PRESBYTERIAN BANNER & ADVOCATE.

Presbyterian Banner, Vol. VI, No. 50.
Presbyterian Advocate, Vol. XX, No. 45.

"ONE THING IS NEEDFUL:" "ONE THING HAVE I DESIRED OF THE LORD:" "THIS ONE THING I DO."

WHOLE NO. 310

DAVID McKINNEY, Editor and Proprietor.

PUBLICATION OFFICE, GAZETTE BUILDING, FIFTH STREET, ABOVE SMITHFIELD, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Philadelphia, 111 South Tenth Street, below Chestnut.

TERMS.—IN ADVANCE.

FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1858.

By Mail, or at the Office, $1.50 per Year, Delivered in the City, 1.75 " " } SEE PROSPECTUS.

Original Poetry.

What is Man?

What is man in all his pride
Of youth or manly bloom?
A wasting form on Time's dark tide,
His earthly goal the tomb.

What are the hopes that o'er him play,
That bind his soul to earth?
What are the joys that gild his way,
Those passing gleams of mirth?

The forms that glide around him, fade,
As fades the day at even;
They pass away—their forms are laid
Where fall the dews of heaven.

The friends that round his pathway play,
Prove fickle and untrue;
They pass like fleecy clouds that stray
Through Summer's skies of blue.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

College Endowment.

Having been applied to lately for aid in purchasing a telescope for one of our Colleges, I have been thus led to reconsider the subject of College endowment. The small sum I was able to give for the telescope would have been very cheerfully increased, even at the expense of self-denial, if the object in view had been the endowment of the good old College under Ecclesiastical supervision. But the friends of the College are divided in their opinions on this subject, many of them objecting to the plan of having the College placed under the formal supervision of any Church Synod. On this question, it is not considered desirable that former discussions should be revived. Your present correspondent has never taken part in them, and chiefly wishes now to suggest one or two practical points connected with the general subject of College endowment.

While it is firmly believed that, as a general thing, our Colleges ought to be conducted under the supervision of church courts, it may be seriously doubted whether the method, in which the relation between the College and the Synod is commonly constituted, is really the best. That method in most cases is founded on the idea of annual report and review. It devolves upon the Synod the nomination, and sometimes the actual appointment, of professors. It brings before the Synod the various questions connected with the administration of College affairs. Now, it is believed that the Synod is not a suitable body for *this kind* of College supervision. It is too large a body for the careful review of such various and often minute details. It meets but once a year, but for a few days, and then it must give attention to many other important matters. It can do but little justice, therefore, to the affairs of the College; while these are often so urgent that they require a prompt and authoritative decision. The practical result is likely to be, that the interests of the College will receive little benefit from the great principle of Ecclesiastical supervision; and the members of the Synod will grow weary of a trust which they cannot satisfactorily fulfill, especially if it is found to open the door for painful discussion of personal matters on the floor of Synod.

There is, it is believed, a better way. And it is a very simple one. It is to place the election of Trustees of the College in the hands of the Synod, vacancies to be filled when they occur by death or resignation, and then to leave everything to these Trustees. No better electing body could be devised than is afforded by a Synod, or by two or three neighboring Synods. Their members, being ministers and laymen, would fairly represent the intelligence, piety, and influence of the region of country, or at any rate of the community, from which the College must derive its chief supplies of all the elements of success. Not to enlarge on this, it may next be stated that the Trustees elected by such a body would be men in whom public and Christian confidence could be placed, and with whom the affairs of the College could be safely entrusted, without much risk of local or other embarrassment. Or if, under disturbing influences, these Trustees should at any time give way to the temptation of perverting the College from its original and true design, the evil would surely be redressed in the long run; the new Trustees from time to time chosen by the Synod, would bring everything straight. On this plan, neither the College at Carlisle nor the College at Meadville would now be in the hands of our Arminian friends. *Local interests* powerfully affect most self-perpetuating select bodies; but these would have only a minor influence in a Trustee Board, constituted as here recommended. Local interests, it is believed, mainly led to the perversion of Harvard and other Colleges; but on the plan under consideration, the Trustees would not so much represent these local interests, as they would the old faith and the only unchangeable body to be found in this world—the Church of God; while yet they would be fully competent to exercise a wise care over all the important affairs of the College, however these might be affected by local or general causes. Having thus secured the main thing, every thing besides would follow in its train; all the details might be left to the Board of Trustees.

These views are general, though brought again to mind by a pleasant 'local' incident; but if they are true, they admit of application to all our Synodical Colleges.

In regard to the College endowment question in the bounds of the *old* Synod of Pittsburgh, now divided into four Synods, the writer shares deeply in the perplexity which many brethren have expressed. *One College*, deriving its chief support from the Presbyterian churches in these bounds, might be the most largely attended by students, the most substantially endowed by funds, the most ably manned by Professors, *the noblest College* in all the land. No other College in the country would draw its life blood and breath from such a constituency. But we have two Colleges now, and we must not weaken either. Can we not, however, unite them together? In some way, by some good means, at some time, this must surely be done; and the sooner, the better—provided we do not sacrifice any good we now possess, nor even risk what we all prize in both these Institutions. Various things have been suggested in order to bring about this good and great end; but this paper is already too long to admit of their being considered, and besides it has been written mainly with reference to the method of linking our Colleges to our Synods. JOHN.

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

The Associate Secretaryship.

MR. EDITOR:—I would unite with others in expressing my warmest approbation in regard to the course you have taken in reference to the Boards of the Church, especially in regard to the Associate Secretaryship of the Board of Domestic Missions. The tendency to large expense has existed for years, and I am satisfied that it has come to a point now, when it will be *policy* never to send the *Financial Statements* to any but large city churches and prudent country ministers. The machinery of our Boards are so complicated that over thirty two thousand dollars must go to keep the wheels in motion. Till this much money is raised yearly, not a dollar can go to the poor missionary student or colporteur. Many country pastors have doubtless felt, as the writer, like asking, is all this expense necessary?

You, Mr. Editor, are attacked as if you were the cause of all the trouble. I can not help thinking of the charge brought against Elijah, the Tishbite. Still I do not call the brethren Ahabs. They will find, however, that the trouble is not in you. There are hundreds of ministers and thousands of laymen who think as you do. The voice of the Church will in the end be heard in favor of retrenchment. Why should it not be so? What reason is there that the toiling Domestic missionary should labor and travel too on five hundred and twenty-two dollars when the Secretaries must cost two thousand dollars and even more? Why should there be *two* in the Board of Domestic Missions, with a Treasurer and Clerk, when *one* is willing to do all the work? We should have men for Secretaries, willing to make sacrifices and to endure labor, as well as the missionaries. I do not say that their salaries should be on a level. But, if a great city is such an expensive place should we not think of moving the Boards to some country town! But I am persuaded that if the country and city would be disposed to compromise a little more, the Boards might remain where they are and all would be satisfied. If this is not done, I am just as fully persuaded that the streams of benevolence from the country and even weaker city churches will dry up. I have not handed the reports of the Boards to any of my elders or members for the last four or five years, nor have I made any effort to extend the circulation of the *Record*, simply because I had learned, that the *light*, as to money matters, would in my field, do more injury than the other *light* given would do good. I love the Boards and have always done all I was able as an individual and as a pastor for them all. But I have frequently asked, whether no worthy and competent men could be found to serve the Church on salaries which would not startle country churches; or, whether the Boards could not be so united in the same treasurers, etc., as to make them less expensive?

I am a pastor of "*Eastern Pennsylvania.*" I was not a Commissioner to the Assembly. I have never had any connexion with the Domestic Board, other than that of Honorary Member. I have never been at a meeting of the Board, and have no acquaintance with the Associate Secretary, other than when a student, hearing what I supposed to be his first sermon on "How shall ye escape," etc, till I thought the *stars* were against me as to variety of preacher and subject. I also once sat in Synod beside a classmate of his, and heard his remarks after the Dr. had tried to enlighten us as to our duty to this Board. Still he may be the best available man for *that post*. I only wonder that in existing circumstances, any man could be found for any reasonable sum, to accept the place.

I have read the last article of "Western Pennsylvania." I was astonished, I was angry, I was grieved as I read. You are almost a stranger to me; yet, you are a brother in Christ. I know not the name of your assailant. I can have no personal feelings toward him. But I do feel that the whole *spirit* of the article is unchristian, even *unmanly*. It puts me in mind of an attack made by a *Political Methodist local preacher*, upon a beneficiary of our Board of Education who had offended him. I advised the young man to treat it with dignified, silent contempt. I feel satisfied that you might publish the article with nothing but a note of introduction to the readers of your paper, and it would do you a favor, carrying its own refutation upon its face. I wonder if the writer thinks that he might be taken for Dr. H., No. 2 at least, in a personal defence of himself. Wonder if the editor of the *Presbyterian* imagines that *such an article* will do the cause of Christ, or even *his sheet* any good. Is there not an attempt to throw contempt upon all efforts to make the Gospel *so cheap* that *the poor* can have it either through the religious press or the living missionary? Good men sometimes greatly err through personal interest and one-sided views. Good men may even for a while oppose the whole spirit and principles of the Gospel, which is for "the poor."

