for a considerable time if it were the appropriate thing to do. Woman's proper destiny is on a distant line from that of masculinity, and she will savor less and less of masculinity according as she approaches the perfection and consummation of her being. Now, on the contrary, there is an element in the community—a small one, I would fain hope, yet the size of a thing is no measure of the disquiet it will produce—there is an element in the feminine world that is suffering from what I shall venture to call andromania. The word is not an English one, for the reason, I suppose, that the English language makers never supposed that we should need such a term. It is constructed on the same principle as the word Anglomania, which means a passionate aping of everything that is English. Andromania means, similarly, a passionate aping of everything that is mannish. It is an attempt on the part of those infected with the disease to minimize the distinctions by which manhood and womanhood have been supposed to be differentiated, whether as regards their culture, their interests or their activities. It is that animus which prompts a woman to imagine that she has achieved a great triumph if she succeeds in doing something that only man has hitherto been accustomed to do, but that no woman up to date has availed to do.

I am not here to render a bill of particulars. That is not my business. I am following a very slender, but a very straight line. I am not criticising any particular act of these andromaniacs; I am only criticising the disposition on their part to narrow the distinctive features of woman to the smallest possible margin. That is not saying that it hurts a woman to do what a woman has never done before. It is not saying that if, up to a certain time, only men had been admitted to the Bar it is therefore an injury to a woman to be admitted to the Bar. But it is saying that if she makes that move at the impulse of an idea, that activities that are suitable for men are therefore suitable for women, and that the supreme distinction between the two is physiological, it is an injury to her, and an incalculable injury, and one that will have to be paid for somehow before it is all through with. As said before, if you want particularization, you have come to the wrong place. We are determined to hold ourselves strenuously within the area of Scriptural authorization. It is not safe to infer that because Hannah, the mother of little Samuel, did not practise law it is therefore unbecoming to women to do so now. We must be careful and not strain our premises to the yielding of an unjustified conclusion. The times are different now from what they were then, whatever that may mean. It is not prudent to conclude that, because Mary and Martha seem not to have mixed in the public affairs of Bethany, either stumping the town, or frequenting or manipulating the primaries, that therefore there is an inherent unseemliness in those things being done by the Marys and Marthas of later time and a different style of civilization. It did not lie in the general mind as conceivable at that time; besides there is nothing to indicate that there were any caucuses to go to in Bethany.

NOBODY VOTED IN NAZARETH.

So you would have no logical warrant for deciding that, because the Virgin Mary does not seem to have turned over the miraculous babe into the clumsy keeping of Joseph in order to get opportunity to skip to the polls, therefore mothers of our own era and city are morally restrained from oscillating between the crib and the ballot-box. Nobody voted in Nazareth, and so, of course, Mary couldn't. I don't say that she wouldn't. The Bible does not say that she wouldn't, and we are not going to step out from Scriptural ground here. Still I wanted to mention them, for Hannah and the Holy Virgin are such transcendent types of womanliness and motherliness, that the contemplation of them seemed fitted to lead the thoughts and opinions of their sex along lines of womanliness similarly true and sincere. Our only ambition has been to lay the largest possible emphasis upon womanhood as a mode of being that is radically, physically, intellectually and spiritually differentiated from manhood; that womanhood, in its interior and distinctive sanctities, is the first thing to be considered and appreciated as preparation for the just solution of any problems relative to feminine discipline, rights or activities, and that all questions, such as those that are being discussed in these days, require to be considered solely in the light of what woman is, or God intends her and conceives of her. I am obliged to say that, to a very large degree, these questions are being handled in an exceedingly flippant and superficial kind of way, in regard to matters of occupation, education and profession, it is said if a man engages in certain industries, why shouldn't a woman? If a man goes to college, why shouldn't a woman? If a man preaches and practises medicine and law, why shouldn't a woman? If a man votes, why shouldn't a woman? We are not saying that she shouldn't; but we do say that that way of stating the case betrays an easy-going inappreciation of the vastness of the interests and realities involved, of which any intelligent Christian woman ought to be ashamed. There is no reasoning across from the one to the other. Each of the two has its own distinctive personal dowry and that dowry, and nothing else, is what will have to determine the uses to which the dowry can appropriately be put, and the functions through which it can fitly be exercised. Now, when I see women commencing to bore down into the real meat of this matter, animated by that inspiriting and Biblical conception of womanhood as of something that is apart and alone, unapproached, inimitable and supreme, endowed with gifts of personal beauty and delicacy to which man is a stranger, then I shall feel that the sex is on the track of a successful quest, and that its search will issue in results that are valid, whatever those results may prove to be.

