The Sun.

VOL. XLI.—NO. 174. NEW YORK, MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1874. PRICE TWO CENTS.

BEECHER AND HIS CRITICS.

THEIR CORRESPONDENCE ON THE DISCIPLINE DISPUTE.

A Series of Letters that did not Adjust the Differences between Them—A Phase of the Bother that came of Dropping Tilton's Name from Plymouth's Roll.

Following the stormy meetings of Dr. Storrs's, Dr. Budington's, and Beecher's churches, after the dropping of Theodore Tilton's name from the roll of the latter, when the interchange of public letters had failed to adjust their differences of opinion on the involved question of discipline, a private correspondence was had by the three pastors. The first letter in this correspondence is dated Jan. 7, and is from Storrs and Budington to Beecher. They take up, with few preliminaries, the question of Plymouth's right to drop Tilton from the Church without investigating the charge made against him of slandering his pastor. They say that two principles are essential to Congregationalism. The first is that church members covenant not only to worship together, but to watch over each other, and that, therefore, as one does not enter the body by his own act alone, so he cannot leave by his own act alone, but only as the brotherhood consents. Moreover, if one member is charged by another with unchristian conduct, the charges must be tried. The second principle is, that each local church, while independent so long as it remains Evangelical in faith and watches over the purity of its members, is responsible to other churches in fellowship, so that these may remonstrate with it in these particulars, and if it resists, disfellowship it. Both these principles seem to them to have been overlooked and imperilled by the action of Plymouth Church. They conclude by asking answers to the following questions:

Suppose a member of the Plymouth Church to have been absent from the communion for a year, while still reckoning to the church as one that to have been unfairly treated by a brother in the church with having led a life inconsistent during that year, and when thus accused he should have notified his withdrawal from the communion and from the church, would it be according to the fundamental principles and policy of Plymouth Church to accept such notice, to suspend inquiry as to the facts, and to proceed to erase from the roll the name of the offender? Suppose, further, that you should follow the supposition that the church should, in accordance with its articles of Faith that all who profess the reconciliation of the Scriptures, or the Word of God, to be the rule of life, and the Lord, would be received to membership upon their own profession and covenant, or in yours, be entitled to claim that the charges before fellowship with it should be tried, and that such claim continue in force even without reference to its action?

BEECHER TO STORRS AND BUDINGTON.

The reply of Mr. Beecher is dated Jan. 14, and is full explanation of his views. He admits that for the sake of good order, courtesy, and Christian kindness, "a member leaving a church should so write, with the assent of the church, that it may be known that it was not a case of discipline." He admits that "when the question is pressed rigorously to the absolute rights of a man, he is left free to take a church dismissed of the right to leave on his own proper evidence and authority." He says "the covenant is Scriptural or reasonable, which is in the nature of a legal contract," and argues that the power of the individual to cut off his membership from bodies social, political, and commercial, though not from the state, is not a sufficient argument for Parliament, for instance, cannot resign), is established by custom and by law in America. He does not, however, wish them to suppose that he advocates the common practice of such a right in churches. Only, if it be exercised in any such case, by a member going along into another church or into the world, no church professing to derive all its authority from the Scriptures can make the act an offense. When charges have been made, if the accused member desires to escape the ordeal of a church investigation, it may be the duty of the church, for its own vindication or that of wronged parties, to proceed and declare its judgment; but not to follow with pains and penalties the member who has withdrawn. But if one has been for years absent, is known to have changed his religious views, and is known for years to have disavowed church membership, it is not the duty of the church to attempt to bring back under jurisdiction, for the sake of trial, one whom by his own act they have treated as no longer a member. Coming more directly to Tilton's case, but without mentioning his name, Mr. Beecher says:

Any representation to you that proceedings against a member have been hurried or have been forbidden by us with a view to escape investigation, or withdrawal or any other reason from a recognized membership, which we believe to be false, is worse than the truth. It is time to forget quarrelsome, hurtly grievances. The only point in which there is any hope of a conference of principles is the inherent right of a church to dismiss a member who has left it and its fellowship, whatever, for obvious reasons, it may be wise or kind to do. But after the dismissal, the question of moral right and wrong may be considered and treated as if it had not been.

THE QUESTION OF FELLOWSHIP.