I have this morning written this hasty note to congratulate you upon the course you have taken. I trust you will have grace to stand firm, and to act wisely in this whole matter. You have thousands who will feel and act with you. They may be the poor of Christ's flock, but will not this very fact encourage you. I do hope the controversy will take place with as little personal feeling and abuse as possible, and that the result will be for the true glory of Christ and of Presbyterianism. **

Eastern Pa., Aug. 23d, 1858.

Happy Through Grace.

Christians might avoid much trouble and inconvenience, if they would only believe what they profess—that God is able to make them happy without anything else. They imagine that if such a dear friend were to be removed, they would be miserable; whereas God makes them a thousand times happier without them. To mention my own case, God has been depriving me of one blessing after another; but as every one was removed, he came in and filled up its place; and now, when I am a cripple, and not able to move, I am happier than ever I was in my life before, or ever expect to be; and if I had believed this twenty years ago, I might have been spared much anxiety.—*Last Days of Dr. Payson.*

For the Presbyterian Banner and Advocate.

Equality.

"True Presbyterianism estimates country pastors, and elders too, as equal in Church Courts, to city pastors, professors, and secretaries."

DR. McKINNEY:—The above remark is found in your article on the Associate Secretaryship, in the *Banner* of the 31st of July.

The writer has long been pained to see the Christian character of church members estimated or esteemed in the congregation of which they are members, by the amount of wealth which a bountiful Providence has given them.

In standing, not long since, in the vestibule of one of our city churches, as the congregation was assembling, and seeing the deference paid by Christians to those who were rich in this world's goods—though no one knew them to be rich in faith and good works—we thought of what an inspired Apostle once said to some church members on this point. (Read James ii: first four or five verses.)

This pride is a great evil in our Church, or rather in the Church of Christ. It would, perhaps, be a less one, however, were Christians only affected by it. But the scoffing worldling is influenced by such acts, and will question, either the truth of Christianity or the sincerity of its professors.

How far this spirit prevails and affects ministers in the Presbyterian Church, the writer cannot determine. But it is feared that sometimes the influence of the way-worn missionary in the far West weighs but little in church Courts, when in opposition to the city pastor, or a professor who obtains a large salary.

If such sentiments are permitted to spread and become common in congregations and church Courts, where and in what shall we find the republican equality of the Presbyterian Church? Is not the Family of Christ a Royal Family, and should not *every* member aim to be like the Head, who is no respecter of persons; but all, and in every place, those who fear God and work righteousness, are accepted of him. S.

From the New York Observer.

The Union, Associate and Associate Reformed.

The protestors against the act of union between the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church and the Synod of the Associate Church, object to that proceeding.

1. It was on the part of the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Church an abandonment of the Constitution and Standards of the Associate Reformed Church, which they were bound to observe by their ordination vows, and it was an entering into another body.

2. Because it was a violation of the compact with the Associate Reformed Synod of New York, in 1855, made on the ground of the Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church, adopted at Greencastle in 1799, with a modification of the powers of the General Synod, and securing to each Synod its own institutions and property.

3. Because the Basis of that union contains the heresy of Erastianism, which had been expunged from the Confession by the Associate Reformed Church. That heresy gives to the civil magistrate supreme control over the Church concerning faith, worship, conversation and the power of godliness.—Ch. 20, sec. 4; 23, sec. 3; 31, sec. 1. It is no more a justification of this heresy in the body of the Confession, that it may be explained away by an orthodox interpretation, than if Socinianism, or Deism, or Atheism, occupied a place in the Standards of the Church, and as an expression of her creed, although accompanied by an interpretation of such heresies as would reconcile them with orthodoxy on those subjects.

4. The Basis is heretical on the subject of communion, being a point blank contradiction to the twenty-sixth chapter of the Confession of Faith of both parties to this union. That chapter enjoins the extension of communion, as God gives opportunity, to all those who in any place call on the name of the Lord Jesus. The Article on communion in the Basis (Art. 16,) prohibits any such extension, by declaring, "That the Church should not extend communion in sealing ordinances to those who refuse adherence to her profession, or subjection to her government and discipline, or who refuse to forsake a communion which is inconsistent with the profession which she makes."

5. The Basis being a fixed testimony of equal authority with the Confession of Faith, is in contradiction to the act, in which the said Confession of Faith, Larger and Shorter Catechisms and Form of Church Government, and Directions for Worship, was adopted by the Associate Reformed Synod at Greencastle, in 1799, as their "*Fixed Testimony* by which their principles are to be tried, or as the judicial expression of the sense in which they understand the Holy Scriptures in their relation to the doctrine, government, and worship of the Christian Church."