WOMAN'S HAND ON THE RUDDER OF HISTORY.

But until the movement is motived by any consideration less serious than womanhood's consciousness of her own superb but distinctive endowments, queen over a province quite as important as that of men, contiguous to it, but in no sense identical with it—till that time arrives we shall be obliged to consider much of this miscellaneous ebullition as a passing distemper which will wear itself out in time, yet serving a most wholesome purpose, nevertheless, if only it leaves in its track, as it retires, the seeds of an earnest, meditative and devout desire to get nearer to the heart of all this great matter. My object in all this, as you have assuredly perceived, has not been to belittle what is known as the "woman question," but rather to indicate and set forth its significance. Man does not understand woman yet, and, what is a good deal more to the purpose, she by no means clearly understands herself. You need no better proof of that than the wordy warfare which has waged in this city the last six weeks. The sex has a presentiment of the splendor of its destiny with no clear appreciation of what that destiny is to be. That that destiny lies along the line of the family and the home, Scripture gives us no liberty to doubt. It is impossible to forget—the Bible does not allow you to forget—that the home is the cradle of everything that is best, truest and most heavenly in the world we are living in, and that the queen of the home is the wife and the mother. That is Bible. You may not like it, but it is all the worse for you if you don't. And if I were to put my finger on what seems to me to be the sorest spot in the municipal condition of our city, and the National condition of our country at large, I would say that it was in the decadence of the home idea. The proofs of that are many and painful, and some of them, unmentionable. Things cannot exist in any finer shape of society, in the State or in the Church, than they lie incipiently in the little commonwealth of the family circle, and the atmosphere of that commonwealth, first of all, is an emanation from the personality of the mother. Woman rocks the cradle and, in so doing, holds her hand on the rudder of history.

I have kept you longer than usual. If I have failed this morning to keep within the lines of Scriptural authorization, that is my fault. If, having kept within those lines, I have said anything that any one of you does not like, that is your fault. You will have to settle it with the Bible.

SOME FIGURES ON SUFFRAGE.

ADELE M. FIELDE SEES NO REASON TO FEAR THAT THE FOREIGN-BORN FEMALES WOULD HOLD THE BALANCE OF POWER IF VOTING.

Adele M. Fielde contributes the following to the discussion on woman suffrage:

A fair question arises whether the enfranchisement of the women of this State would not greatly add to the proportion of its foreign-born voters. At the last census, 1890, the native-born population was 4,426,893, and the foreign-born 1,571,050, or nearly three times as many natives as aliens. Of the males of voting age, 1,769,649 in all, 1,084,187 were native and 685,462 were foreign-born, while of the latter number only 416,352 were naturalized. Naturalized aliens, aliens who had a legal right to vote, were therefore less than one-quarter of the total number of voters.

For many past decades the female immigrants from Europe have annually been less than the number of males. In fact, at the last count, June 30, 1893, there had been during the preceding year only four females to eleven males among the immigrants. At the census of 1890 there were 56,000 more of native-born white females than of native-born white males in this State. The proportion of native-born white voters would therefore be increased by the enfranchisement of its women.

If the 2,151,096 native-born white males can successfully compete in government with 788,873 foreign-born white males, then the larger number, 2,207,164, of native-born white females may be expected to successfully compete with a lesser number, 776,819, of foreign-born white females.

Even in New-York City, where the political power of the foreign element is most manifest, the native-born white males outnumber the foreign-born by 105,968, while the native-born white females outnumber the foreign-born by a still greater proportion—that is, by 109,687.

Among the colored population, which is but 1¼ per cent of the whole, the number of males and females is so nearly equal that the effect of doubling the vote need not be considered.

The influence of inherited national proclivities should also be contemplated, since these may affect the welfare of the State. Though the Irish outnumber those of other alien ancestry, the Germans and English together again outnumber the Irish. So divided are the tribes of the foreign-born that no measures taken by any one of them can offer serious menace to the State when other tribes are made watchful by self-interest, and the total native white population, being 72 2-3 per cent of the whole, have but to attend faithfully to political duty in order to enjoy the high privilege of self-government. Duties and rights are always commensurate. Obligation and privilege are morally inseparable.

