

THE

DUTY OF CHRISTIAN FREEMEN TO ELECT

CHRISTIAN RULERS:

A

DISCOURSE

DELIVERED ON THE FOURTH OF JULY, 1827,

IN THE SEVENTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, IN PHILADELPHIA:

BY

EZRA STILES ELY, D. D.

PASTOR OF THE THIRD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THAT CITY:

WITH AN APPENDIX,

DESIGNED TO VINDICATE THE LIBERTY OF CHRISTIANS,
AND OF THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY WILLIAM F. GEDDES.

.....
1828.

THE FOLLOWING PAGES

ARE RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED TO THOSE MEMBERS OF THE
SENATE OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, WHO,
IN FEBRUARY, 1828,

SIGNALIZED THEMSELVES,

BY REFUSING TO GRANT AN ACT OF INCORPORATION TO
"THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION."

Extracts from the Sermon having been submitted to your Honour-
able Branch of the Legislature, your attention is
solicited to the Discourse itself,

BY THE AUTHOR.

A DISCOURSE, &c.

PSALM II. 10—12.

“Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way; when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.”

THIS Psalm represents the Lord Jesus Christ as the rightful sovereign of all lands. The nations may rage, and the people imagine vain things; the kings and other rulers of the earth may take counsel and perseveringly oppose the Lord and his anointed, saying, “Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us,” for we neither feel, nor will regard, the obligations imposed by christianity; but it is all fruitless rebellion, for “He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.” He will exercise his government over them, with, or without their consent; and if they are refractory, “then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give the heathen,” i. e. *all the nations*, “for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces, like a potter’s vessel.”

On this exhibition of Messiah’s reign over all the inhabitants of the earth, whether Jews or Gentiles, the exhortation and benediction of our text are founded. Let all princes, kings, judges, and rulers of every description, says the Psalmist, be exhorted to be wise for themselves and their people; let them learn true wisdom; and act in conformity with their duty and privilege in serving the Lord with filial fear and reverential joy. Let them render

to the Son of God, in their private character and public stations, that submission of the heart, and homage of their lives, which he claims, "lest he be angry and they perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." The benediction follows: "Blessed are all they," whether nations or individuals; whether public rulers or private citizens, "that put their trust in him;" who is the Saviour of sinners and Governor among the nations.

Yes, "happy is that people that is in such a case: yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord."

We have assembled, fellow citizens, on the anniversary of our Nation's birth day, in a rational and religious manner, to celebrate our independence of all foreign domination, and the goodness of God in making us a free and happy people. On what subject can I, on the present occasion, insist with more propriety, than on the duty of all the rulers and citizens of these United States in the exercise and enjoyment of all their political rights, to honour the Lord Jesus Christ.

Let it then be distinctly stated and fearlessly maintained IN THE FIRST PLACE, that every member of this christian nation, from the highest to the lowest, ought to serve the Lord with fear, and yield his sincere homage to the Son of God. Every ruler *should be* an avowed and a sincere friend of Christianity. He should know and believe the doctrines of our holy religion, and act in conformity with its precepts. This *he ought* to do; because as a man he is required to serve the Lord; and as a public ruler he is called upon by divine authority to "kiss the Son." The commandment contained in Proverbs iii. 6. "*in all thy ways acknowledge him,*" includes public as well as private ways, and political no less than domestic ways. It is addressed equally to the man who rules, and to the person who is subject to authority. If we may not disown our God and Saviour in *any* situation, it will follow that we are to own him in *every* situation. Infinite wisdom has taught us, that *he who ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.* No *Christian* can gainsay this decision. Let all then admit, that our civil rulers ought to act a religious part in all the relations which they sustain. Indeed, they ought pre-eminently to commit their way unto the Lord that he may di-

rect their steps; delight themselves in him, and wait patiently for him; because by their example, if good, they can do more good than private, less known citizens; and if evil, more harm. Their official station is a talent entrusted to them for usefulness, for which they must give account to their Maker. They are like a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid; and it is a fact indisputable, that wickedness in high places does more harm than in obscurity.

I would guard, however, against misunderstanding and misrepresentation, when I state, that all our rulers ought in their official stations to serve the Lord Jesus Christ. I do not wish any religious test to be prescribed by constitution, and proposed to a man on his acceptance of any public trust. Neither can any intelligent friend of his country and of true religion desire the establishment of any one religious sect by civil law. Let the religion of the Bible rest on that everlasting rock, and on those spiritual laws, on which Jehovah has founded his kingdom: let Christianity by the spirit of Christ in her members support herself: let Church and State be for ever distinct: but, still, let the doctrines and precepts of Christ govern all men, in all their relations and employments. If a ruler is not a Christian he ought to be one, in this land of evangelical light, without delay; and he ought, being a follower of Jesus, to honour him even as he honours the FATHER. In this land of religious freedom, what should hinder a civil magistrate from believing the gospel, and professing faith in Christ, any more than any other man?—If the Chief-Magistrate of a nation may be an irreligious man, with impunity, who may not? It seems to be generally granted, that our political leaders in the national and state governments ought not to be notoriously profane, drunken, abandoned men in their moral conduct; but if they may not be injurious to themselves and their fellow men, who shall give them permission to contemn God? If they ought to be just towards men, ought they not also to abstain from robbing God, and to render unto him that honour which is HIS due?

Our rulers, like any other members of the community, who are under law to God as rational beings, and under law to Christ, since they have the light of divine revelation, ought to search the scriptures, assent to the truth, profess

faith in Christ, keep the Sabbath holy to God, pray in private and in the domestic circle, attend on the public ministry of the word, be baptized, and celebrate the Lord's supper. None of our rulers have the consent of their Maker, that they should be Pagans, Socinians, Mussulmen, Deists, the opponents of Christianity; and a religious people should never think of giving them permission, as public officers, to be and do, what they might not lawfully be and do, as private individuals. If a man may not be a gambler and drink to intoxication in the western wilds, he may not at the seat of government; if he may not with the approbation of his fellow citizens, in a little village of the north, deny "the true God and eternal life," he may not countenance, abet, and support those who deny the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ at Washington. In other words, our Presidents, Secretaries of the Government, Senators and other Representatives in Congress, Governors of States, Judges, State Legislators, Justices of the Peace, and City Magistrates, are just as much bound as any other persons in the United States, to be orthodox in their faith, and virtuous and religious in their whole deportment. They may no more lawfully be bad husbands, wicked parents, men of heretical opinions, or men of dissolute lives, than the obscure individual who would be sent to Bridewell for his blasphemy or debauchery.

God, my hearers, requires a Christian faith, a Christian profession, and a Christian practice of all our public men; and we as Christian citizens ought, by the publication of our opinions, to require the same.

SECONDLY, Since it is the duty of all our rulers to serve the Lord and kiss the Son of God, it must be most manifestly the duty of all our Christian fellow-citizens to honour the Lord Jesus Christ and promote christianity by electing and supporting as public officers the friends of our blessed Saviour. Let it only be granted, that Christians have the same rights and privileges in exercising the elective franchise, which are here accorded to Jews and Infidels, and we ask no other evidence to show, that those who prefer a Christian ruler, may unite in supporting him, in preference to any one of a different character. It shall cheerfully be granted, that every citizen is eligible to every office, what-

ever may be his religious opinions and moral character; and that every one may constitutionally support any person whom he may choose; but it will not hence follow, that he is without accountability to his Divine Master for his choice; or that he may lay aside all his Christian principles and feelings when he selects his ticket and presents it at the polls. “*In all thy ways acknowledge him,*” is a maxim which should dwell in a Christian’s mind on the day of a public election as much as on the Sabbath; and which should govern him when conspiring with others to honour Christ, either at the Lord’s table, or in the election of a Chief Magistrate. In elucidating the duty of private Christians in relation to the choice of their civil rulers, it seems to me necessary to remark,

1. That every Christian who has the right and the opportunity of exercising the elective franchise ought to do it. Many pious people feel so much disgust at the manner in which elections are conducted, from the first nomination to the closing of the polls, that they relinquish their right of voting for years together. But if all *pious* people were to conduct thus, then our rulers would be wholly elected by the *impious*. If all *good men* are to absent themselves from elections, then the *bad* will have the entire transaction of our public business.

