

The Sun

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 25, 1892.

London Office of THE SUN, 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

The Gag in the Senate.

The gag resolution presented by Senator Aldrich is substantially the same in tenor as the one proposed by Senator Hoar in the last session. It gives to a majority of the Senate the power to close debate upon any measure which, in their opinion, has been "under consideration for a reasonable time."

A reasonable time means, of course, whenever a majority can be drummed up to apply the gag. What would be the feelings of the ancient Mr. Hoar if, after the Force bill has been switched off, the irrefragable Plumb should get up a coalition of silver Senators, and debate on freer coinage, and send rattling through the Senate a Silver bill that would make the solid men of State street shake in the red armchairs in which, according to Wendell Phillips, these respectable persons are wont to rest?

Hence it is not difficult to understand why so large a part of the great individual wealth of recent accumulation has been gathered by Baptists and Methodists, or by men whose rearing was in that faith or in the other religious denominations which inculcated and practised abstemiousness of life and abstinence from the pleasures and dissipations of the world. Though once poor in this world's goods, the Baptists of New York especially number in their membership some of the richest men of modern times. Hence they put up costly churches, ecclesiastical in their architectural style, instead of unsteeped meeting houses of barnlike construction; and many elegant equipages are drawn up before them to let out wealthy Baptist worshippers. These families no longer turn from the luxuries of life, now that they have obtained the means of getting them. Some of the young people, brought up in elegance, may be turning away from the severe simplicity of the worship of their fathers to seek more fashionable religious surroundings, but the old usually remain. Mr. Trevor continued faithful to the last.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last number of the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. W. H. Hurlbert contributes the first of a series of papers in which he proposes to discuss in the light of his personal observations the present state of things in France. Does the type of republican government which has been exhibited since 1879 command the confidence of the French people as a matter of fact, and should it as a matter of right have their approval?

No reader of Mr. Hurlbert's recently published book on "Contemporary France" needs to be told that both questions are answered by Mr. Hurlbert in the negative. He holds that the narrow oligarchical majority obtained by the supporters of the present régime in the general election of September, 1889, was a sham verdict, procured by intimidation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. Hurlbert is a staunch Baptist, and during his lifetime was a liberal giver to Baptist colleges, theological schools, churches, and missionary enterprises. The communion of which he was so loyal a member was formerly made up of people who were not rich in this world's goods. They were plain people worshipping in meeting houses distinguished for the simplicity of their architecture. Probably the combined wealth of the whole Baptist membership of this city fifty years ago was not so great as the fortune just left by Mr. Trevor alone. In those earlier days the Baptist family most notable for their wealth were the COLGATES, but their possessions were small then as compared with what they are now. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE, the partner of Mr. Trevor in the banking business, is reputed to have a great fortune as that left by him, and several other members of the family are among the millionaires of the town. With very few exceptions they cling to the faith of their fathers, remaining still simple Baptists. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE has not been less liberal than Mr. Trevor in his gifts for the propagation of Baptist teaching.

But their fortunes are small by the side of the enormous estate of those other Baptists, the ROCKEFELLERS. If Mr. Trevor has left more than the combined wealth of the Baptists of New York fifty years ago, Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER'S fortune probably amounts to as much as the aggregate wealth of the whole membership in the United States at that period. In those days both Baptists and Methodists generally were disposed to look on plain living as essential to godliness, or perhaps because the great mass of them could afford no other. Itinerant evangelists displayed elegance of apparel as worldliness destructive of true spiritual vitality, and social recreations like dancing and ball going were looked upon as totally unfit for members of the household of faith. Of course, taste and refinement, with the means of gratifying their demands, in the large towns more especially, could be restrained altogether within these bounds of austerity. Well-to-do Baptist people dressed like their neighbors of the same condition and kept up equal state; but besides the two denominations we have named all the communions known as evangelical abstained from richly furnished mansions. Their members were never seen at the theatre. They might go to hear Fanny Kemble read SHAKESPEARE or JENNY LIND sing, but they feared to enjoy the dramatic performances of FORBES and MACBRIDE, or to appear in the audiences at the opera. They took little or no part in the gay social functions of New York which PHILIP HORN describes in his *Diary*. Sobriety of walk and conversation formed their distinguishing feature. Especially among the Baptists and Methodists the prevailing sentiment was that the true Christian must divide all such pleasures, and present profits of his election as one of the saints by living apart from the ways of the ungodly.

