

# The

# Christian

# Visitor.

A FAMILY NEWSPAPER: DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

REV. I. E. BILL, Editor and Proprietor. "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Peace, good will toward Men."

GEO. W. DAY, Printer. SAINT JOHN, NEW-BRUNSWICK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1855. VOL. 8.—NO. 17

### The Reviewer Reviewed;

Or the Reply of the Rev. Charles Mackay to the Review of his Pamphlet on Capital Punishment by the Editor of the Morning News.

No. 2.

"A Christian man will not become intoxicated if he drinks from a cask." So says Dr. John Cummings in the passage quoted against us on the Temperance question by the editor of the *News*. And yet, a little further on in the same passage the Doctor says, "Nothing can be more disgraceful to a Christian man than excess." If a Christian man can disgrace himself by drinking to excess will he not become intoxicated whether he drinks from a cask or from a bottle? We leave the Doctor to reconcile his own contradictory assertions. Perhaps he will deny that to drink to excess is to drink until one becomes intoxicated. If so, then we shall demand of the learned Doctor to give us a satisfactory explanation of the difference between a Christian man drinking to excess, and drinking until he becomes intoxicated. "Nothing," he assures us "can be more disgraceful to a Christian man than excess." How much more disgraceful then can it be to a Christian man to drink until he becomes intoxicated?

But where, we ask, did the editor of the *News* get this passage of Dr. Cummings in defence of wine, and by implication of the liquor traffic? Did he get it from the published speech of some of the anti-liquor law advocates who have been making a capital use of the Doctor's wine-drinking, and liquor traffic favouring defence in the Legislatures of Canada, New Brunswick, and elsewhere? If he did; he has unwittingly put a weapon into our hands to wield with serious effect against himself. But if he got it direct from the original source—the lecture itself; then we charge him with a disingenuous use of the Doctor's language. Will the reader believe it? Our editor has actually taken several sentences employed by the Doctor in defence of capital punishment, and made him utter them as in defence of wine drinking, and the liquor business; and, consequently, as against our views of Temperance!

Here they are: "I cannot get over this. It is not my prejudices that influence me. I feel that I am here the interpreter of that word, the glory, the perfection, the beauty of which shine forth more and more. I must bring all my likes and dislikes, all my preferences and prejudices, to God's law and to God's testimony: I dare not say what is not here, I will not shrink from saying what is here."

Such a disingenuous use of an author's language is a cruel injustice to the author himself, and an imposition upon the public; as it is employed with the obvious design of producing a false impression, under the sanction of the author's name. It is by just such a similar use of Scripture language that men succeed in making the Bible teach any doctrine they may please to inculcate; or to support any dogma they may choose to propagate. The opponents of a prohibitory liquor law and the advocates of the no death penalty must be extremely hard driven for arguments in support of their views, when they feel themselves compelled to resort to such dishonourable shifts in order to sustain them.

In his peroration to the feelings in the finish of his articles, the *News* remarks, "If anti-liquor be any sanction for Law—if all the Law and the Prophets hang upon the 9th of Genesis wherein we read—'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, &c.'—we then ask, have not the opponents of the galleys the same right to go a little farther, and see in what way God punished the first murderer—Cain? In God's dealings with Cain there was no prophecy. It was a command (if we may so speak to Magistrates as well as others)—THOU SHALT NOT KILL! It was an example that we should not imitate the conduct of the murderer, but merely set a mark upon him—banish him from the world—'for in the image of God made He man, &c.'"

Let us now hear Dr. Cummings in reply to the *News* as above. After a statement of his anti-temperance views, he proceeds to say, "Let us, therefore, be jealous of the glory of God; and let us not shrink from faithfully expounding what seems to be the mind and spirit of God. And so I may speak with reference to capital punishments, on which subject I receive many remonstrances. I say I abhor them, I shrink from them. I wish, society could do without them; but I cannot condescend from myself plain facts, and I may reply to some of the notes I receive by alluding to them. It is said that the stronghold of all that advocates capital punishments (remember, I do not advocate them, I deplore the deep and terrible necessity for them)—this is precisely our own case and feeling—is in the text 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.' I made the remark that arose from the chapter in which the text occurs, that here is distinct permission, at least to the civil magistrate to put to death the murderer. I said this was not the Levitical law, because it was given before the law of Levi was in existence. The objection of one correspondent is this—that God did not take away Cain's life when Cain committed murder. I answer: 'Perfectly true; but what God does in his sovereignty is one thing, and what God enjoins in his word upon us is quite a different thing. God ever tries the mildest means before he has recourse to the more terrible ones. Well, he tried the mild means; he desired it to be seen if sparing the murderer would put an end to murder. And what took place? At the end of two thousand years, the path was filled with violence, a word that means murder, cruelty, rage; and then God enacted, a severer law, that 'Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall

his blood be shed.' I cannot get over this. It is not my prejudices that influence me. I feel that I am here the interpreter of that word, the glory, the perfection, the beauty of which shine forth more and more. I must bring all my likes and dislikes, all my preferences and prejudices, to God's law and to God's testimony: I dare not say what is not here, I will not shrink from saying what is here."

"Surely we have no right to take" Mr. Fenety's "testimony as conclusive, and reject that of Dr. Cummings as spurious. We place the two authorities in direct antithesis, and it is for the unbiased reader to determine the question for himself."

We now insist upon the editor of the *News* informing the public where he got the passage from Dr. Cummings which he has cited against us on the Temperance question. If he obtained it from some one of the published speeches of the opponents of a prohibitory liquor law he is not guilty of the original offence of making a wilfully disingenuous use of the Doctor's language in the sentences we have italicised. He has sinned in ignorance. But if he obtained the passage direct from the lecture itself, we must hold him chargeable with a dishonourable and misleading use of the Doctor's language. We expect, therefore, that our editor will, at his earliest convenience, let us know whether he has been wilfully or ignorantly guilty of the injustice he has done to Dr. Cummings, and the false impression which, under the authority of that Clergyman's name he has produced upon the public mind.

Our editor informs his readers that we have charged him "with mercenary motives," and that his independence as a journalist has been rudely assailed. No such thing. Our language was general, and our editor has no right to say that it meant him, unless he feels that it is strictly applicable to him. And if it be, we make no hesitation in saying that we did mean him; for we meant all to whom it might apply. It is as follows: The time will come when the liquor business—that heaven-dishonouring, misery-spreading, crime-engendering, murder-producing, hell-peopling business—will be put an end to; not only by legislative enactment, but by the good sense and general intelligence of the people; notwithstanding there are editors now-a-days, who, for the sake of gain, will give up the columns of their papers to long liquor advertisements; and who, while now and then, complimenting the temperance portion of the community, will also, occasionally, write an original, or an extracted article in their papers in favour of the liquor dealers, and against the temperance movement, in order to keep good friends with all parties, while unwittingly, they show to thinking men that they have no fixed principles on the question—are neither on the one side nor on the other—but prepared to advocate either as their own personal pecuniary interests may dictate."

Now, we ask, is there not truth in the above sentence? There is. Are their not editors now-a-days, who, for the sake of gain will trim to suit both parties—the liquor dealers and the temperance people—having no fixed principles on the question? There are. Are all the editors in our City and Province independent journalists? No; if Mr. Fenety himself, is to be believed. Hear him:—"Several of our secular contemporaries have also expressed themselves favourably to the author; but this is quite natural; having no opinions of their own, but liberally imbued with a spirit of sycophancy, they are invariably attracted to the point, which is supposed to possess the greatest amount of animal magnetism. The esprit-de-corps, which is a feeling to all honourable professions, is not a feeling that avails any among our brethren of the Press in this Province." Now it certainly will become our editor to complain of his independence having been rudely assailed by our language, while he himself has the effrontery to give such an unqualified insult to his contemporaries of the Press in this Province. "Our independence as a journalist is rudely assailed." Our language which is thus construed into an assault on his independence, had reference exclusively to Temperance. And to show how independent he is a journalist on the Temperance question, he goes into a long self-laudatory detail of what a champion he has been "in the way of bringing about Civil, Religious, and Political Liberty! Our editor evidently needs to be reminded that modesty is a virtue which it might, perhaps, be to his advantage to cultivate a little more than he seems to have done. In "The Book" it is written, "Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth; a stranger, and not thine own lips." And surely he cannot be ignorant of the well known maxim, "Self praise is no honour."

