

In one of the groups which I approached the orator was hurling in a most impassioned manner his philippic against Roman Catholics and the Irish. I had listened to him but a moment when the crowd dissolved and left him alone. His animation soon cooled down, and he quickly came to a close. I asked one of those who had been listening to him, why the hearers left the speaker as they did. In reply to my enquiry he said:—"The man is fou." They would not listen to a man under the influence of strong drink.

No one can estimate the amount of knowledge which has been disseminated, the extent to which the principles of free thought and religious liberty have been engendered, by these practices of the lowest classes in the city of Glasgow.—They have learned to conduct themselves orderly and mutually to concede fairness and liberty, independent of written rules and appointed officials. Such a practice, restrained and controlled as it is in Glasgow, would prove a safety-valve to any city which is flooded with crowds of manual labourers. It would put an end to the disorderly, noisy gatherings, such as disturb many of the cities and towns in Ireland. A demonstration by a Glasgow crowd, I will venture to say, would not take place without an intelligent cause, and an intelligent end in view. Any man who has any thing worth saying, and can say it, will be sure of a respectful hearing on Glasgow Green. A man need not hesitate to speak there on any subject, however distasteful it may be to the hearers. Their strongest opinions and feelings seem to be perfectly under their control. Freedom would not be denied to a man to speak against things dearest to Scotchmen, both in politics and religion. The same liberties, taken with a crowd in any town in the South of Ireland, would expose a man's head to Irish shellechs, and perhaps cost him his life.

It was the most pleasing exhibition of knowledge, freedom of opinion, fairness and good order, on the part of the class represented there, that ever came under my notice. Good attention was every where given to what was said; and any manifestation of unfairness elicited at once the disapproval of the assemblage; but cleverness, success and fair dealing were applauded. Politics and religion supplied the greater part of the subjects for consideration.

The manner of commencing and ending were very simple. A man desirous of saying any thing without any pre-arrangement, began to speak, and if he could attract the attention of any persons, and interest them, they would give him a hearing; but if he could not, then he was left to speak to empty space. If a man spoke too long or became dry and uninteresting, his audience forsook him, giving him the liberty of concluding at his leisure.

These groups standing here and there, on the soft grassy carpet with which this Park is overspread, under the shadow of a high obelisk monument, raised to the hero of Trafalgar, engaged with one another in these intellectual pastimes, was a sight which will not soon fade from my memory.

If the lowest classes of a nation can deal thus fairly, and manage the deliberations of their assemblies with so much order and fairness, without rules or officers, no fear need be entertained about the government of the people, in politics or religion, if justice and liberty are respected. Here is the secret of the satisfaction and success of Scotland in British connection. While the Irish have been resisting and disturbing the peace of the nation, and bringing themselves to poverty, Scotchmen have brought under tribute their barren hills and limited resources; and have grown rich and prosperous. Transfer the Scotch to Ireland, and according to its resources and advantages, they would soon make it as rich as England. Transfer the Irish to Scotland, and they would soon fight themselves into a nation of beggars.

The meeting-houses and parish school-houses of Scotland have put the Protestantism of John Knox into the hearts and heads of Scotchmen who have assimilated it to themselves, till it has become a part of their nature. Scotland substituted Presbyterianism for Roman Catholicism. England took Episcopacy in exchange for the same system. A good opportunity is consequently afforded of contrasting results which are altogether in the favour of the people whose work was well done. One phase of this contrast passed under my eyes; and an account of it may be interesting to you, Mr. Editor, and to your readers.

The Cathedral in Glasgow which is in a good state of repair and preservation, is the finest and most elaborate ecclesiastical edifice in Scotland, which, having escaped the destruction that overtook most of the religious architecture, reared to Roman Catholicism, passed into the

hands of the Presbyterians. York Minster which fell into the hands of the Church of England, is the largest, and is also regarded as the grandest and most charming edifice of the kind in the Empire. I had the opportunity of witnessing worship in both of these spacious, beautiful old Cathedrals. The style of both these structures is the varied Gothic, which produced in me (but I speak not as a connoisseur) the most exquisite and pleasing sensation, which culminated in a chastened and powerful rapture.—The Choir of each one of these Cathedrals is set apart for worship. At Glasgow no organ poured its deep billowy bass along the spacious nave, nor sent its melodious strains echoing among the lofty arches. A plain and intelligent congregation, stood, and led by a small group of singers before the pulpit, sung the Psalms of David to solemn and animated music. The minister, wearing no mark of Rome, save the black gown,—and Baptists have nothing to say against this, so long as their ministers wear the same on baptismal occasions,—preached the gospel in a plain and affectionate manner. The worship was as simple as a Baptist prayer meeting. My soul was filled with religious joy. In the depths of my heart I said:—"What hath God wrought." I have joined in worship; hearty, simple and earnest, in log-school-houses.—Here was worship beneath lofty arches and amid the beauties of a Gothic Cathedral, just as simple, hearty and joyful. There was no surpliced choir, no fluttering of white robes, no intoning, no genuflexions.

