

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, AUGUST 11, 1858.



Public interest of almost every kind for this week past has been absorbed in the one great event—the successful laying of the Atlantic Telegraph Cable from Ireland to Newfoundland. The feat, however wonderful, has been achieved. After two unsuccessful attempts, one last year in August and another in June last, the latter failure under very discouraging circumstances, the Directors of the Company determined to renew the experiment a third time, and consequently the British and American Frigates, Agamemnon and Niagara, having the Cable on board, after going back to Ireland and laying in a fresh stock of coal, returned to mid-ocean between the two continents, where they arrived on the 29th of July. After uniting the Electric Cable, they separated, the Niagara paying out towards Trinity Bay, Newfoundland, and the Agamemnon towards Valentia Bay, in Ireland. About 12 o'clock on Friday last, we may fairly say, Halifax was electrified by a message over the wires from Trinity Bay, that both ships had arrived at their destinations, and that the "communications were perfect through the whole line." This achievement of the two great Anglo-Saxon Nations over natural obstacles of the most stupendous character, can scarcely be magnified. It would be difficult to say which of the two countries can claim the greater credit in the original discovery and perfecting the wonderful art of electric communication; as it has been gradually being developed during the few years since its discovery, by the unwearied efforts of scientific men on both sides of the water. The merit, however, of originating, and to a very large extent of executing the design of a great Submarine communication between England and America, is, we believe, justly due to CYRUS W. FIELD, Esq., a Professional Gentleman of high character and standing in New York. So far the communication throughout this vast wire of 2000 miles in length, and at an average depth of two miles at the bottom of the ocean, is perfect, and no doubt in a few days at farthest, if not at this moment, messages on public and private business will be glancing with lightning speed from shore to shore of earth's great Continents.

The results of this mighty work it would be difficult to estimate. That it will have a most powerful effect on the great political and moral status of the world at large, cannot be doubted. The mistakes and misapprehensions so often arising in national intercourse, must of necessity be greatly diminished by speedy information and the avoidance of long delays, in cases of international difficulties. The advantages to commerce must be incalculable, nor is it one of its least beneficial effects, that it will greatly benefit the administration of criminal justice, and as regards civilized nations, render it almost impossible for the perpetrator of a crime to escape. As respects the benefits which must result to the cause of religion, we may only observe, that whatever tends to connect the great brotherhood of nations, to extend the bounds of commerce and civilization, or to humanize and instruct mankind, must inevitably react with the most salutary influence upon their highest interests as immortal beings.

The rejoicings in every part of the North American Continent, and no doubt in Great Britain, will have been great and sincere on the occasion. In our own metropolis the demonstrations were such as might be expected, considering the very brief period allowed for preparation. Some account of them will be seen in another column.

Religious Liberty in Sweden.

We gave some account a week or two since of the delegation of London Baptist Ministers, to Sweden. In a later number of the Freeman we find a letter from Dr. Steane, Secretary of the Baptist Union, to Sir Culling Eardley. Our readers will be interested to learn something further of

this country in its present interesting state. The late banishment of seven Catholic females from a Protestant State has been by many but imperfectly understood. The following statement from the pen of Dr. Steane will throw some light on the matter, and will afford an explanation of what has occurred in other places also.