The next paragraph of the Review we here insert in full. "Page 24 is soverely upon Publishers and Booksellers, for advertising and selling such books as the 'Life of Barnum,' and the former particularly for opening their columns to lengthy liquor advertisements. This is a commercial view of the subject, with which we think no one has a right to interfere. But since it has come to this, we think we might as well ask if there is no commercial spirit in the Church—among the Ministers of the Gospel! Have there not been some churches which have been built for favourite Pastors by not over wealthy congregations; and because better worldly prospects have awaited them elsewhere, they have obtained 'calls' and 'fat salaries'—excusing themselves for leaving their flocks by laying it to the Lord, as it was the 'Lord's will' that they had to obey." How many churches have been thrown into confusion in this way! We refrain from going into particulars—for there

it would be said 'See he's trying to pull down the Church as well as the Gallows.' Now no one entertains a higher respect for the Clergy of this City than ourselves. We believe them to be correct, upright men. Some of them with whom we are on terms of intimacy rank high in our opinion as men and Christians. But then, ministers like others are apt to err—men are mortal—and when we take the clergy as a body we are not satisfied that they possess more meekness, gentleness, forbearance, long-suffering, brotherly love, forgiveness, &c., &c., than other people (like ourselves for example) who are supposed to be less acquainted with that blessed Book, the Chart of our common Faith."

"Is there no commercial spirit in the Church—among the Ministers of the Gospel? Yes; it is divinely ordained" that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." But we do not think that it is equally divinely ordained that the proprietors of secular papers should live of liquor advertisements. The editor who gives up the columns of his paper to long liquor advertisements for the sake of gain is near a kin in wrong doing to the liquor seller himself. Both are supported by a heaven-dishonouring, and body and soul-ruining business.

Have there not been cases where churches have been built for favourite Pastors, by not over wealthy congregations; and because better worldly prospects have awaited them elsewhere, they have obtained 'calls' and 'fat salaries'—excusing themselves for leaving their flocks by laying it to the Lord, as it was the 'Lord's will' that they had to obey? Yes; but such cases are few indeed compared with the pastors who remain with their flocks; and that, too, while receiving a very inadequate temporal support. Does the editor of the *News* mean to insinuate that there is nothing in the Church—among the Ministers of the Gospel but a commercial spirit? Does he believe that there is no disinterestedness among this body of men? Does he not know that the great majority of them have voluntarily given up worldly avocations in which they had as fair a chance of arriving at affluence and distinction in society as others who have attained to these; and that they have willingly made this sacrifice for the love they had to the souls of men, and the honour of preaching the "glorious Gospel of the blessed Jesus? If our editor does not know this, how does he know what his position is worth when he says, "Enough is an indefinite word with a Clergyman as with others." In that blessed Book of which our editor, as we will show by and by—has evidently made very little use during his life-time, it is said of man as a general truth that "as he thinketh in his heart, so is he"; that is, he is just what his expressed thoughts reveal him to be. And as "Give—give—get—get—take—take—is the great rule of life to our editor; he thinks of course, that it must be the great rule of life to all others besides—ministers not excepted.

Now we fearlessly affirm—and we challenge the *News* to disprove the affirmation—that clergymen of all denominations, considering their education, position, influence, talents, labours, and usefulness, are the worse remunerated body of men in Christendom.

We take the following from the Canada Evangelist, for this month: "Annual cost to the United States of supporting  
The Christian Ministry. . . \$6,000,000.  
Lawyers, . . . . . 35,000,000.  
For Intoxicating Drinks, . . . . . 46,000,000.

We have travelled extensively over the Provinces of British North America; and therefore claim to know something from actual observation of the self-denial arising from inadequate temporal support, of many of the men "of whom the world is not worthy." And many a touching instance could we relate of what our own eyes have seen and our own ears have heard of privations which these men have patiently and uncomplainingly endured. Let our editor beware, therefore, how he uses either his tongue or his pen against the men who are in a special sense "the servants of the Most High God." "The ambassadors" of the Lord Jesus, "The glory of Christ," or else, perhaps, the time is not far distant when he will not be held guiltless before a tribunal from which there can be no escape; and where he may hear a voice addressing him and saying, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, YE HAVE DONE IT UNTO ME."

"If a Minister of Religion could, by his talents and eloquence command six hundred pounds a year, we believe he would not preach for three hundred—no matter how spiritually destitute his poor flock might be and in need of his services." Our editor is welcome to his belief on this point. As he would do himself, were he in the ministry, so he judges others who are in the ministry, do.

We can assure him however, that we have received several 'calls' to leave St. John within the last few years past; and in each instance to the pastorate of a church three or four-fold the size of our present charge; and to the enjoyment of a salary one-third more than we were receiving when the calls were presented. But we did not regard any one of these 'calls' as the 'Lord's will' which we had to obey. We make this statement as a practical contradiction, at least in our own case, of what our editor believes to be the mercenary spirit of the ministry.