Once the gaudy display and superstitious symbolisms of Romanism flourished here; but they had been driven out, and, no doubt, are gone forever. The worship impressed me as apostolic in form and spirit.

When in York, I had been walking under the lofty arches of the great Minster, till I had become charmed and moved, as I had never been charmed and moved by the magnificence of architecture. Just then the time came for public worship. It was the stated service for Monday afternoon. Thirty or forty white-robed officials—men and boys—marched in, and took the conduct of the services. I joined the small congregation which was scarcely equal in number to the ornamented functionaries. The services were intoned, and no one but an expert could understand them. The Choir chanted, and the great organ poured out its soul-dissolving music. Gothic grace was shed down upon the soul from majestic pillars and lofty, graceful arches. I was filled even to overflowing, but it was with pleasing sensations which left the deep spiritual nature and conscience untouched. At Glasgow I forgot the glory of the earthly, and thought of sin, of Christ, of heaven; but at York, beauty and melody poured their streams of influence through the nerves and sensibilities; and flooded the soul with the pleasure which it is their prerogative to produce. Before I had analysed my feelings or intentions, one of the priests, opened the Bible, and read, as he said, from the Word of God as contained in the Book of JUDITH. Then I came to myself, and my pleasing sensations were gone. I was filled with indignation. It was no longer worship to me. I went out. The functionary who kept the door that led into the nave, growled at me, as I passed; and said, "It is against the rule to go out during divine service." I went on nevertheless, thinking that the mildest term that could be applied to it was not divine but *fine* service. My soul loathed it. It was Romish. If a John Knox had been given to England, he would have made a cleaner sweep in purging the old York Minster of Popery. In Scotland the work was well and thoroughly done; in England it was only half done. Having left this display of mouthing, millinery and music, I went to the most distant corner of the nave, and enjoyed the organ, not as religion, but as music to gratify the ear and fill the soul with pleasing sensations. When the services came to an end, the thirty or forty surpliced men and boys retired—a white procession, not dazzling and attractive as they would be in a small church. In that spacious Cathedral, five hundred feet long, having arches towering up as high as the tops of tall trees, these officials looked as insignificant as a troop of white mice would in an ordinary building.

My attention was directed to the titles of the many officials connected with this boasted apostolic institution. If the number and names of the different orders are correct and scriptural, Paul has not given an exhaustive list in his epistles. In the opening of the Epistle to the Philippians, the apostle says, "To all the Saints which are at Philippi with the Bishops and Deacons, but he should have said, "To all the Saints with the "Right Revd. the Lord Bishop, The Very Rev. the Dean, The Rector, The Curate, The Canon, The Precentor, The Vergers, The

Vicar, The Choristers, The Bishop's Chaplain, The Bishop's Apparitor, The Succentor," and numerous others which space does not permit to name.

Truly yours,
EDWARD MANNING.

For the Christian Messenger.

DESBRISAY'S HISTORY OF LUNENBURG COUNTY.

Mr. Editor:

A work has recently come under my notice, professing to be a "History of the County of Lunenburg," written by Mather B. Desbrisay, Barrister at Law, M. P. P. Its introductory notice is addressed to the inhabitants of the County of Lunenburg, and signed, "Your Friend and Representative." Had he signed himself *misrepresentative*, it would have been more in keeping with some portions of the work.

With regard to the general character of the history, I have nothing to say at present. Nor with its religious aspect, outside of the Township of Chester, do I find fault. It strikes me, however, that the unprejudiced reader cannot fail to perceive that in this department throughout, great prominence is given to personages and events connected with the, so called, established church, while those of other denominations are lightly passed over, or left quite in the background. But looking exclusively at the religious history of the Township of Chester, every Baptist must feel—and indeed every candid reader must acknowledge—that that body of Christians is most grossly misrepresented. The following brief references to the work will fully justify the above statement.

On the 106th and following pages, under the head of "Religion" we are carried back to the year 1794, when the Rev. Thomas Lloyd, Missionary, arrived in Chester. Then follows a list of subscriptions towards the erection of the first church in 1795, together with particulars of the sad and lamented death of the missionary. In 1797, we are informed that Rev. Robert Norris, Missionary, came to Chester, and "in 1811 the first ordination was held in Chester, when Charles Ingles, A. B., was ordained Deacon, and appointed to the Parish." Then follows a list of his successors, namely, Rev. Joseph Wright, Rev. James Shreve, with Rev. W. Weinbler his Curate, Rev. C. I. Shreve the present Rector, and Rev. H. M. Jarvis his assistant.