If the wise, the prudent, the temperate, the friends of God and of their country do not endeavour to control our elections, they will be controlled by others: and if *one* good man may, without any reasonable excuse, absent himself, then *all* may. Fellow Christians, the love of Christ and of our fellow-men should forbid us to yield the choice of our civil rulers into the hands of selfish office hunters, and the miserable tools of their party politics. If all the truly religious men of our nation would be punctual and persevering in their endeavours to have good men chosen to fill all our national and state offices of honour, power and trust, THEIR WEIGHT would soon be felt by politicians; and those who care little for the religion of the Bible, would, for their own interest, consult the reasonable wishes of the great mass of Christians throughout our land. If any good men in the community ought to abstain from the exercise of their rights in relation to the choice of civil rulers, they

are those clergymen whose hearers are unhappily divided by the bitterness of party spirit. If it would prevent their usefulness as ministers of the gospel to show that they have any judgment and choice about public concerns, *they may*, doubtless, from expediency, refrain from voting for any one—but none have a right to disfranchise them, (as the state of New York has done,) for fearing God and working righteousness.

It is a pleasure to be able to say, however, that the people of my pastoral care never interfered with my personal rights as a citizen and a christian; and in most instances I am persuaded, that even a divided congregation will be perfectly willing that their pastor shall *vote* as he thinks best, if he will do it without becoming a preacher of party politics.

Some connect the idea of giving a vote, with the electioneering tricks which are too commonly the disgrace of a free people, but there is no necessary connection between voting and the suborning of votes. Let all the good set a worthy example in this matter, and discountenance those who would purchase to themselves places, by promises, lies, strong drink, and noisy declamation at taverns, grog-shops and the polls, and these abominations, which have become too common in our land, will in a great measure cease. I could wish to see every professing Christian in attendance on elections; but rather let him never give a vote, than receive *a treat* for his suffrage.

I propose, fellow-citizens, a new sort of union, or, if you please, *a Christian party in politics*, which I am exceedingly desirous all good men in our country should join: not by *subscribing a constitution* and the formation of a new society, to be added to the scores which now exist; but by adopting, avowing, and determining to act upon, truly religious principles in all civil matters. I am aware that the true Christians of our country are divided into many different denominations; who have, alas! too many points of jealousy and collision; still, a union to a very great extent, and for the most valuable purposes is not impracticable. For,

2. All Christians, of all denominations, may, and ought to, agree in determining, that they will never wittingly sup-

port for any public office, any person whom they know or believe to sustain, at the time of his proposed election, a bad moral character. In this, thousands of moralists, who profess no experimental acquaintance with Christianity, might unite and co-operate with *our Christian party*. And surely, it is not impossible, nor unreasonable for all classes of Christians to say within themselves, no man that we have reason to think is a liar, thief, gambler, murderer, debauchee, spendthrift, or openly immoral person in any way, shall have our support at any election. REFORMATION should not only be allowed, but encouraged; for it would be requiring too much to insist upon it, that a candidate for office *shall always have sustained an unblemished moral character*, and it would be unchristian not to forgive and support one who has proved his repentance by recantation and a considerable course of new obedience.

Some of the best of men were once vile; but they have been washed from their sins. Present good moral character should be considered as essential to every candidate for the post of honour. In this affair I know we are very much dependent on testimony, and that we may be deceived; especially in those controverted elections in which all manner of falsehoods are invented and vended, wholesale and retail, against some of the most distinguished men of our country: but after all, we must exercise our candour and best discretion, as we do in other matters of belief. We must weigh evidence, and depend most on those who appear the most competent and credible witnesses. It will be natural for us to believe a man's neighbours and acquaintances in preference to strangers. When we have employed the lights afforded us for the illumination of our minds, we shall feel peace of conscience, if we withhold our vote from every one whom we believe to be an immoral man.

Come then, fellow Christians, and friends of good morals in society, let us determine thus far to unite; for thus far we may, and ought to, and shall unite, if we duly weigh the importance of a good moral character in a ruler. Let no love of *the integrity of a party* prevent you from striking out the name of every dishonest and base man from your ticket. You have a right to choose, and you glory in your freedom: make then your own election: and when all good

men act on this principle it will not be a vain thing. Candidates then, must be moral men, or seem to be, or they will not secure an election.

Moral character has now *some* influence in our elections, but not that place which it deserves. The law of public opinion excludes confirmed sots, and persons judicially convicted of high crimes and misdemeanors against the State; but it ought to render the election of all profane swearers, notorious Sabbath breakers, seducers, slanderers, prodigals and riotous persons, as well as *the advocates of duelling*, impracticable. I humbly entreat, that all who reverence the Lord's day, will abstain from supporting by their suffrages the open violaters of the fourth commandment; that no sober man would vote for a tippler; that no lover of domestic purity would vote for one whom he knows to be lewd; and that no lover of order would support the profligate. Is this asking too much from the friends of good morals? Are the openly wicked fit to rule a moral and religious people? Cannot drunkenness, gambling, debauchery, and habitual contempt for the Sabbath, be banished, by the suffrages of a moral people, from our halls of legislation and benches of justice? "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn." "If a ruler hearken to lies, all his servants are wicked."

3. All who profess to be Christians of any denomination ought to agree that they will support no man as a candidate for any office, who is not professedly friendly to Christianity, and a believer in divine Revelation. We do not say that true or even pretended Christianity shall be made a constitutional test of admission to office; but we do affirm that Christians may in their elections lawfully prefer the avowed friends of the Christian religion to Turks, Jews, and Infidels. Turks, indeed, might naturally prefer Turks, if they could elect them; and Infidels might prefer Infidels; and I should not wonder if a conscientious Jew should prefer a ruler of his own religious faith; but it would be passing strange if a Christian should not desire the election of one friendly to his own system of religion. While every religious system is tolerated in our country, and no one is established by law, it is still possible for me to think, that the friend of Christi-

anity will make a much better governor of this commonwealth or President of the United States, than the advocate of Theism or Polytheism. We will not pretend to search the heart; but surely all sects of Christians may agree in opinion, that it is more desirable to have a Christian than a Jew, Mohammedan, or Pagan, in any civil office; and they may accordingly settle it in their minds, that they will never vote for any one to fill any office in the nation or state, who does not profess to receive the Bible as the rule of his faith. If three or four of the most numerous denominations of Christians in the United States, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Methodists and Congregationalists for instance, should act upon this principle, our country would never be dishonoured with an *avowed infidel* in her national cabinet or capitol. The Presbyterians alone could bring *half a million of electors* into the field, in opposition to any known advocate of Deism, Socinianism, or any species of avowed hostility to the truth of Christianity. If to the denominations above named we add the members of the Protestant Episcopal church in our country, the electors of these five classes of true Christians, united in the sole requisition of apparent friendship to Christianity in every candidate for office whom they will support, could govern every public election in our country, without infringing in the least upon the charter of our civil liberties. To these might be added, in this State and in Ohio, the numerous German Christians, and in New York and New Jersey the members of the Reformed Dutch Church, who are all zealous for the fundamental truths of Christianity. What should prevent us from co-operating in such a union as this? Let a man be of good moral character, and let him profess to believe in and advocate the Christian religion, and we can all support him. At one time he will be a Baptist, at another an Episcopalian, at another a Methodist, at another a Presbyterian of the American, Scotch, Irish, Dutch, or German stamp, and always a friend to our common Christianity. Why then should we ever suffer an enemy, an open and known enemy of the true religion of Christ, to enact our laws or fill the executive chair? Our Christian rulers will not oppress Jews or Infidels; they will *kiss the Son and serve the Lord*; while we have the best security for their fidelity to our republican, and I may say scriptural forms of government.

It deprives no man of his right for me to prefer a Christian to an Infidel. If Infidels were the most numerous electors, they would doubtless elect men of their own sentiments; and unhappily such men not unfrequently get into power in this country, in which ninety-nine hundredths of the people are believers in the divine origin and authority of the Christian religion. If hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens should agree with us in an effort to elect men to public office who read the Bible, profess to believe it, reverence the Sabbath, attend public worship, and sustain a good moral character, who could complain? Have we not as much liberty to be the supporters of the Christian cause by our votes, as others have to support anti-christian men and measures?

Let us awake, then, fellow Christians, to our sacred duty to our Divine Master; and let us have no rulers, with our consent and co-operation, who are not known to be avowedly Christians.