Undoubtedly such a sentiment had the effect to promote habits of frugality which encouraged the accumulation of wealth; for the pursuit of money and thrift in keeping it were not treated by these austere people as sinful. The young men were brought up in the practice of economy and away from all social dissipation. Therefore, when they went to work to make fortunes for themselves, they gave their whole energies to the task without the distractions of those in a gayer sphere. Moreover, the most of them had only themselves to depend on, and that necessity for self-dependence developed their moral strength. From among them, country boys and town boys, the millions of this present period have come almost wholly.

In New York to-day there is not a single fortune of the first class as to size which has not been built up during the present century; and the great bulk of the accumulations has been made since Mr. Trevor came to New York in 1843. The original JOHN JACOB ASTOR entered upon the country with the next best of his fortune only, and it was not until about that time that he began to live in a dwelling apart from his place of business. The VANDERBILT fortune is wholly a creation of this century. The GOLETT estate has been built up during the same time from small beginnings. The Standard Oil fortune are of much more recent growth. They have been accumulated within the memory of men now young. So also is it

with the estate of Mr. JAY GOULD, and with the fortunes of ninety-nine out of a hundred of the thousand millionaires of the town. These rich men started with nothing except their own energy and their heredity of sagacity and habits of industry, thrift, and sobriety, but these were vastly more to them than any rich inheritance of material wealth. They were also, with few exceptions, the sons of men in a modest social sphere, at a great remove from the circles of fashion. The wealth which was notable in New York sixty or seventy years ago, if we leave out the Astors, has either been dissipated or has come down to this day, with all its increase, as small relatively to the fortunes made since then. About sixty years ago Commodore VANDERBILT was the Captain of a steamboat plying between New York and New Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the route to Philadelphia. Forty years ago JAY GOULD was keeping the books for a village blacksmith in Delaware county. Not one of the millionaires of this day were much, if any, better off than he at that time. They were, almost invariably, men who came from families Puritanical in their religion and mode of life, and frugal in all their habits. They did not know the taste of luxury.

Hence it is not difficult to understand why so large a part of the great individual wealth of recent accumulation has been gathered by Baptists and Methodists, or by men whose rearing was in that faith or in the other religious denominations which inculcated and practised abstemiousness of life and abstinence from the pleasures and dissipations of the world. Though once poor in this world's goods, the Baptists of New York especially number in their membership some of the richest men of modern times. Hence they put up costly churches, ecclesiastical in their architectural style, instead of unsteeped meeting houses of barnlike construction; and many elegant equipages are drawn up before them to let out wealthy Baptist worshippers. These families no longer turn from the luxuries of life, now that they have obtained the means of getting them. Some of the young people, brought up in elegance, may be turning away from the severe simplicity of the worship of their fathers to seek more fashionable religious surroundings, but the old usually remain. Mr. Trevor continued faithful to the last.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last number of the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. W. H. Hurlbert contributes the first of a series of papers in which he proposes to discuss in the light of his personal observations the present state of things in France. Does the type of republican government which has been exhibited since 1879 command the confidence of the French people as a matter of fact, and should it as a matter of right have their approval?

No reader of Mr. Hurlbert's recently published book on "Contemporary France" needs to be told that both questions are answered by Mr. Hurlbert in the negative. He holds that the narrow oligarchical majority obtained by the supporters of the present régime in the general election of September, 1889, was a sham verdict, procured by intimidation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. Hurlbert is a staunch Baptist, and during his lifetime was a liberal giver to Baptist colleges, theological schools, churches, and missionary enterprises. The communion of which he was so loyal a member was formerly made up of people who were not rich in this world's goods. They were plain people worshipping in meeting houses distinguished for the simplicity of their architecture. Probably the combined wealth of the whole Baptist membership of this city fifty years ago was not so great as the fortune just left by Mr. Trevor alone. In those earlier days the Baptist family most notable for their wealth were the COLGATES, but their possessions were small then as compared with what they are now. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE, the partner of Mr. Trevor in the banking business, is reputed to have a great fortune as that left by him, and several other members of the family are among the millionaires of the town. With very few exceptions they cling to the faith of their fathers, remaining still simple Baptists. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE has not been less liberal than Mr. Trevor in his gifts for the propagation of Baptist teaching.