To Storrs and Budington's statement of the principles of fellowship, Mr. Beecher replies at length. His points are, first, that fellowship should be exercised among all churches, but "it is to be exercised with great tenderness and charity, and with a view to the good of the brother." Second, "Whenever any church shall, by flagrant neglect, make itself a reproach for Christian charity, or shall become a pernicious and immoral influence upon the community, or upon sister churches, they have the right to withdraw themselves from the contagion. Practically disfellowship all such cases, there may be instances of such affectionate and reasonable plea as shall show that the evil is real, that the causes of it are within the control of the church, that the evil is not a transient evil, such as may befall any church, but is permanent and tending to increase rather than diminish. Thirdly, he distinguishes between such a withdrawal of fellowship and the arraignment and trial of a church before a council. There is no power on earth that can try a sovereign church, he says, "By whatever name it may be attempted, and by whatever authorities justified, the denunciation or excommunication of a church by recommendation is a derogation of its local independence, and is without warrant in the Word of God." With regard to the action of Plymouth Church, he says, this is simply a matter of fact. The person declared that he was not a member, and the church declared that he was not a member. Is not the church competent to determine its own membership? Does fellowship allow a neighboring church to review and redetermine the action of a church in regard to a member? Fourth, as to the questions of Plymouth church on its independence, he asks them to explain wherein they think these resolutions differ from the doctrine laid down by Dr. Dexter in his work on Congregationalism. To the hypothetic case of a member, absent one year, &c., he replies that the church had no such cases, and therefore he cannot speak of her "custom." Nor can he say what the church would do, since it would act after its own matured judgment. But what he would advise would be that the Examining Committee should see the party, make due inquiry, satisfy itself as to the serious and well-supported character of the charges, and if it thought best proceed to trial. If the defendant failed to appear, he would advise that the trial should proceed. If the defendant should, pending the proceedings, formally notify the committee that he had withdrawn from the church, he would advise the continuance of the trial for the ascertaining of the facts, the reporting of results to the church, to be placed on the record, the dropping of the name from the roll, with such other action as seemed needful for the vindication of the church or any of its members. In reply to the hypothetical case of a church changing its creed, &c., he repeats that it is the duty of sister churches to withdraw fellowship, but thinks it is best done by each church individually. "Ecclesiastical history reveals not a single instance of beneficial results from an attempt to discipline a church by associated ecclesiastical action."

STORRS AND BUDINGTON'S TWO QUESTIONS.

The rejoinder of Storrs and Budington is dated January 26. They write briefly this time, taking issue with Beecher on the point of the jurisdiction of membership. They ask him if he will use his influence with his church, and endeavor to gain assent to having the following questions submitted to a council:

1. Does the order and usage of Congregational churches permit a member who has entered into public covenant with a church to terminate his relations with that church by his own volition or act, so that no action on the part of the church is requisite to such termination of membership?

2. Was the action of Plymouth Church on the 31st October, 1873, in dropping a member against whom grave and specific charges had been formally preferred, so acting in accordance with the usages of Congregational churches, and with their understanding of the rule of Christian discipline?

They say that answers to these questions, rendered by a competent council, representing the Christian experience and judgment of our churches, if accompanied with a declaration by Plymouth Church of the doctrine of fellowship, would secure a settled and lasting peace. They also ask Beecher if he will favor the introduction into the manual of Plymouth Church of a statement that "whenever any church shall openly and avowedly change the essential conditions on which it was publicly received into the fellowship of neighboring churches, it is their right, either by individual action or by council, to withdraw their fellowship." Their estimate of Beecher's doctrine and its effects is put as follows:

leave a church at any time for another church, or for the world; that the exercise of this right is not condition d upon the consent of the church; that the covenant into which he entered in joining the church was only the expression of his then present intention and purpose; and that his separation from the church is completed with his own act or volition in retiring, the church having simply to drop his name, in accordance with his will. This seems to us a principle wholly unknown to Congregationalism, and contradicted by its history from the beginning; the admission of which would render impossible the administration of Christian and orderly discipline; the prevalence of which would absolutely dissolve the bands of church association. We feel that a doctrine so novel, and, as we think, so injurious in its tendency, ought not to be left to work its way among our churches without being first accepted and authorized by the ablest and best minds among us; and that their testimony should at once be sought in regard to it.

THE ANSWER THAT BEECHER MADE.

The reply of Beecher to these questions is dated Feb. 6. He accepts, with a single addition, the first article to be submitted to a council, making it read thus:

Does the Word of God and the order and usage of Congregational churches permit a member who has entered into public covenant with a church to terminate his relations with that church by his own volition or act, so that no action on the part of the church is requisite to such termination of membership?

Mr. Beecher further suggests that, as he has asserted the right of individual withdrawal to be a latent one, and not ordinarily to be used, the words "in any case" might be inserted, thus: "To terminate, in any case, his relations," &c. Of the second article, he says if it can be put in a form which shall leave out the particular case of Plymouth Church, and be made general, he would be very glad to hear the opinions of a council upon it; and he suggests, "May a church, according to the Word of God and the usages of the Congregational churches, exercise its own discretion in dropping from its roll the name of one against whom serious charges are preferred, but who declares himself not to be a member of the church; or must the church, according to the Word of God and Congregational usage, go forward with the trial of charges to a final issue?" With reference to the proposal of a change in the manual of Plymouth Church, he says the church, excited by what it regards as a dangerous exercise of authority in its affairs, would be likely to regard with surprise and jealousy such a request from other churches. But if these two churches, in token of affectionate reciprocity, would change their manuals, so that at every business meeting a chairman should be chosen by the brethren, and that no action involving the interest of other churches should be transacted except at a meeting publicly called from the pulpit on the Sunday preceding, he thinks this action would secure a cordial response from Plymouth Church to the changes they suggest. In conclusion, he says he has given his own views only, and that possibly the points they have offered might be accepted by Plymouth Church with less modification than he has proposed, as a basis for a mutual council. He therefore invites them, after a full consideration of the feeling of his church, to draw up a form of letter missive which he may lay informally before members of his church—to be followed, if the latter see their way to accept it, by a formal request from the two churches to Plymouth Church on the basis of those informal approaches.