It will here be objected, that frequently we must choose between two or more candidates who are in nomination, or must lose our votes; and that no one of the candidates may be of the right religious and moral character.

I must answer, that every freeman is bound to give his voice in such a manner as he judges will best conduce to the public good; and that it is not usually beneficial to give a suffrage for one whose election is wholly out of the question. If no good man is in nomination he must choose the least of two natural evils, and support the better man to exclude the worse. But I pray you, who make, or should make, our nominations? Are they not the people who select their own candidates? And are not the majority of the people in profession Christians? The influence of the friends of Christ ought to be exerted, known, and felt *in every stage* of our popular elections. If we intend to have our civil and religious liberty continued to us, and to transmit our institutions unimpaired to posterity, we must not suffer immoral, unprincipled, and irreligious men to nominate themselves to office, and then tell us, that we must elect them or have no rulers.

We have good men in abundance to fill all civil offices, from the highest to the lowest; and it is the fault of all

the numerous Christians of our country if such are not elected.

It will be objected that my plan of a truly Christian party in politics will make hypocrites. We are not answerable for their hypocrisy if it does. There is no natural tendency in the scheme to make men deceivers; and if real enemies of the Christian religion conceal their enmity, that concealment is for the public good. We wish all iniquity, if not exterminated, may, as if ashamed, hide its head. It will be well for our country when all men who expect office are under the necessity of appearing honest, sober, pure, benevolent, and religious. It will be well for us when men cannot expect to retain, if they for a time occupy high places, by bribery, deception, coalition, and hypocrisy. It is most of all desirable that public officers SHOULD BE good men, friends of God, followers of Jesus Christ, and lovers of their country; but it is a matter of thankfulness if they are constrained TO SEEM such persons; for in this way vice, and the propagation of vice by evil example, is prevented. It will be objected, moreover, that my scheme of voting on political elections according to certain fixed religious principles, will create jealousies among the different denominations of Christians. But why should it? Our rulers which we have elected are of some, or of no religious sect. If they are of no religious denomination, they belong to the party of infidels. If they are of any one of the denominations of true Christians, it is better, in the judgment of all true Christians, that they should be of that one company than in the fellowship of infidels. Let a civil ruler, then, be a Christian *of some sort*, we will all say, rather than not a Christian of any denomination. If we fix this as a principle of our political morality, we shall all be gratified in turn, and in part, by having Christian rulers of our own description.

I am free to avow, that other things being equal, I would prefer for my chief magistrate, and judge, and ruler, a sound Presbyterian; and every candid religionist will make the same declaration concerning his own persuasion; but I would prefer a religious and moral man, of any one of the truly Christian sects, to any man destitute of religious principle and morality.

Suffer, my Christian fellow-citizens, a word of exhortation. Let us all be Christian politicians; and govern ourselves by supreme love to our blessed Master, whether we unite in prayers or in the election of our civil rulers. Let us be as conscientiously religious at the polls as in the pulpit, or house of worship. This course of conduct will promote good government and true religion in our country at the same time. Our public rulers then will prove a terror to them who do evil, and a praise to them who do well. Let us choose men who dare to be honest in their own religious creed, while they are too much of Christians and of republicans, to attempt to lord it over the faith of others. Let us never support by our votes any immoral man, or any known contemner of any of the fundamental doctrines of Christ, for any office: and least of all for the Presidency of these United States; for "blessed are they who put their trust in Christ." The people who with their rulers *kiss the Son*, shall experience special divine protection, and be a praise in the whole earth. Let us elect men who dare to acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ for their Lord in their public documents. Which of our Presidents has ever done this? It would pick no infidel's pocket, and break no Jew's neck, if our President should be so singular as to let it be known, that he is a *Christian* by his Messages, and an advocate for the Deity of Christ by his personal preference of a Christian temple to a Socinian conventicle. It would be no violation of our national constitution, if our members of Congress should quit reading of newspapers and writing letters on the Lord's day, at least during public worship in the Hall of Representatives.

If all our great men should set a holy example of reverence for the Sabbath and the worship of Almighty God, it would not convert them into tyrants; it would not make our national government a religious aristocracy; it would not violate our federal constitution.

We are a Christian nation: we have a right to demand that all our rulers in their conduct shall conform to Christian morality; and if they do not, it is the duty and privilege of Christian freemen to make a new and a better election.

May the Lord Jesus Christ for ever reign in and over these United States, and call them peculiarly his own.
Amen.

APPENDIX,

DESIGNED TO VINDICATE THE LIBERTY OF CHRISTIANS, &c.

The preceding discourse, and the author of it, have been publicly charged, in many of the News Papers, and lately, before the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with advocating THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE, and the establishment of a predominant religious sect by civil authority. The perusal of the sermon, which is now reprinted without alteration, as it was delivered from the pulpit, and first published in *The Philadelphian*, will satisfy any candid mind, that this allegation is UTTERLY FALSE. Nothing more is claimed for Christians in the Discourse than our political institutions secure alike to Christians and Infidels of every description; the liberty of thinking for themselves, of publishing their opinions, and of acting in conformity with them, in any such manner as will not interfere with the rights of others. An avowed enemy to Christ has *the political liberty* of being an infidel in his opinions; of preferring an infidel for his civil ruler; and of giving his vote in aid of the election of an infidel. I am a Christian in opinion, and claim the right of preferring a Christian to an infidel; and of giving my suffrage only in favour of persons whom I deem friendly to Christianity, and of good moral character. I publish my opinions, and invite my fellow Christians of all denominations, to consider the subject, and, if they shall think proper, fix for themselves the same rules of conduct which I design to regard in my exercise of the elective franchise. What is there, in all this, friendly to a religious establishment of a sect, or the union of Church and State? Are Christians the only men in the community who may not be guided by their judgment, conscience, and choice, in electing their rulers? And what is there, in the foregoing discourse, which should induce any friend of liberty, morality, and the equal rights of his fellow citizens, to vote against the incorporation of the American Sunday School Union, under the pretext that some aspiring Presbyterians and Episcopalians, united in that benevolent Institution, aim at a religious establishment? Surely the discourse advocates no *establishment*, but that of every Christian's own mind in correct principles of action, in relation to political men and measures. But if it did, the Sunday School Union, as Mr. Duncan well argued in the Senate, is not answerable for the opinions of a man, who has no concern in the management of their affairs. Surely the Presbyterians in the Union

would not agree to establish Prelacy; and the Episcopalians would never consent to establish Presbyterianism. Besides, there are several other denominations of Christians represented in the School Union, who would effectually guard against any legislative enactment in favour of any one sect. The Managers of the School Union requested that such privileges of a body corporate might be granted to them, as would enable them in that capacity to hold the property entrusted to them, and publish such books as meet the approbation of the "Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, the Associate Reformed, Lutherans, Congregationalists, German Reformed, Reformed Dutch, Friends, Moravians, Roman Catholics, and we believe others,"* who are united in the Association. Their petition was rejected. Does not this savour of irreligious proscription of a large portion of our fellow citizens, because they are Christian in opinion and practice? Societies for the encouragement of agriculture, the arts and sciences, money-lending, bridge-building, and coal-heaving, can obtain chartered privileges with little difficulty; and what is it but a spirit of anti-christian persecution which denies to a body of men associated for the publication of good books, and the aid of Sabbath Schools, the advantages which are readily accorded to their fellow-citizens engaged in other pursuits? Is the Sunday School Union more dangerous to the liberties of the community than a system of interminable lotteries?

Surely, there must have been some strange influence concerned in opposing the School Union at Harrisburgh; and I should feel ashamed, indeed, were my sermon justly chargeable with any thing which could militate against that grand Nursery of youthful piety in our country.

Circumstances have given my Discourse such notoriety as it would not have obtained in the ordinary course of things. I shall detail some of them.

The Rev. W. T. Brantly, in the *Columbian Star* of June 23d, 1827, a *Religious News-Paper*, published the following article.

“GENERAL JACKSON AND THE BAPTIST PREACHER.