But their fortunes are small by the side of the enormous estate of those other Baptists, the ROCKEFELLERS. If Mr. Trevor has left more than the combined wealth of the Baptists of New York fifty years ago, Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER'S fortune probably amounts to as much as the aggregate wealth of the whole membership in the United States at that period. In those days both Baptists and Methodists generally were disposed to look on plain living as essential to godliness, or perhaps because the great mass of them could afford no other. Itinerant evangelists displayed elegance of apparel as worldliness destructive of true spiritual vitality, and social recreations like dancing and ball going were looked upon as totally unfit for members of the household of faith. Of course, taste and refinement, with the means of gratifying their demands, in the large towns more especially, could be restrained altogether within these bounds of austerity. Well-to-do Baptist people dressed like their neighbors of the same condition and kept up equal state; but besides the two denominations we have named all the communions known as evangelical abstained from richly furnished mansions. Their members were never seen at the theatre. They might go to hear Fanny Kemble read SHAKESPEARE or JENNY LIND sing, but they feared to enjoy the dramatic performances of FORBES and MACBRIDE, or to appear in the audiences at the opera. They took little or no part in the gay social functions of New York which PHILIP HORN describes in his *Diary*. Sobriety of walk and conversation formed their distinguishing feature. Especially among the Baptists and Methodists the prevailing sentiment was that the true Christian must divide all such pleasures, and present profits of his election as one of the saints by living apart from the ways of the ungodly.

Undoubtedly such a sentiment had the effect to promote habits of frugality which encouraged the accumulation of wealth; for the pursuit of money and thrift in keeping it were not treated by these austere people as sinful. The young men were brought up in the practice of economy and away from all social dissipation. Therefore, when they went to work to make fortunes for themselves, they gave their whole energies to the task without the distractions of those in a gayer sphere. Moreover, the most of them had only themselves to depend on, and that necessity for self-dependence developed their moral strength. From among them, country boys and town boys, the millions of this present period have come almost wholly.

In New York to-day there is not a single fortune of the first class as to size which has not been built up during the present century; and the great bulk of the accumulations has been made since Mr. Trevor came to New York in 1843. The original JOHN JACOB ASTOR entered upon the country with the next best of his fortune only, and it was not until about that time that he began to live in a dwelling apart from his place of business. The VANDERBILT fortune is wholly a creation of this century. The GOLETT estate has been built up during the same time from small beginnings. The Standard Oil fortune are of much more recent growth. They have been accumulated within the memory of men now young. So also is it

with the estate of Mr. JAY GOULD, and with the fortunes of ninety-nine out of a hundred of the thousand millionaires of the town. These rich men started with nothing except their own energy and their heredity of sagacity and habits of industry, thrift, and sobriety, but these were vastly more to them than any rich inheritance of material wealth. They were also, with few exceptions, the sons of men in a modest social sphere, at a great remove from the circles of fashion. The wealth which was notable in New York sixty or seventy years ago, if we leave out the Astors, has either been dissipated or has come down to this day, with all its increase, as small relatively to the fortunes made since then. About sixty years ago Commodore VANDERBILT was the Captain of a steamboat plying between New York and New Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the route to Philadelphia. Forty years ago JAY GOULD was keeping the books for a village blacksmith in Delaware county. Not one of the millionaires of this day were much, if any, better off than he at that time. They were, almost invariably, men who came from families Puritanical in their religion and mode of life, and frugal in all their habits. They did not know the taste of luxury.

Hence it is not difficult to understand why so large a part of the great individual wealth of recent accumulation has been gathered by Baptists and Methodists, or by men whose rearing was in that faith or in the other religious denominations which inculcated and practised abstemiousness of life and abstinence from the pleasures and dissipations of the world. Though once poor in this world's goods, the Baptists of New York especially number in their membership some of the richest men of modern times. Hence they put up costly churches, ecclesiastical in their architectural style, instead of unsteeped meeting houses of barnlike construction; and many elegant equipages are drawn up before them to let out wealthy Baptist worshippers. These families no longer turn from the luxuries of life, now that they have obtained the means of getting them. Some of the young people, brought up in elegance, may be turning away from the severe simplicity of the worship of their fathers to seek more fashionable religious surroundings, but the old usually remain. Mr. Trevor continued faithful to the last.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last number of the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. W. H. Hurlbert contributes the first of a series of papers in which he proposes to discuss in the light of his personal observations the present state of things in France. Does the type of republican government which has been exhibited since 1879 command the confidence of the French people as a matter of fact, and should it as a matter of right have their approval?

No reader of Mr. Hurlbert's recently published book on "Contemporary France" needs to be told that both questions are answered by Mr. Hurlbert in the negative. He holds that the narrow oligarchical majority obtained by the supporters of the present régime in the general election of September, 1889, was a sham verdict, procured by intimidation, corruption, and fraud.

