

Our Young Folks.

A Thousand Boys Wanted.

There are always boys enough in the market, but some of them are of little use. The kind that are most wanted are—

- 1. Honest. 6. Obedient. 2. Pure. 7. Steady. 3. Intelligent. 8. Obedient. 4. Active. 9. Polite. 5. Industrious. 10. Neat.

Each boy can suit his taste as to the business he would prefer. The places are ready in every kind of occupation.

Many of these places of trade and art are already filled by boys who lack some of the most important points, but they will soon be vacant.

One is an office where the lad who has the situation is losing his first point. He likes to attend the singing saloon and the theatre.

His employers are quietly watching to learn how he gets on such spending money; they will soon discover a leak in the money drawer, detect the dishonest boy, and his place will be ready for some one who is now getting ready for it by observing point No. 1, and being truthful in all his ways.

Some situations will soon be vacant because the boys have been poisoned by reading bad books, such as they would not dare to show their fathers, and would be ashamed to have their mothers see.

The impure thoughts suggested by these books will lead to vicious acts; by the boys will be ruined, and the places must be filled.

Who will be ready for one of these vacancies? Distinguished lawyers, useful ministers, skilful physicians, successful merchants, must all soon leave their places for somebody else to fill.

Mind your ten points, boys; they will prepare you to step into vacancies in the front rank.

Every man who is worthy to employ a boy is looking for you if you have these points.

Do not fear that you will be overlooked. A young person having these qualities will shine as plainly as a star at night.

We have named ten points that go toward making up the character of a successful boy so that they can be very easily remembered. You can imagine one on each finger, and so keep them in mind; they will be worth more than diamond rings, and you will then never be ashamed to "show your hand."

A Word to Thoughtless Girls.

In a late number of Fors Clavigera Mr. Ruskin advises his girl readers as follows: "Dress as plainly as your parents will allow you, but in bright colors (if they become you, and in the best materials—that is to say, in those which wear longest."

When you are really in want of a new dress buy it (or make it) in the fashion; but never quit an old one merely because it has become unfashionable. And if the fashion be costly you must not follow it. You may wear broad stripes or narrow, bright colors or dark, short petticoats or long (in moderation), as the public wish you; but you must not buy yards of useless stuff to make a knot or a founce of, nor drag them behind you over the ground.

And your walking dress must never touch the ground at all. I have lost much of the faith I once had in the common sense, and even in the personal delicacy of the present race of average English women by seeing how they will allow their dresses to sweep the streets, as if it is the fashion to be scavengers. If you can afford it, get your dresses made by a good dressmaker, with the utmost attainable precision and perfection; but let this good dressmaker be a poor person living in the country—not a rich person living in a large house in London.

thrown away, and a beautiful angel stood before them. "The loving heart and the kindly hand," said she, "are always beautiful, and where these are not, there is no beauty left," and straightway she vanished out of their sight.

"Right," said Uncle Charlie, "beauty is but skin deep, and I would rather have the rough brown fist and iron hook of kind-hearted Sailor Jack, than the fairest hand that ever wore diamonds, with a proud unfeeling heart behind it. The Good Book tells us of One whose hands were pored with nails, and whose visage was more marred than any man's; and yet He was the fairest among ten thousand and altogether lovely; and the more we are like Him, however plain in feature, rude in form, or coarse in raiment, the more truly beautiful we are."—London Christian Globe.

Saving the Children.

On this subject the pith of the question is stated in the Vermont Chronicle. It says: "The welfare and permanence of the Church depend on the conversion and ingathering of the young children. Much of our preaching and Christian work is ineffective and powerless because it is aimed at the conversion of those who are entrenched in their earth-works of long-continued habits of unbelief and sin. We are aiming our artillery in the pulpit at the impregnable old gray-headed sinners. There is a pleasure and excitement in firing away at them from Sabbath to Sabbath that can hardly be resisted. But the time spent in trying to demolish the strongholds of ancient unbelief, and of life-long habits of impiety, is nearly wasted. If we can reach the children, they will be reached also. So to aim lower is better. The interests of the church are soon to be committed to the coming generation, and the trust is the most weighty that can be given to man. The life of the church is to be perpetuated through the children, and not through the old or the middle-aged. The old man has only heaven before him. The young child has earth and heaven too. All the energies of Christian usefulness are brought into action for scores of years when a child is brought to the Son of God, and if the church should address itself to the conversion of the children, there would be little fear that its sources of power and usefulness would ever be dried up. The stream of piety and life would constantly be renewed at its fountain head."