As to whether the Clergy as a body are not possessed of more of the graces of the Holy Spirit than other people (the editor of the *News* for example) we shall leave it to other people to decide.

so censured? Not in our pamphlet. We did not know that you had advertised Barnum's "Life." How then could we censure you for that of which we were altogether ignorant? (No word is said in our pamphlet about advertising any one's "Life.") What we did say was this: "The time will come when booksellers and publishers will not be found offering at public auction, enormous sums of money for the copyright of the Life of such a notorious showman as Barnum—a life of cunning, trickery, imposture, deceit, and shame." Does that language censure the *News* for advertising the "Life of Barnum?"

What can our editor gain by such glaring misrepresentations of the statements contained in our pamphlet? Such conduct is dishonourable and unjust and cannot but meet with disfavour from all intelligent and truth-loving men.

"But after all," says the *News*, "there are more Barnums in the world than one. The great original Barnum is but an epitome of the rest of mankind. If there was a hail-storm today and it should break all our windows, the price of glass would immediately advance, and so will every thing else in the way of commerce. We all try to make the most for ourselves out of one another's gains or losses." What do our City merchants think of that? Acting upon the fair and honourable principle in trade that the plenty or scarcity of an article regulates the price; they are according to the belief of the *News* its second edition improved of the "low, cunning, trickster—Barnum!"

What does our editor mean? where does he intend to end? He insults his secular contemporaries of the Press in this Province by declaring that they have no opinions of their own but are liberally imbued with the spirit of sycophancy! He insults the Clergy as a body by declaring that they are actuated by a commercial spirit; would leave their flocks spiritually destitute for the sake of an increase of salary; and that enough, is as indefinite a word with them as with others! He insults our merchants by declaring that in raising the price of articles the demand for which has increased, they are all in spirit and practice Barnums—the great original Barnum being but an epitome of the rest of mankind! He insults all the Officials of the Province from the Lieutenant Governor on the throne down to the public executioner, by declaring that when they put the murderer to death they resemble in the feeling and manifestation of cruelty, cannabals, hindoes, and savage brutes!! Why, our editor is an Ishmaelite. His hand is against every man, and every man's hand is against him.

Our editor admits that we have the Religious Press of the city on our side of the question. He farther admits that several of his secular contemporaries of the Press have also expressed themselves favourably to our views. Let us now see what is the weight of authority which he has on his side of the question has arrayed against ours.

First,—he says: "There are clergymen in this city, as well as those above quoted from, who are opposed to the doctrine of Capital Punishment."

We call upon our editor to make good this statement by publishing the names of those clergymen. We profess to have a pretty extensive acquaintance and intimacy with most of the clergymen of all denominations in this City; and all with whom we have conversed on the subject have expressed themselves as entertaining our views. We request, therefore, that the *News* will let the public know who are the clergymen in this City that are against capital punishment; and until he has done this, we shall regard his statement as made merely for the sake of effect.

Secondly,—One of the ablest Ministers that ever resided in Saint John was against the death penalty, viz: the Rev. Robert Irvine. This Minister while in the City was our own most intimate and familiar ministerial brother. No minister of another denomination more frequently occupied our pulpit, and not unfrequently we supplied him. We were free and unreserved in our mutual intercourse. We were among the last to part with our brother, on board the steamer, when he left our City. We claim, therefore to know a great deal more of the Rev. Robert Irvine than does the editor of the *News*. His talents were certainly far above mediocrity, but as to his being one of the ablest ministers that ever resided in Saint John, we profess not to judge; as we have no knowledge whatever as to what were the abilities of the ministers in this City that preceded him. Now when he addressed the note to the *News* which is given in No. 2 of the Review. Mr. Irvine either was or had been attending in his official capacity on Redburn the murderer, who was executed in this City some eight years ago. Redburn professed to be, and was perhaps, a sincere penitent. The sympathies and sensibilities of our brother were very naturally touched. He exerted himself to obtain a commutation of the sentence that had been passed upon the criminal. This led to an agitation of the question in the newspapers of the day; and Mr. Irvine came out in opposition to the death penalty. He could hardly have done otherwise. He was in fact committed to that side by the peculiarity of his position. And we question whether Mr. Irvine had ever given the subject an hour's consideration up till the period when he was thus led to write against the doctrine of capital punishment. And, moreover, we further question whether he entertains the same sentiments on the subject now which he did then. Our editor may easily ascertain this for himself by communicating with Mr. Irvine Hamilton, Canada West. We only wish that

that friend and brother were in the City now. We should feel vastly more satisfaction in having a public discussion through the press with him, than with the editor of the *Morning News*.

