

but he confines himself to the mention of a vase of glass presented to the Emperor Tai-tsoa (A. D. 627), which was so large that a mule could have been put into it, and was brought to the palace in a net suspended between four carriages. The manufacture was, however, he thinks, never carried on extensively—the writers who mention it speaking with a kind of contemptuous pity of the false pearls, the mirrors, the celestial globes, the windows, screens, and great vases made under the Han dynasty. The ancient books, he says, stated that mirrors were made from pebbles and a material obtained from the sea and reduced to ashes, an evident allusion to soda prepared from seaweed. Glass-making, therefore, having been in China a manufacture not generally diffused over the country, but carried on in a few localities, it cannot be expected that, with our small acquaintance with the literature of the country, much should have been ascertained as to its history from the native writers. One allusion to glass, which proves it was known to the Chinese in the fourteenth century, may be mentioned; it is from a Chinese writer of about the year 1350, and occurs in an account of Ceylon: "In front of the image of Buddha is a sacred bowl, which is made neither of jade nor copper nor iron; it is of a purple colour and glossy, and when struck sounded like glass." This vessel was the famous *patra* or almspot of Buddha. Considering how little communication took place between China and Europe until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is not surprising that with one exception very little is to be learnt from any European writer on the subject of Chinese glass. In the geography of El Edrisi, written in Sicily in the year 1154, the following passage occurs in the chapter relating to China:—"Djan-kou . . . is a celebrated city . . . the Chinese glass is made there." Djan-kou has not been satisfactorily identified with any existing Chinese city. M. Labarte expresses his opinion that porcelain, not glass, was really what was made at Djan-kou; but this seems to have been formed rather rashly: the words meaning glass and porcelain differ widely, both in Chinese and Arabic, and neither El Edrisi nor his informants would have been likely to have made any confusion between the two substances, both of which must have been well known to them. At the end of the sixteenth century we get a little light upon the state of glass-making in China. Father Ricci, a Jesuit missionary who was in China about 1590—1600, narrates ("Purchas' Pilgrimes," vol. 3) that he gave a prism of glass to a native convert, one Chuitaso, who put it into a silver case with gold chains, and "adorned it further with a writing that it was a fragment of that matter whereof the heavens consist. One was said to offer him 500 pieces of gold soon after for it, which, till Father Matthew had presented his to the king, he would not sell; after that he set a higher price and sold it." From this we may infer that brilliant colourless glass was unknown to the Chinese, and in another passage Ricci states that the Chinese make glass, "but therein are short of the Europeans."—*Pottery Gazette*.

### ADDRESS TO LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS.

A Discourse delivered in Zion Church, Montreal, on Sunday, Oct. 24, by the Rev. A. J. Bray.

Those here to whom I am not a stranger will know that when I was requested to invite the Grand International Division of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, now holding a Convention in this city, to attend the service here this evening, I at once without doubt or hesitation consented; for I was sure that my friends would show them a courteous hospitality, and use every endeavour to make them feel that they are among those who are earnestly trying to carry out the spirit of our Lord and Master. Our visitors are from every part of this great Continent where railways have been built. They are met in Convention to discuss their position and prospects, to amend any old rules which may need amending, and to legislate upon many things with which their order is concerned, and you and I are not. What that legislation is we outsiders cannot tell; for our friends, very wisely I think, keep their doors closed during the different sittings since the first, and their mouths closed about their own business at other times. Of one thing I feel confident—they are capable of doing all that may be required of them. If there is anything in physiognomy, they are intelligent, and their conduct since they have been in the city would have inspired confidence, if we had not that confidence before they came. You will expect that I shall use the occasion to say what I can that may be useful to our visitors; for you know that I like to preach *special* sermons—sermons out of the grooves in which sermons generally run—sermons that have some present and practical value. But I cannot preach simply and only to this Society; that is to say, I cannot tell them how to conduct their affairs—how to legislate and put into practice—so I must speak of things in general with regard to such Societies, and of things in particular when I come to speak of what concerns manhood and character. The gentleman who first brought me the request very earnestly reminded me that the Delegates belong to every denomination of Christians, and I answered back at once "So do I." And so I do, and therefore shall not offend my friends by attempting to give them any strong doses of denominationalism.

The question naturally occurs on such an occasion as this: Have men the right—speaking of right in the abstract—have they the right to organize themselves into Trades-unions, and other great Societies, for the purpose of com-

elling employers to give just terms to their employees? That question has not been answered to the satisfaction of every one concerned up to this year of grace, 1880. Capitalists especially (a few of them that is) use hard words against them, and think them but unredeemable iniquity. Well, although at times they have wrought harm and not good, I believe, not only that they have the right to organize, but that they *ought* to organize, and are wrong and foolish when they do not. The lower down you go in the animal world, the more simple is the form of life. As you ascend you will find it ever more complex—more organized that is. The nearer you get to barbarism the more simple is the life the people live. As you advance in civilization you find more and more of what is called society, and more and more of various kinds of organizations. There is a natural tendency in us towards this. Men of particular modes of thought or operation are drawn to each other by instinct and interest; they regard themselves as a class, and bound to help each other against those whose interest it is to limit them and undervalue their work. The Jews were more than a nation; they were a vast organization. Christianity itself very early took an organized form for defence and development in the face of great opposing forces. They had one head, Christ—one faith, and one baptism—common interests and common enemies, and they joined forces that they might the better live. And it is quite natural that, when many men are engaged about the same work, and that labour is their capital which they are in duty bound to make as much as they honestly can of, they should concentrate their forces so as to make their power felt when needful for their good, and in the interests of justice. That these Societies have not always acted with prudence is not in evidence against their right to exist—any more than the fact that the Church has often misunderstood her mission, and misused her gifts and abused her power, is proof that the Church is of no good in the world.

The main, the one important question is: What are the objects of the organization? If they are good—if they are for justice and right, then it is right. If they are not for these things, then it is bad. The great Powers of Europe are organized after a fashion just now, and it is good; for the intention is to send the Turk back to his Asiatic home, which he never should have left. Mr. Parnell has managed to organize some poor, hot-headed Irish, and it is bad; for it is based upon folly, and means—first, murder and then suicide. There are some organizations which are utterly useless to the members of it and to society;—you have seen the thing itself when you have looked upon a badge, and you have heard all its meaning when you have heard the beat drum. I have one of them in my mind now, which is nothing more nor better than an organized impertinence.

For what may men organize then? to put the matter in the positive. I answer, first of all for self-protection. That is the first law of nature. There is something which a man calls his own, his right—and not to have that is to suffer a wrong. It is his duty to strive to have justice—nothing more, but that—Justice. And there is such a thing as absolute justice between employer and employed; there is a law which regulates the price of labour; but it is not a fixed and determined thing, written out like the statutes of a land. Sometimes labour is worth more or less than at other times; and some kinds of labour are more valuable than other kinds of labour, and I do not see that one party to the bargain should be judge and jury, all in one, with power to commit—and that the other party must work along never reasoning as to the worth of his work, but blindly trusting to that uncertain thing we call competition. Competition is not the absolutely wise and impartial adjuster of all balances, and I do not see why intelligent men should put faith in it; I do not see why they should not have something, a good deal to say to and for each other about the kind and amount of return they in justice ought to get as the price of their labour. They do but act as men, and not as machines when they do that, and I for one think that men should be men, and not machines. But when that labour is skilled labour, requiring years of apprenticeship, and when learnt involving a constant exercise of the mental faculties, great watchfulness and care, there is all the more reason why an honest effort should be made to secure an honest return for that. The argument is complete when you add to that the fact that the men, of whom I more particularly speak to-night, carry on their skilled labour, not in the safety of a workshop, not under the ordinary circumstances of labour at all, but in a position of extreme danger to life and limb. No one can appraise that danger like themselves; railway stockholders cannot; railway directors cannot; perhaps many railway officials cannot; and certainly the travelling public cannot. If a traveller gets hurt in an accident on the line, he can claim for damages; if one is killed, his friends can do it; but with the driver of the engine it is not so. What then? For his perilous labour he should demand a price which will allow him to put something aside for those dependent upon him in case of emergency. So, I say emphatically, men have a right to organize; not to coerce their brethren; not to set up a tyranny of labour; not to get an undue power over capitalists; not to extort more money than their work is worth—but to protect themselves from the ignorance and injustice and greed of those who have no concern for their fellow-men—think nothing of the hunger and weariness their servants suffer; turn deaf ears to the wailing cry of widows and orphans, but have care and trouble only to know how to get the best possible interest for their money.