Again, the question as to the preponderance of influence among the sectarian bodies, in case women were enfranchised, is one frequently mooted. The church in this State having the largest number of nominal adherents is the Roman Catholic, and these are given as 1,150,139 in the census of 1890. This includes men, women and children, and equals nearly one-fifth of the population of the State. But there seems to be no valid reason for expecting that one-fifth the population would outvote the other four-fifths upon any question in which the other four-fifths had an opposing interest. Differences of creed will probably continue to prevent a union of Church and State, and since the majority of women now form even their theological views independently, they are not likely in political questions to be unduly influenced by the clergy.

The International Encyclopedia, 1892, gives the churches in this State in the order of their numerical importance, as follows: Methodist, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Baptist, Reformed Dutch, Congregational; all these having adult adherents numbering over 150,000.

Whether the enfranchisement of women would strengthen the moral element in political life cannot be certainly foretold. In the prisons and penitentiaries of this State there are fourteen times as many men as women, the number of men being 8,190, and of women 589, in 1890. Since women generally receive less pay for equal work, and are therefore more stricken by poverty than are men, and since guilty men go scot free in a class of offences for which women are arrested and punished, the lesser number of female convicts indicates that the moral status of women may be higher than that of men.

It is not incumbent on women to prove that their enfranchisement would benefit the State. Plain justice requires only that they should show that their enfranchisement would not harm the State; and this is amply indicated by the above deductions, from bulletins issued by the Census Bureau since 1890, chiefly from the one numbered 183.

ADELE M. FIELDE.

New-York, May 12, 1894.

DR. RYLANCE SAYS IT IS MADNESS.

HE THUS CHARACTERIZES THE PROPOSAL TO GIVE THE FRANCHISE TO WOMEN.

"You are mad. You are mad, I say. If to the women you extend the franchise, and the welfare of our Republic."

Shaking his hand with a half-threatening gesture, the Rev. Dr. Joseph H. Rylance, of St. Mark's Protestant Episcopal Church, formed a striking picture last night as he uttered the foregoing words. It was only one sentence of many almost equally emphatic against the woman suffrage movement of the day. Dr. Rylance's sermon was a strong one, and doubtless on next Sunday night, when, according to his own promise, he will raise a voice of still stronger warning against woman suffrage, quiet St. Mark's will have a still greater number of visitors than last night.

"Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection," was Dr. Rylance's text. He found it in Timothy, ii, 11. He said the text suggested that in Paul's estimation woman's place was one of subordination. If the old canons of the Bible are to obtain, then this saying of St. Paul would discredit the assertion that woman is the equal of man. The speaker did not hold, however, that this injunction of St. Paul is binding for all time. He would like to know how orthodox preachers who were up in arms against hitcher criticism could justify themselves by totally ignoring the teachings of St. Paul on the question of the subordination of women. Some women are better than some men, he admitted, but that was no reason for bestowing upon all women the franchise. Again, it is urged that because woman is a person, a human being, she ought to be allowed to vote. "The Digger Indian," said Dr. Rylance, "is also a person—a human being; but his right to vote would be questioned even in 'Pa' ' Divver's election district.

"The notion that every man has a right to have everything that every other man has was brought to this country by a sentimental politician named Lafayette, but the claim was not indorsed by us until the adoption of the XVth Amendment. Abstract or absolute rights are things intangible to practical politics. It is therefore silly to claim any such right for women.

"The truth is that much of the advocacy of woman's rights has sole regard to a few choice specimens of human bipeds. It is your ideal, not your common woman, that your orator has before him in his panegyric. The women that Parkhurst has been hunting you may feel a sympathy for, but you would not advocate their voting. One great wrong we are suffering under to-day is the wrong inflicted by low, ignorant men sharing in the conduct of this government. Your woman suffragists would double that wrong. The overwhelming majority of women have no conception of the duties of citizenship. They would become the easy prey of tricksters and of the intrigues of scheming priests and preachers. Women always like to reach perfection at a bound. Political perfection doesn't bound. It is a plant of slow growth.

"The proposed measure would be a leap in the dark; it would be confusion worse confounded. You are mad—you are mad, I say, if to the women you extend the franchise and the welfare of our Republic. Is it time, when the newspapers teem with news which fills us with dismay affecting the great social questions, to spring this new problem on us? Isn't it much better to wait until we have settled some of these other vexing problems?"