“In the year 1815, it seems, six militia men were executed within the military jurisdiction of the General, for an alleged mutiny at Fort Jackson. In his vindication, he says, that one Harris a Baptist Preacher, was at the head of the mutineers, and leaves it for the public to judge whether ‘This professed ambassador of Christ did not well deserve death for the crimes of robbery and arson and this outrageous mutiny.’ Now we do not intend to call either the justice or the expediency of the transaction into question, nor are we at all concerned with it as a matter affecting the politics of the General. But as Baptists we feel indignant that he should have found it requisite to his own exculpation, to assign us that *Mr. Harris*, and that too upon the mere oscillation of memory. Before he undertook to class this ‘ambassador of Christ,’ as he sneeringly calls him, with any respectable body of Christians, he should have had better evidence of the pretended case.”

The Philadelphian, another *Religious News-Paper*, on the 29th of June last, copied the foregoing article from the *Star*. In the establish-

* Memorial of the American Sunday School Union.

ment and patronage of the *Philadelphian* I had made some exertions, and felt unwilling that it should do injury to what I deemed a good cause. On the 30th of June, therefore, I addressed to the Editor of the *Philadelphian* the following Note, which was published on the 6th of July.

"GENERAL JACKSON AND THE BAPTIST PREACHER AGAIN.

Mr. Editor—Your extract from the *Columbian Star*, inserted in the last *Philadelphian*, would lead a stranger to General Jackson to suppose, that he would speak sneeringly of the ambassadors of Christ, the ministers of the gospel. Permit me to assure you that General Jackson is a friend and supporter of Christianity, and that no man treats those who may lawfully claim to be ministers of Christ with more respect. This is true of every denomination of Christian ministers: but if he abhorred the conduct of a "professed ambassador of Christ," who proved himself unfit to live in civil society by committing such crimes as the Divine Lawgiver of Israel punished with death, who will blame him?

The Editor of the *Columbian Star* feels indignant that General Jackson should have classed *Mr. Harris* with the Baptists. What if he did say "that one Harris a Baptist preacher was at the head of the mutineers?" This does not impeach the respectable denomination of Baptists. They do not receive to their fellowship every preacher who advocates immersion: and yet every such person might with propriety be called a Baptist preacher. I once heard in the vicinity of General Jackson's residence a Baptist preacher who was a Socinian, and which is rather remarkable for a Socinian, a downright blockhead; but because this man held the peculiarities of the Baptists on the subject of Baptism, it did not follow that he was associated with the great body of Baptists in the United States.

"There were a few years ago hundreds of Baptists in the western country, so essentially unsound in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, that the Baptists in the Northern and Middle States would not, I am sure, have admitted them into their communion. There are Presbyterian preachers, as well as Baptist preachers, who are not owned by any extensive denomination of Christians: there are even deposed Presbyterian preachers; and there may be deposed Baptist preachers, of whom any good man may speak with disrespect, *without sneering at the gospel ministry.*

"That *Mr. Harris* was, or was not a Baptist, I do not affirm; but of this I am confident, that General Jackson had reason to think him a Baptist preacher, and a *pretended* ambassador of Christ. The real ministers of the Gospel of Christ he reverences and esteems; and when opportunity presents in the most serious and respectful manner waits on their ministrations.

EZRA STILES ELY."

Philadelphia, June 30th, 1827.

On the 4th of July I preached the foregoing Discourse; and on the 20th and 27th of July it appeared in the *Philadelphian*. My Note above copied, no doubt, was considered as a commentary on my sermon; for without it, I certainly should not have been accused, as I have been in many Administration News-Papers, with prostituting the pulpit for

the basest of purposes. The Discourse itself does not name any candidate for a public office; and now I may be permitted to say that if His Excellency, John Quincy Adams, is known and believed to sustain a better moral and religious character than General Andrew Jackson, then my Discourse on the 4th of July, decidedly favours the present incumbent of the Presidential office more than the HERO OF NEW-ORLEANS.

On the 7th of February, 1828, while the bill to incorporate the Trustees of the School Union was pending in the Senate at Harrisburg, a SHOW BILL was laid on the desks of the members, of which the following is a copy: viz.

“SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,
OR
UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

“Your Board have felt desirous therefore not only of furnishing their own schools with suitable books; but of introducing such books into schools of a different description, and of rendering them so abundant as to *force out of circulation* those which tend to mislead the mind.”—“They have not been backward therefore to assume the high responsibility of revising and altering the books they have published wherever alterations seemed necessary.”

Sunday S. Union 2d Report, page V.

“While the Committee feel the immense responsibility which they assume, in becoming **DICTATORS TO THE CONSCIENCES** of thousands of immortal beings, on the great and all important subject, of the welfare of their souls; while they dread the consequences of uttering **FORGERIES**, or giving their sanction to misrepresentations of the glorious truth of the gospel, they are not backward to become the responsible *arbiters* in these high points, rather than tamely issue sentiments which in their consciences **THEY BELIEVE** to be false or inconsistent with the purity of divine truth, in preparing works for the press, the utmost liberty is used with regard to whatever is republished by them.” Catal. A. S. S. U. 1826.

“These institutions may terminate in an *organized system of mutual co-operation* between ministers and private christians, so that every church shall be a disciplined army, where every one knows his place, and where every one has a place and a duty in the grand onset against sin.”

“**IN TEN YEARS, OR CERTAINLY IN TWENTY, THE POLITICAL POWER OF OUR COUNTRY WOULD BE IN THE HANDS OF MEN WHOSE CHARACTERS HAVE BEEN FORMED UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF SABBATH SCHOOLS.**” p. 93, Appendix to 2d An. Rep. S. S. U. 1826.

“The annual report of the Managers was then read by the Rev. Dr. Ely, of the Third Presbyterian Church, by whom it was written.” Page XVII. Report of 1827.

Extracts from a Sermon delivered by the Rev. Dr. Ely, July, 1827. . See Reformer Page 135. Vol. 8th.

“Our rulers, like any other members of the community, who are under law to God as rational beings, and under law to Christ, since they have the light of Divine Revelation, ought to search the Scriptures, assent to the truth, profess faith to Christ, keep the Sabbath holy to God, pray in private and in the domestic circle, attend to the public ministry of the word, **BE BAPTIZED, and CELEBRATE THE LORD’S SUPPER.**”

“In other words our Presidents, Secretaries of the Government, Senators, and other Representatives in Congress, Governors of States, Judges, *State Legislators, Justices of the Peace, and City Magistrates*, are just as much bound as any other persons in the United States, to be **ORTHODOX IN THEIR FAITH.**”——

“I propose, Fellow Citizens, a new sort of Union, or, if you please, a *Christian party in Politics*, which I am exceedingly desirous all good men in our country

should join, not by subscribing a Constitution and the formation of a new Society, but by *adopting, avowing, and determining* to act upon truly religious principles in *all civil matters.*"

"The *Presbyterians* alone could bring **HALF A MILLION OF ELECTORS** into the field."—

"The electors of these five classes of true Christians, united in the sole requisition of *apparent* friendship to Christianity in every Candidate for office whom they will support, **COULD GOVERN EVERY PUBLIC ELECTION IN OUR COUNTRY**, without infringing in the least upon the Charter of our civil liberties."

"It will be objected that my plan of a truly Christian party in Politics will make *Hypocrites*. We are not answerable for their hypocrisy, if it does."

"I am free to avow, that other things being equal, I would prefer for my Chief Magistrate, and Judge, and Ruler, a **SOUND PRESBYTERIAN**.

"Suffer my Christian Fellow-Citizens, a word of Exhortation: *Let us all be Christian Politicians.*"

"*Let us be us conscientiously religious at the POLLS, as in the pulpit, or House of Worship.*"



"The whole number of scholars in Philadelphia, is not less than 12,000, and probably exceed that number. *The estimate for this State, in connexion with the Union, is 480 schools, 4459 teachers, and 34,261 scholars.*" page viii. 3d report S. S. Union.

The Union has issued this year 1,616,796 publications, "which added to those issued by the society in the two preceding years, make a grand total of 3,741,849." 3d Report, p. 1.

On the subject of this extraordinary document, and in favour of the desired act of Incorporation, Mr. Duncan, a Senator from this city, who faithfully represented the great body of his constituents, and who with Peter Hay, Esq. one of the Senators from the county of Philadelphia, voted in such a manner as to deserve the thanks of all the friends of the Sunday School Union throughout our country, made the following remarks, which are extracted from "The Harrisburgh Chronicle."

A number of benevolent individuals, Mr. Duncan said, had associated together, and established the Sunday School Union. Their object was general diffusion of education and the spread of knowledge. It was the duty of representatives in a christian community to encourage the establishment of institutions, having for their object the dissemination of religious information, and in addition to this, they could not possess a higher claim to the character of republicans, than by laying a sure and broad foundation for the perpetuity of the government in the intelligence of the country. For these reasons he was in favor of incorporating the American Sunday School Union. He confessed that he might have taken a wrong view of it; but he could not persuade himself that any of the dangers apprehended would be realized. It seemed to him altogether illusory that any religious tyranny would grow out of this incorporation. Such an objection to it had been urged in the remonstrances, and this morning a letter headed *Union of Church and State* had been thrown on the desks of the members, intending to operate something like a scare crow upon this subject; it reminded him of the placards exhibited on the days of election, and all that was wanting to make it perfect was to have a likeness of poor Dr. Ely placed at the top in the shape of a Pope.

The only objection, and the one pertinaciously urged, against the society is, that it has been laboring to establish a union of church and state. If that objection were removed, there was no doubt but a grant of the powers contained in this act would be permitted. Now Mr. D. said all history proved that it never entered into the plans of those who meditated a union of church and state, to commence their labors by enlightening the ignorant. The ignorance of the many, acted upon

by the knowledge of the few, was the engine with which the few had erected a tyranny over the consciences of the many. This was not to be accomplished by the diffusion of knowledge: no set of men would be guilty of such an act of folly, as to attempt it: the means would mar the end. And if, on the present occasion, he should satisfy the members that there was no sectarianism to be promoted by the passage of this bill, he trusted that the great obstacle would be removed.

In order to determine how far they ought to extend encouragement to religious institutions, they must look to the constitution. That instrument had thrown a barrier around the rights of conscience. It is declared in Art. 9, §3 of the constitution "that no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of public worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; that no human authority can in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishments or modes of worship." This injunction, Mr. D. said, prohibited a preference, by law, of any one mode of religious worship over another, but it is also implied that the necessary aids should be afforded to all modes of worship.— And this idea was supported by the provision of Art. 7, §3 of the constitution.— "The rights, privileges, immunities and estates of religious societies and corporate bodies shall remain, as if the constitution of the state had not been altered or amended." Indeed there could be no doubt, but that in this christian community, where the legislature stood as the guardian of the public morals, that every facility should be given to promote the labors of religious societies. This, then, being the fact, the only enquiry was, were the provisions of this bill at variance with the constitution? He asked members to compare the bill with the constitution. So long as they avoided ecclesiastical encroachment, they were under an obligation to encourage and give effect to every institution that would be likely to operate beneficially on the morals of the country. Did they ever deny to a church, no matter what might be its peculiar doctrines, the facilities of an act of incorporation to enable the trustees to manage its secular concerns? And when they had incorporated one, they would have violated the constitution if they had not made provision for incorporating all. He asked, after the thousands of churches that had been incorporated, what good ground there could be for alarm, when application for incorporating a religious society was made? He believed that there never had been before so much alarm on account of an incorporation, as was witnessed in the present instance. Had they not incorporated a theological seminary? The general assembly of the Presbyterian church, which comprehended all the churches of that most numerous denomination of Christians in the United States, whose object was to propagate their own peculiar religious tenets, had also been incorporated. He asked whether they were not every day further from ecclesiastical tyranny?— The Presbyterian churches, and bible societies, and missionary societies, spread over the country, contained in their history sufficient evidence that they had not intermeddled with the political relations of the country, nor grasped at civil power.

If there was no danger then from an incorporated Presbyterian church, so powerful in numbers: from a bible society having power to hold real estate of \$10,000 income a year; if, in New York, a society having a revenue of under its control, no bad effects had been produced, what danger could arise from the present incorporation, whose simple object was the instruction of youth?— When the members of this society belong to different sects, all united for the common object of instructing youth, and that object unquestionably for the good of society, why should fears of ecclesiastical tyranny be excited? Why was the phantom of ecclesiastical tyranny conjured up in this instance, when others had been allowed to pass without objection? In order to convey the produce of the country to market they had incorporated companies, by whom turnpike roads had been constructed; and when individuals came before them, asking for the same facilities to improve the avenues to the minds of the youth of the country, why should they be refused? For his own part, Mr. D. said, he could not imagine how this institution could exercise any more dangerous influence than other societies, possessing an equal amount of capital.

Mr. Duncan returned to the letter to which he had before slightly alluded. He did not know from whom it came, but it comprehended the principal objections

that had been urged against this bill. He asked attention to the extracts contained in the letter. If the object of this association was to establish a hierarchy, would they make use of such language? This very open and undisguised language contained in itself evidence that no such intention as that imputed to them was harboured by the members of this association. The first extract says "Your board have felt desirous, therefore, of not only furnishing their own schools with suitable books, but of introducing such books into schools, of a different description, and of rendering them so abundant as to *force out of circulation* those which tend to mislead the mind." "They have not been backward, therefore, to assume the high responsibility of revising and altering the books they have published, wherever alterations seemed necessary." Before the establishment of the Sunday School Union, Mr. D. said, the books used in the Sunday schools were of a character calculated to inculcate sectarian feelings. Since the establishment of the Sunday School Union, the books circulated have not been peculiarly favourable to any one sect, but have been selected with a view to convey religious instruction without reference to the peculiar doctrines of any sect. And why, when the opposers of this incorporation had been so industrious in hunting up something to the prejudice of the institution, did they not make some extracts from the books circulated by the Sunday School Union? The reason was at hand, these books did not inculcate the peculiar tenets of any sect. If objections, then, were made to this institution, founded upon letters and reports with which it had nothing to do, instead of bringing into question the books that it had circulated, was not a conclusion the most favorable to be inferred from this very course? The simple fact was, the Sunday School Union only printed and circulated books that could be afforded cheap, for the use of schools: and if one word of sectarianism could be pointed to in them, he would give up the argument: on this issue he would be willing to rest the decision.

As he had before said, before the establishment of the Sunday School Union, books were put into the hands of youth by individuals with a view of spreading the tenets of the religious sect to which they belonged. Now there was not a book circulated by them containing an objectionable passage.

Mr. D. read another extract—"While the committee feel the immense responsibility which they assume, in becoming dictators to the consciences of thousands of immortal beings, on the great and all important subject of the welfare of their souls; while they dread the consequences of uttering forgeries, or giving their sanction to misrepresentations of the glorious truth of the gospel, they are not backward to become the responsible arbiters in these high points: rather than tamely issue sentiments which in their consciences they believe to be false or inconsistent with the purity of divine truth, in preparing works for the press, the utmost liberty is used with regard to whatever is republished by them."

Now, Mr. D. said, it might appear that this passage from a preface to the catalogue of the Sunday School Union, favoured the idea of sectarianism, but by examining the whole preface it was quite manifest that they meant nothing more, by proclaiming themselves dictators to the consciences of thousands of immortal beings, than that the publishing and circulating books filled with moral and religious instruction, would enlighten the minds of thousands, without any reference to sectarian tenets.—Such was the only sense intended at the time by the person who wrote it. Again, another extract in this letter says—"These institutions may terminate in an organized system of mutual co-operation between ministers and private christians, so that every church shall be a disciplined army, where every one knows his place, and where every one has a place and a duty in the grand onset against sin."—Could any one, Mr. D. asked, object that an army should be raised, and warfare be waged against sin? Was not this warranted by the language of scripture itself?—Further, "In ten years, or certainly in twenty, the political power of our country would be in the hands of men whose characters have been formed under the influence of Sabbath Schools."—Here again, Mr. D. said, it had been supposed that this sentiment proceeded from the managers of the Sunday School Union: but what was the fact? A clergyman in his zeal writes a letter, filled with the most sanguine predictions with regard to the Sunday Schools: but does the Sunday School Union adopt his language? No such thing.

The letter is published, as from a clergyman in Connecticut to a member of the board, it was a mere letter from a clergyman, a member of an auxiliary society in Connecticut, who had nothing to do with the government of the Schools.