Thirdly,—We have a communication in opposition to our views from a party with whom our editor is personally unacquainted; but whom he designates "one of the first literary ladies of this City." We beg to inform the *News* that we are personally acquainted with his female correspondent; and that for him to style A. M., one of the first literary ladies of the City, is a piece of extravagant bombast—an insult, we should deem it to the first literary ladies of the City. We are creditably informed—we have not had a personal interview with A. M., since her literary communication appeared in the *News*—that this lady was so elated in having been elevated, by a single stroke of our editor's pen to a par with the first literary ladies of the City, that she could not conceal from her friends that she was the party that had figured in the *Morning News* as one of the first literary ladies of the City. Such is the weight of authority which our editor employs to overpower the authority of the Religious Press of the City; most—if not all—of the Ministers of the City, and several of his contemporaries of the secular Press!!

Since our pamphlet was published, we have received several flattering notes from gentlemen of high standing in this community and elsewhere to whom it was sent, approving of the sentiments it contains, and assuring us that we have done good service by our timely and manly utterances on the subject. These notes being private we cannot give them publicity without the consent of the respective writers which in one instance was sought, but refused, on the ground that the party intends to speak himself on the subject by and by.

With such authorities as we could mention sustaining us in our views, and believing that we are contending for what has the sanction and authority of Deity, and now that we have gone into the question, we are content to have heaped upon us all the opprobrious epithets that the vocabulary of our language can furnish. No matter will it be to us now though we be designated unchristian, cruel, hard hearted, blood-thirsty, unfit to be a minister of the Gospel, &c.; so long as we are convinced that we are contending for the Truth of God, and sustaining the majesty of Civil Law. Our blessed Lord himself was stigmatized "as a gluttonous man and a wine bibber," "a deceiver," "a blasphemer," "a Samaritan," "a violator of the law of Moses," "an enemy of Cæsar." And to crown the climax it was said, "He hath a devil and is mad."

The opponents, therefore, of capital punishment may apply to us whatever opprobrious epithets they please. We shall regard their odium as our honour, their abuse as our glory. Most cordially do we adopt as expressive of our own feelings and intentions, and most emphatically do we reiterate the language of Dr. Cummings which the editor of the *News* has put in italics—"I am placed in this pulpit" (and in this City) "not to preach to your prejudices or to echo your opinions, but to proclaim, as responsible at the judgment bar of God, what is true, and that by God's grace I am deterred to persevere in doing."

In our next article we shall deal with the Scriptural arguments adduced by our editor in opposition to the death penalty.

### Character of the Modern Greeks.

(Concluded.)

Whatever may be his patriotism he never for a moment loses sight of himself. Whatever may be the necessities of his country he is not satisfied so long as he sees others occupying stations which his vanity tells him is qualified to fill. Hence since Greece became a kingdom it has been disgraced by exhibitions of a factious spirit which have gone far to render government impossible. In circumstances which one would think must render improvement inevitable, this factious spirit has been so powerful as to keep the kingdom stationary, and to nullify the advantages of a free constitution.

Yet this fault, base as it is, has been kept in check by a principle still more degrading. King Otto has been enabled to subdue the vain and factious spirits whom he governs by means of systematic corruption. Bribery is almost a legitimate power in Modern Greece. Venality must be reckoned as a besetting sin of her people. They love their country—they love peace and power,—but they love gold and silver still more.

The modern Greek is egregiously vain. If Greece were still pre-eminant in arms, in arts, and song, he could feel no more contempt for all other people. He feels towards them, as the ancient Athenian felt towards the Barbarian when Athens was the centre of civilization, when the Parthenon was still in its peerless beauty, and when the Grecian mind exhibited its unrivalled powers in art and literature.

A spirit of fiction has characterized this people ever since Greece became a kingdom. This has gone far to nullify all the advantages of a free constitution. To this fault must be added a love of display. To gratify this, time and treasure have been exhausted, and Greece has been rendered contemptible in the eyes of Europe.

To these vices must be added a total absence of truthfulness. The Greek is proverbially wily and crafty. He has a habit of attributing all his actions, to the operation of the best of motives.

