

the churches of Christ are radically mistaken in their policy in neglecting, as they do, the great cities. When a miner seeks for gold he does not go to the little surface deposits, but to those regions where the gold is abundant, even if it is embedded in the solid quartz. He says, "The gold is here in great quantities; the field is a hard one; the quartz will have to be crushed out with powerful machinery; the cost at first will be great, but in the end it will pay the best." Thus ought the Church to reason with reference to the cities. The souls of men are there by the hundreds and thousands. The field is difficult and hard; to evangelize the cities as they ought to be, will require mightier combinations of spiritual power and better agencies than are at present in use. The expense will be great at the outset, but the results will be far greater and more marked in the end. Why send all or nearly all our missionary force, and the bulk if not all of our pecuniary resources to the new and sparsely-settled districts of the country, and pass by the dense centres of population at our doors?

In my judgment, the problem of the evangelization of our cities is becoming a more serious one every year. It is a common mistake to suppose that the Territories and the outlying districts are growing faster than the cities; the opposite is the case. The ratio of increase in population is greater in the cities than in the country; and, more than that, it can be demonstrated that the population of the cities is rapidly gaining in numbers over the number of those who are brought directly under the influence of the ministry of the gospel: in other words, the churches and other agencies for disseminating the gospel are not keeping pace with the population. Brooklyn used to be called the "City of Churches," and a few years ago this was a true designation, for, in proportion to her population, she had more churches than any other city of the Union. But at this time she stands fifth in the list of cities in this respect—not because other cities have been increasing the relative number of their churches, but because the population of Brooklyn has been rapidly outgrowing and overlapping the means provided for their accommodation in the churches. And yet there is no stir or alarm on this matter in our goodly city. Our churches are just as quiet and easy-going as if the facts were in the other direction. Our godly ministers are just as comfortable and conservative as if the city was stagnating for the want of a new family. There is an occasional chapel built, only to thrive up to a certain point and then languish into a moribund condition. Our population is increasing at the rate of 25,000 a year, and one of our best-informed daily papers has recently demonstrated in a conservative article on the future growth of the city, that this vast annual increase will reach 50,000 within the next decade. This ought to mean at least *two* new and flourishing churches each year at the present rate, and *five* new churches a year within the next ten years. But what are the facts?