But, Mr. Duncan said, a sermon of Dr. Ely had been dissected, and a variety of extracts from it presented in this letter. If every indiscretion committed by clergymen should be set down as the fault of the Sunday School Union, the case would be a hard one. Dr. Ely was a man of talents and respectability, but he had some eccentricities. The sermon in question was delivered at Norristown on last 4th of July occasion, and went to favor the election of General Jackson. The design appeared to be, to establish the principle that none but religious men ought to be elected as rulers, and to shew that General Jackson was a religious man. This might be indiscreet zeal in Dr. Ely, but the Sunday School Union was not answerable for it. He, Mr. D. had, some time ago seen in a newspaper the account of a debate, in which a member of the house of representatives had laid down the qualifications of a clerk of the house: the first was to be competent, 2d he must have a family—3d it was necessary to be a good *Jackson man*. Now was the house of representatives to be saddled with this doctrine, because it had been advanced by a member? There would be just the same degree of propriety in that, as if the sentiments of Dr. Ely's sermon should be visited upon the Sunday School Union.

The danger of ecclesiastical tyranny growing out of this institution might be estimated from the variety of sects to which the managers of the Sunday School Union belonged. Mr. Duncan named the managers, and stated their respective religious professions, from which it appeared, that there were Episcopalians 9, Presbyterians 8, 4 Methodists and 5 Baptists.—Those he said, who were most active in opposing this incorporation, knew very well that the only way to defeat it was by stirring up sectarian jealousies and to instil into the minds of the credulous the belief that the design of this institution was to form a connection of Church and State. The composition of the board of managers fully refuted any design of the sort. For his own part, he cared not what might be the religious tenets of the individuals by whom the schools should be conducted, so that the advantages of education were diffused among the people. Children improved in a tenfold degree in these schools more than in common schools.

He did not believe that the instructors attempted to distil sectarian principles into their pupils, as Sunday Schools were now established. If any danger was to be apprehended from these schools, as they had heretofore existed and been conducted, that danger would be removed now that they would be thrown upon the legislature, and obliged to conform to the objects of the institution as expressed in their constitution: they would be the mere creatures of the legislative will; they would be in their hands, to be wielded as they pleased, and to be crushed at once if their operations should be considered prejudicial to the public interests.

Mr. Duncan having concluded his Speech, J. HARE POWELL, Esq. a Senator from this city, made, according to the report of *the Harrisburgh Chronicle*, the following oration.

Unhappily I am constrained (said Mr. P.) to contend not only against persons whose motives I cannot condemn, but I am coerced to oppose my personal friends in a misguided effort to promote the cause of religion, important alike to all conditions of men.

It is not against Sabbath Schools, for of them I honestly approve, nor is it against the patriotic gentlemen whose names are embodied in your bill, that I shall say aught, which even the cavils of fanaticism can condemn.

If I were to seek security for good intentions, I should find it in their high standing as individuals, in their good works as members of religious associations, wherein many of them have been exalted by their charity and christian zeal. I trust sir, I shall be defended from all suspicion of hostility to Sunday School institutions—of desire to cast oblique censure upon the parties, who by their influence give countenance, and by their purses afford aid, to the religious instruction of the

ignorant, fitting them to endure the sad trials of this world, and preparing them for the object of our being—happiness in that which is to come.

When I accuse their *agents* of machinations, I do it fearlessly—I am prepared to establish that which I utter by their own language—by tracing a systematic effort, to boldly assume the despotism of “dictators,” daringly avowing their object, exclusion from “all the political power of the country,” of all men whose consciences have been warped—whose characters have not been formed, whose devotion has not been secured by their system of education—their rites of “baptism”—their modes of worship—their notions of the trinity and of transubstantiation, promulgated by certain blind zealots, who would make all men and all doctrines subservient to an established “orthodox” creed.

We have had an elaborate and eloquent exposition of the wishes of the Sunday School Union—an ingenious attempt, to confute by anticipation all which it is supposed the opponents of the bill can adduce in support of the grounds which they have assumed. With great deference for the sagacity, with the utmost respect for the ability of the accomplished advocate of the Sunday School Union, I venture to assert that he will not attempt the refutation of that which I am about to offer—that which they have written—that which they have published—that which they have put upon our desks to enable us to measure the extent of their usefulness, to decide upon the tendency of their efforts, the great object of their plans. He resolutely denies that one sentence can be shown—that a single fact can be brought in support of the positions, which he has assailed. [Here Mr. Powel turned towards Mr. Duncan saying] permit me sir, to ask, will you deny that this substantial octavo entitled “the Sunday School Union Magazine” is authentic—that this collection of Sunday School documents: of Sunday School Union reports—of Sunday School precepts—of Sunday School Union political disquisitions, and plans, is sanctioned by the managers whose names are paraded at length in various parts of the work? Can my friend deny, that *it* is worthy of belief—that *it* is a compilation of such miscellaneous papers—of such pathetic addresses—and of such documents as they consider illustrative of their intentions, or conducive to their ends? I find in this work, 2d report of the American Sunday School Union, page 93, May 1826:—“These institutions may terminate in an organized system of mutual co-operation, between ministers and private christians, so that every church shall be a disciplined army, where every one *knows* his place, and where every one has a place, and a duty, in the grand onset against sin.” “In ten years, or certainly in twenty, the political power of our country, would be in the hands of men, whose characters have been formed under the influence of Sunday Schools.” And in page 5, of the same work: “And the experience of the civilized world demonstrates that the character of the man is built upon the principles instilled into the mind of the child. Your board have felt desirous therefore, not only of furnishing their own schools with suitable book, but of introducing such books into schools *of a different description*, and of rendering them so abundant as to force out of circulation, those which tend to mislead the mind. They have not been backward, therefore, to assume the high responsibility of revising and altering the books they have published, wherever alterations seem necessary. They have chosen to do this rather than tamely issue sentiments, which in their consciences they believe to be false or inconsistent with the purity of divine truth.” That this is not a vain boast, they have proved by their 3d report of 1827, on the 1st page, I find [Here Mr. Powel read another book which had been laid upon his desk] that “1,616,796 publications which added to those issued by the society in the two preceding years, make a grand total of 3,741,341.” Not satisfied, sir, with this vainglorious display in their regular reports, republished and circulated in their Magazines, they have appended a catalogue to one of their works wherein they have reiterated in stronger terms, if practicable, the great object of their association. [Here Mr. Powel again turning to Mr. Duncan said] will the gentleman receive this as a fact? Will he consider their own statements as worthy of regard? Or will he contend, that in the assumption of the power to alter books, to change the *ideas* of the author, they have contrived to make their advocate consider them possessed of authority to alter the vocabulary of the language which we use. If I were to call them dictators, I should be accused of injustice, yet they say in their catalogue “while the con-

mittee feel the immense responsibility which they assume, in becoming *dictators to the consciences of thousands of immortal beings, on the great and all important subject of the welfare of their souls*, while they dread the consequences of uttering *forgeries*, or giving their sanction to the misrepresentation of the glorious truths of the gospel, they are not backward to become the responsible arbiters in these high points, rather than tamely issue sentiments which in their consciences they believe to be false or inconsistent with the purity of divine truth." They continue in the same page to assert, "in preparing works for the press, the utmost liberty is used with regard to whatever is republished by them:" And "in changing even the *ideas*." They alter the arrangement, mutilate the work, and change the ideas, yet retain the name of the author, thus making established names and forced constructions of received doctrines, subservient to their dictatorial will.

We are told that the managers did not write the passage predicting that political influence which "in ten years is to assume all the power of the country," and in ten years is to turn us all out of our seats. We are told that it was written by a clergyman: is it on that account of less force? It has been urged that it was written by a *Connecticut* clergyman. The gentleman has forbore to make comment on this point; he exultingly exclaimed it was only the production of a Sunday School teacher; would he have us infer that it should, therefore, be rejected as futile and unworthy of belief? No sir, he will not venture to tell us this; he has told us much which I did not expect to hear; he has introduced an Episcopal Bishop with some irrelevant and harsh remarks which I shall pass by as unworthy of my regard. I am concerned that my friend in his happy vein of sarcasm, has placed Dr. Ely in a ludicrous light, "poor" Dr. Ely as he calls him! Heaven forbid that I should call him poor, or compare him to "a scare crow," or to "the pope"—He has coupled him with Gen. Jackson, and attempted to excite the Jackson feeling in this house: I regret that he has done so, although I well know his appeal will avail nought. I have never seen, sir, any instance, in which that feeling has been excited on this floor, and I am well assured it never will be exerted, except on fit occasions, if such can here arise, in relation to the great contest for political sway. I cannot conceive by what motive he could be impelled to introduce General Jackson's name, unless it be from the connection in his own mind with the views of the agents of the Sunday School Union, and their determination in "*ten, or at most twenty years*" to establish ecclesiastical domination, and the Union of Church and State. [Here Mr. Powel read from the 3d report of the Sunday School Union, May 1827, page 17.] "The annual report of the board of managers was then read by the Rev. Dr. Ely, of the third Presbyterian church, by whom it was written." I will ask my colleague, is not poor Dr. Ely, by this passage identified with the Sunday School Union, as the expounder of their views, as the writer of their report. [Here Mr. Powel read the following extracts from Dr. Ely's sermon.]