however, to consider the report until Jan. 23, 1890, and then, instead of entering a caveat, directed a new inquiry to be made at Lódève by a committee composed exclusively of friends of the official candidate. Even this committee, after taking evidence on the spot, felt constrained to report on March 22, 1890, that the election of M. MENARD-DORNIAN had been rendered invalid by downright fraud. At least the Chambers consented to act, and ordered a new election for April 27. The sinister purpose of the delays was now made manifest. The interval had been spent by the local agents of the Government in overhauling the new electoral or registration lists, which were to come in force on April 1, 1890. That is to say, they substituted a falsification of the registration schedules for a falsification of ballots. The names of 400 electors who in September, 1890, had voted for the Party of the Right, were struck off the lists, and as many names were inserted of men, strangers to the district, and brought there for the purpose of voting for M. MENARD-DORNIAN. But, it may be asked, why did not the friends of M. LEROY-BEAULIEU avail themselves of the provision of law requiring the registration lists to be published two and a half months before they go into force, so that errors may be judicially corrected? The Mayors of the communes refused to obey this law and publish the lists, and the Prefect of the department and the Minister of the Interior, though repeatedly appealed to, refused to make the Mayors do their duty. The result of this performance was that, although M. LEROY-BEAULIEU received 7,333 votes, or 110 more than he did in the previous September, his opponent had 7,500, and the election was declared null and void. It is only now that all the papers, the only memorable case, having been sent to the Department of Justice, have there been pigeonholed.

In view of the course pursued by the French Government toward M. PAUL LEROY-BEAULIEU, it is impossible to maintain that the freedom of elections is safeguarded under the third republic. We shall wait to see whether Mr. HURLEBERT can bring forward equally impressive facts to support the charge of judicial, fiscal, and executive misconduct against the existing régime. Meanwhile, it should be borne in mind that, even if he succeeds in proving all that he attempts to prove, it will still be open to debate whether the French people would not prefer revision to revolution, or, in other words, a readjustment of the republican system upon the American model to a restoration of the monarchy.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last number of the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. W. H. Hurlbert contributes the first of a series of papers in which he proposes to discuss in the light of his personal observations the present state of things in France. Does the type of republican government which has been exhibited since 1879 command the confidence of the French people as a matter of fact, and should it as a matter of right have their approval?

No reader of Mr. Hurlbert's recently published book on "Contemporary France" needs to be told that both questions are answered by Mr. Hurlbert in the negative. He holds that the narrow oligarchical majority obtained by the supporters of the present régime in the general election of September, 1889, was a sham verdict, procured by intimidation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. Hurlbert is a staunch Baptist, and during his lifetime was a liberal giver to Baptist colleges, theological schools, churches, and missionary enterprises. The communion of which he was so loyal a member was formerly made up of people who were not rich in this world's goods. They were plain people worshipping in meeting houses distinguished for the simplicity of their architecture. Probably the combined wealth of the whole Baptist membership of this city fifty years ago was not so great as the fortune just left by Mr. Trevor alone. In those earlier days the Baptist family most notable for their wealth were the COLGATES, but their possessions were small then as compared with what they are now. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE, the partner of Mr. Trevor in the banking business, is reputed to have a great fortune as that left by him, and several other members of the family are among the millionaires of the town. With very few exceptions they cling to the faith of their fathers, remaining still simple Baptists. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE has not been less liberal than Mr. Trevor in his gifts for the propagation of Baptist teaching.

But their fortunes are small by the side of the enormous estate of those other Baptists, the ROCKEFELLERS. If Mr. Trevor has left more than the combined wealth of the Baptists of New York fifty years ago, Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER'S fortune probably amounts to as much as the aggregate wealth of the whole membership in the United States at that period. In those days both Baptists and Methodists generally were disposed to look on plain living as essential to godliness, or perhaps because the great mass of them could afford no other. Itinerant evangelists displayed elegance of apparel as worldliness destructive of true spiritual vitality, and social recreations like dancing and ball going were looked upon as totally unfit for members of the household of faith. Of course, taste and refinement, with the means of gratifying their demands, in the large towns more especially, could be restrained altogether within these bounds of austerity. Well-to-do Baptist people dressed like their neighbors of the same condition and kept up equal state; but besides the two denominations we have named all the communions known as evangelical abstained from richly furnished mansions. Their members were never seen at the theatre. They might go to hear Fanny Kemble read SHAKESPEARE or JENNY LIND sing, but they feared to enjoy the dramatic performances of FORBES and MACBRIDE, or to appear in the audiences at the opera. They took little or no part in the gay social functions of New York which PHILIP HORN describes in his *Diary*. Sobriety of walk and conversation formed their distinguishing feature. Especially among the Baptists and Methodists the prevailing sentiment was that the true Christian must divide all such pleasures, and present profits of his election as one of the saints by living apart from the ways of the ungodly.

Undoubtedly such a sentiment had the effect to promote habits of frugality which encouraged the accumulation of wealth; for the pursuit of money and thrift in keeping it were not treated by these austere people as sinful. The young men were brought up in the practice of economy and away from all social dissipation. Therefore, when they went to work to make fortunes for themselves, they gave their whole energies to the task without the distractions of those in a gayer sphere. Moreover, the most of them had only themselves to depend on, and that necessity for self-dependence developed their moral strength. From among them, country boys and town boys, the millions of this present period have come almost wholly.