"Somebody Must Be In."

Here is a little story which tells better than a dictionary can the meaning of the word "disinterestedness."

The late Archbishop Hare was once, when tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge, giving a lecture, when a cry of "fire" was raised. A way rushed his pupils, and forming themselves into a line between the building, which was close at hand, and the river, passed buckets from one to another. The tutor, quickly following, found them thus engaged. At the end of the line one youth was standing up to his waist in the river. He was delicate and looked consumptive.

"What!" cried Mr. Hare, "you in the water, Sterling, you so liable to take cold!"

"Somebody must be in," the youth answered; "why not I as well as another?"

The spirit of this answer is that of all great and generous doing. Cowardice and coldness, too, say, "O, somebody will do it," and the speaker sits still. He is not the one to do what needs doing. But nobility of character, looking at necessary things, says, "Somebody must do it; why not I!" And the deed is done.—Chatterbox.

"Give Thyself Wholly To Them."

Passing through the chambers of the factory at Sores, we observed an artist drawing a picture upon a vase. We watched him for several minutes, but he appeared to be quite unconscious of our observation. Parties of visitors passed through the room, glanced at his work more or less hurriedly, and made remarks, but he as a deaf man heard not, and as a dead man regarded not. Why should he? Had he not royal work on hand? What mattered to him the approbation or the criticism of passers-by? They did not get between him and the light, and therefore they were no hindrance, though they certainly were no help.

"Well," thought we, "after this fashion should we devote our heart and soul to the ministry which we have received. This one thing I do." Bowing over our work, scanning earnestly our copy, and laying on each line and that with careful, prayerful hand, we would finish the work which the Lord has given us to do without regard to friend or foe. The Sevres vase retained no impress of the outlooker's gaze; the result of the workers' skill would have been the same if he had been altogether unseen; human criticism can help us but little, and human approbation may damage our work most seriously. Let us forget that we are judged of men, and henceforth live only as in the Great Master's eye, absorbed in doing his will.—O. H. Spurgeon.

Our Methodist brethren are worthy of all praise for their zeal and energy, and for the spirit which leads them out oftentimes in advance of every other church. But there is an excess of boastfulness in the following quotation, which makes it pure plain "brag":—"Methodism has given a vitality to every other denomination they greatly needed and could get nowhere else, and checked their tendency to error and decay, which once so threatened them."

Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Russia and Italy have adopted a system of national compulsory education, under the control of the State instead of the Church. This subject is now discussed with great earnestness in England. Max Muller, in the Contemporary Review, nobly advocates such a plan. He would not, however, exclude religion from the schools, but would have certain hours set apart for that purpose aside from the regular secular course. He does not here go into details.

The Pyramid of Ghizoh.

We find in a recent number of the New York Tribune a communication from Prof. H. L. Smith, of Hobart College, with reference to the supposed discovery, by M. Chabas, a distinguished French scholar, of the date of the Pyramid of Mycerinus. This is the small pyramid at Ghizoh, known as the third pyramid, and its construction is attributed to King Mycerinus, on the strength of the inscription upon a mummy case, which was found in it. The syllables of the inscription would seem to have been shaken together, and when they came out, they were supposed to correspond with a title which an eminent Greek astronomer gave to Mycerinus; it is hence concluded that the pyramid was built by the fourth king of the fourth Memphite dynasty. The proof that Mycerinus ever built the pyramid does not strike us as overwhelming. It seems that M. Chabas has discovered an old astronomical table in this pyramid where the mummy case was found. And we believe that the fragments of a human being have been discovered in one of the sepulchral chambers of this same pyramid, supposed by some to be portions of King Mycerinus himself, but thought by others to be only the remains of a common Arab, because the right knee joint showed a case of ankylosis. We never knew before that the kings of Egypt were exempt from having stiff knee joints. But M. Chabas thinks that he has found out from his old astronomical table that the ninth year of Mycerinus falls between the years 3,000 and 3,010 B.C. There is an exactness about this date which is refreshing in the field of Egyptian chronology. According to the received systems of Bible chronology, Mycerinus must have built this pyramid soon after the Flood, and as there are pyramids that are claimed to be older than the pyramids at Ghizoh, they must have been built before the Flood. Manifestly there must be a mistake somewhere. The Tribune suspects that the report is slightly inaccurate in one respect, and Prof. Smith writes that he is very far from believing the accuracy or authenticity of such a discovery. He says that even supposing M. Chabas be right in the facts from which he draws his inference, it can be as readily inferred from his facts that the date was somewhere between 1708 and 1706 B.C., as that it was between 8007 and 8010 B.C. And further, that the particular star that M. Chabas has to deal with in his calculations is a very uncertain star. It would seem that a good deal of the reasoning about the pyramids is of a piece with the argument that a mummy with a stiff knee joint could not have been a king of Egypt. Prof. Smith writes still further, that the fact can scarcely be disputed that if we reject the astronomical date, say 2170 B.C., obtained for the date of the Great Pyramid, upon the principal ground by Sir John Herschell, Egyptian chronology is utterly at sea, and dates for the epochs of the earlier dynasties may be assumed, according to each individual theory or fancy.—Standard of the Cross.