6. The Basis contains new articles of faith and terms of communion never received by the Associate Reformed Church, on slaveholding, secret Societies, communion and covenanting, and thus invades the prerogatives of Zion's King, to whom alone it belongs to make laws for his Church.

7. The act of union was consummated in violation of all order. The Basis sent in by the Associate Synod and overtured to the Presbyteries, was only adopted without amendment by eight out of twenty-seven Presbyteries of the Associate Reformed Church. It was never afterward even voted upon by the General Synod. Not in 1857, for what they did adopt had important amendments. Not in 1858, for they only declared it to be a historical fact, that the Basis sent to the Presbyteries was adopted by the General Synod. Whereas it was not a fact: one Basis was sent to the Presbyteries, and another containing the modifications appended to it adopted by the General Synod. Moreover the Basis as finally agreed upon and containing an article on Forbearance, was never submitted to the judgment of the Presbyteries of either body.

8. The whole Basis as finally amended is a series of contradictions. It contains the doctrine of Erastianism, making the Church entirely subject to the civil magistrate in the body of the Confession, and contradicts that doctrine in the testimony. It contains the doctrine of inter-communion in the Confession, and contradicts it in the testimony. It makes the Basis sent down to the Presbyteries a term of communion, and in the Article on Forbearance leaves every man to do what seems good in his own eyes. It seems to be in favor of the Associate men, by requiring, as a term of communion, all that they have prescribed without the alteration of a syllable, while it seems to favor Associate Reformed men who declare openly in Synod, their determination to disregard some of its terms, by securing to them the right of dissent and non-conformity. This union, therefore, is a misnomer. Can two walk together except they be agreed?

Their practice is as Janus faced as their theory. They proclaim to the world, with a great flourish of trumpets, the consummation of this union, with which the mountains have been laboring for a score of years, and where is this great United Presbyterian Church? The men that made the Church are not in it; they are still Associate and Associate Reformed men, or their present appearance and profession are a sham. They cannot belong to two distinct churches at the same time.

If they belong to the United Presbyterian Church of North America, they cannot belong at the same time to the Associate or Associate Reformed Churches.

Ghost of a Church! thou comest in such a questionable shape that I would speak with thee; who is the Moderator of this Church? Is it Doctor McLaren, or Dr. Cooper, or Dr. Pressly, or like the fabled Cerberus, has it three heads at the same time? Will it continue to wear its three heads for all its future life, or will two of them be absorbed? Is this Scotch wedding consummated, or after the pronouncing of the marriage ceremonies in the State House in Pittsburgh, have the young persons, for family reasons, not expedient to be divulged, gone home to their Mammas for another year?

Last, but not least, the whole proceeding is so entirely destitute of warrant, from the Constitution which it discards, or from the Word of God, that none of Christ's freemen ought to give place to it by subjection, no not for an hour. J.

From our London Correspondent.

The Close of the Session—Review of Results—Palmerston's Fall, and Its Causes—Malmesbury's Foreign Policy—Spain and Cuba—The Coming Reform Bill—The Corrupt Practices Bill, and Electioneering—A Bigot Bishop, and a Scene in the Lords — Government — "Neutrality," Religion, and Missions in India—Ellenborough's Malice—The Faithful Protesters—Roebuck versus Missions—Government Schools in India, and their Probable Future—India and Vernacular Education—Home Evangelization—Exeter Hall and Sabbath Evenings—Open-Air Preaching—Greenwich Park, and Lord Hudde—Scotland and Lay Evangelists—A Revival Begun—"The British Evangelist"—The Queen at Cherbourg—The "Disabled Officer" and Sir Colin—A Postscript Indeed.

LONDON, August 6th, 1858.

THE CLOSE OF THE SESSION of Parliament naturally suggests many reminiscences and reflections to our writers at the press. One of them says: "It has been an era of Parliamentary surprises, disappointments, and paradoxes; of unexpected defeats, and of unanticipated triumphs; of Tory men and Liberal measures; of Indian, and main-drainage discussions; of liberty extended by the Bill on Oaths, and abridged by that on Corrupt Practices; of a minority in office, and an Opposition in power.

"When it opened, Lord Palmerston stood at the head of a magnificent party, greater than any that ever followed the late Sir Robert Peel; and it was with flippant congratulations that Mr. Hayter" (the Whig "whipper in,") "uttered the well-remembered words: 'This is something like a majority.' Four hundred Liberals, returned at the general election of 1857, were arrayed around the Minister, who had thoroughly embodied the National spirit when he resented the ferocious insolence of Chinese officials at Canton.

