

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---com- placently hear, and impotently announce *opinions*. If con- tending 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 de- cision, 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 five men, or of fifty thousand---the principle is the same.

In a word, a Government without force among deprav- ed creatures, *is will*, in place of *law*. To this it must come; and this, as it appears to me, is just no Government at all. Excellent state of things this for the cunning sharper, and the ruffian greedy for rapine: what it might be to the virtuous, peaceable, and simple-minded citizen, is quite another matter. But the whole thing is as far wrong in an international point of view, as it is in a municipal. Assuredly, my brethren, the time will come "when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Universal sub- mission to the Prince of Peace will bring all this to pass. But ere this consummation takes place---a consummation for which all christians are bound to pray and to labour---it will be too soon "to beat our swords into ploughshares, and our spears into pruning-hooks." It would be well if persons who speculate on this matter would look a little more carefully into the cause---the true cause of universal peace. The complete triumph of the Redeemer's kingdom alone can bring about this. But to ex- pect universal peace in a world "that lieth in wickedness" is what neither reason nor prophecy warrants. And to suppose a Government to exist without power to enforce all its just claims, in the various relations in which it stands to its own subjects, and to foreign states, is the height of folly. A folly, it is true, quite congruous with the other notions bred in the minds of crazy enthusiasts. But what shall be thought of those who are now clamouring against defensive war, but who neither ask, nor are entitled to, the same apology which, in all fairness, ought to be made for the enthusiast? Who can for- bear to smile, when he sees this affected humanity employed to hide principles as different from justice and mercy, as they are from loyalty? Defensive war murder! Pity it is that John the Baptist did not understand this matter better, so that, instead of telling soldiers "to be content with their wages," he ought to have told them, in plain terms, that they were murderers. We wonder much what these persons would have said to St. Paul, when he accepted a guard of Roman