

Hill. He had the highest respect for their character, the deepest personal affection for themselves, and the very highest opinion of the reality of their personal piety. They left behind them friends among all who had ever come in contact with them; and he had no hesitation in stating his opinion that he knew no young licentiates who, if they were in this country, were more certain of being appointed to parishes than those four. They returned to Nova Scotia, three of them preaching the Gaelic language of their countrymen. One of them was not able to speak Gaelic, but he would back his friend Mr. Grant against any man for speaking in the English language. (Applause.) To him (Dr. Macleod) this was an intensely interesting day. He could not tell the effect it would have on the colonies. From the affectionate and friendly manner in which they had been received by the clergy and their success at the University, he might be permitted to express a hope, which perhaps might go to the Colonial Church, that other Presbyteries in the colonies would follow the example of the Presbytery of Pictou. Two other young men had been sent to this country since the four gentlemen in question; and he hoped that the principle would be carried out further, as he believed that this was the best way, in every respect, for the Colonial Church being supplied with efficient ministers. He was sure those young men left this country with the most earnest prayers of the Presbytery for their success; and he believed their going back would be truly a day of jubilee in Nova Scotia—and he did not wonder at it.

The motion was then agreed to, Dr. Runniman remarking that the absence of examination should not be made a precedent.

The ordination was proceeded with in the usual form; and thereafter the Moderator addressed the young men in an admirable speech.

This concluded the public business of the Presbytery.

—o—

MINISTERS OF RELIGION AND POLITICS.

A good deal has often been said respecting Ministers interfering with political questions, or taking part in election meetings. A Congregational Minister of Sydney, Australia, having been invited to represent a constituency in the Australian Legislature, which he declined to do, led to the annexed remarks being made in the *London Patriot*. We slightly condense them:

It is worth while, perhaps, to reflect a little on the general question which this rather startling attempt to induce a Christian minister to become a member of the Legislature naturally raises. Are the two positions incompatible? John Owen, I remember, was elected Member for the University of Oxford, and was willing to sit, but was pronounced

by a Committee of the House ineligible, on the ground of his being a Minister. Which was right, Owen, or the laymen that unseated him?

Of course, as a general rule, the duties of the Ministry are far too onerous for a diligent and conscientious member, even of a Colonial House of Representatives, to say nothing of the British House of Commons, to discharge them rightly. But it is possible for a Christian Minister to be tolerably prominent and active in political movements without neglecting the pulpit, or being altogether unfaithful to the more private duties of his office; and it is an important practical question whether or no he is in his right place, as the eloquent advocate or opponent of political Reform in a town's meeting, or the champion or the foe on the hustings of the Cabinet of the day.

The foolish fancy that a Christian must have nothing to do with politics, was only a device of the Devil's to keep the government of the world in his own hands; but since that delusion is happily fast wearing out, is it not possible that the rising persuasion that Christian Ministers can with safety and wisdom plunge into the hottest and fiercest party struggles, may have come from the same fertile source of evil?

But may a Christian Minister so associate himself by public and active advocacy with ordinary political movements and controversies as to be identified by all his neighbors with a particular political party, and regarded as one of its local chiefs?

I venture to think not.

For his own sake he ought not to do it; the atmosphere of political agitation is very unfriendly to the culture of those devout affections which ought to maintain an unbroken ascendancy in the nature of a man whose function it is to quicken and sustain the devotion of others; and those quiet and reclusive studies by which alone he can acquire most necessary knowledge of the truths which constitute the substance of his ministry are likely to be sorely disturbed by the turbulent excitement of political party warfare.

For the sake of the church over which he presides, he ought not to do it. A Christian Church is a Divine institution, not an association created by a merely human wisdom, and subject to merely human laws. To identify a church with a political section of the community, is to impair its highest strength, and to misinterpret to the people around, its true nature and ends. Even good men, and wise men, differ about some important questions of constitutional reform and foreign policy; and it is hardly fair to the members of a church who may happen to differ from a minister on these questions, to make them feel that through his public advocacy of views which they disapprove, the whole church, and and they as members of it, are credited with