Now, I am not at all disposed to question the correctness of these statements, or the probity and worth of the men whose names appear in connection with them; but while Mr. Desbrisay has been thus explicit in detailing the events connected with the Church of England, how has he disposed of the history of the Baptists, and, I may add, of all other denominations that ever had an existence in Chester? Why Mr. Editor, in his *unbounded generosity*, he has devoted to the whole of them combined, AN ENTIRE LINE FROM BEGINNING TO END!! And as the result of his elaborate researches he has with marvellous accuracy, succeeded in compressing within the compass of that single line the profound statement—which by the way may be found in the pages of Belcher's Almanac for the last nine or ten years—viz. that Rev. I. J. Skinner is the resident Baptist Minister. But where are all his predecessors, together with their abundant labours and cheering results? "Echo answers where?" They are consigned by our historian to the dark domains of oblivion. No one unacquainted with the facts would ever dream—from a perusal of the History alone—that a Baptist church ever had an existence in Chester, till the year 1870, and even then the reader is left entirely to vague conjecture as to its origin or extent.

But let us look at the statements of our Author, side by side with facts, which although ignored by him are nevertheless patent to every one conversant with the early history of this Province. According to Mr. Desbrisay, the religious element in Chester had its inception in 1794 on the arrival of Rev. Thomas Lloyd. But we have it on equally good authority, that 35 years previously in 1759 the Rev. John Secombe, a Presbyterian Minister began his labours, which were continued with much success for 34 years, and that after his decease the Rev. Joseph Dimock a Baptist Minister, took the field, and after an eminently successful career of more than fifty years—during which time hundreds were converted and baptised into the fellowship of the christian church—he was succeeded respectively by Revs. George Armstrong, James Spencer, S. W. DeBlois, Thomas Crawley, and James C. Hurd. Now let us see how our Author has disposed of these facts. The only mention of Rev. John Secombe's name, is an incidental reference

to the, so called, baptism of the first child borne in Chester, and the date of his death. The name of Rev. Joseph Dimock, a name long since embalmed in the hearts of hundreds, and still fragrant with precious and hallowed memories, finds no place in the history of the land where abundant fruits of his un-remitting and self-denying toils are yet distinctly visible. Not even a solitary incidental reference to him, or any of his successors in the [pastorate,—with the single exception before alluded to—is to be found in the whole work.

Now I ask in the name of common honesty, is this fair? can it be made by any means to harmonize with the principles of justice? What right has any man in the capacity of an historian, whose duty it is to transmit to future generations a truthful picture of the events of past years, to place in the fore-ground the distinctive features and details of the denomination to which he himself belongs, and leave events connected with all other persuasions, however important and worthy of transmission to posterity, under the seal of profound silence? If a man is writing the history of his own religious sect, I have nothing to say; but if he comes before the public in the character of a general Historian, the public have a right to expect a truthful history.

One of two things is painfully evident, either our Author is ignorant of those men, and the events connected with their history; or else by the suppression of facts in his possession, he is guilty of the most unpardonable misrepresentation. If the former, let the reader judge of his capabilities for the task he has undertaken. If the latter, judge of the depth and extent of his integrity. Which horn of the dilemma will Mr. Desbrisay take?

Yours truly,
FAIR PLAY.

For the Christian Messenger.

EXPLANATORY REMARKS.

Mr. Editor:

After the late Convention closed, having yielded to the decision of the majority, I determined not to publish any thing that might be deemed controversial on the subject of our Foreign Mission, unless necessity should imperatively demand it. But the two long communications, in C. M., Oct. 12th, by Rev. S. T. Rand and "Signa" evidently require examination and correction. The impression which they are adapted to produce on the public mind, (as the members of the Board, fifteen in number, were unanimous in their view and measures,) obviously is, that they are, without a single exception, a body of unwise, imprudent, and cruel men. This is not only a serious charge against them, but it is also discreditable to the Convention by whom they were chosen.

When my brethren of the Western Association nominated me as Chairman of the Committee on our Foreign Mission, I declined to act, remarking, that I was in the minority, and, having submitted to the decision of the majority, did not wish to keep up any contention. But, yielding to importunity, I could not conscientiously prepare a Report in opposition to my deliberate convictions of what is right.

Had Bro. Rand proposed to speak on the Report, undoubtedly he might have done so. His objections to it could have been easily obviated. Surely he knows that when a vote is taken in which all concur, frequently many remain silent. He is obliged to admit, "that the vote was unanimous." The first "objection to undertaking a separate and independent Mission" is, "we have no men competent to undertake such a Mission." And yet he says, soon after, "I have the utmost confidence in the ability, and piety, and other qualifications of the two young brethren who are preparing for the work, and long to be sent forth." Why, then, does he attempt to present obstacles to their being "sent forth," "prepared for the work," by their brethren in these Provinces, in accordance with their ardent desires? Dr. Murdoch told us, that he and his brethren of the Union are not willing that we should squat in Burmah—a part of the British dominions—but that they are quite agreeable to our establishing a Mission in Siam. Bro. Rand, however, affirms, that it would be "madness" and "presumption," and of course cruelty, "to send Bro. Armstrong or Bro. Sanford away off into the Siam jungles, amongst tigers and savages." Did the first preachers of the gospel adopt such a timid policy? Did Judson, when he, a young man, "without previous training in Missionary labor," commenced an independent Mission in Burmah? Did our Presbyterian brethren in those Provinces, when they, though opposed by some, established an independent Mission among ferocious savages? When