THE RESULTLESS END OF IT.

The next letter from Storrs and Budington briefly declines the alteration suggested by Beecher in the form of letter to be submitted to a council, they say that his proposal of changes in their manual is "wholly irrelevant." Their conclusion is that if Plymouth Church will not adopt the declaration as to fellowship they suggested, or "if it will do this only on some impossible condition, then they shall feel constrained to add that point to the others on which they would desire the action of a council. They add:

We regret that the three propositions submitted to you in our letter of the 26th inst. as a possible basis of an ecclesiastical council, are not satisfactory to you, and as we can not amend them or modify them in any important particular, there is probably no occasion, in view of your many engagements and ours, for further protracting the correspondence.

This ended the skirmishing on paper. Beecher did not reply to the last letter, and Storrs and Budington reported to their churches that the private correspondence had come to no satisfactory result. Indeed, it had left the controversy more muddled than at its beginning. The last public letter of Plymouth Church and the last private letter of Beecher professed to await an invitation to join in calling a mutual council, and the two accusing churches professed to be anxious for that result. But some time after, however, Storrs and Budington did not definitely extend this invitation, thus leaving a flaw of which Plymouth may take advantage. At the close of the correspondence the call for the council, which Plymouth was invited to attend only "to counsel and to give testimony and to furnish any needed facts," was sent to the eighty selected churches.

What Mr. Beecher Said Yesterday.

In his prayer before the sermon yesterday morning Beecher implored the blessing of God on the coming council—that those who joined in it might be taught of God, and that their deliberations might be conducive to harmony and good. He also announced a meeting of Plymouth members at 9 o'clock A. M. on Wednesday next in the church auditorium, with the first business of which the council in the Clinton Avenue Church, and requested a full attendance.

"Although the council is called to advise other churches," he said, "it is to advise them in matters that concern us. We have declined the invitation to send a committee there, for reasons that have been amply published. It is, however, only the invitation of the two churches that we have declined. We entertain for the council only feelings of the deepest respect and affection; and we trust that it will express we shall feel the same respect and affection."

The Chicago Churches' Action.

CHICAGO, March 21.—Three of the Congregational churches of this city have taken action relative to the invitation to Drs. Storrs and Budington's Congregational Council in Brooklyn, N. Y., to investigate certain charges against Plymouth Church. The First Church of this city has accepted the invitation, and appointed Dr. William Patton to attend, while the Union Park and Plymouth Churches have declined. These claim that the council is improperly called, and is ex parte.

THE DEAD GYMNAST.

Yesterday's Scene in the Little Church Round the Corner.

On Saturday Coroner Eickhoff held an inquest over the body of James Cluney, otherwise known as James Sylvester, the trapeze performer, who met his death while attempting to do a perilous act in the Thirty-fourth Street Theatre on Thursday evening. A verdict of accidental death was rendered by the jury, as it was shown that had the safety net been in position it would have been of no use. The gymnast was a native of Massachusetts. Yesterday morning the body was taken from the Morgue to a room in a building adjoining the theatre. The room was draped with American flags, and seats were arranged close to the walls. Near the windows was the handsome coffin. A silver plate on the lid bore the words, "James Sylvester, died March 19, 1874, aged 19 years." The body was dressed in the costume worn when the gymnast made his last leap. The sash was tastefully arranged and the spangled collar and cloth worn around the loins were visible. Around the head and shoulders white flowers were strewn, and in the arms were full-blown roses and immortelles rested on the coffin. At an early hour friends of the dead gymnast began to pour in. The mother was almost heartbroken. Mr. Jacob Berry, proprietor of the theatre, and Mr. J. H. Campbell, the stage manager, superintended the funeral. At 12 o'clock the body was put in the hearse and the employees of the theatre fell in line and followed it. The first carriage contained the mother and brothers of Sylvester and the second Mr. Berry and wife and Mr. and Mrs. Campbell. An immense concourse viewed the procession on its way to the "Little Church Round the Corner." The Rev. Dr. G. H. Houghton met the body at the door and preceded it down the centre aisle to the chancel. The church was thronged by members of the theatrical profession, men and women who labor hard in the lower ranks in the theatre. The interment was in the Cemetery of the Evergreens.

A JUDGE ASSASSINATED.

Shot by a Lawyer whom he had Imprisoned for Contempt of Court.