Faithful to Our Own.

The following extract from an editorial in the Christian Intelligencer presents some truths that are important. There is no truth more clearly established than that a thorough consecration to our denominational principles will give us success in our denominational work. No one has a right to be bigoted towards his neighbor's church, but neither has he a right to be bigoted towards his own, and the only true eclecticism of which the church has reason to be proud is that which is shown out of an honest devotion to a chosen creed and form of worship. If men are dishonest with respect to the doctrines embodied in the formularies of faith to which they are attached by a religious profession, it may be taken for granted that they are dishonest in extending excessive courtesies to their neighbors. Churches grow by a wise fidelity to their own interests, and hence these words of the Intelligencer are full of wisdom:

"It is not necessary to argue the propriety and necessity of a wise denominational activity. The churches which succeed grow by their enthusiasm, by intelligent earnestness, and by the persistent prosecution of well-devised plans. They push things. They hold fast that which is good. They make the most of their history, doctrines and peculiarities. They take care of their own church work. They are true to their creeds, to their forms of worship, to their benevolent agencies. They work their own ground, and are content to let their neighbors do likewise. They also bear their share of the common burdens. But they need not be bigoted, nor exclusive, nor uncharitable."

This second extract from the same editorial we present as being equally wise and forcible with the other. There is inevitable religious ruin to professors who leave their own seats in the house of God to run to this, that and the other church, like boys and girls after an elephant or monkey, attracted by a travelling preacher or a little fantastical music. It is a rule unerring as logic, that

"Those individual Christians who do most for the general cause of Christ, are, as a rule, intensely loyal to their own particular communions. They adorn and magnify their own churches, and they are not less of the 'City of God.'" But they do not get about all the churches in town, nor patronize all the popular preachers, nor neglect their own places in the sanctuary, nor boast of being liberal to everything, but those truths and vows to which they have sworn allegiance."

Kingdom of Peace.

One of Caesar's captains solicited for him of the senators of Rome an extension of his government, but was denied. Grasping his sword, Caesar said, "Since you will not grant it to me, this shall give it to me." Pompey's answer to the citizens of Messana was, "What I do you prattle to us of your law that have swords by our sides?" Mohammed dissolved all argument by the sword; but the scepter of Christ's kingdom is not a sword of steel, but of the Spirit.—Spencer.

The Irish Presbyterians and the Scottish Churches.

