

THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

(NEW SERIES.)

VOL. VI.]

TORONTO, APRIL 1, 1887.

[No. 7.

Editorial Jottings.

"MEASURES not men," is an excellent motto, but, like many other sayings of a similar character, it is often carried too far. It comes constantly at election times, and is the cry of either party when it is wished to divert attention from an obnoxious candidate. But is it morally right to follow the maxim in such cases? Let us see. Mr. A—— is the nominee of the party to which you give the preference, Conservative or Liberal, it is of no consequence which. But Mr. A—— is, say, a man of dissipated habits, notoriously so, or his past reputation for honesty and fair dealing is very cloudy, there are certain disreputable transactions that cannot be denied or explained away, or, he is an avowed unbeliever, a sceptic, possibly a scoffer at religious truths. In any of these cases are you willing that this man shall represent you? It is vain to say that you only vote for him as representing your political opinions. He will be called upon to vote on questions affecting the religious and moral well being of the Commonwealth—is that fitting? Hardly so we think. What shall I do, then? you say. This is our view, that if there is not a candidate for whom you can conscientiously vote, then abstain from voting. Two instances that have just come under our notice may serve as an illustration. A farmer, driving us to a meeting, began speaking about the Dominion elections; he had been a Conservative all his life, all his family and friends were Conservative, but the candidate for that party was a man of bad character, and our friend felt that, as a Christian, he could not vote for him, so he intended to give his vote to the opposing candidate, a tried Christian man. On the other hand we were told by a Liberal in another constituency, that the candidate in the interests of that party was practically an Atheist,

and that as the opposing candidate was not worthy of support, he should not vote at all. The elections are over, but the practical truths are of wide and constant application.

MARRIAGE is a thing that most ministers let carefully alone (we mean teaching about, not the act). If they were to touch the subject they would assuredly put their foot in it (pardon the bull); yet there is no social religious subject of deeper importance. From the time when "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose," nothing but evil has come from ungodly marriages. Jezebel was certainly a terrible curse to her poor, weak husband, who would not, likely, have been a bad man otherwise. So Solomon was led astray, and down through the ages comes the solemn warning, "Remember Lot's wife." Remember her, young man, for this one thing, if for nothing else, she was, beyond doubt, a woman of Sodom, heathen and licentious herself. She demoralized poor Lot, made his salvation very hard, and, perishing herself, left a legacy of two infamous daughters, a thorn in the side of her unhappy husband.

Of course the evil is not all on that side, far from it; it is without question that there are thousands of women to-day, weeping bitter tears of useless regret that they were so foolish as to marry mean, ungodly, dissipated men; poor fools, they thought that they could reform him. Happy they if he has not dragged them down morally and spiritually, as well as physically and socially. We declare that the recklessness of young women, Christian young women, and their willingness to enter upon an union, bringing life-long good or evil, with men whose characters are indifferent or positively bad, is one of the most appalling facts of the age.