LITTLE ROCK, Ark., March 21.—A despatch from Forest City, Ark., says that Judge John W. Fox, Judge of the Eleventh Judicial District, was shot this morning by J. R. Aldridge, a lawyer, and died this afternoon. Judge Fox was on his way to the Post Office from his hotel when Aldridge stepped out from a drug store and said, "Now, Judge Fox!" and fired. Judge Fox sank to the ground, exclaiming, "Oh! Lord! I am a dead man!" Aldridge fired the second barrel of the gun after Fox had fallen, and subsequently delivered himself up to the Sheriff.

It seems that at the last term of the court Aldridge behaved in a disorderly manner, and was rebuked by Judge Fox. Aldridge made some insulting reply, and was fined and imprisoned ten days for contempt of court. He was released through the mediation of some friends, and on entering the court again renewed his disorderly behavior. Judge Fox ordered his imprisonment a second time for discourteous and unbecoming language in the court room during the transaction of business. For this imprisonment Aldridge determined to kill the Judge. Either by accident or design he met Judge Fox in the street this morning, and shot him twice with a double-barrel shot gun.

This is the second Circuit Judge assassinated in this State within six months. Aldridge was a member of the last Arkansas Legislature.

FORCING OUT THE TRUTH.

MAKING IT LIVELY FOR THE BOSS AND HIS FRIENDS.

Some of the Transactions of the Real Estate Ring—How Senator Stewart Made $18,000 in Less than Eighteen Months.

WASHINGTON, March 22.—The District investigation was decidedly interesting on Saturday, and from this time henceforward it promises to be lively for Boss Shepherd and his followers. The chief clerk of the Auditor's office was examined in regard to the payments made on contract No. 40, known as the Parisen contract for paving Vermont avenue and Jackson place. It will be remembered that on Friday Judge Wilson called attention to the fact that the total payments which the contractor swore he received were less by several thousand dollars than the Board of Public Works in their report gave as the total cost of the same. Judge Wilson called for the final vouchers on Friday, and they showed a payment of $37,201 only. The cost reported by the board for improving these two streets was $43,100. None of the employees of the board being able to account for the discrepancy, they were given until Saturday to inquire into it. Mr. Morris, the Chief Clerk of the Auditor's office, explained it as follows:

MORE VIOLATION OF LAW.

The total cost of the two streets was $43,100. The contractor received $37,216 under his contract. The board charged him and deducted from his bills $3,664 for materials furnished, and the remainder, $2,225, was for extra work outside the contract, done upon the verbal order of Alex. R. Shepherd. This verbal order by Boss Shepherd for extra work was in direct violation of the organic act, the 37th section of which contains the following clause:

All contracts made by the said Board of Public Works shall be in writing, and shall be signed by the parties making the same, and a copy thereof shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of the District.

If the board had no power to make a verbal contract, of course the Vice-President of the board could not either. This item is a small one, but when it is recollected that there are some thousands of contracts, and it is altogether probable that extra work was allowed for under each one of them on the verbal order of Shepherd, it will be seen that millions could be spent in this loose way.

THE RING REAL ESTATE BROKERS.

James M. Latta was the next witness. He is of the celebrated firm of Kilbourne & Latta, living real estate brokers, and universal trustees for members of Congress and of the District Ring, who were in the real estate pool which Kilbourne speaks of in his letter to Huntington. Mr. Latta testified that he had been associated with Kilbourne in the real estate business since 1866. He admitted that Henry D. Cooke furnished Hallett Kilbourne, his partner, with $25,000. The money was given to Kilbourne as trustee, to be invested in real estate. He had no knowledge of this money being returned to Cooke, but did not profess, however, to know much about it. It was a matter relating entirely to Kilbourne, and was one of his private transactions with Cooke. The firm did not act as trustees, the members of it only in their individual capacity. Latta had admitted that both he and Kilbourne had made large purchases as trustees in the northwestern section of the city, but he would not pretend to give an approximate estimate of the amount so purchased or the total cost of the same, from memory. He was then asked from whom he obtained the money to purchase the property which he held as trustee. Here objection was made by the counsel for the District, where upon Sen. for Stewart requested permission to ask witness certain questions, which was granted.

SENATOR STEWART'S REAL ESTATE OPERATIONS.

Mr. Stewart then proceeded to give an account of his transactions in real estate in the northwestern section of the city, through Kilbourne & Latta, who acted as his trustees. At certain stages of his explanation he would ask Latta if so far he was correct, and the witness would answer in the affirmative. By his own explanation, it seems that in the 18th of April, ten days after the new District Government was installed, Stewart and Curtis J. Hillier bought through and in the name of Latta a square of ground between Twenty-first and Twenty-second streets, on Massachusetts avenue, for $18,000. On the 1st of May, 1871, they purchased square 96 in the same locality, and on May 3, 1872, they purchased in the name of Hillier square 115, where Stewart's palace and magnificent mansion now stands. In May and June, 1872, he said that they made purchases at Latta's sale, Latta acting as their trustee. The whole of the purchases in which he was interested amounted to $38,300. He then went on to say that he sold out his interest to his partner in December, 1872, at a profit of $18,000, realizing a profit of $1,000. He did this because he needed the money invested to carry on mining operations in the Far West. He then told

