

men." Nobody, except fools, can be tempted to think and say that it is really the amiable Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto, because he has heard "this is Archbishop Lynch." He knows very well that it is only some paper with the shades and colours put by the artist. Nevertheless, he calls that paper, and those shades and colours Archbishop Lynch, for the simple reason that it is there to make them remember His Lordship. So Christ said, "Kill the passover," though the passover could not be killed. He said "Prepare the passover," though the passover could not be prepared. He said, "I eat this passover," though He could not eat the passover. So He said, "This is my body" though it was not His body. He said, "Eat this, my body," though they could not eat His body.

But, once more, as the bread was the representation of His body, Christ had to call that bread "body." Christ could not eat His own body, but He could eat what was to represent His body. He could not possibly give His body to be eaten and His blood to be drunk, without making His disciples anthropophagi, but He could give what represented His body and His blood to be eaten and drunk without being guilty of that disgusting and criminal cannibalism. It is true that Christ said, "This is my body." But do you not read in Genesis xlix. 9, "I am a lion's whelp." In the verse 14, "Issachar is a strong ass." Was Judah's father a lion, and Issachar's father an ass? No, but these were figures of speech, just as when Jesus said, "This is My body." St. Paul, speaking of sinners, says, "Their throat is a sepulchre." Does the Archbishop of Toronto really believe that the throat is a sepulchre? No. Then, he has no more reason to believe that the body of Christ had taken the place of the bread, after He had said, "This is My body." In both cases the verb is means, (represents) and brings to the mind a memorial. David says, Psalm cxxi. 105, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet." Will ever the Pope sufficiently forget all the laws of common sense to tell us that the Word of God is really a lamp? And when Christ says, "I am the door," (John x. 9): "I am the true vine," (John xvi. 1); had He really the intention to make us believe that He was a door or a vine? Does not Paul, speaking of the rock from which Moses drew the water in the desert, say, "That rock was Christ?" Will the Roman Catholic bishops and priests some day try to persuade us that the rock was really Christ, His body, soul and divinity, because the Holy Ghost says, "That rock was Christ?" No: they acknowledge that the rock was not Christ, though Paul says, "The rock was Christ." It was only a figure, a type, a memorial of Christ, and because it was so it was called Christ. So when our Saviour says, "This bread my body," "do this in remembrance of me," He makes us understand that the bread was called His body, because it was presented to us that we might remember His body. Jesus, speaking to the Samaritan woman, said, "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life," (John iv. 14). Why does not the Church of Rome try to persuade those who believe in Christ that they have such a large well of water within themselves, that it will flow even through all eternity? That well of water, which is in every Christian to quench his thirst, is just like the body of Christ, which is eaten by every one of His disciples, that they may never be hungry. Both are most beautiful and simple figures when taken in the sense they were given, but both turn into a ridiculous and disgusting idea when taken as a material reality.

In a few days, (D.V.) I will show the idolatry of the Church of Rome in her worship of the Virgin Mary.

Truly yours, C. CHINQUY
Ste Anne, Illinois, July 26th, 1884.

THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGION APPLIED TO PARTY POLITICS.

BY REV. W. D. ARMSTRONG.

There are not a few in our Church who would like to see a more vigorous and courageous application of the principles of religion to the politics of this country. This cannot be accomplished without some agitation and the careful instruction of the public mind. Much good will be done by the Church giving a clear and distinct tone in the matter, and ministers of the Gospel, who are in the position of leaders in all moral movements, bringing the subject fairly, calmly and

thoroughly before the people. We believe that the foundations of good government can only be laid in accordance with the teachings of God's Word. Milton was no less a patriot than a Christian poet when he put forward the Scriptures—

"As better teaching
The solid rules of civil government
In their majestic unaffected style,
Than all the oratory of Greece and Rome:
In them is plainest taught and easiest learnt,
What makes a nation happy and what keeps it so,
What ruins cities and lays kingdoms flat.

We are not wrong, surely, in holding, as Christians, that the teachings of the Word and the morality of the Word shall be applied to political movements and measures. There is, too, such a thing as a social conscience, and it is our clear duty to see that conscience developed in purity and vigour; but if we quietly acquiesce in political or social evils, that conscience will be weakened and debased. The conscience of the Church should therefore be thoroughly alive to a sense of duty in regard to matters affecting the public weal. This would go far towards maintaining a wholesome righteousness in the life of the body politic.

The overture on evils of party politics recently presented to the General Assembly, had for its object the obtaining from the Assembly such a declaration as would call the attention of the church to these evils, and to the fact that they are injuriously affecting our national life and giving a wrong bias to the development of our national character. The object aimed at has been attained. The resolution passed by the General Assembly cannot fail of itself to have a good effect, but I mistake the temper and attitude of our Church, if this movement stop with an overture, a discussion and a resolution. There was but one opinion as to the existence of the evils complained of, and when the existence of any evil is recognized by good men it ought not to be difficult to predict their line of action.