### Canada.

OPENING OF THE GREAT RAILWAY SUSPENSION BRIDGE AT NIAGARA FALLS—UNION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CANADA.—A special train left Hamilton, C. W., yesterday morning, for the purpose of crossing the Suspension Bridge, being the first train that has passed over this magnificent triumph of engineering skill. The Managing Director of the Great Western Railway, the Vice President, and the heads of several departments, with their invited guests, arrived at the bridge about 1 o'clock. The passenger engine and tender, crowded with people, crossed over to the American side, and after returning, one of the mammoth English freight engines made its appearance on the track, gaily decorated with the British and American colors,—flying in honor of the union of British America and the United States—and crowded with the novelty and excitement-seeking spectators. At the moment that the colossal engine entered upon the Bridge, the crowd united their voice in singing "God Save the Queen!" and as it passed to the centre, three hearty cheers were given and responded to by the delighted multitude on both the American and Canadian sides of the river.

The train then proceeded to the American side where—British mingling with Yankee voices—Hail, Columbia, and Yankee Doodle, were sung with the same heartiness and spirit that had characterized the singing of Britain's national air.

The opening of this mighty and magnificent structure—well worthy of being classed with the world's wonders—really forms an epoch in the history of the world. It unites with strong iron bands two countries—to the intelligence and enterprise of whose inhabitants the bridge owes its existence, and stands a fitting monument.

The prediction, by that justly celebrated engineer, Stevenson, that no wire suspension bridge could ever be used for railway purposes, has, as was confidently asserted by the projectors of this enterprise, thus been proved erroneous. He must have looked with a jealous eye from his own favorite Tubular Bridge upon this great design, and allowed his professional prejudices to warp his excellent judgment. The bridge proves to be all that its accomplished engineer, Mr. Roebelin, has claimed for it, and will undoubtedly sustain the weight which we give in figures below. Its strength, indeed, can never be fully tested, the weight of a fully laden train being but a trifle in comparison to its capacity. A train of eight cars, locomotive and tender, weigh but about 130 tons; this being only one-sixtieth of its immense capacity.

The influence that this union of Railroads will have, both in a commercial and social point of view, can hardly be over estimated—judging from the enormous traffic that already seeks this delightful and expeditious route under the heretofore existing want of connections with the Railways terminating at the Bridge.

The Railway portion of the Bridge, is, we understand, leased and controlled by the Great Western Railway Company, and has laid upon it tracks of three different gauges, viz:—  
The "N. Y. Central," 4 feet 3 1/2;  
The "Elmira, Canandaigua, and N. Falls," 6 ft.;  
The "Great Western," 5 ft. 5 in.;

—thus affording facilities for the transit of passengers and freight from all the different lines.

The following statistics will give some idea of the Great Bridge and its capacity, from which some interesting calculations might be made, such as total length of wires, &c., &c., but these must be reserved for a future occasion.

Length of span from centre to centre of towers, 822 feet.  
Height of tower above rock on the American side, 88 feet.  
Height of tower above rock on the Canada side, 78 feet.  
Height of tower above rock on the floor of the Railway, 60 feet.  
Number of wire cables, 4.  
Diameter of each cable, 10 inches.  
Number of 9 wires in each cable, 3458.  
Ultimate strength of cable, 12400.  
Weight of superstructure, 750 tons.  
Maximum weight the cable and stays will support, 7300 tons.  
Height of tract above water, 234 ft.  
The Engineer, Mr. Roebelin is, we understand, a German, and this, undoubtedly the crowning achievement of skill, will rank him amongst the greatest Engineers of his day. He has reared a monument of the greatness of his mind, which will be lasting as time.

This sketch has been very hastily written, and will convey but a faint idea of the enthusiasm that prevailed amongst the spectators on this interesting occasion, or of the wonderful structure whose opening for passage of the "iron horse" was celebrated. If any other inducement, than the Falls was needed to attract the pleasure seeker, this bridge will surely afford it.—*Buffalo Express*, March 7.

DESCRIPTION OF RUSSIA.—The annexed description of Russia, is copied from a scarce volume, printed so far back as the year 1813 entitled, "The dove; or passages of Cosmo graphy," by Richard Zouche, Civilian of New College in Oxford.

"The spacious empire of vast Muscovy, whose Duke, like Boreas in his big-bellied hall, Does frow at hand alight, far off appals." From this extract it is obvious that two hundred and fifty years ago, the Muscovite power was regarded with considerable apprehension.