"In other words, our Presidents, Secretaries of the Government, Senators, and other Representatives in Congress, Governors of States, Judges, State Legislators, Justices of the Peace, and City Magistrates, are just as much bound as any other persons in the United States, to be *orthodox* in their faith."

"Our rulers, like any other members of the community, who are under law to God as rational beings, and under law to Christ, since they have the light of divine revelation, ought to search the scriptures, assent to the truth, profess faith in Christ, keep the Sabbath holy to God, pray in private and in the domestic circle, attend on the public ministry of the word, *be baptised and celebrate the Lord's Supper.*"* The electors of these five classes of true Christians, united in the sole requisition of *apparent* friendship to Christianity in every candidate for office whom they will support, *could govern every public election* in our country, without infringing in the least upon the charter of our civil liberties.

The *Presbyterians* alone could bring *half a million of electors into the field.*"

"I propose, fellow citizens, a new sort of union, or, if you please, a *Christian party in politics*, which I am exceedingly desirous all good men in our country should join."

"I am free to avow, that other things being equal, I would prefer for my chief magistrate, and judge, and ruler, a sound Presbyterian.* It will be objected that my plan of a truly Christian party in politics *will make hypocrites*. We are not answerable for their hypocrisy if it does"

We have seen, continued Mr. Powell, that a reverend and erudite gentleman, whose piety and good works might have been taken as guarantee against all danger of clerical violence or sectarian proscription, has boldly exposed the system of tactics, and has designated the modes of attack in which even he, so highly revered, so implicitly obeyed, would employ the "disciplined army where every one has a place, where every one knows his place," to exclude from "all the political power of our country," all men whose characters have not been formed by Sunday Schools. If this gentleman, justly elevated by talents, so highly embellished by learning and so much distinguished by religious sway, be so zealous as to consider ecclesiastical domination the dear object of his career, what may we not suspect, what ought we not to expect from ignorant and bigotted satellites, radiating light and heat from a grand luminary, a "retrospective theologian," a Machiavelian politician, soaring in regions of visionary philosophy, calling on half a million of followers to rally for the exclusion of all men who are not "orthodox" from the polls.

This reverend and meek christian, we have seen, is not merely an associate of the Sunday School Union—he is their organ—the person selected to compile their report—to read their report—and I have their own authority, to write their report; thus made the guide of the vast machine, prepared to "*force out of circulation,*" all works which they do not approve—to force upon "*Schools of a different description,*" books which they have mutilated, still sanctioned by the authority of the original authors' names, although perverted, and adapted to the tastes of those who are to be trained as implicit believers in that which, the christian pastor happens to deem the orthodox faith.

That the Managers of the Sunday School Union, are full well impressed with the danger of clerical interference, is sufficiently manifest from the clause in their constitution, which admits but laymen as members of their board, and that they apprehend the force of the arguments which such interference would inevitably adduce, in opposition to their prayer for a charter is evident from the fact, that they have told you, that all but laymen are excluded from their board. But it happens that notwithstanding the resolution they have evinced, the acumen they have displayed, the sagacity and determination, with which all these movements are fraught, they have been seduced from their purpose by that good feeling—that christian acquiescence—that high degree of humility which religion imposes, and which her pastors can adroitly turn to any end which they deem good.

They have assured us that all men and all children, and of all denominations are alike objects of their fostering care and that no religious creed—no sectarian feeling, no desire but that of doing good can operate upon their minds. I believe them: they are incapable of falsehood, it is not possible to make them designedly do wrong. I repeat it is not of them I have fear, nor is it of men remarkable as the reverend pastor, that I have dread: for I am assured that he is stimulated but by an honest desire, to make all men christians after his own fashion—to make them all happy in his own way—to make them all orthodox in his own faith; he has told us this, and he has told us the truth. Nor have I objection to the denomination of christians whom he would lead. I am not one of those who would denounce them as sectarians—who are disposed to deny to them the full measure of good intentions and good works. I am, satisfied, Sir, there are no christians whose usefulness here, whose prospects of eternal bliss hereafter, are better established than those of that portion of the community distinguished by that name. Far be it from me to entertain doubt, or tacitly to submit to insinuation which could cast aspersion upon them. I have, Sir, resisted upon this floor, what I conceived to be an attack upon the Trustees and Professors of a neighbouring college, because accidental association and the unalterable affinity of juxta-position, had not failed to operate upon these Presbyterians, as it must do, ever has done and always will do upon all men, whether high churchmen, Mahomedans or Jews.

It is to the casuistical workings of priest craft—the ceaseless efforts of misguided men, whose brains inflamed by any passion, would make them humble and willing tools, prepared either to act as decorated pageants in the grand army, as it is called, in a crusade for political power, or to submit as ejaculating martyrs at the stake, to satisfy the vengeance of religious bigotry and mad zeal. This is strong

language, but, sir, have we not been told that "all the political power in the country within ten or twenty years shall be in the hands of persons whose characters have been formed at Sunday Schools"—formed under the direction of those who can force out of circulation that of which they do not approve—of those who boldly assert that they will force into use that which they have mutilated, and have adapted to their own ends—of those who daringly declare that they are dictators to the consciences of thousands of immortal beings—of those whose organ utters anathemas from the House of God, calling on his followers to form a "christian party in politics," to be supported by half a million of followers—to establish ecclesiastical domination—the rites of baptism—the orthodox faith throughout the land.

Such consequences are not to be apprehended within our day, but they are to be apprehended if we believe the predictions of the pious gentleman, and if we regard the prayer of the petitioners asking a charter, and the bill which they have prepared for our file, authorizing them "forever hereafter to hold all and all manner of lands, tenements and hereditaments," without limitation of time or capital, but merely acquiescing in the limitation of monied income, not to exceed ten thousand dollars per year.

We are told that no sectarian feeling can operate in the board of managers—that all persons may become contributors—may be made voters, and that no man is disqualified by his religious sentiments from participation in their concerns. Let it be admitted that there is no test at this time in force. But has not their reporter—the accomplished and frank expounder of their views, the Reverend gentleman told us, from the pulpit, in the house of God, that he would marshal his forces,—that he would call on half a million of followers to proscribe, exclude from the highest to the lowest civil offices those who had not been "baptized"—who are not orthodox in their faith—"those who are not Presbyterians". Can it be believed that this gentleman whose character stands so deservedly high for steadiness of purpose, would say that which he did not mean to be seriously received, that having said it, he would not act upon it, or that he acting upon it would disregard the means which we have been told would in ten years give effect to the great end? Would he in his pious endeavours to do that which he conscientiously thinks right, forbear to apply his eloquence? would he not marshal his forces to exclude from the list of agents, if not from the board of managers, all those whose creed, whose purposes and whose objects were not consistent with his own?

But, sir, how is the fact? A reverend gentleman has already been employed with a large salary "to take the field:" a missionary fund has been established, collected from the auxiliary schools connected with the vast machine.

A grand system of proselytism has been formed—rules are given for the modes of attack upon the old and the young—"the hour of affliction, the moments of despair," are pointed out as fit occasions to grasp the victims of sectarian zeal.

I must again absolve the gentleman at the head of this institution; and, Sir, most emphatically do I except those, whose names are embodied in your bill with their consent, and those whose names are so *embodied without their consent*, and those who have contributed by their money, and their countenance, to the objects of the Sunday School Union—from all suspicion of aught unjust or unfair.