BULLET FITTED THE DEAD MAN'S PISTOL

UNDER-SHERIFF PUGSLEY STILL HELD, HOWEVER, FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION—WEST CHESTER COUNTY OFFICIALS FURNISH $20,000 BAIL.

Howard H. Pugsley, charged with having shot dead Joseph Schnellbach, who was wanted for felonious assault upon his sister-in-law, Martha Schilling, was arraigned for examination in Yorkville Court yesterday. Although the doctors who performed the autopsy on the dead Schnellbach testified that the bullet that killed him fitted his own pistol, yet Police Justice Voorhis said that, in the absence of any of Schnellbach's relatives, he would continue the case to-morrow morning. He admitted the defendant to bail in the sum of $20,000, which was furnished by Sheriff Duffy, of Westchester.

THE COMING SEASON AT NORTHFIELD

CLOSING EXERCISES OF THE SCHOOLS—FEATURES OF THE THREE CONFERENCES TO BE HELD.

Northfield, Mass., May 13.—Again the Northfield summer calendar presents a triple series of gatherings. A prominent feature of the season will be the opening and dedication of the new Northfield Auditorium—seating capacity 2,500. With new and varied programmes each conference aims to excel preceding ones in interest, profit and attractiveness. On Saturday, June 9, the Northfield Seminary trustees will hold their first meeting of the season at "The Northfield," and on Monday the trustees of the Mount Hermon School will meet at Mount Hermon. On June 16 there will be a reunion of former students at Mount Hermon and a meeting of the Northfield Students' Aid Society at "The Northfield"; and in the evening the alumni prize debate at Mount Hermon. On the next day, Sunday, the graduating classes of Mount Hermon and Northfield will assemble in the Northfield Trinitarian Church to hear the commencement sermon, and there will be special services in Stone Hall, conducted by Mr. Moody. On Monday, June 18, class day exercises and the Allen prize declamations will occur at Mount Hermon, with a concert by students at Stone Hall in the evening. The Mount Hermon commencement is set for Tuesday; the address to be delivered by the Rev. Dr. R. S. MacArthur, of New-York City. The alumni hold their annual business meeting in the afternoon, and their annual dinner at night. On the next day the commencement exercises of Northfield Seminary will be held in Stone Hall.

The Young Women's Conference will be in session from June 22 to 28. Among the speakers will be Major D. W. Whittle, Mrs. A. J. Gordon, of Boston; Dr. Pauline Root and Mr. Moody. The music will be in charge of Miss Mary Whittle, together with a number of Vassar students; and a committee composed of students from Mount Holyoke, Wellesley, Smith, Vassar and the Women's College of Baltimore, will have charge of the athletics. Workers' Bible training classes will be conducted, as well as special missionary conferences and a regular twilight meeting on "Round Top" has been arranged for.

The time from June 30 to July 10 will be devoted to the World's Student Conference. Among the speakers are to be Professor W. W. Moore, of Hampden-Sidney, Va.; the Rev. Dr. Alexander McKenzie, of Cambridge, Mass.; the Rev. Dr. H. C. Mable, of Boston; the Rev. Dr. J. E. Tuttle, of Amherst College; Professor Winchester, of Wesleyan University; the Rev. Dr. A. T. Pierson, of Philadelphia, and Bishop Thoburn, of India. Mr. Moody will be present during the session and personally conduct many of the services. The music will be conducted by Professor D. B. Towner. On July 3 the Neff School of Oratory will be instituted and will continue until July 27.

The General Conference of Christian Workers will assemble on August 1, and will continue in session until August 12. Among the well-known men who will address this conference are the Rev. Dr. A. J. Gordon, of Boston; the Rev. F. B. Meyer, of London; Dr. A. C. Dixon, of Brooklyn; Major D. W. Whittle, of Northfield; the Rev. George C. Needham, and the Rev. Dr. A. T. Pierson. Mr. Moody will personally take charge of the services of the convention. The singing will be conducted as usual by Messrs. Ira D. Sankey and George C. Stebbins. Accommodations may be secured at any of the Northfield Seminary buildings during this conference. Although this conference formally closes on August 12, the Rev. F. B. Meyer has consented to give daily Bible lectures or readings throughout the rest of the month. Some one of the seminary buildings will be kept open to accommodate those who wish to remain for these meetings.

