

are the rocks among which many of all parties, Whigs and Tories, Churchmen and Dissenters, for I apply the remark to all, have split."

Lastly, Moral or religious interests, whenever such are involved in political movements, should be regarded by the christian as of having the *first* claim upon his attention. There may be political issues which contain no moral element, but wherever there is such an element he should regard it as of greater importance than any merely political question which he is called to decide. We need not say how different is the view of worldly men. With them political questions are everything, and religion and morality are either not regarded at all or only so far as they are subservient to the advancement of political ends. In common with this, too, we consider it a matter at which christian men should aim, to have men of decided christian character filling the higher stations of the country. A question may here arise—whether a christian is authorized to vote for men who give no evidence of personal religion? This is a point of some difficulty. On the one hand, it will be at once admitted that it is extremely desirable to have men of piety in high places.—It will render their office in the highest degree a blessing to the community. And yet, on the other hand, it may well be asked, will it be for the interests of the community to entrust public affairs to the hands of incapable men, merely because they are pious? A man may be a good christian, and but a poor statesman, and should a christian vote for a man whose views of public policy he believes to be not only erroneous but deeply injurious to the interests of the country,—even although he believes him to be a converted man? We must therefore admit, that while piety is extremely desirable in public men, it is not indispensable. It is in this as in some other matters. What christian would not desire, when sickness enters his dwelling, to have a pious as well as skilful physician? But in a case of emergency, who would not prefer the most skilful, whether he were religious or not?

And yet we are very far from admitting that christians are justified in disregarding the moral character of public men. We know that it is commonly held that we should look only at their public principles, and some would have us vote for those with whom we might agree in political views, whatever their moral character. Such a sentiment we must utterly repudiate. The interests of morality we regard as of higher importance than any merely political issue that may be tried. The injury done to all the higher interests of the community by the elevation of bad men, is such, that we cannot conceive of any political interest which would justify a christian in lending his assistance to place in situations of public honor, persons of open ungodliness or decided immorality. We humbly conceive that there is need for christians making a stand here. At present, the men who press into public offices are the ambitious and the unscrupulous; and as long as christians from party feeling raise no difficulty about giving their suffrages to such, this is likely to continue to be the case. Were christians to take a firm stand against the elevation of men destitute of moral principle, the result would, in a short time, be most favorable to the interests of the country. We cannot see in what other way that state of things can be brought about, when "our officers shall be peace and our exactors righteousness."

The remarks made regarding christians, to some extent apply to the christian minister. There is, however, this difference: that the *business* of the latter is attendance upon religious services, and that therefore, in all ordinary cases, he can have no call to be actively engaged in political affairs, any more than any other worldly employment. "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath