

slayer will be shed.' A similar expression is used in Ecclesiastes viii. 9, 'Dominatus est homo inter homines in malum suum.' It also often occurs in the books of Moses, RAADAM OURABRIEMA, among men and beasts, as in Exodus xiii. 2. But "G. D." goes to the New Testament, in order to sustain his argument. Let us look at his grounds; he quotes the words of Christ to Peter, "Put up thy sword again into his place; for all they which take the sword shall perish with the sword." This evidently referred to the actual existing law of the Jews, but it does not follow it was promulgated as the *law of Christ*. The mere fact of its being quoted by the Lord does not give it his sanction. Again, "G. D." gives us the words of Paul, "For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die." Now here, Paul is simply asserting his innocence of any crime bringing him within the existing laws of the Jews. But does he by this give his sanction to those laws? Paul had been a Pharisee and a strict observer of the laws—as a Pharisee, he had persecuted the Christians, thinking by the act that he was doing God a service. His opinions on many points had now changed—but in becoming a Christian he had become also a better citizen. He was called to preach the Gospel—not to agitate as a politician. As such, then, it was not his duty to disclaim against bad laws, but as a citizen and a Christian to express his willingness to suffer by the law as it existed, if he had sinned against it. Whilst our opponents fail to produce stronger proof in favour of retaining this ancient *law*, we must denounce it as unscriptural and barbarous.

We will also adduce the testimony of a few eminent clergymen, holding similar views upon this subject:—"I have been thirty years in the ministry," wrote Father Matthew, "and I have never yet discovered that the Founder of Christianity has delegated to man any right to take away the life of his fellow man." The Rev. Dr. Murphy says:—"I have considered the subject (Capital Punishment) long, patiently, and carefully, on Bible principles, and I have deliberately adopted the opinion that the death penalty ought to be abolished." The Rev. J. N. Maffit, a Wesleyan, says:—"We join our voice in condemnation of a system (Capital Punishment) barbarous and condemnable, and at once unworthy of the religion we profess, and the civilization we boast." "When I first approached the subject," wrote the Rev. H. Christmas, A. M., F. R. S., "I felt perfectly persuaded that the punishment of death, inflicted by the civil magistrate, was not only of divine appointment, but of universal obligation. It has been gradually and slowly that this persuasion has been changed. That it is an error, I have no longer any doubt." The Rev. Dr. Welsh, a Baptist preacher, writes thus:—"I am well pleased with the opportunity of signing the Petition for the abolition of Capital Punishment. I feel well persuaded that there is nothing contained

in the Gospel of Christ authorizing the infliction of Capital Punishment." We may add, that the head of the Catholic Church, Pius IX., is also an advocate of this cause.

More of such testimonials might be adduced, but these are sufficient to show that we are not without the support of eminent, learned, and eloquent Catholic and Protestant Clergymen. The mention of these names recalls to our memory an article which we read a few weeks since in a certain weekly family newspaper; the writer of this article said he was shocked to hear that any clergyman should be opposed to such a mild mode of punishment as hanging; and he gravely added, that all those who did so were ignorant of what they were doing, and were thus entangling themselves in the doctrines of "free-thinkers and universalists!" Listen to that, ye who have dared to assert that it was unchristian to hurl an ignorant wretch suddenly and unpreparedly before his Maker, and hang down your faces with shame and sorrow. And, Father Matthew—don't profess to be any longer a Christian; Henry Christmas—don't dare to preach again from a Christian pulpit; Dr. Murphy—we charge you to write no more sermons; Dr. Welsh—you are no longer worthy the name of a Baptist preacher, now that this startling discovery has been made by an editor of a weekly family newspaper, which must place him, for the future, on a level with the great names of Newton and Galileo!

Our opponents have had the christian charity to charge us with infidel doctrines upon one or two occasions, because we deny that the Mosaic penal laws are binding upon us in the present day. In their zeal, and with characteristic discretion, they seem to have forgotten the inconsistency they exhibit in making this assertion. This Mosaic code ordains Capital Punishment in thirty-three different cases. If it is binding in the present day, its supporters ought to recommend hanging for breaking the Sabbath, for smiting father or mother, for eating any manner of blood, for blasphemy, incest, and witchcraft. Such injunctions form a part of that code, and if one portion is now in force, all the others are equally so. But would it be believed—would it be credited at some future day—that while these individuals contend for the divine command of hanging for murder, because it forms a part of the Mosaic code, they actually deny the legality to apply Capital Punishment to the thirty-two other cases, for which that code also declared that Capital Punishment should be also applied? If, then, we are infidels, for disbelieving the applicability of the Mosaic code to the present age, must not they be both sceptics