The following appears in the Belfast Witness, which represents the Irish Presbyterian Church:—"There was a pretty general impression that another effort would be made this year to open a correspondence with the Established Church of Scotland; but if this idea was seriously entertained, it did not come to the surface, and we confess our gratification that it should be so. We have always occupied a peculiar position in relation to the Free Church of Scotland. At the time of the Disruption, our Assembly, again and again, by solemn resolution, recognized the Free Church as by right the Church of Scotland—the true and genuine representative of our old Mother Church of the days of the Covenant and Second Reformation. To her we gave our sympathy, our influence, our money. We stand, therefore, in altogether a different relation to her than that occupied by the Continental and American Churches, which send deputations to both Assemblies. Any change of front on our part would be construed to mean either that we regarded the Disruption difference as originally insignificant, or as having now passed away. We believe the Free Church would so regard it. And besides, we do not really see what we have to gain by renewing our intercourse with the Scotch Establishment, unless, at least, we opened at the same time, negotiations with the United Presbyterians, and went on the broad principle of seeking a closer union with all branches of the Presbyterian Church which hold the same Standards, and of ignoring all minor differences. Whether rightly or wrongly, the tide of public opinion seems to be running strongly in the direction of disestablishment, and it would be unwise in us to ally ourselves more closely with an Established Church merely for the purpose of buttressing a waning cause. And the state of doctrinal opinion in the Scotch Establishment is not of such a kind as to assure us that a closer union would tend to maintain the purity and soundness of theological belief among ourselves. A good many of the ablest men in the Established Church of Scotland avow Broad Church sentiments, and hold exceedingly loose views about the obligation of subscription to the Westminster Standards. Such opinions unfortunately at the present day are very infectious, and therefore we think our Church is safer just to maintain, at least for the present, the position she has now occupied with honour and advantage for a generation."

How to Break a Church Down.

The following was published in the Home and Foreign Record of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces in 1868. We publish by request. We have no doubt it will "fit" in many instances now as well as then. The science of breaking up congregations is an old one, but not incapable of "improvement." To break down a congregation effectually, you must—

- I. DISCOURAGE THE PASTOR. II. DISCOURAGE YOUR FELLOW-MEMBERS. III. DESTROY THE CONFIDENCE OF THE COMMUNITY.

I. To discourage the pastor—

- 1. Absent yourself from one service every Sabbath, or miss at least one in three—if he is not very strong, once in four times may answer. 2. Neglect the prayer-meetings. 3. Criticize your minister freely—pray for him little or none. 4. Give yourself no concern whether his stipend is paid or not. 5. Never allow him to think that his comfort or that of his family is a matter of any importance in your eyes.

II. To discourage your fellow-members—

- 1. Observe the directions given above. 2. Complain about everything they do or don't do. 3. Contrive to make yourself the head of a clique, and by their assistance and your own industry, keep the church in hot water generally. 4. While doing this, lose no opportunity to complain of the bad treatment you are receiving. 5. Be as much like Diotrophes and as little like Paul as you can. 6. Discard charity and candour, take distrust to your bosom, and make scheming your speciality.

III. To destroy the confidence of the community—

- 1. Observe the foregoing directions. 2. Tell the people that you are in the church by force of circumstances, but have no respect for the way in which business is conducted. 3. Publish the faults of your brethren, taking care to magnify them. 4. Publish it on all occasions that you have no confidence in the concern—predict that it must fall—go down—never can succeed—and then—move off.

By observing these directions faithfully, you may have the satisfaction, if the church is not unusually vigorous, of witnessing the fulfilment of your predictions.

Duration of Christ's Kingdom.

I shall soon be in my grave. Such is the fate of great men. So it was with Omar and Alexander. And, I too, am forgotten; and the Marengo conqueror and emperor is a college theme. My exploits are tasks given to pupils by their tutors, who sit in judgment over me. I die before my time; and my dead body, too, must return to the earth and become food for worms. Behold the destiny now at hand for him who has been called the Great Napoleon! What an abyss between my great misery and the eternal reign of Christ, who is proclaimed, loved, and adored, and whose kingdom is extending over the whole earth.—Napoleon.

Love and sorrow to our souls resemble the fire in some deep mines; it may for a long time be apparently smothered, we fancy that it is entirely extinguished, but some sudden draught, some sudden drop, and the flame, wild and consuming, will break forth with redoubled fury.—Brewer.

The Comfort of Love.