A new feature this year will be the publishing of an illustrated magazine, "Northfield Echoes," which will contain much of interest in connection with Northfield. The first number will be ready about June 1.

TRAMPING ON A WAGER OF $10,000.

Dayton, Ohio, May 13.—Vyvian Grey, the London newspaper man, dubbed "The Prince of Tramps," who is travelling 14,000 miles afoot on a wager of $10,000, arrived in this city yesterday afternoon and is the guest of Mayor McMillen, at the Hotel Dickey. Mr. Grey is a correspondent of the London Press Association and "London Daily Telegraph," and intends to make the trip from London to Monterey, Mex., and return by March 7 next, having started on his eventful journey on February 6. He is now eight days ahead of his itinerary as calculated by himself. He is accompanied by a Bavarian bloodhound.

THE ROMAN CHURCH RESPONSIBLE.

THE REV. DR. MACARTHUR DECLARES THAT TO ITS INFLUENCE IS LARGELY DUE MUNICIPAL MISGOVERNMENT THROUGHOUT THE LAND.

The Rev. Dr. MacArthur, the pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, celebrated his twenty-fourth anniversary in the pastorate of the church yesterday morning. He was assisted by the Revs. F. Rogers Morse, J. B. Calvert, John Love, his assistants, and the Rev. John B. Willis, who is one of the oldest Baptist ministers in this country. After giving thanks for the many favors received in the last twenty-four years, Dr. MacArthur made some pointed remarks on the liquor-store keepers, Tammany Hall and the Roman Catholic Church. He said, among other things:

The political degradation of our municipal government under its present management is one of the darkest crimes in our history. If the pulpits would but take up this matter and concentrate their efforts we should then witness the dawn of a brighter, purer and better political era. Another danger that is paid little heed to is the illiteracy of the lower classes of the people. This is due largely to the vast hordes of immigrants that are infesting our shores; the majority of them come from Papal Italy, Catholic Poland, Hungary, Ireland and Austria. The dangers of Romanism as a religious political machine must not be lost sight of.

The Roman Church is opposed to the prime essentials of American citizenship, and to it may be ascribed the political venality of our municipal government and the political strength of the saloon. When has the Roman Church uttered her thunders against the saloon power as she has against our schools? Why does not this Church use its tremendous power against the saloon? True, here and there we hear a poor, weak voice crying out against this wrong, but what I may justly criticise is the evident apathy of this great Church and its eloquent silence on this question.

The crying wrongs of municipal misgovernment are largely due to the Roman Church. Our city officials, even down to the charwomen, are of that faith. Within the term of my pastorate the Catholic Church has received from the general fund in this city the vast sum of $1,213,000. During that same period all the churches of Protestant denominations have received but the insignificant sum of $75,000. And so it goes throughout our broad country. Other cities show the grasping greed and the un-American spite of this Church. Rome has gone too far. I can do no better than to point to the fact that at this very moment there are societies organized for the maintenance of American integrity, loyalty and patriotism. I am not here to oppose or indorse the views of this movement, but I am here to warn the American people of the dangers that encompass them as a people, as a Nation, so that when the time comes for action they shall know what to do.

THE REV. THOMAS DIXON, JR., ON THE A. P. A.

The Rev. Thomas Dixon, jr., preached in Association Hall yesterday on "The Association for the Protection of American Institutions." He said in part:

"Every movement has some fools in it; so has this, but, at the same time, it has a serious and important mission. I have been asked to join it, but I will not, because there are many things about it that I don't like. But, at the same time, it has a tremendous residue of American patriotism. It was not born in religious hatred of Catholics, but to defend American institutions against a certain element of the Catholic Church. Cardinal Gibbons defines religious liberty as 'the right to worship God according to the dictates of a right conscience.' Never did Jesuit pen a more cunning sentence. His 'right conscience' means a Roman Catholic conscience. Catholics deny the right of Protestants to form secret societies, but the Catholic Church is itself a huge secret society of the most binding and terrible sort. The Roman Catholic Church is a gigantic political machine, extending from the chair of St. Peter to the limits of South America. The Catholics have a monopoly of the public offices in this country. They have three times more than they are entitled to. In this city they have furnished us with rulers and machines. This should not be so, for the brains and genius of this country are Protestant."

TO SPEAK AT DOBBS FERRY.

VICE-PRESIDENT STEVENSON WILL TAKE PART IN THE CEREMONIES THERE ON JUNE 14.