Since there has been some misunderstanding and some foolish talking in regard to this overture, I may be permitted to call attention to its actual purport. The overture complains that the spirit of intense party politics "interferes with the exercise of fair mindedness in regard to public men and public questions." One need scarcely take time to give illustrations and proofs of this. Perhaps the most notable illustration is to be found in the action of our party newspapers. Attention was called to this very forcibly by one of the speakers during the discussion. "Read in either of the papers you swear by, the estimate of a public man a week after he died, and compare it with what was said of him six days or six weeks or six months before and you will be edified." Not merely, however, in giving an estimate of public men, but even in the ordinary matter of giving a report of a political meeting, whether great or small, who expects to see a fair account in the columns of the paper of the opposite party? A political gathering is held in one of our towns; look at the rival papers next morning: "Miserable Fizzle," says one; "Grand Demonstration," says the other. No political event, great or small, is honestly chronicled.

The debates in Parliament share the same fate. If you wish to know what Sir John A. Macdonald said, you must read the *Mail*. If you would know what Mr. Blake said, you must read the *Globe*. Neither of them give you anything like a *Hansard*. As a result of this pernicious process, people are getting into the habit of reading without believing. They do not expect the whole truth to be told. There is no need to point out the hurtful result upon the mind and character of the reader. The habit of incredulity bred in the political atmosphere is transferred to other spheres—the spirit of distrust spreads, and "loyalty to truth is undermined."

Little need be said with regard to the second evil complained of in the overture, viz., that the spirit of party politics tends to "engender and foster a spirit of strife and bitterness in connection with political issues, it seriously disturbs the exercise of the love and goodwill that ought to prevail in a Christian land." This will be admitted on all sides. Certainly by those who take an active part in election contests. The only difference of opinion can be as to the possibility of a remedy. Should not the Church utter her voice with regard to an admitted and wide-spread evil? Ought not our ministers to urge upon the people the duty of mutual forbearance, of kindly consideration for one another's opinions and judgments in these

matters? Will not the fact that the Assembly has given a deliverance on this point enable ministers to bring it more freely before their congregations, and that not merely on the eve of an election, or in the very heat of the contest; but now, when men's minds are in a calmer and more reasonable mood. The third point brought up in the overture, perhaps, requires a little explanation. It states that the intensity of party politics, "by demanding unswerving obedience to the interests of party prevents the free and honest expression of opinion both at the polls and in the halls of Legislature."

That this is an evil and a great evil no one will dispute. I shall give two illustrations that will, I think, make this point perfectly plain. An important question is brought before our House of Commons. It is debated for several days with great earnestness and ability. Long speeches on one side are answered by long speeches on the other. The vote is then taken. One hundred vote on one side, fifty on the other. Another question, equally important, but radically different, is introduced—a great debate follows—long speeches on the one side followed by long speeches on the other—the vote is taken—the division is the same—the same hundred men are found on one side the same fifty on the other. The following week another question is introduced, debated, voted on, and the same one hundred are found on the one side, and the same fifty on the other. Has the independent judgment of these men been expressed on all these three questions? It is a simple psychological impossibility. Men do not think in platoons. It is simply party policy and party exigency that produce this result. Surely some way of testing the right of certain men to govern the country could be devised, which would give men liberty in Parliament to vote, when their judgments so dictated, in opposition to the party to which they may nominally belong. It is a painful thing to hear the word "voting machine" applied to the Assembly of our statesmen and to know that in many cases it is not inappropriate. As an illustration of the statement that party politics prevents the honest expression of opinion at the polls, I will take the nomination of candidates by caucuses. A clever, cunning, immoral wirepuller obtains by dint of constant work and intrigue the nomination of his party at one of these caucuses, and forthwith men of that party who despise the candidate and who know that he is unworthy, are called upon to vote for him and unfortunately, in the interests of the party, too often do. The representative of the people, by this process is not in the real sense, their representative—does not represent the moral and political worth of the constituency for which he sits. This insitution of the caucus is a sore evil in the political frame-work of our neighbours across the line, and is a growing evil in this country. Christian men have a right to protest against a system which not unfrequently shuts out worthy men, real representative men, from the halls of Legislature and opens the way for the clever upstart and wirepuller.

There are sufficient reasons in the above why the Assembly of our Church should give forth the deliverance it has done in this matter, and why it should urge upon ministers and members the serious duty of seeking, in a way consistent with the Gospel profession, to obviate those evils that are a real hindrance to the advancement of religion and hurtful to the national life of our young country.

IS IT SO—AND WHY?

MR. EDITOR.—Is it so? If so, why is it so, and what does it mean? In the Assembly's report it is said that the increase of members for the whole Church during the past year was 380,—that all the Synods show a decrease except Toronto and Kingston,—that all this is in the face of a staff of 683 ministers, 660 of whom, if not more, being in pastoral charges, the whole work of the Church being carried on with an income, if not an expenditure, of \$1,466,700, and adds "The Assembly expressed itself well pleased with the report."

In the Methodist Conference report it is said, "that in this Province (Ont.) the Church has increased its members by about 8,000 during the past year. Of this number the London Conference contributed 3,400."

You quoted very opportunely, and you might have profitably done so more extensively, from Dr. Whyte in a recent issue. Allow me to add thereto, "No supervision is at present exercised over a minister after he has settled in a charge. He might be an