To an invalid friend, who was a trembling, doubting believer, a minister once said: "When I leave you I shall go to my own residence, if the Lord will; and when there the first thing I expect to do is to call for a baby that is in the house. I expect to place her on my knee, and look down into her sweet eyes, and listen to her charming prattle, and tired as I am, her presence will rest me, for I love that child with unutterable tenderness. But the fact is she does not love me, or to say the most for her, she loves me very little. If my heart were breaking under the burden of a crushing sorrow, it would not disturb her sleep. If my body were racked with excruciating pain, it would not interrupt her play with her toys. If I were dead she would be amused in watching my pale face and closed eyes. If my friends came to remove the corpse to the place of burial, she would probably clap her hands in glee, and in two or three days totally forget her papa. Besides this she has never brought me in a penny, but has been a constant expense on my hands ever since she was born. Yet, although I am not rich in the world's possessions, there is not money enough in the world to buy my baby. How is it? Does she love me, or do I love her? Do I withhold my love until I know she loves me? Am I waiting for her to do something worthy of my love before extending it to her?"

"Oh, I see it," said the sick man; while the tears ran down his cheeks. "I see it clearly. It is not my love to God, but God's love to me I ought to be thinking about, and I do love him now, as I never loved him before." From that time his peace was like a river.

A Happy Home.

In a happy home there will be no fault-finding, overbearing spirit; there will be no peevishness or fretfulness. Unkindness will not dwell in the heart or be found on the tongue. Oh, the tears, the sighs, the wasting of life and health and strength, and of all that is most to be desired in a happy home, occasioned merely by unkind words! A celebrated writer remarks to this effect, namely, that fretting and scolding seem like tearing the flesh from the bones, and that we have no more right to be guilty of this sin than we have to curse and swear and steal. In a happy home all selfishness will be removed. Its members will not seek first to please themselves, but will seek to please each other. Cheerfulness is another ingredient in a happy home. How much does a sweet smile, emanating from a heart fraught with love and kindness, contribute to make home happy. At evening, how soothing is the sweet cheerfulness that is borne on the countenance of a wife and mother! How do parent and child, the brother and sister, the mistress and servant, dwell with delight upon those cheerful looks, those confiding smiles that beam from the eye and burst from the inmost soul of those who are dear and near! How it hastens the return of the father, lightens the cares of the mother, renders it more easy for youth to resist temptation, and drawn by the cords of affection, how it induces them with lowly hearts to return to the paternal roof! Seek then to make home happy.—Exchange.

Secret of Happiness.

Men and women wed each other to be happy. And why not, if they marry wisely? "The man should always be a little bigger than his wife, a little older, a little stronger, a little wiser, a little more in love with her than she is with him. The woman should always be a little younger, a little prettier, and a little more considerate than her husband. He should bestow upon her all worldly goods, and she should take care of them. He may owe her every care and tenderness that affection can prompt; but pecuniary indebtedness to her will become a burden. Better live on a crust he earns than a fortune she has brought him. Neither must encourage sentimental friendships for the opposite sex. Perfect confidence in each other, and reticence concerning their mutual affairs, even to members of their own families, is a first necessity. A wife should dress becomingly whenever she expects to meet her husband's eye. The man should not grow slovenly, even at home. Fault-finding, long arguments or scolding end the happiness that begins in kisses and love-making. Sisters and brothers may quarrel and "make up." Lovers are lovers no longer after such disturbances occur, and married people who are not lovers, are as if bound by red hot chains. If a man admires his wife most in private, she is silly if she does not wear them. If she likes him best in black cloth, he is a fool if he neglects to indulge in it. They should contrive to please each other, even if they please nobody else, for their mutual happiness can only be a result of their mutual love, and that love will never fail to exalt its object.—Select.

Mary and Martha.

On one occasion there was a gathering of friends at the house of the late Dr. Archer, of London. Among other guests were Dr. Harris, author of "Manmon," and Dr. Philip, of Maberly chapel, the worthy author of "The Marthas," "The Marys," etc. In the course of conversation the question was mooted, which was the most amiable of the two sisters of Bethany, Mary or Martha? Dr. Archer immediately replied, "I prefer Martha for the unselfishness of her character, in being more ready to provide for the comfort of her Lord than gratify herself." "Pray," rejoined Dr. Harris, addressing Dr. Philip, "what is your view? which of the two do you think would have made the best wife?" "Well, really," replied the good man, "I am at a loss; though I dare say, were I making the choice for myself, I should prefer Mary." Mr. Archer, turning to Dr. Harris, said smartly, "Pray, Dr. Harris, which of the two would you prefer?" The author of "Manmon" was only for a moment disconcerted, and replied in a stylish but not a stylish manner, "Oh, I think I should choose Martha before dinner, and Mary after it."