"We find the state of things here not only religiously, but, in a political point of view, considerably better than we had expected. We have had interviews with several of the leading members of the Government and principal authorities in Church and State, and from all of them we have received the assurance that they are not only willing but desirous to bring the laws of Sweden in relation to religious liberty more into accordance with the spirit of the age. Sweden herself, Baron Mandastrom remarked to us, has outgrown her laws. It was music to hear such an acknowledgement from such an authority, for he is, perhaps, the ablest statesman which the nation possesses, and one of the most influential members of the Cabinet. M. Anjou, Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, said, in effect, the same thing; and Archbishop Rewterdahl, Primate of Sweden, who was formerly opposed to all concession, told us that he was now satisfied they could no longer withhold toleration from Christian sects. Absolute liberty he was not prepared to grant; the State must see that its subject should belong to some Evangelical confession; but it could no longer insist on their being Lutherans. They all concur in the opinion that toleration will be granted at the next Diet, and in the mean time they told us that the council was charged to prepare the measure. At the desire of the archbishop we are engaged with the heads of the Baptist communion in preparing a paper of suggestions to be laid before the council. The official copy of the sentence pronounced by the High Court of justice on the seven Roman Catholic ladies, which I enclose, I have procured with some difficulty and at some expense. If the Cabinet could have prevented it, the prosecution would long ago have been dropped. The Chancellor of Justice told us he had held it in abeyance upon his own responsibilities till he could not safely do so any longer. It is said that the Queen and her confessor, who is reported to be a Jesuit, intrigued in favour of Popery, and one of the great personages we have seen, I forget which, remarked, evidently in allusion to it, 'We know that the Baptists are not a political party, but quiet and peaceable people.' There is no doubt that a dread of the Roman Catholics lies at the bottom of much of the opposition which religious liberty has to encounter; and Mr. Von Koch, the Chancellor of Justice, told us that the clergy throughout the country made a handle of it to inflame the minds of the peasants prior to the last election. They all came up to the Diet pledged against it. They had been made to believe that the dearest rights of their country were at stake and that patriotism and the old traditions of their fatherland called upon them steadfastly to oppose the royal measure. They afterwards, he added, said that they had been cajoled, but it was then too late, as they could not break their promises. It will not, however, be so easy to practise upon them a second time.

Besides these interviews and conversations with people in power, we have been privileged to have much social intercourse with larger or smaller circles of Christian friends. A personal and much-valued friend of my own has in this way rendered us most essential service. At her house we have met two morning parties composed of some of the most distinguished Christians in Stockholm. Last night we had a party of nearly forty noblemen, clergymen, ladies, and others. We invited these friends, including the Committee of the Evangelical Alliance, that we might have the opportunity of removing mistakes, giving explanations, and setting our principles and objects before them under aspects in which they had not before been seen in this country. The conversation was very spirited and general, and lasted without flagging for nearly four hours. The English chaplain, the Rev. Mr. Ellison, opened the meeting, when I had briefly welcomed our visitors and thanked them for the honour they had done us in our invitation, by reading John xvii. in English, and Mr. Rosepins (Lutheran) offered prayer in Swedish, and the Baptist minister concluded with another prayer in the same tongue. I think I may say that everybody present was delighted with the evening, and they all told us that good results must ensue.

\* A general act of toleration to other denominations dissenting from the Lutheran Established Church.

Our contemporary, the Morning Chronicle, does not yet appear willing to let us alone. He has honored us with near two columns in his last Saturday's issue, we were about to say in reply to our brief remarks of last week, but that would be incorrect—no reply being required or attempted. The very heading—"Tupper's attack upon the Pugwash Church—The C. Messenger's approval."—is what we believe every one of our readers, Mr. Rogers and the Hon. Provincial Secretary included, will, without hesitation, pronounce an absolute falsehood. The man who would make such a statement to start with must be expected to set at defiance everything like truth or honor as he proceeds, and will not of course suppose we are willing to follow him in his tortuous path.

This writer is resolved to make a desperate onslaught upon us, and now not only complains of what we admit into our columns "without note or comment" and so tries to intrude into our sanctum, but

actually wishes to tell his readers what we think and feel respecting the Government and Opposition, and seems determined to make opponents of us, whether we will be so or no.

Being unable to bring forward a particle of evidence to substantiate his statements, he seizes hold of "the Bible in Schools," "Temperance," and several other subjects which have as much to do with the Pugwash Church resolution as with the Feejee Islands. He certainly deserves credit for the labour he has expended in his futile attempts to bring a verdict against us. What a pity it was not employed in some more profitable manner.

