

have taken the name of the Lord in vain. Besides twisting an Act of Parliament in a way that every straightforward man must say is a perversion of judgment, and which if applied to criminal or civil jurisprudence would render law a mockery;—besides this, the majority of the present Cabinet have insulted the Majesty of Heaven by taking a deceptive oath. The law provides that a Cabinet minister may vacate one office, and within thirty days assume another in the same Government, without the necessity of resigning his seat in the Assembly or appearing before his constituents for re-election. But how this has any bearing upon the resignation of an entire ministry, or the formation of a new Government, we fail to see. Yet, with an ingenuity more than human, we find this statute twisted in such a way as to screen the new Cabinet from the inconvenient ordeal of appearing before their constituents. The device has the merit of perfect novelty. To comply with the letter of their own interpretation of the law, the Ministry, except three, assumed for the nonce other offices than those they intended to fill, and solemnly took oath before God faithfully to discharge their duties; yet the very next morning these offices are resigned, new ones accepted, and new oaths taken. In sober judgment, was not this, we ask, a mockery of the name of God? Was it not a violation of the Third Commandment, which says: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain"? We cannot conceive of any man, whose moral sense is not vitiated, acting such a part as this, or stamping such proceedings with his approval. From some of the actors we had expected better things. Their position and antecedents led us to believe that they would not thus have wantonly profaned the sacred name of Jehovah. But the old word seems in this instance to be true, which says that "evil communications corrupt good manners."

What blessing can such a Government expect from God? How can its members pray for His approving smile, when, in the act of taking office, they have dishonoured His name? Political necessity may be pleaded in defence, but we have yet to learn that it is a principle of our constitution that "the end justifies the means," or that any political necessity can justify disobedience to a plain command of God.

We besides hold that the magistrate is under law to Christ—that he ought to be guided in all his official transactions by a regard to His revealed Word. The question with him is not always what is expedient, but what is right. Nineteenth of the corruptions which have stained governments and afflicted nations have arisen from the fact that the law of expediency, and not the law of God, has been the rule in political transactions. There is a constant tendency among men entrusted with power, to forget, that, in their official station, they are under obligation to Christ. In public affairs they not unfrequently act upon principles from which, in private life, they would recoil. It is all the more necessary, therefore, for religious men and the Church to maintain the doctrine of Christ's supremacy over the nations, and to insist upon its practical recognition in all the affairs of the State. This is an instance in point which we offer to