"But Lord Palmerston had been too successful, and from being popular, he endeavored to become supreme. Something resembling the voice of a dictator was heard in the House of Commons, and added to this, (which brought down on the Premier the bitter censures of his most consistent friends,) the fatal grenades of Orsini had exploded, and if they failed to destroy Napoleon's throne, they indirectly overthrew Lord Palmerston's Cabinet."

The *Telegraph*, a morning penny paper, gives, in the foregoing, a graphic and truthful account of the precursors of the advent of Lord Derby's Cabinet to power. But as a Liberal paper, and with a strong hankering after Palmerston still, it is constantly decrying the present Administration. It did its best, along with the *Times*, to upset it at the outset, but the country would not forgive Palmerston so readily. The truth is, it is well that he is out for the present. His great merit it was to rally the National spirit when the news of Crimean mismanagement came home, and to press on the contest to a successful conclusion. But his *Continental* policy was *not* satisfactory. He bullies and threatens the weak, but he never *acts* or *strikes* a blow for liberty against despotism, however he may declaim against it at times. A useless irritation is thus kept up. The Tories recently have managed to settle questions which the Whigs trifled with, especially that of the *Cagliari* and Naples, and the imprisoned British Engineers.

The *Times*, in its review of the Session, pays a special compliment to Lord Malmesbury's dispatches and acts in this matter. His reproaches of Spain for her complicity and dishonesty, as to Cuba, and the slave-trade, were sufficient to rouse the contemptible Court, or Cabinet, to threats of retaliation which have only excited laughter here. If ever Spain is humbled by the United States, no one in England will pity her. We *have* faith in your Cabinet that it will *not* flinch from treaties, as to the suppression of the slave-trade. As to Spain, it is false and corrupt, because Popish, to the very core.

The country has gained much by the strife of parties. The Conservatives are fast ceasing to be Tories, and the concessions necessary for their very existence, made by them in reference to the abolition of the Property Qualification and other matters, indicate pretty clearly that they will strive, next Session, to outbid Palmerston, and please Bright and his friends by a Reform Bill startling in its liberality. It will, indeed, be strange if the Tory Squires follow Disraeli, should he turn aside in that matter from his old theories about the representation of the land, and reverse his past ideal of strengthening the franchise of the counties, and weakening the power of the boroughs. But he will adroitly manage it, I expect, after all, and the Squires will follow him after some recalculation, because they cannot help it.

The Bill for the prevention of Corrupt Practices at elections, has been so shaped and modified, as in the event of a dissolution of Parliament, by reason of any adverse vote next year, to serve the cause of the Tories and of the landed aristocracy. It makes it perfectly legal for a candidate to pay the traveling expenses of all his voters, and thus the candidate *with the longest purse*, is likely to win the day. He hires, *all*, or nearly *all* the hackney carriages, and their owners' influence and votes, with those of their friends, will go, of course, the same way.

Lords John Russel and Palmerston both voted with the Ministry, and against the extreme Liberals, in this matter. The first vote given by the newly-admitted Baron Rothschild, was *against* this corrupting clause in the Bill. By its operation, the abolition of the Property Qualification for members, will, in many cases, be rendered of no practical value.

The House of Lords has yielded very ungracefully in the matter of the Jews, but has stoutly reaffirmed its old opinions on the question of Church Rates, (still retaining them,) and the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. In both cases, the majorities were almost as large, in the *statu quo* Conservative sense on the one hand, as were those of the Commons, in the Liberal sense, on the other.

A scene in the House of Lords—if the performance of a single actor can be so called—was enacted by that obstinate Prelate, Henry Phillpots, of Exeter. In the course of the debate, the young Bishop of Ripon (the Evangelical Bickersteth, nephew of the late Edward Bickersteth, Rector of Wotton,) had declared his conviction that there was no Scriptural prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Whereupon the Bishop of Exeter, furious if not foaming, leaped to his feet and expressed his "more than surprise" at such a declaration. He said if the utterer of it had been a clergyman only, he would have been liable to be called to account by his Bishop, and that it was shocking to hear one who had actually sworn to the "Canons of the Church" in which these marriages were forbidden, make such a statement. *Canon Law* seemed to be uppermost in Phillpot's mind, not the Scriptural authority, or (as I consider,) the weighty argument based on the *general principle* laid down in the chapter of Leviticus, from which *one* verse is usually quoted. The argument to which I refer, was fully brought out some years ago in the *North British Review*, in an article from the pen of Dr. Candlish, distinguished by all the acuteness and grasp of his remarkable intellect. But the *scene* in the Lords, is what I am writing about, not a vexed question on which good men differ. The Bishop of Exeter, in his notice of the Bishop of Ripon's speech, threw down the printed copy of the obnoxious measure on the floor of the House, hissing out, in his rage, the words, "This *wretched Bill!*" The words, and the accompanying expression of disgust, ran thus: "A faithful minister would be bound to declare that *the Sacrament, which was necessary to salvation, if this wretched Bill!*" (here he threw on the floor the copy of the bill, which he held in his hand,) "passed, must be abandoned by every man who should contract these marriages."