Instead of expressing his obligations to us for our successful efforts last year to prevent him from forcing the Roman Catholic Bible with the Apochrypha into our Schools and thereby fastening upon us Separate Schools in their worst form, with a claim on the Revenues of the Province, he now has the ingratitude to say on this question we "flung all principle to the wind," whereas the Hon. Mr. Howe actually admired and seemed better pleased with the Hon. Attorney General's amendment on that subject, carried by so large a majority last Session, than with the original resolution he had himself moved.

Having failed in this, the writer of this editorial in the Chronicle next tries his hand with the Temperance question, and with a false premise he goes on to argue an incorrect conclusion. He gives some account of the action on Temperance at the last Session of the Legislature, whether it be the true one or not we have no means of ascertaining, and draws to a conclusion with the following ambiguous sentence, "and all this without a single word of reprobation or condemnation the Christian Messenger stood by and witnessed."

This writer is so determined to fasten upon us that he opens up a new paragraph by saying, "We are prepared for any discussion the Messenger folks wish to provoke on this or any other subject." We must confess that the Editor, whoever he may be, who writes in this style is possessed of no small amount of self-confidence, we might perhaps say, self-sufficiency or bragadocio. As we have expressed no wish to provoke a discussion or felt inclined to encounter so valiant a knight, we shall content ourselves as we have done hitherto, with treating whatever may appear to demand our attention, without reference to what he may wish discussed or not. We have no desire to tread on his coat, he may therefore flourish his shalalah as long as it affords him or his friends any pleasure.

As, however, he has referred to the Temperance question, and is so much in want of a subject to discuss, we will just remark that our own policy and that of the Baptists generally has been and will continue to be for prohibition of the traffic. If he wishes, therefore, to "discuss" that question with any hope of pleasing the denomination he must take no doubtful position and "shrink no responsibility in that respect."

We perhaps ought to thank our neighbour for the information he proffers when he tells us "the Baptist people believe in Responsible Government—they believe in Railroads—they believe in the Bible in Schools—and they disbelieve in an Alliance with Roman Catholics." We would also tell the Chronicle Editors that the Baptist people do not believe in any man being deprived of his Civil or Religious liberty because of his creed, they do not believe in Religion established by law, or in compelling the use of the Roman Catholic Bible in Schools, nor yet in an Alliance against Roman Catholics. But they do believe that "Baptist people" are as eligible to offices of trust or emolument as any other denomination, and, further, they believe that for various reasons in several counties they have not hitherto received their fair share of consideration in proportion to their numbers and intelligence.

We have, however, been led away from the subject to some extent and into greater length than we intended, but will just return for the purpose of reminding our friend of the Chronicle that whilst he seems so troubled with us for inserting the Hon. Provincial Secretary's note, he omitted to give his readers even a hint that we had also inserted Mr. Rogers' letter—which was about three times as long—on the same subject. The truth is sometimes perverted by the omission of certain essential facts connected with it, and is thereby made worse than a direct falsehood; we leave it to his own conscience, and to those of our patrons who are also readers of the Chronicle, to decide whether it is not so in the present case with the writer in that paper.

In another column will be found a second letter from Mr. W. H. Rogers, having reference to the resolution of the Pugwash Church. We were not desirous of a controversy on this matter appearing in our pages. We published the resolution at the request of that Church, as a matter of course, and as the Hon. Provincial Secretary's letter and those of Mr. Rogers have reference to it, they being the principal parties referred to, we felt that it would be unfair to prevent them from being heard so long as the discussion was confined to that one subject and over their own signatures.

We, however, hold ourselves bound to preserve our columns from any undue extension of this matter, and from permitting any improper liberty being taken to bring in other subjects of a partizan or personal nature.

THE ORGAN QUESTION. INFANT BAPTISM IN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.—At the recent Annual meeting in Scotland, of the United Presbyterian Synod, quite an animated discussion took place on the propriety of introducing instrumental music into public worship.

The News of the Churches for July gives a brief report of the speeches delivered on the occasion. Our space will not permit us to give more than a few extracts.