HOW HE CAME TO BUILD HIS HOUSE

on square 115, fronting Farragut circle. He said it was at the instance of Kilbourne & Latta, and others whom he did not name, who wanted him to do so in order that the value of property in that locality might be increased. He said that Hillier and Sunderland, his former associates, agreed to sell to him square 115 at a price fixed by Latta, 60 cents per foot; that this was 15 cents less than the same was actually worth, and that the reduction was in consideration of his building a house there. He then detailed how Kilbourne & Latta found him a builder who would take his old house in part pay for the new one, but did not tell how. Kilbourne & Latta arranged for a loan of $21,000 for him from Col. Geo. Taylor at 10 per cent, and said Kilbourne & Latta agreeing to pay 2 per cent. of the interest for him. With this exception his confession was complete. It is only necessary to add, that in all these transactions Senator Stewart's name does not appear at all. It was

A COVERT PIECE OF BUSINESS

throughout, and has anything out the appearance of an honest and honorable transaction. It will be remembered that the speculation soon after the new Government came into power. At that time the whole northwestern section of the city was an open common. There was no street or avenue laid out any where near the property bought by him. There was no sound reason on the general public to believe that the new Government intended to make any improvements in this locality. Indeed, they had declared in their communication to the Legislative Assembly when they submitted their comprehensive plan of improvements that the improvements were to be made only as the growth of the city demanded them. It, therefore, is quite apparent that Mr. Senator Stewart was advised of the plans and intentions of the Board of Public Works in regard to improvements in this locality, and took advantage of the information given him to make $18,000 in less than eighteen months. It is quite significant, too, that it must be remembered that he sold his third interest in the property bought for this advance, and also that most of it was bought on long time. After the Senator had concluded his confession the committee examined Mr. Latta to tell

WHO FURNISHED THE MONEY

to buy the property which he held as trustee, and he positively refused to tell. He did not do so, but he would swear till he was all sorts of colors that no member of the Board of Public Works or of the District Government was directly or indirectly interested therein. The committee just as promptly informed him that this was no answer to the question, and that he must answer explicitly and in detail. The usual questions were then put to him if the answer would in any way tend to criminate himself or render him infamous, and he replied that it would not. He was again asked who furnished the money, and he refused to answer, saying it would be a violation of confidence reposed in him by his clients. Judge Thurman asked him if he knew the law on the relation of counsel and client, to which he replied that he knew what the law was. Judge Thurman then very emphatically told the witness that he must furnish all the information requested of him about these purchases, that it was proper that he should do so, and the committee would require him to do so. Latta then stated that he could not answer as to the various purchases made from memory, and was given till Monday to refresh his memory and produce the papers in his possession.

WHERE THE NAME MAY BE FOUND.

It will be remembered that in all the deeds placed on record by Kilbourne & Latta as trustees that the habendum and tenendum clauses are as follows:

To have and to hold the said pieces or parcels of ground and premises and appurtenances, with and to the use of the said party of the second part, his heirs and assigns, in and upon the trusts, and for the purposes particularly set forth in a printed paper bearing even date with these presents, and signed and sealed by the said party of the second part, with full power, however, in the said party of the second part to sell and convey the said property in the manner set forth by way of mortgage or deed of trust, to secure payment of money at such time and place for such sums of money, upon such terms and in such manner as the said party may be proper, without any liability on the part of the purchaser or the mortgagee or trustee to the application of the purchase money or money advanced on mortgage or deed of trust aforesaid.

These printed papers referred to in this clause of the deeds set forth the names of the parties who have furnished the money to purchase the several pieces of ground, &c. These Mr. Latta has been directed to produce.

THE REAL ESTATE RING.

He admitted that H. D. Cooke furnished Kilbourne $25,000 for the purpose. Cooke is not the President of the Board of Public Works, but is also known that President [illegible] is interested in [illegible] that [illegible] the new Government [illegible] of the Ring organs, admits that public men are interested in these speculations. It says:

If the American people will not be ashamed of this low, systematic, and captious discouragement of their public manhood and their capital city, we are much mistaken. No man in public life dare stand the abuse which is now visiting upon those who merely obeys national instinct and plant a stake in the Federal district. Hence the present resort to a trustee and his commercial prudence to withhold their secret until such time as the people have more charity and the press more decency. It has now come to that passage where the trustee must disclose the names of his principals or go to the coal hole. We presume Mr. Latta will go. Then the reaction for decency will have just begun.

We shall see what we shall see.

DR. PORTEOUS'S NEW CHURCH.

The Liberal Episcopalian's Platform—How False Doctrine has Hurt Christianity—The Particular Conscience Plays.

