

has, therefore, any right to feel hurt or aggrieved, if there is, in any number, a communication, with the sentiments of which he cannot fully agree. He has the right of reply, and he replies, not to an editorial staff, but to a private person, who has not attempted to conceal his identity. Does any one desire more, or what more can be desired, except a law be passed that no person shall be allowed to write anything in the *Record* that would disturb the opinions or prejudices of any other person. Why, even dogs are not so muzzled in the dog days.

II. That we are all agreed that the praise in our churches should be the people's service. There is no desire for "fine singing," "fine music," or "esthetical" effect of any kind. Those who advocate organs, do so because they believe that their use would enable the congregation to join in the psalmody better than is now generally done. Now, there can be no doubt that, in our town churches, the mass of the people take no part in the singing. The reasons seem to be because the choirs shoot too far ahead of the average powers of the congregations, and because the people of our town charges, strange to say, are more ignorant of Psalmody than our country people. In almost every district of the country, there are singing-classes every winter, which are attended by many of the young men and young women; but you cannot get the people so generally in the towns to such practisings. The consequence is that most of the people in city churches are afraid to join in with the choir, and plead their inability, but say that they would have more confidence if there were a more powerful and sustained volume of sound. And it is a little trying to hear men protest against any such help being given, who never open their own lips to praise God in His own house.

III. That it is absurd for people or congregations opposed to instrumental music to feel or speak angrily on the subject, because no one dreams of even asking them to change their usages. All that is asked is liberty for those who think differently to act without being fettered by the tastes of people who may live 100 miles away, and be very differently circumstanced. And for such congregational liberty, I will contend, at all hazards. The articles and laws of the Church of Scotland are numerous and stringent enough, and these are not the times to attempt to make them more so. They are the innovators who would make a new law where no law now exists, and any such attempt would alienate ten for every one it would confirm. In a large and historic Church, there cannot be, there ought not to be, absolute uniformity in things indifferent, and, though personally all my tastes and prejudices are opposed to instrumental music in churches, I shall never sanction any narrowing of the congregational liberty which, I believe, we possess.

IV. That to push this question aside by the mere cry of "Innovations," or "the Church of our fathers in danger," or any such note of alarm, is unfair. Let the question be discussed on its own merits, or on the ground of Expediency, but not hushed away, nor burked. "Time doth change all things," says Bacon, and he, then, is the greatest innovator who will make no change. Every Protestant, every Presbyterian Church, but our own, actually makes use of instrumental aid in public praise; and in our own there is no law against it, and, "where no law is, there is 'no transgression.'" Even the English Puritans never included organs in their list of abuses; and, with what scorn would Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, Cranmer or Knox have listened to any argument, the substance of which simply was the cry, "Innovations!" G.

French Protestant Church in Paris.

WE mentioned, last month, that, of six laymen to be elected this year, as members of the Presbytery of Paris, five orthodox delegates had been chosen, and that, in all probability, M. Guizot would be the sixth. Such has proved to be the fact, and, we believe that now all the lay delegates in that Presbytery are orthodox, while, of the nine pastors, three are "liberal," or heterodox. M. Guizot was elected by only 10 of a majority, and the opposition to him was exceedingly bitter. The Liberal Protestants of Paris,—that is, those who do not think it necessary to believe in the Divinity of the Saviour, or in miracles, or in anything of the supernatural in Christianity, are furious against M. Guizot, because, last year, he supported the Presbytery and Synod in refusing to give license to preach to M. Athanase Coquerel, who holds the opinions of Renan, with regard to the Lord Jesus Christ. M. Coquerel, and several others of the Liberal Protestants, are men of talent, and are popular writers, and have therefore exercised much influence for evil on the Protestants of France. They are praised by the *Westminster Review*, but that does not inspire any confidence with regard to them in the minds of Christians, nor entitle them to rule and teach in the Church. But they have raised a great cry of "persecution," because the Paris Church Courts refuse to clothe them with that official authority; and they have been especially bitter against M. Guizot, because, after he had long borne patiently with them, he, last year, announced that their attacks on the very essentials of Christianity were so flagrant that it was impossible to overlook them, or to license the authors of such attacks as the accredited teachers of the faith. G.

BARON ROTHSCHILD has erected a Protestant Church at Mentmore for the use of Protestants in his service.