"Memorials were read from the sessions of five Glasgow congregations, craving the Synod to leave individual churches to regulate their own psalmody as they see fit, by the use of the organ or otherwise, and to enjoin mutual forbearance in this matter.

The Rev. Mr. M'Ewen of Claremont Church, Glasgow, supported the memorials. He contended that the Church ought not to denounce the use of instrumental music, unless it could be proved to be sinful or unscriptural or necessarily deteriorating to spirituality. The attempt that had been made to prove that they should have nothing in their worship except what they could adduce chapter and verse for, rested upon a most indefensible principle of interpretation. On this ground, how could they support Infant Baptism; and what would become of their choirs and preceptors, of their pulpits, with the exclusive right of the minister to them, and that, too, with gown and bands? He laid little stress on the argument as to the unspiritualizing influence of instrumental music.

After some discussion, the subject was formally taken up by the Synod, whether or not the use of instrumental music was to be a matter of forbearance in the Church.

The Rev. Dr. M'Kerrow, Bridge of Teith, considered that they were not at liberty to introduce anything into their worship which was not sanctioned by Christ or his apostles. With regard to the celebration of the worship of God, they were told in the New Testament what they were to sing, and how they were to sing; but he did not find a single syllable about there being instrumental music to be used in the worship of God. They were to sing "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs," and to sing them "with the spirit, and with the understanding also." The employment of organs was prohibited just in the same way as any other portion of the Old Testament ritual—such as the blowing of trumpets, and the playing upon harps, cymbals, and psalteries.

The Rev. Mr. Renton of Kelso proposed a motion condemning as sinful the use of instrumental music.

The Rev. Professor Lindsay also argued against the use of instrumental music, especially on scriptural grounds.

The Rev. Dr. Eadie contended that the instrumental music of the old dispensation formed no part of the real and proper Mosaic ritual, and was therefore not abolished with it. It was a superadded element when the nation became large and settled. David, doubtless, meant the Psalms to be sung with a musical accompaniment. The term "Selah" was neither more nor less than the old music pause. As to the historical view of the question, John Knox and the first reformers said nothing against instrumental music in their early books, and the reason was plainly that they did not consider it part and parcel of the antichristian worship which they attacked.

On the various motions being put, that of Mr. McGill, of Glasgow, forbidding the use of the organ on all occasions of public worship, was carried by a very large majority.

The remark of the Rev. Mr. McEwen, that chapter and verse could not be brought forward to support Infant Baptism and his allowing that that practice stands on no better ground than the use of instrumental music does, is another concession to Baptist principles which, by the silence on the subject of all the other ministers then present in Synod, may be taken, we presume, as so much ground given up by that body.

On the question of organs in places of public worship, as the Synod has forbidden the use of them on all occasions of public worship, we suppose the churches composing that Synod will have to submit, otherwise, if they would be consistent, they must come out and adopt another principle which Baptists enjoy besides that of exemption from the difficulties of Infant Baptism—that of independence in church government.

1858 WE obs account of peasantry of Russia, and which boring ter pended b The serfs though in condition are yet w landholder rank of being po present m tel, is br which mu intellige ly acquire out the va peror is efforts, t subjects f of Slaver; that mill kened to such, an been so l to wait th view the From of the ru and the r a late Ca eighteen alone, fo others fr well as fr doubt fol We co Messenge "Letter have for ternate w We p writer it Mr. Fife Dr. CR It is k Messenge is some r in some respects production Mr. Orch 1. In r work of always to lecture fo regard to the fact himself second ha Baptism, is a con point, at the testi ard, wh fallen into other ha amine fo which o patience produce authority 2. Dr us a bett embrace letters w Scotia M lished in dollar ready to book, Cramp and a re BUSIN HAL Rich This ence to Post O Tariff, tions, & tion of The for som one o'e We Charle steam C. B. of giv Fat 7 or 8 in a h tion fo P. I last w with and T 7th