Three weeks ago a movement was begun in Brooklyn to organize a new church, of which the Rev. Dr. Porteous, late of London, promised to become pastor. The effort has been successful. Adherents to almost every sect have joined the new organization, which is henceforth to be known as "All Souls Protestant Episcopal Church," and last evening the new band met for the first time in the capacity of worshipers in the Clinton Avenue Congregational Church. Every available foot of room was occupied. Dr. Porteous read the usual evening service of the Church of England, and added thereto a long extemporaneous prayer. The sermon was explanatory of his belief—the foundation of his religious platform. Throughout the audience listened mid almost painful silence. His text was:

"And He shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

The life of Christ is true as a history and also as an experience, he said. Born in history, as He was, He is still more born in the human mind. The Christ that was born in a manger was destined to be born in every human heart. The Christ of history, in regard to His extremists, to His characteristics, deserves our highest admiration and esteem. We cannot have too much definite knowledge of His place in the Godhead, of His character and attributes; but there are aspects of His life and of His external existence which perplex and do not relieve us. They have been magnified to the hurt of theology. Much of the doctrine about Christ may be true; is scholastic and theologic; but we have had enough of such food. We want to see the Christ of the human soul. As the Christ of history was born in Bethlehem in a manger, with the poorest and meanest surroundings, so the Christ of our souls is at first a very poor child. The truth of Christ is at first very feeble indeed, and can scarcely be perceived at all, but when by great sorrow or adversity we come to really see Christ, then all his attributes flash up in the soul, then we realize what he is to us, then he becomes indeed to us the way, the truth, and the life, then we say his name is wonderful. The Christ of history has become an extremely dry fact. We are so anxious about his position and appearance that we forget that he is a factor of Christian experience.

THE STIR THAT A NEW TRUTH KICKS UP.

All new truth is wonderful. Christ, the embodiment of all known truth, is wonderful. When a soul first feels a new truth, it stands amazed and motionless. As Socrates, after discovering a new principle, stood silent and motionless from sunrise to sunset, so the soul feels strange when it first feels a new truth. But by and by this truth rouses the soul into action, and becomes the leader, the teacher. This is what Christ does. No sooner does the soul feel the truth of Christ than he says to it, "Go forth, preach the truth, live the truth and by truth, live." That Christ is not only the child wonderfully born, but man's "counsellor." Then we feel that this truth does not come from history nor from man, but from God himself, and that this God is Jesus Christ himself, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father. But in its rude, stiff, character, God himself is harsh and cold, rather a Judge than a Father. But why does God come so close to us as if our souls were necessary to Him? Why? Because God is our kind, sympathizing Father. We want Christ, we want the truth, not the cold truth of moonlight but the Truth is "the Everlasting Father."

Truth creates disturbance in every mind. Any new truth in science, in chemistry, in philosophy, upsets all old opinions. A new truth from God disturbs the world, shows it what we are in contrast to the truth. This truth from Jesus Christ shows that the Father means to disturb us, that after a storm there may be a calm, that after the struggle we shall enter into peace. We come to Christ and we find when it realizes the Fatherhood of God. This makes him the "Prince of Peace."

NO DODGING CONSCIENCE.

There is no escaping the Christ of consciousness. He is equally in matter and mind. Knocking at the door of every heart, pleading for admission. To have this Christ developed in our minds and hearts, is this not better than any theories, than any dogmas? Where this Christ of consciousness is present, is first in our hearts, our beautiful scaffolding of intellectual truth will stand alone with no building within. On his shoulders the government shall be fixed, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

Dr. Porteous said that this was a specimen of the way he thought and spoke, of the way he intended to think and speak. Never in any doctrinal way; always in a personal way. With God's help he should always strive to get the spiritual meaning of the Gospel of God's love as long as he had the confidence and cordiality of any constituency as no adventurer, but opposed to adventure, except the adventure of thought. His people might expect him to preach, not to doctrinize, to vitalize, not to galvanize them; that his aim, every one who was thoroughly imbued with living Christianity could do this. Before God this should have his best and purest thought and effort. He should strive to bring from the word of God food for every soul.

THE DOCTOR DOESN'T CRAVE POPULARITY.

His position, then, was not self-elected. He did not crave popularity, knowing the misery it entails. He felt called to the office of the American church only as a plain man of common sense. He stood before them as a Church of England clergyman, having never declined allegiance to nor broken away from the church. In his own country the church grants him great liberty. He should take the same liberty here that he would on the other side of the water.

"And, now, will you keep me here," he added, "it is for you to answer. To work for you will be my joy. To strive to teach you will always be my earnest aim."

CHECKMATING GOLD-PEN POLEY.

Bankers Telling the Legislature how their Signatures were Obtained.

A memorial has been sent to the Legislature asking for the investigation of certain charges against Comptroller Green. They are that Mr. Green paid Mr. Dexter A. Hawkins $8,000 for lobbying services in Albany; that through Mr. Green's mismanagement the City Government is conducted nine months in the year on borrowed money, involving a loss of $500,000 annually in interest; and that because of his refusal to pay honest claims, four thousand suits have been begun against the city which it will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to defend. The memorial was prepared by the Hon. John Foley, and is signed by C. P. Leverich, R. H. Lowery, W. H. Macy, C. F. Timpson, and other well-known Dock Presidents and business men.