The Bishop is a notorious bigot. For long months, if not years, he refused to "consecrate" the Episcopal part of a rural Cemetery in his diocese, unless a solid wall of separation was set up between it and the soil in which the heretical Dissenters found their unblessed resting place! The law at last brought the proud priest to his senses, and he was cunning enough not to brave its penalties. His long Episcopate has been an increasing incubus on the breast of true Evangelism over a district in England, one of the loveliest and finest—as to its physical aspect, its rich mineral treasures, its magnificent scenery, and its abundant harvests—in the United Kingdom.

EDUCATION AND MISSIONS in India have had fresh light thrown on their future, since I last wrote. I refer, first, to an announcement, by Lord Stanley, the Indian Minister, of strict adherence to "*the ancient policy of neutrality in matters affecting religion,*" in the terms of Lord Ellenborough's dispatch, some months ago, in which "all persons in authority were most earnestly cautioned not to afford, by their conduct, the least suspicion that this policy had undergone, or would undergo, the least alteration."

Mr. Spooner and Mr. Kinnaird, in succession, expressed their grave apprehensions and dissatisfaction at this announcement. Both disclaimed all idea of partiality, but both knew too well, in common with the Christian public, that "neutrality" meant, hitherto, a *cowardly concealment* of Christianity, by the Company, for the sake of filthy lucre. Even a Hindoo writer has said: "The people knew that the Government is a Christian one; let it act openly, as truly Christian. The people will never feel themselves truly disappointed; they will only admire it." Every body knows that it was not in those stations in India, where Christian efforts were countenanced by Government officials, that insurrection took place, although apparently most exposed to danger, but in Oude, which was destitute of missionaries, and from the Sepoys, whose instruction in Christianity was barred.

Mr. Spooner spoke, solemnly and impressively, thus:

The noble Lord had stated that neutrality was still to guide and govern the councils of India with regard to religion. Now, if it were meant by "neutrality" that there should neither be an attempt to compel or bribe conversion to Christianity, and that all religions should be treated with perfect impartiality, then he readily granted that that would be a right line of conduct to pursue; but if that were the meaning of the noble Lord, "neutrality" was not the proper term by which to designate it (hear, hear.) On the other hand, if it were not his meaning, then he would ask whether the noble Lord intended to declare that it was a matter of indifference to a Christian country and government whether or not idolatry still prevailed in the large empire committed to our care? For his part he was entirely at a loss to see how they could justify in a Christian assembly and nation the expression that we ought to be neutral upon the question whether an idolatrous system continued, or whether the Hindoos were sufficiently enlightened to know the value of the Christian religion. If the proclamation assured the natives of India that there should be no compulsory interference with their religion, that there should be no bribery, and no attempt to make converts by coercion; that they should be left entirely to the effect of the Word of God, and his Spirit upon their minds, he had confidence enough in that Word and Spirit to leave them to do their own work, and produce their own effects; but whilst that was declared, the proclamation ought also to express the full conviction of the government that Christianity was the only sound and true religion; the only method either to civilize or to make happy the inhabitants of India, and at the same time the only sure foundation by which we could look for the blessing of Almighty God upon our rule (hear, hear.) For many years we had followed a very different system in that country. We had been guilty of great crimes in India (hear, hear;) and he agreed with the noble Lord the member for Tiverton, when he stated, in a manner that had made a great impression upon his (Mr. Spooner's) mind his conviction that India was not given to us merely to gratify our ambition as a nation or to realize fortunes for our merchants. No; there were great responsibilities and high duties connected with its possession, and we had not acted up to those responsibilities and duties. For many years we had not merely preserved the neutrality of which he had complained, but we had actually supported, encouraged, and paid for the maintenance of idolatrous practices, and, if he were not wrongly informed, we were not quite clear of the sin of doing so yet (hear, hear.) Then, with respect to the subject of education in the schools of India, he had been told that we did not suffer any minister of the Christian religion to interfere in the teaching of those schools, whilst we permitted interference on the part of the Brahmins and other religious castes of Hindoos.

The Hon. Arthur Kinnaird complained that Lord Stanley's statement was in contradiction to that of the Premier in the Lords, who expressed his anxiety to disconnect the Government from the management of endowments to Mosques and Temples. He contended that Christian converts were as well entitled as others to Government employment. Colonel Sykes had the boldness to get up and say (lying in his teeth!) that Christian converts had never been discountenanced by the Company!!

