

church, who told his clerk that a certain piece of work must be finished by Monday. To the statement that that would necessitate working on Sunday, he replied: 'I do not wish you to work Sunday, but the work must be done.' The same man told of his experience as a boy in the employ of a man famous in church life, who used to send him to the top story of his great establishment to replace the labels of goods bought at auction with others indicating a very different sort of manufacture. So ingrained in his very being had become the distrust aroused by that experience, that he never saw the notice of an unusually dishonorable failure or defalcation but that his first thought was whether the criminal "was a prominent church member."

No one who lives in the life of a great city, is cognizant of its shadows as well as its lights, will fail to recognize that there is great advance in even common honesty. The very fact of the outcry when such flagrant violations occur shows that the public conscience is growing in sensitiveness. It is undoubted, too, that not a few seek the prestige of church membership simply for its pecuniary value. "It helps a

fellow to get on" to belong to a church, and could we trace the history of those men who have given most cause of rejoicing to the church's enemies by reason of their failures, we might very probably find that their public confession was a confession, not of their own sin and need of a Saviour, but of the high character of Christ's people, so that even worldly wisdom dictated adherence to their number. How emphatic, then, should be the warning from the pulpit against "false balances," "divers weights and measures," by which men discriminate against one or in favor of another. It is not merely the positive advantage of the Golden Rule, but the positive disgrace of dishonesty that should be set forth.

If the first critic of the pastor's sermon was right, still let the pastor preach, in order that that church may stand forth noted in its community not only for its strict integrity, but its steadfast opposition to all evil. If the second was right, then all the more let him preach; lest there be those who dare not search their own hearts to see whether their own conscience be alive or dead.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

To Europe For Three Hundred Dollars.

"WHAT can I see of Europe for \$300?" A correspondent asks us this question. We have referred it to Dr. E. P. Thwing, of Brooklyn, who has crossed the sea fourteen times, and written "Outdoor Life in Europe." He gives this concise and practical information.—[EDS.]

Thirty-four years ago, when the cost of an ocean passage was nearly double what it is now, I went to Europe and back by the Cunard Line, and was absent ten weeks, the entire cost of board and travel being less than \$300. Scotland, Ireland, Eng-

land, France, Belgium and the Rhine were visited.

In 1881 I went from Liverpool to Hull, along the coast of Norway, stopping at Stravengen, Bergen and Tronjheim, thence to Stockholm, Abo, Helsingfors and Finland to St. Petersburg; returning *via* Gota Canal, Cattogat, Copenhagen, Keil and Hamburg to Hull and Liverpool; distance, 3,678 miles. Steamer and railway fares were \$78.96. The board on the Norway coast four days was included in the ticket. Then I paid from Liverpool to Paris and return \$26.64, by the short Dover and Calais