In New York to-day there is not a single fortune of the first class as to size which has not been built up during the present century; and the great bulk of the accumulations has been made since Mr. Trevor came to New York in 1843. The original JOHN JACOB ASTOR entered upon the country with the next best of his fortune only, and it was not until about that time that he began to live in a dwelling apart from his place of business. The VANDERBILT fortune is wholly a creation of this century. The GOLETT estate has been built up during the same time from small beginnings. The Standard Oil fortune are of much more recent growth. They have been accumulated within the memory of men now young. So also is it

with the estate of Mr. JAY GOULD, and with the fortunes of ninety-nine out of a hundred of the thousand millionaires of the town. These rich men started with nothing except their own energy and their heredity of sagacity and habits of industry, thrift, and sobriety, but these were vastly more to them than any rich inheritance of material wealth. They were also, with few exceptions, the sons of men in a modest social sphere, at a great remove from the circles of fashion. The wealth which was notable in New York sixty or seventy years ago, if we leave out the Astors, has either been dissipated or has come down to this day, with all its increase, as small relatively to the fortunes made since then. About sixty years ago Commodore VANDERBILT was the Captain of a steamboat plying between New York and New Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the route to Philadelphia. Forty years ago JAY GOULD was keeping the books for a village blacksmith in Delaware county. Not one of the millionaires of this day were much, if any, better off than he at that time. They were, almost invariably, men who came from families Puritanical in their religion and mode of life, and frugal in all their habits. They did not know the taste of luxury.

Hence it is not difficult to understand why so large a part of the great individual wealth of recent accumulation has been gathered by Baptists and Methodists, or by men whose rearing was in that faith or in the other religious denominations which inculcated and practised abstemiousness of life and abstinence from the pleasures and dissipations of the world. Though once poor in this world's goods, the Baptists of New York especially number in their membership some of the richest men of modern times. Hence they put up costly churches, ecclesiastical in their architectural style, instead of unsteeped meeting houses of barnlike construction; and many elegant equipages are drawn up before them to let out wealthy Baptist worshippers. These families no longer turn from the luxuries of life, now that they have obtained the means of getting them. Some of the young people, brought up in elegance, may be turning away from the severe simplicity of the worship of their fathers to seek more fashionable religious surroundings, but the old usually remain. Mr. Trevor continued faithful to the last.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last number of the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. W. H. Hurlbert contributes the first of a series of papers in which he proposes to discuss in the light of his personal observations the present state of things in France. Does the type of republican government which has been exhibited since 1879 command the confidence of the French people as a matter of fact, and should it as a matter of right have their approval?

No reader of Mr. Hurlbert's recently published book on "Contemporary France" needs to be told that both questions are answered by Mr. Hurlbert in the negative. He holds that the narrow oligarchical majority obtained by the supporters of the present régime in the general election of September, 1889, was a sham verdict, procured by intimidation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. Hurlbert is a staunch Baptist, and during his lifetime was a liberal giver to Baptist colleges, theological schools, churches, and missionary enterprises. The communion of which he was so loyal a member was formerly made up of people who were not rich in this world's goods. They were plain people worshipping in meeting houses distinguished for the simplicity of their architecture. Probably the combined wealth of the whole Baptist membership of this city fifty years ago was not so great as the fortune just left by Mr. Trevor alone. In those earlier days the Baptist family most notable for their wealth were the COLGATES, but their possessions were small then as compared with what they are now. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE, the partner of Mr. Trevor in the banking business, is reputed to have a great fortune as that left by him, and several other members of the family are among the millionaires of the town. With very few exceptions they cling to the faith of their fathers, remaining still simple Baptists. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE has not been less liberal than Mr. Trevor in his gifts for the propagation of Baptist teaching.