Since the memorial was sent to Albany several of its signers met and prepared the following, which is to be sent to the Legislature:

To the Legislature of the State of New-York, Albany.

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned, learning that our names are appended to a document purporting to be a memorial of citizens and taxpayers of the city of New York, addressed to your honorable body, containing the gravest charges against the Comptroller and Finance Department of this city, begs to say that our signatures were obtained under the representation and impression that it was merely a petition to the Legislature asking that a committee be appointed to examine and report upon the accounts and financial condition of the city. We understand the charges to be supported by affidavits of other persons, and, without reading or examining its contents. Speaking in the circumstances of our signing the document, and its contents being so different from what we supposed it contained, we now respectfully beg that our signatures may be removed from it.

C. P. LEVERICH, D. L. SMITH,
R. H. LOWERY, J. J. SLOCUM & CO.,
W. H. MACY, C. F. TIMPSON,
W. B. MEEKER.

A Compromise on the Currency Question.

WASHINGTON, March 21.—The Senate Committee on Finance held a special meeting to-day, at which a compromise financial measure was agreed upon, to be reported to the Senate next Monday. In its main features the bill will fix the amount of greenback circulation at $382,000,000, thus legalizing the release of that portion of the $44,000,000 legal-tender reserve which is now outstanding, and making it part of the permanent circulation. The amount that has been released and which is now outstanding is something over $[illegible]000,000. The bill will also authorize free banking on the national banking system, but will contain a requirement that national banks shall be compelled to maintain a relation proportionate as now fixed between the amount of circulation issued and the amount of bonds held and kept in circulation. The latter provision is intended to obviate the necessity of the proposed Government issue, thus keeping in circulation the [illegible] which have come into and from the reserve is considered a substantial gain over the present system. The bill will also provide for the redemption of the reserve, which is to be kept in the Treasury, the principle having been thus adopted in regard to the question of the $44,000,000 reserve, the whole question of the reserve should be accordingly placed in abeyance.

[illegible] A fact or information free [illegible] [illegible] Sun [illegible] Tribune [illegible]

THE ABSTINENCE UPROAR.

THE REV. DR. HOWARD CROSBY'S ATTITUDE OF DEFIANCE.

An Onslaught Upon the Temperance—The Temperance of Our Saviour—The Coercion of Ministers of the Gospel.

In his temperance sermon yesterday the Rev. Howard Crosby said that the total abstinence men are in the wrong. When the Lord came on earth he did not preach total abstinence. The first miracle was to turn water into wine. The Lord not only did not favor total abstinence, but he showed Christian men how to use the ordinary things of this life without abusing them. It has been said that He did not make wine at the marriage at Canaan; that it was not intoxicating. Unfermented grape juice is not wine. Fermented grape juice is the only wine. We sometimes have decoctions of beans called coffee, but when one asks for coffee he does not expect to have presented to him a decoction of beans, but pure coffee. Why did the enemies of Jesus call him a wine bibber, if he did not drink wine? If he ever drank anything it was the fermented juice of the grape. Christ drank wine and we should do well to follow his example. If the wine in those days was not intoxicating, what did the Apostle mean by saying to the deacons that they should not be given to much wine? Surely it was intoxicating or else they could have drank any quantity without effect. The temperance cause of to-day is doing the cause of Jesus Christ much harm. It gives scenes of Gospel truths entirely wrong, and false standards of comparison. It puts an interpretation on God's word never intended. Thousands perish by its means. To it many of the infidels owe their origin. By its misrepresentations of the Bible the total abstinence cause plays a more men into

ETERNAL DAMNATION

than any vice in existence. It has always been in the minority in all legislative halls. Ministers of the gospel have been terrorized into the so-called temperance movement. Some time ago Dr. Crosby received a letter from a college student, saying that his views on the temperance question were like those of the learned doctor; but the ministers, the young student said, were wild on the total abstinence question. He asked for advice, whether he should remain quiet or speak out.

Dr. Crosby advised him to speak out. A few months afterward Dr. Crosby said he found the student the President of half a dozen temperance lodges. As an explanation he said that he had been frightened into the cause. Dr. Crosby characterized this as cruel bigotry, and said that no man ought ever to allow his mouth to be closed in giving expression to honest convictions. He had been maligned for giving utterance to his views on this subject; but he would be untrue to himself and to his God if he remained quiet. Ministers are human as well as other people, and liable to err. The fanatics call themselves temperance people, and those who differ with them anti-temperance folks. Honest men would never be caught in using such chicanery. Let them believe that not Labmanites, but they are the people who dragged the flag of temperance as their motto, because it is a mockery to use the pure word to such an intemperate cause. The doctor, after speaking against drinking while making New Year's calls and entertaining, and urging the hearers to be temperate in all things, said that the drunkard should be punished for his crime, instead of being tenderly taken into an asylum.

The Women's Total Abstinence Meeting in the Jersey City Theatre.

No combination of dramatic talent has ever thronged the new Jersey City Theatre as did the temperance women's meeting last night. From the orchestra to the top gallery there was nothing but faces, and from behind the scenes peeped many inquisitive eyes. The ladies of the Jersey City League sat on the stage. Mr. Campbell, the proprietor of the theatre, and manager Baker were in their private box. Miss Anna Raymond, who has led the movement in Jersey City, introduced the Chairman, the Rev. Mr. Verrinder. The City Missionary, Mrs. Clark, knelt behind a chair near the foot lights, and in a clear ringing voice prayed for mercy on those who have given themselves up to intoxicating drinks. She prayed for the proprietor of the theatre and for his family. When the Rev. Mr. Verrinder spoke, Dr. Eddy, of the Second Presbyterian Church, favored a temperance drama, and longed for the ability to construct and even act one. Mrs. Clark spoke with fervor, and walked the stage, speaking in a voice that all could hear, and commanding the respectful attention of all. She had felt in her visit to a brewer in this city that God spoke to her through His spirit, and said that if the saloon keepers did not recognize His power and heed the words of His servants, the women, a pestilence would sweep over the city, and in its trail there would be none left to walk the streets. Mr. S. B. Ransom, the lawyer, and Miss Anna Raymond followed in addresses. Resolutions were passed thanking the theatre proprietors for the use of their building, and "Praise God from whom all blessings flow" resounded through the theatre from every voice, and the immense throng dispersed.

The Open Air Meeting in Harlem, and Other Meetings in the City.

Notwithstanding the raw March winds a larger multitude gathered under the willows in the park at 121st street and Third avenue yesterday afternoon to attend the open air temperance meeting. Mr. G. C. Taylor and Deacon Kraft were busy distributing tracts. A few ladies were there to assist in singing, but the majority of the assemblage was composed of delegates from the numerous saloons in the neighborhood. After "Coronation" had been sung, and Mr. M. E. Crastow had prayed, the Rev. J. V. Osterhout, pastor of the First Harlem Baptist Church, addressed the meeting.

He said one of the first things to be done was to get the owners of real estate converted to the temperance movement. An influential gentleman told him on Saturday that Trinity Church was no longer going to rent buildings to rum sellers. [Applause.]

Mr. M. E. Crastow spoke, and after him Mr. J. B. Gibbs.

At the Church of the Strangers yesterday afternoon a throng that filled the chapel, the stair way, and blocked the sidewalk in Greene street, collected at the temperance meeting. A few of the crusading women were among the number, but the leaders were unaccountably away. A meeting was opened in the upper chapel, and the women, finding the lower gatherings mingled, A petition to the Mayor, Excise Board, and Police Board, praying for a strict enforcement of the Sunday Liquor law, was circulated for signatures. From the crusaders the chairman reported that fifty saloons had been visited and six closed. Mrs. Lawrence said that she had been to see Stewart and Vanderbilt, pleading for their influence in the crusade. To-day she will visit all the leading hotels and present a pledge to the proprietors. She asked every woman to go with her, and one young lady volunteered.

In the Forsyth street meeting Mrs. S. Wilson, the city missionary who closed the lager beer saloon in Hester street, said she had visited thirty saloons, and one liquor seller, who was a backsliding church member, had promised to give up his business by the first of May, when his lease expires. Twelve ladies volunteered to visit the saloons and add those who were fighting the demon rum through their grocers. One grocer under the ladies' supervision has ceased to sell whiskey.

Last night a few ladies prayed in Dazzle's barroom, Park avenue and Willoughby street, Brooklyn. They were courteously treated by the proprietor and the bar men. There was a meeting in Charles Meyers's saloon, Bridge street. Placards announced that hereafter the place is to be closed. The temperance women have purchased his stock of liquors.

Cleveland's Mayor Forbidding Street Demonstrations.

CLEVELAND, March 22.—The Mayor's proclamation forbidding such assemblages in the street as may tend to disturb the peace of the city, which applies to the praying women as much as to the crowds which follow them, has been the topic of conversation to-day. The friends of the temperance movement and the opposing element each place constructions on its meaning favorable to themselves. No saloons were visited to-day. Services were held in several churches by women who expressed the settled determination to go on with the work under the provisions of the proclamation. They will be unable to hold services on the sidewalk, and on the strength of this, many saloon keepers have determined to close their doors upon them.

Excitement exists among the brewers and German saloon keepers, who will oppose to the utmost further movements of the crusaders against their business. Precautions have been taken by the authorities to promptly suppress any disturbance of the peace. Some of the more determined women intend to hold their meetings in spite of the Mayor's proclamation. The fire department has been ordered to hold itself in readiness. [illegible] Church, of which Dr. Pinney is pastor, [illegible] 93d. The church [illegible]

The Weather To-day.

WASHINGTON, March 22.—[illegible]

Findlay, Clyde, and Bellevue, many liquor dealers have