

they took in repelling the recent insurrection. They were amongst the first who repaired to the relief of the city of Toronto: they were in the front of the battle, or rather pursuit, of the rebels in Yonge street; and in their barracks and on their march, like the soldiers of the Covenant 200 years ago, they had their pastor with them. And now to their higher honour be it said, they have called on him to print the sermon which he preached to them on the occasion of the public thanksgiving for the suppression of the insurrection, and that sermon, we venture to say, was amongst the best that were preached on that day.

Like all the sermons of Mr. George which we have heard, and like the one which he published, and which we reviewed in an early number of this Journal—it is a powerful and massive discourse. We perceive some want of care or of art in the jointing and polishing its minutest parts, but it has many substantial excellencies. It is founded on these words of Paul: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers."—Romans, xiii. 1., and the scope of it is to set forth the duties of subjects to their rulers. These are illustrated and enforced under the following heads:

I. *That it is the duty of all good subjects to pray for their rulers.*

II. *That it is the duty of subjects to pay taxes, that the Government under which they live, and by which they are protected, may be supported.*

III. *That subjects ought to honour their rulers.*

IV. *It is the duty of subjects, in all cases, to aid their rulers; and, if assailed by violence, to defend them.*

In the illustration of these, there is greater minuteness in expounding the principles of the British Constitution and of other topics which go to constitute the argument for the expediency of submission to rulers, than what we conceive to be strictly proper for a pulpit discourse; but, a considerable latitude must be given to preachers on such occasions, and certainly no minister who was himself a good subject, could on our day of public thanksgiving have contented himself with an illustration of the duties of subjects in the abstract.

We earnestly wish an extensive circulation for this sermon in our congregations.

We take a few passages from it at random; any one page of it is a fair specimen of the whole.

Under the fourth head, which states it to be "*the duty of subjects, in all cases, to aid their rulers, and, if assailed by violence, to defend them,*" we quote the following remarks:

"This may be looked at under two aspects. First, it is the duty of all subjects to aid their rulers in carrying the laws into effect. It really matters nothing, how excellent soever the laws may be, unless the people generally are ready to lend their assistance in de-

fecting offenders, and in bringing the guilty to punishment. Without such aid from the people, the magistrate will be impotent, and the law become a dead letter. And this truth and its consequences are just the more apparent the freer the civil institutions of a country are. Where disregard to the laws begins, all safety ends. Nor can there be a more dangerous state of things, than when criminals can count on impunity, from the protection thrown around them by the morbid sympathy of a community ignorant or regardless of the high claims of justice. Every man—the meanest not less than the greatest—should feel that he has a deep interest in the laws being fully supported, and the claims of justice being ever held inviolate. Hence, it is his duty to give all the assistance he can to the ministers of justice—the servants of Government.

"But, second, subjects must defend rulers if they are assailed by violence. Under ordinary circumstances, the regular force of the state is quite sufficient for the protection of authority. There may, however, be emergencies—you are at no loss to conceive of such—when this force may either not be at hand, or may not be sufficient. The path of duty is then plain—if the Government be unprotected, and assailed by violence, every man who does not wish it overthrown will rush if he possibly can, to its defence. And when he has done so, and exposed himself to danger, he has done nothing more than what was barely his duty.

"But the discharge of this piece of duty rests, of course, on the supposition that defensive war is lawful. This, you are aware, has, of late, in this Province, been frequently called in question. This opinion is not novel, although it has acquired, in our times, rather a novel form; and is found to embrace principles neither wise nor safe, and, in some cases, far from being honourable to those who hold it. I beg that it may be distinctly understood, that it is my sincere conviction that war on any other grounds whatsoever than those purely defensive is the most heinous wickedness. And were it possible to collect all the curses which the prophets of God ever pronounced against sinners, and pour them forth in one deep denunciation, that denunciation ought to fall on the guilty heads of those men who have been the means of originating and carrying on unlawful wars. Aggression in this matter is a sort of wickedness that has hardly any parallel. But does the criminality of this hellish conduct render defensive war unlawful? We think the very reverse. It is just because men will make aggressive wars that defensive war becomes absolutely necessary, and, on the plainest and most sacred principles of justice, clearly lawful. I shall not take up your time by any lengthened argument in support of this. The people whom I address do not need argument on so plain a matter; and they have, I trust, too much honesty and loyalty to pretend perplexity of judgment, where there is merely perversity of will. Those who deny the lawfulness of defensive war for the sake of consistency, ought to go a step further, and deny the use of all civil Government. For in such a world as ours—and we must just take men as they are, and not as we could wish them to be—a Government without force will very quickly be resolved into a number of persons who bear titles—wear certain symbols—play their respective parts in a national pageant—complacently hear, and impotently announce opinions. If contending parties choose to listen, good; if not, the matter, as far as the Government is concerned, is at an end. But if force is used by those in authority, in order to carry out their decision, and if violence must be employed in giving effect to law—in defending the innocent—or in bringing the guilty to punishment—whether this shall be the work of