But their fortunes are small by the side of the enormous estate of those other Baptists, the ROCKEFELLERS. If Mr. Trevor has left more than the combined wealth of the Baptists of New York fifty years ago, Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER'S fortune probably amounts to as much as the aggregate wealth of the whole membership in the United States at that period. In those days both Baptists and Methodists generally were disposed to look on plain living as essential to godliness, or perhaps because the great mass of them could afford no other. Itinerant evangelists displayed elegance of apparel as worldliness destructive of true spiritual vitality, and social recreations like dancing and ball going were looked upon as totally unfit for members of the household of faith. Of course, taste and refinement, with the means of gratifying their demands, in the large towns more especially, could be restrained altogether within these bounds of austerity. Well-to-do Baptist people dressed like their neighbors of the same condition and kept up equal state; but besides the two denominations we have named all the communions known as evangelical abstained from richly furnished mansions. Their members were never seen at the theatre. They might go to hear Fanny Kemble read SHAKESPEARE or JENNY LIND sing, but they feared to enjoy the dramatic performances of FORBES and MACBRIDE, or to appear in the audiences at the opera. They took little or no part in the gay social functions of New York which PHILIP HORN describes in his *Diary*. Sobriety of walk and conversation formed their distinguishing feature. Especially among the Baptists and Methodists the prevailing sentiment was that the true Christian must divide all such pleasures, and present profits of his election as one of the saints by living apart from the ways of the ungodly.

Undoubtedly such a sentiment had the effect to promote habits of frugality which encouraged the accumulation of wealth; for the pursuit of money and thrift in keeping it were not treated by these austere people as sinful. The young men were brought up in the practice of economy and away from all social dissipation. Therefore, when they went to work to make fortunes for themselves, they gave their whole energies to the task without the distractions of those in a gayer sphere. Moreover, the most of them had only themselves to depend on, and that necessity for self-dependence developed their moral strength. From among them, country boys and town boys, the millions of this present period have come almost wholly.

with the estate of Mr. JAY GOULD, and with the fortunes of ninety-nine out of a hundred of the thousand millionaires of the town. These rich men started with nothing except their own energy and their heredity of sagacity and habits of industry, thrift, and sobriety, but these were vastly more to them than any rich inheritance of material wealth. They were also, with few exceptions, the sons of men in a modest social sphere, at a great remove from the circles of fashion. The wealth which was notable in New York sixty or seventy years ago, if we leave out the Astors, has either been dissipated or has come down to this day, with all its increase, as small relatively to the fortunes made since then. About sixty years ago Commodore VANDERBILT was the Captain of a steamboat plying between New York and New Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the route to Philadelphia. Forty years ago JAY GOULD was keeping the books for a village blacksmith in Delaware county. Not one of the millionaires of this day were much, if any, better off than he at that time. They were, almost invariably, men who came from families Puritanical in their religion and mode of life, and frugal in all their habits. They did not know the taste of luxury.

Hence it is not difficult to understand why so large a part of the great individual wealth of recent accumulation has been gathered by Baptists and Methodists, or by men whose rearing was in that faith or in the other religious denominations which inculcated and practised abstemiousness of life and abstinence from the pleasures and dissipations of the world. Though once poor in this world's goods, the Baptists of New York especially number in their membership some of the richest men of modern times. Hence they put up costly churches, ecclesiastical in their architectural style, instead of unsteeped meeting houses of barnlike construction; and many elegant equipages are drawn up before them to let out wealthy Baptist worshippers. These families no longer turn from the luxuries of life, now that they have obtained the means of getting them. Some of the young people, brought up in elegance, may be turning away from the severe simplicity of the worship of their fathers to seek more fashionable religious surroundings, but the old usually remain. Mr. Trevor continued faithful to the last.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last number of the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. W. H. Hurlbert contributes the first of a series of papers in which he proposes to discuss in the light of his personal observations the present state of things in France. Does the type of republican government which has been exhibited since 1879 command the confidence of the French people as a matter of fact, and should it as a matter of right have their approval?

No reader of Mr. Hurlbert's recently published book on "Contemporary France" needs to be told that both questions are answered by Mr. Hurlbert in the negative. He holds that the narrow oligarchical majority obtained by the supporters of the present régime in the general election of September, 1889, was a sham verdict, procured by intimidation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. Hurlbert is a staunch Baptist, and during his lifetime was a liberal giver to Baptist colleges, theological schools, churches, and missionary enterprises. The communion of which he was so loyal a member was formerly made up of people who were not rich in this world's goods. They were plain people worshipping in meeting houses distinguished for the simplicity of their architecture. Probably the combined wealth of the whole Baptist membership of this city fifty years ago was not so great as the fortune just left by Mr. Trevor alone. In those earlier days the Baptist family most notable for their wealth were the COLGATES, but their possessions were small then as compared with what they are now. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE, the partner of Mr. Trevor in the banking business, is reputed to have a great fortune as that left by him, and several other members of the family are among the millionaires of the town. With very few exceptions they cling to the faith of their fathers, remaining still simple Baptists. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE has not been less liberal than Mr. Trevor in his gifts for the propagation of Baptist teaching.