The malignant hate of Roebuck against Evangelism came out strongly when he said, with a folly and ignorance only equalled by audacity and impudence, that, "his opinion was, that greater and more beneficial results would ensue to the people of India, if we endeavored to govern them upon the principles of justice, than if we attempted to orcate so-called Christians and Christian converts by missionarizing the country." (!!)

As to Education in India, it would appear from various indications, *not* made in Parliament, that the Government Schools in India may very probably be greatly modified, and it is not impossible but that State aid may, in the end, be withdrawn from schools for the humbler classes of Mohammedans and Hindoos, while, as Lord Ellenborough recommends, native Princes may be educated in Colleges established for the purpose, and commissions in the army be afterwards presented to them.

The complaint of missionaries has hitherto been, that the Government School sanctioned the use of the Shasters and the Koran, while it withheld the Bible. But notwithstanding the keeping back of the Christian Scriptures, the very teaching of true Science in the schools, upsetting, as it necessarily did, the absurd cosmogony which forms an essential part of Hindooism, led to the suspicion of proselytism. So that, as I have said, we *may* see Government ceasing to subsidize schools in order to appear "neutral," and if so, a *National sin* will be practically abjured and repented of, while the Missionary Schools all over India—already so popular, and every where *more* attractive than the Government Schools—will become more crowded than ever.

Ellenborough, Roebuck, *et hoc genus omne*, would gladly deport from India every Christian missionary and school-master. But neither their malice, nor yet the gates of hell, shall prevail against our God and his Anointed!

CHRISTIAN VERNACULAR EDUCATION for India, is one of the great necessities of the day. A Society has been formed for its advancement on a catholic and Evangelical basis, with Lord Shaftsbury and Sir Culling Eardley, as its Vice Presidents. A number of retired Indian officers, of late Principals of Missionary Colleges, Marshman, of Calcutta, the brother-in-law of the late General Havelock; the Secretaries of the Bible, Tract, Home and Colonial, Church, Wesleyan, London, Baptist, and Moravian Missionary Societies, with Drs. Cumming and Hamilton, form the Committee. The Secretary is H. C. Tucker, Bengal Civil Service—one, I believe, who has, within the last twelve months, come under the frown of the Calcutta Council, for his Christian fidelity and zeal. The following admirable sentiments, given utterance to only twelve months ago by the late Bishop Wilson, in the Cathedral at Calcutta, are printed in small capitals on the front page of every "occasional paper" issued by the Christian Vernacular Education Society, for India:

"Unity and love prevail amongst the different divisions of the Protestant family. We no longer maintain the old and fatal mistake, that Christian men are not to co-operate for *any* thing, till they agree in *every* thing. We now hold the antagonistic and true maxim, that Christian men should act together so far as they are agreed."

The last paper sets forth the claims of India, with its one hundred and eighty millions souls, speaking fourteen distinct languages, besides numerous widely different dialects. It quotes the words of an intelligent Hindoo observer, referring to the Government "neutrality" system: "Education must be carried on, on a sounder system, and religion must be fostered. Don't turn India from Idolatry to Atheism." It also quotes the forcible language of the Commissioner of the Southol districts, with regard to the mistaken policy of the Government, as having "made us appear as cowards before men, and traitors to our God."

It is next indicated that the whole number of missionary pupils is only eighty thousand, or less than three in a thousand of those who are of a school-going age. Tracts of country as large as Russia may easily be traced on the map of India, without containing a single Christian school. Tens of millions of British subjects have never had a single hour's Christian instruction, from either teacher or preacher.

The existing missionary bodies cannot supply the want, for it has been shown that "as missions expand, a less and less proportion of their means is given to schools for the heathen." Besides, it would require half a million of teachers to supply with one instructor every sixty Indian children of school-going age. The conclusion, therefore, is, "*We must train natives to do this great work for their countrymen.*" The education for the masses must be in their own vernacular. In Wales the Reformation adopted the mother tongue; in Ireland it trusted to English; and what a lesson does the difference of the result teach!"

With vernacular translations of the Bible, and a supply of a variety of cheap Christian school-books and pure literature, and by raising up *living* native teachers by the training of normal schools, it is hoped great things may be accomplished. It is proposed to establish a Vernacular Training School in each Presidency, and to aid those schools of this class already in existence. To reprint vernacular Christian books and translations of the Bible, is another important object. "When once a book has been well translated into any particular language of India, it will be a cheap, easy, and improving process to obtain from natives, idiomatic counterparts in all the other cognate dialects."

As auxiliary to Bible, Missionary, and Tract Societies, this new Association, under the Divine blessing, bids fair to prove very useful, and will, I am sure, be attended with the best wishes of the friends of missions in the United States.

Turning to HOME EVANGELIZATION, there is much to cheer and encourage. By November next, the magnificent nave of St. Paul's, hitherto useless, will be made ready for the accommodation of twenty-five hundred persons. Liberal subscriptions have flowed in for the necessary expenses. At Exeter Hall, every Sabbath evening, pious and able clergymen of the Church of England are preaching to the masses. No part of the Liturgy is used, and thus "service," properly and legally speaking, being avoided, the still growling and threatening parish incumbent is set at defiance in his disgraceful attempts to impede a free Gospel. The preachers include Ryle, Molyneux, Maguire, Goodheart, and they are all Evangelicals and Calvinists, to a man.

The OPEN-AIR MISSION has one hundred and fifty preachers, all laymen, engaged every Lord's day in various parts of the metropolis. In other districts ministers collect crowds in the afternoons of the Sabbath. At Wandsworth, ten miles from London, the Rector of Battersea takes his turn with the Dissenting minister. In Greenwich Park, a constant succession of Sabbath evening services has been singularly blessed. The pious and Evangelical Lord Haddo, the eldest son of Lord Aberdeen, who is Ranger of the Park, (an honorary office conferred by the Crown, along with a residence,) earnestly encourages the good work.

In front of the Royal Exchange, in presence of the Lord Mayor, and under the sanction of the Bishop of London, earnest clergymen address a multitude every Lord's day evening, from the steps of that great Emporium of the world's commerce, on whose front is engraven the sentence, "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof."

Special prayer-meetings have been held at Bristol, and many other places, for the revival of religion. In Scotland the lay Evangelists, formerly described, (gentlemen of rank,) are still carrying on their great work. Mr. Atwill, a gentleman editorially connected with the Evangelical press of New York, after witnessing what is going on in England, has said that a real revival is begun.

The second number of the "BRITISH EVANGELIST" lies before me. Its avowed object is to promote "unity, zeal, and activity in the Christian Churches, and advancing the knowledge and love of Christ in the world." It has been originated by two Yorkshire lay gentlemen, one the son of Dr. Boothroyd, the Commentator, and the other a manufacturer in Hudersfield. It is mainly edited by the Rev. J. H. Wilson, of Aberdeen, whose name will always be associated with the "Ragged Church" movement, and who is *on leave*, so to speak, for a time, from the Northern city, to rouse the London Christians to aggressive movements on the teeming myriads of the metropolis. The subject of revivals occupies a prominent place. Of three articles on this point, one is by the editor; another by Mr. Herbert, a country Rector; a third by myself. Unexpectedly, I find myself enlisted in this new effort to advance Christ's kingdom. We are securing contributors from all the sections of the one catholic Church, and God is giving the publication favor, which we trust, under God, will increase, till it is an established and recognized agency for great usefulness. "Give us time," says the editor, "and with God's blessing, our Magazine, which is *unique*, will do the work of an Evangelist, to the honor of our common Lord, and the revival of the Christian Church."

THE QUEEN AT CHERBOURG, with Peers and Commoners in her train, received with salutes from French fleet and batteries, Lord Lyons in a magnificent line-of-battle ship, and the Duke of Malakoff his guest; crowds repairing to the grand opening of the docks, and the inauguration of the statue of Napoleon I.—such is the present position of affairs, as respects England and France. I trust that the Queen's visit will be over-ruled for good, and that this fresh addition to the power of France will *not* end in an insane attempt at the invasion which would react, with ruinous power, on him who would attempt it.

"A DISABLED OFFICER," returned from India, writes at length in the *Times*, against the slow movements and over-cautious strategy of Sir Colin Campbell. He expressed the fears of *many* in India. The *Times* ably defends Sir Colin. J.W.

P. S.—My Postscript, *this* time—like a lady's always—is the *best* of my letter, for it conveys, or rather gives, *one* of a million jubilant utterances on the glorious news, which yesterday *electrified* the Kingdom, namely, that the Atlantic Cable now connects the two great Anglo-Saxon nations and countries. This, with fine harvest weather, and rising funds and trade, makes *all* hearts glad, and *many* thankful. Among other noble sentiments of this day's *Times*, nobly expressed, are the following: "Nor can any regard with indifference the position in which the Atlantic Telegraph has placed us, with regard to the great American Republic. It has half undone the Declaration of 1776, and gone far to make us once again, in spite of ourselves, one people. To the ties of a common blood, language, and religion; to the intimate association in business, and a complete sympathy on so many subjects, is now added the faculty of instantaneous communication, which must give to all these tendencies to unity an intensity which they never before could possess." The shares have gone up from £200 to £900.