Vice-President Stevenson yesterday morning received at the Plaza Hotel a committee of the New-York State Society of Sons of the American Revolution, consisting of Colonel John C. Calhoun, chairman of the Dobbs Ferry Monument Committee, William P. Wadsworth, Edward Payson Cone, A. J. C. Foyé and Edward Hagaman Hall. Mr. Wadsworth, as spokesman, invited Mr. Stevenson to make an address on June 14, at the laying of the basestone of the monument which the society will erect at Dobbs Ferry to mark the place where Washington planned the Yorktown campaign and afterward arranged for the evacuation of New-York City and other posts held by the British. Mr. Stevenson replied with expressions of appreciation, not only of the invitation, but also of the patriotic work of the Sons of the American Revolution, and accepted, with pleasure.

Chauncey M. Depew and General Horace Porter, the former President of the State Society and the latter President-General of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, have also accepted invitations to speak on June 14.

Later in the morning Mr. Stevenson went driving with ex-Mayor Grace. In the afternoon the Vice-President and Mrs. Stevenson—the latter President-General of the Daughters of the American Revolution, took luncheon, informally, with Colonel and Mrs. Calhoun, at their house, No. 517 West End-ave.

The Vice-President started on a special train for Washington at 3 p. m.

RUMORS OF THE QUEEN'S ILL-HEALTH DENIED

Chicago, May 13.—A cable dispatch received in this city this afternoon signed by Sir Henry Ponsonby, private secretary to Queen Victoria, gives an emphatic denial to statements which have been circulated throughout Great Britain during the last few days, and which have been cabled to this country, to the effect that the Queen's health is becoming precarious, that she shows the weakening of physical faculties due to increasing age, and that Sir Henry Ponsonby had announced that she would be unable to officiate at the official opening of the Manchester Canal on May 21.

THE ALBANY CONVENTION RESTRAINED.

Albany, May 13.—Justice Mayham, of the Supreme Court, sitting at a Special Term at Schoharie, on Saturday granted a writ of prohibition restraining the Constitutional Convention from taking any action in the case of Herman Trapper, a delegate from Erie County, whose seat in the convention is being contested, other than taking of testimony in the case. The grounds on which the writ was granted are that the statutory provision under which the convention is acting in the matter is unconstitutional. The parties named in the writ are also ordered to appear at Special Term, before Justice Edwards, at Hudson, on June 2, and show cause why they should not be absolutely restrained from any further proceedings in respect to the seat and rights of Mr. Trapper as a member of the convention. The issuance of this writ makes it impossible for the Committee on Elections and Privileges appointed by the convention to act on the contest for Mr. Trapper's seat. A sub-committee of this committee will begin the taking of testimony in this case on Tuesday, at the Buffalo City Hall.

THE COMPROMISE TARIFF BILL.

BUNGLING WORK BY THE COMPROMISERS.

From The Cincinnati Enquirer (Dem.).

We expected more skilful work from the compromisers. The absurd and contradictory policies of the bill would have some excuse if it had the support of a majority of the Senate, but to frame such a measure and then to have it defeated is sad, indeed.

UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION IN SCHEDULES.

From The Philadelphia Press.

They have rejected the principle of free raw materials, and there is no just reason why they should not defend the million farmers interested in wool as well as the quarter of a million miners interested in ore. They have recognized that protection is right and necessary in some schedules and there is no ground upon which they can excuse themselves in caring for the steel industry and leaving the woollen industry stripped and naked to its assailants.

THE NORTHERN FARMERS TO SUFFER.

From The Chicago Tribune.

Compelled to advance the duties on some of the products of the farm and garden, the Southern Democrats have sought to offset it by depriving Northern farmers of markets of which they have great need. This is the only reasonable explanation of this proposed discrimination against Germany and some of the other beet-sugar countries.

PUBLISH THE BUSINESS MEN'S TESTIMONY.

From The Boston Advertiser.

If the committee should publish the statistics furnished by reliable and well-informed business men the shameful character of the Gorman bill would be even plainer than before. The committee may consider some of the blunt statements of American workers "offensive"; but to the general public the Gorman bill deals and trades and bribes are more "offensive" by far.

THE MAIN ONSLAUGHT ABANDONED.

From The Chicago Inter Ocean.