But their fortunes are small by the side of the enormous estate of those other Baptists, the ROCKEFELLERS. If Mr. Trevor has left more than the combined wealth of the Baptists of New York fifty years ago, Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER'S fortune probably amounts to as much as the aggregate wealth of the whole membership in the United States at that period. In those days both Baptists and Methodists generally were disposed to look on plain living as essential to godliness, or perhaps because the great mass of them could afford no other. Itinerant evangelists displayed elegance of apparel as worldliness destructive of true spiritual vitality, and social recreations like dancing and ball going were looked upon as totally unfit for members of the household of faith. Of course, taste and refinement, with the means of gratifying their demands, in the large towns more especially, could be restrained altogether within these bounds of austerity. Well-to-do Baptist people dressed like their neighbors of the same condition and kept up equal state; but besides the two denominations we have named all the communions known as evangelical abstained from richly furnished mansions. Their members were never seen at the theatre. They might go to hear Fanny Kemble read SHAKESPEARE or JENNY LIND sing, but they feared to enjoy the dramatic performances of FORBES and MACBRIDE, or to appear in the audiences at the opera. They took little or no part in the gay social functions of New York which PHILIP HORN describes in his *Diary*. Sobriety of walk and conversation formed their distinguishing feature. Especially among the Baptists and Methodists the prevailing sentiment was that the true Christian must divide all such pleasures, and present profits of his election as one of the saints by living apart from the ways of the ungodly.

Undoubtedly such a sentiment had the effect to promote habits of frugality which encouraged the accumulation of wealth; for the pursuit of money and thrift in keeping it were not treated by these austere people as sinful. The young men were brought up in the practice of economy and away from all social dissipation. Therefore, when they went to work to make fortunes for themselves, they gave their whole energies to the task without the distractions of those in a gayer sphere. Moreover, the most of them had only themselves to depend on, and that necessity for self-dependence developed their moral strength. From among them, country boys and town boys, the millions of this present period have come almost wholly.

In New York to-day there is not a single fortune of the first class as to size which has not been built up during the present century; and the great bulk of the accumulations has been made since Mr. Trevor came to New York in 1843. The original JOHN JACOB ASTOR entered upon the country with the next best of his fortune only, and it was not until about that time that he began to live in a dwelling apart from his place of business. The VANDERBILT fortune is wholly a creation of this century. The GOLETT estate has been built up during the same time from small beginnings. The Standard Oil fortune are of much more recent growth. They have been accumulated within the memory of men now young. So also is it

with the estate of Mr. JAY GOULD, and with the fortunes of ninety-nine out of a hundred of the thousand millionaires of the town. These rich men started with nothing except their own energy and their heredity of sagacity and habits of industry, thrift, and sobriety, but these were vastly more to them than any rich inheritance of material wealth. They were also, with few exceptions, the sons of men in a modest social sphere, at a great remove from the circles of fashion. The wealth which was notable in New York sixty or seventy years ago, if we leave out the Astors, has either been dissipated or has come down to this day, with all its increase, as small relatively to the fortunes made since then. About sixty years ago Commodore VANDERBILT was the Captain of a steamboat plying between New York and New Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the route to Philadelphia. Forty years ago JAY GOULD was keeping the books for a village blacksmith in Delaware county. Not one of the millionaires of this day were much, if any, better off than he at that time. They were, almost invariably, men who came from families Puritanical in their religion and mode of life, and frugal in all their habits. They did not know the taste of luxury.

Hence it is not difficult to understand why so large a part of the great individual wealth of recent accumulation has been gathered by Baptists and Methodists, or by men whose rearing was in that faith or in the other religious denominations which inculcated and practised abstemiousness of life and abstinence from the pleasures and dissipations of the world. Though once poor in this world's goods, the Baptists of New York especially number in their membership some of the richest men of modern times. Hence they put up costly churches, ecclesiastical in their architectural style, instead of unsteeped meeting houses of barnlike construction; and many elegant equipages are drawn up before them to let out wealthy Baptist worshippers. These families no longer turn from the luxuries of life, now that they have obtained the means of getting them. Some of the young people, brought up in elegance, may be turning away from the severe simplicity of the worship of their fathers to seek more fashionable religious surroundings, but the old usually remain. Mr. Trevor continued faithful to the last.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last number of the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. W. H. Hurlbert contributes the first of a series of papers in which he proposes to discuss in the light of his personal observations the present state of things in France. Does the type of republican government which has been exhibited since 1879 command the confidence of the French people as a matter of fact, and should it as a matter of right have their approval?

