

we vote for a man to sit in parliament, not because he is orthodox in religion, but because he holds views in politics which we regard to be right." In uttering such a sentiment as that, Mr. Spurgeon must have forgotten the plain declarations of that Word which has been given for a "lamp to our feet, and a light to our path," in all the relations of life. What mean those utterances of the king of Israel under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost?—"The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, *ruled in the fear of God.*" Do the words which we have italicised, favor the doctrine that a man's moral and religious qualities have nothing to do with his fitness to bear rule in the State? How could one rule in the fear of God without possessing that fear as the governing principle of his own life? Then, what mean those words of heavenly wisdom in the Book of Proverbs: "Shall he that hateth right govern?" "The throne is established by righteousness." "Righteousness exalteth a nation," &c.

There is one utterance of Holy Scripture which by no critical ingenuity can be made to harmonize with the theory that a man's moral character is no lawful impediment to possession of political office. It would be well if Mr. Spurgeon and others of similar sentiments would seriously consider its import. The royal Psalmist of Israel said long ago: "*The wicked walk on every side, when the vilest men are exalted.*" The judicious commentator, Henry, remarks on that passage: "When the vilest men are exalted to places of power and trust * * * then the wicked walk on every side, they swarm in all places, and go up and down seeking to deceive, debauch, and destroy others." * * * "It is bad with a kingdom, when vile men are preferred; no marvel if wickedness then grows impudent and insolent. *When the wicked bear rule the people mourn.*" Has a man's moral and religious character then, nothing to do with the question of his fitness for a political office? If a wicked man's influence for evil be proportioned to the degree of his exaltation in society, then does it not follow that they who elevate that man to office, are responsible for the malarious moral effects of his debasing and corrupting influence? Surely if Mr. Spurgeon, and others who would divorce religion from politics, and eliminate the idea of moral character from a man's fitness for legislative responsibilities, would calmly and prayerfully consider the matter, they would tremble at the very thought of giving their sanction to the elevation of a vile man, and so placing him in a position in which the corrupting influence of his teachings, and his example, will be vastly more powerful than it would be in a more private and humble sphere of life.

That a blaspheming atheist is numbered amongst "the vilest men," Mr. Spurgeon will hardly deny. To say, then, that the atheistic licentiousness of Charles Bradlaugh has nothing to do with his political aspirations, and that it was perfectly proper for the constituency of Northampton to elect him as their representative, and that it was perfectly right and proper for the Imperial Parliament to receive him to its privileges and honors, is just to affirm that it is right to exalt him to a position in which his prestige as an M. P. will secure more readers for his vile publications, impart more potency to his atheistic harangues, and make him tenfold more successful in his efforts to drag immortal souls into the depths of a dark and cheerless atheism.