The attempt to reduce Northern wages and to destroy Northern manufactures "at one fell swoop" has been abandoned as impracticable. But Senator Mills openly confesses his chagrin at its abandonment, and virtually pledges himself to the support of any measure, however ill-framed, and however fraught with injustice, that shall effect a reduction of protection, however small such reduction may be.

"FAKE" LEGISLATION TO BE THE RESULT.

From The Rochester Post-Express.

It puzzles us to know why the Democrats meddled with the tariff at all, if they were not ready to do something worth while. Is all the excitement, panic and business confusion of the year to end in a piece of "fake" legislation?

ST. ANDREW'S STATEMENT.

THE DIFFICULTY BETWEEN THAT PARISH AND ST. PAUL'S EXPLAINED.

REASONS WHY ST. ANDREW'S PEOPLE OBJECT TO A RIVAL CONGREGATION IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD—MEETINGS OF TRUSTEES DESCRIBED.

Touching upon the differences of St. Paul's and St. Andrew's Methodist Episcopal churches, arising out of the change of site of St. Paul's Church, the following formal statement has been issued:

During the year 1888 St. Andrew's Methodist Episcopal Church, then located in West Seventy-first-st., resolved to meet the demands, prospective and immediate, on the West Side, by erecting a new and attractive edifice and parsonage in West Seventy-sixth-st. between what are now known as Columbus and Amsterdam aves. The undertaking was a bold one, as the membership at that time was only about one hundred, but, generously aided by members of the denomination outside of St. Andrew's, as well as individuals not connected with the denomination, an outlay of $220,000 was made, involving a mortgage loan of $100,000. In providing a parsonage this loan was necessarily increased, but the annual outlay for rent, as before, ceased. Less than eighteen months after the dedication of the church, and while the development of the congregation and church life was progressing satisfactorily, St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, located at Fourth-ave. and Twenty-second-st., was pulled down, letting loose upon the community what time has proved to be a roving commission seeking a spot upon which to spend the money derived from the sale of the property, but having no regard for the interests of churches of the same denomination elsewhere located. In November, 1891, it came to the knowledge of the officers of St. Andrew's that St. Paul's trustees contemplated the purchase of land in West Eighty-sixth-st., within ten minutes' walk of St. Andrew's, and near the residences of many of its pew-holders, whereupon a meeting of the official members was held, and resolutions kindly, but emphatically protesting against St. Paul's locating at the above-mentioned site were unanimously adopted and a copy sent to the trustees of that church. This was followed by an invitation from the then presiding elder, the Rev. Dr. A. J. Palmer, to a conference with the trustees of St. Paul's, and a meeting of the two boards was held on November 28, at the Bishop's room, No. 159 Fifth-ave. The question of location was fully discussed, and the reasons stated by St. Andrew's why St. Paul's should not build a church unencumbered with debt, at the very threshold of a church which, by incurring indebtedness, had provided for the needs of the denomination in all that vicinity for many years to come.

AN ATTEMPT TO COMBINE THE CHURCHES.

Soon after this a meeting of the officers of the two boards was held to arrange, if possible, a combination of the two societies, but St. Paul's consenting to nothing which did not involve the practical destruction of St. Andrew's, the meeting ended with nothing accomplished. Thereafter the people of St. Andrew's rested in the belief that nothing more was to occur to menace their peace and prosperity. This belief was strengthened by the publication in "The Evening Post" the day after the meeting mentioned of an interview with Judge E. L. Fancher, president of the board of St. Paul's, in which he says, "We do not wish to interfere with St. Andrew's in any way," and concludes by saying, "The trustees of St. Paul's are looking for a site that will be objectionable to no other church probably in upper Broadway, but they would much prefer one in or near Fifth-ave."

In January, 1893, after an interval of more than a year, St. Paul's returned to the consideration of the same site, and, as a last resort, St. Andrew's appealed to the District Board of Church Location of the New-York Conference, "to protect her interests from a rivalry calculated to arrest the growth and progress of this church, and to discourage further effort for the establishment and development of this organization."

This board has advisory powers only, but by a majority vote gave consent to several sites submitted by St. Paul's, one in Eighty-sixth-st., among the rest, but strongly recommended the selection of a site below the Park. Notwithstanding this, no action was taken. Then followed a series of negotiations with St. James', Harlem, and Grace Church, at One-hundred-and-fourth-st., but without result. We now come down to the recent and final stage of the case. A Committee on Site was currently reported to have selected a location at