

from this to keeping Lent is natural and easy. And thus a way is opened for all abominations.

Quite recently we have had in this city an animated discussion concerning the use of the organ in the services of public worship. A very respectable ecclesiastical body had it formally presented to them that a congregation of their number had placed an organ in their church. This was clearly an innovation, and seemed to be a hard stroke to the feelings and prejudices of some members present. One speaker said "that whenever he went into a church and saw and heard an organ, he was completely undone. He did not think the organ could understand the music which it sends forth in praise of God. If they should have any instrument, he'd sooner have the fiddle." In this gentleman's case it is evident that the presence of an organ would be a hindrance to worship, through the effect its sight and sound would have on his sensibilities. He evidently believes that his own organs of speech are intelligent members, and transfers to the throat the functions which are usually ascribed to the brain, or some more inscrutable part. For it is on this that his main argument against the organ rests. And he prefers the fiddle because he is more used to it, which is very natural. The next speaker was better. He "lifted up his testimony against the organ, not that he disliked the organ, but its use and effects in church. He thought that where the organ was, the voices were silenced, and he quite agreed with Mr. T. respecting the fiddle." The third speaker rose to the level of common sense. "He thought the introduction of the organ would offend unnecessarily, and that at present they were not prepared for its introduction on account of the many prejudices which exist."