No reader of Mr. Hurlbert's recently published book on "Contemporary France" needs to be told that both questions are answered by Mr. Hurlbert in the negative. He holds that the narrow oligarchical majority obtained by the supporters of the present régime in the general election of September, 1889, was a sham verdict, procured by intimidation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. Hurlbert is a staunch Baptist, and during his lifetime was a liberal giver to Baptist colleges, theological schools, churches, and missionary enterprises. The communion of which he was so loyal a member was formerly made up of people who were not rich in this world's goods. They were plain people worshipping in meeting houses distinguished for the simplicity of their architecture. Probably the combined wealth of the whole Baptist membership of this city fifty years ago was not so great as the fortune just left by Mr. Trevor alone. In those earlier days the Baptist family most notable for their wealth were the COLGATES, but their possessions were small then as compared with what they are now. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE, the partner of Mr. Trevor in the banking business, is reputed to have a great fortune as that left by him, and several other members of the family are among the millionaires of the town. With very few exceptions they cling to the faith of their fathers, remaining still simple Baptists. Mr. JAMES B. COLGATE has not been less liberal than Mr. Trevor in his gifts for the propagation of Baptist teaching.

But their fortunes are small by the side of the enormous estate of those other Baptists, the ROCKEFELLERS. If Mr. Trevor has left more than the combined wealth of the Baptists of New York fifty years ago, Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER'S fortune probably amounts to as much as the aggregate wealth of the whole membership in the United States at that period. In those days both Baptists and Methodists generally were disposed to look on plain living as essential to godliness, or perhaps because the great mass of them could afford no other. Itinerant evangelists displayed elegance of apparel as worldliness destructive of true spiritual vitality, and social recreations like dancing and ball going were looked upon as totally unfit for members of the household of faith. Of course, taste and refinement, with the means of gratifying their demands, in the large towns more especially, could be restrained altogether within these bounds of austerity. Well-to-do Baptist people dressed like their neighbors of the same condition and kept up equal state; but besides the two denominations we have named all the communions known as evangelical abstained from richly furnished mansions. Their members were never seen at the theatre. They might go to hear Fanny Kemble read SHAKESPEARE or JENNY LIND sing, but they feared to enjoy the dramatic performances of FORBES and MACBRIDE, or to appear in the audiences at the opera. They took little or no part in the gay social functions of New York which PHILIP HORN describes in his *Diary*. Sobriety of walk and conversation formed their distinguishing feature. Especially among the Baptists and Methodists the prevailing sentiment was that the true Christian must divide all such pleasures, and present profits of his election as one of the saints by living apart from the ways of the ungodly.

Undoubtedly such a sentiment had the effect to promote habits of frugality which encouraged the accumulation of wealth; for the pursuit of money and thrift in keeping it were not treated by these austere people as sinful. The young men were brought up in the practice of economy and away from all social dissipation. Therefore, when they went to work to make fortunes for themselves, they gave their whole energies to the task without the distractions of those in a gayer sphere. Moreover, the most of them had only themselves to depend on, and that necessity for self-dependence developed their moral strength. From among them, country boys and town boys, the millions of this present period have come almost wholly.

with the estate of Mr. JAY GOULD, and with the fortunes of ninety-nine out of a hundred of the thousand millionaires of the town. These rich men started with nothing except their own energy and their heredity of sagacity and habits of industry, thrift, and sobriety, but these were vastly more to them than any rich inheritance of material wealth. They were also, with few exceptions, the sons of men in a modest social sphere, at a great remove from the circles of fashion. The wealth which was notable in New York sixty or seventy years ago, if we leave out the Astors, has either been dissipated or has come down to this day, with all its increase, as small relatively to the fortunes made since then. About sixty years ago Commodore VANDERBILT was the Captain of a steamboat plying between New York and New Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the route to Philadelphia. Forty years ago JAY GOULD was keeping the books for a village blacksmith in Delaware county. Not one of the millionaires of this day were much, if any, better off than he at that time. They were, almost invariably, men who came from families Puritanical in their religion and mode of life, and frugal in all their habits. They did not know the taste of luxury.

Hence it is not difficult to understand why so large a part of the great individual wealth of recent accumulation has been gathered by Baptists and Methodists, or by men whose rearing was in that faith or in the other religious denominations which inculcated and practised abstemiousness of life and abstinence from the pleasures and dissipations of the world. Though once poor in this world's goods, the Baptists of New York especially number in their membership some of the richest men of modern times. Hence they put up costly churches, ecclesiastical in their architectural style, instead of unsteeped meeting houses of barnlike construction; and many elegant equipages are drawn up before them to let out wealthy Baptist worshippers. These families no longer turn from the luxuries of life, now that they have obtained the means of getting them. Some of the young people, brought up in elegance, may be turning away from the severe simplicity of the worship of their fathers to seek more fashionable religious surroundings, but the old usually remain. Mr. Trevor continued faithful to the last.

Mr. Hurlbert on the Outlook in France. To the last