I shall be forgiven, I trust, by them, if in obedience to my oath to defend the constitution, I oppose a deliberate plan to exclude in ten or twenty years, any set of men, whether educated or uneducated, whether "orthodox" or heterodox, from the political power of the country, a plan avowedly to operate in destroying the freedom of the press—in fact to establish ecclesiastical domination throughout the land.

The Honourable Mr. Wise followed in the train of Mr. Powell, and announced a wonderful discovery. "But, Sir," said he, "this is not all that has been discovered.—Whether it be the intention to form a union of Church and State, can only be known or suspected from circumstances. I take this opportunity of noticing a sermon delivered by the celebrated Doctor Ely, on the 4th of July last in the seventh

Presbyterian Church. He was pleased to say, 'That our presidents, secretaries, representatives, judges, justices and city magistrates are bound to be *orthodox* in their faith.' I concur with him in opinion, that true piety and faith in the Saviour should belong not only to our rulers but to all of us." In this one sentence Mr. *Wise* indicates that his name is not wholly a *misnomer*. He then proceeds to quote the passages in my discourse which are above cited in *the show bill*, and then adds,

"Sentiments in direct opposition to the sacred charter of our liberties, which declares, "that no person who acknowledges the being of a God, and a future state of rewards and punishments, shall be disqualified to hold any office or place of trust or profit," and that "Our elections shall be free and equal," but further does this gentleman say, "I am free to declare, I would prefer for my chief magistrate, and judge and ruler, a sound Presbyterian."

I leave this part of the subject without further comment; only observing that the gentleman last spoken of, is the writer of the report and in full confidence and league with the Sunday School Union. If our elections are to be trammelled upon, if our rights are to be invaded, if public opinion is to be forestalled by the adoption of these principles—from such a union may we be delivered."

Let me ask Mr. *Wise* if my preference of a Presbyterian, other things being equal, to a man of different theological opinions *disqualifies* any one from holding an office? That our elections may be free and equal, is it necessary that I should vote for every man, whether *wise* or *other-wise*, to be a ruler? Must I violate our constitutional charter, if I refuse to vote for a man whom I deem not merely worthless, but absolutely a nuisance to civil society?

I should rejoice to believe, on good evidence, that there are none in the Senate of this State who deny "a future state of rewards and punishments;" but confessedly, Mr. *Wise* being my expositor of the constitution, I may refuse to vote for one who does not acknowledge "the being of a God and a future state of rewards and punishments;" and this is no violation of the freedom and equality of our elections. Will Mr. *Wise* have the goodness to inform the republic what part of our constitution it is, which requires a Deist to vote for a Christian, or a Christian for a Deist? Where is our freedom, if we may not, so many of us as are agreed in the propriety of the measure, support a man of good moral character, who is friendly to Christianity in preference to such profane, drunken, scurrilous, and anti-christian characters as are sometimes found in our halls of legislation?

It seems that all the *liberty* which some men conceive that our constitution secures is granted to *the enemies* of Christianity; for they will allow us no liberty to withhold our suffrages from candidates for office whom we think, on account of irreligion and immorality, to be unworthy of public confidence.

I have contended for no other privilege than this, that all good and Christian men, who can coincide with me in judgement, should be at liberty to withhold their votes from candidates whom they do not *choose to elect*, and to confer them on persons whom they may prefer, on account of their morality and religion. *This liberty* it seems we may not exercise, without hearing from the senate chamber the cry of a sage *Wise* man indeed, "our elections are to be trammelled upon;" [pray, what does that mean?] "our rights are to be invaded," and "public opinion is to be forestalled by the adoption of these principles." From

such Senators may our enlightened, Christian people be delivered; not by legislative, not by constitutional disfranchisements, but by the prevalent good sense, and established moral principles of an honourable, but dishonoured community.

The Pennsylvania Reporter of Feb. 15th, from which the sayings of Mr. Wise were cited, ascribes to Mr. Brown the following pertinent language, which bears not on my Sermon, but on the business before the Senate.

“ Now, sir, what is it that the members of the Sunday School Union ask of this Committee? Do they ask you for the privilege of writing, publishing, and disseminating their books throughout the commonwealth or the union? no, they ask you for no such thing; and why, because they have the privilege already to the greatest possible extent.—But, sir, they ask you for an act of incorporation, they ask for the usual corporate privileges—privileges which have been granted to all literary, charitable, and religious societies without distinction, and it is the first time, sir, since I have had the honour of being a representative of the people, yea I might add, since the formation of our most happy system of government, that such objections have been made as those raised to defeat the bill now under consideration.

But it is gratifying, sir, that the opponents of this bill are constrained to admit, that Sunday Schools have done much good, and that many poor and destitute children have been taught through their instrumentality. This being admitted, why refuse an act of incorporation? If the old adage still stands good, that “ the tree is known by its fruit,” why refuse the usual facilities that are given to other societies, to enable them to transact their fiscal concerns. Might not this society with the greatest propriety, say to the opposition in this committee, “ many good works have we done among you, for which of these do you oppose us and reject our application?”

But sir, in my humble opinion, the objection that is urged against this bill, that the society may probably at some future period do much mischief, is one of a most extraordinary nature: they tell us, sir, that there is danger of this institution producing sectarianism, and a thousand other evils that they have conjured up. Indeed sir, they deserve credit for the fertility of imagination, with which they have gone back many centuries to the dark ages of the world, and presented to our view an host of hobgoblins, that had long since been consigned to the shades of forgetfulness, and with this appalling picture of human misery and degradation, they flatter themselves that they will be able to deter us from granting an act of incorporation to the Sunday School Union. But sir, I conceive the gentlemen have been extremely unfortunate in the application of their arguments—for if I know any thing about the natural connection between cause and effect, the very reverse of what they predict, will be the consequence of Sabbath School teaching.

I believe sir, it will be admitted, that ignorance is the parent of bigotry and superstition, and that in proportion as a community becomes enlightened, it is less liable to be led away by what the gentlemen are pleased to call religious fanaticism; now if this be the case, the Sabbath schools are raising the most effectual barrier, that human wisdom could devise, to prevent the very evil so much deprecated by the gentlemen in the opposition, for until the order of nature is inverted, it will never be dangerous to enlighten the minds of our children. Indeed sir, a very large portion of human calamity may and will be prevented by the course of instruction, that is adopted in Sabbath schools; for in this institution children are not only taught to read, but they are instructed in the principles of morality and religion.

But sir, we are told that the incorporation of this institution will have a tendency to produce a union of church and state. I am at a loss to know how the gentlemen have come to this conclusion, as there is nothing in the premises that will warrant it.—So far from there being any danger on this score, the manner of teaching in Sabbath schools will most effectually prevent it, for it is certain as any demonstra-

tion can be, that an enlightened and intelligent community, composed too of different denominations of christians, will never suffer such an unholy alliance. But, Mr. Chairman, why won't the gentlemen oppose this bill on the usual grounds of opposition; if we were to be told in this case, that it would be injudicious to grant this society corporate powers—that it would be unsafe to remove that personal responsibility which now attaches itself to it—Then sir, we could meet the question fairly, and discuss it on its true merits—but sir, I do protest against the introduction of objections to this bill on the score of religion—it is the first time that such objections have been urged against granting a simple act of incorporation and I hope it will be the last.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentlemen in the opposition, to point out what part of the constitution will be violated—which of your laws will be broken—what right or privilege of the citizen will be invaded by this act of incorporation—and if they point out to me all or any of these, then sir, I will go with them in rejecting the bill.”

To the Honourable gentlemen who have introduced my sermon to considerable distinction I tender my thanks, because their strictures, whether just or unjust, will have a tendency to promote the consideration of the truth, and the more extended influence of Christian principle in our future elections.

Some of the errors, however, into which these learned commentators have fallen ought to be corrected.

It is not true that I have ever advocated *the union of Church and State* in any publication from the pulpit or the press: but on the contrary in my discourse on the 4th of July last, the very discourse which is adduced as proof of a disposition friendly to such a union, it is distinctly stated,

“I would guard, however, against misunderstanding and misrepresentation, when I state, that all our rulers ought in their official stations to serve the Lord Jesus Christ. *I do not wish any religious test to be prescribed by constitution, and proposed to a man on his acceptance of any public trust. Neither can any intelligent friend of his country and of true religion desire the establishment of any one religious sect by civil law. Let the religion of the Bible rest on that everlasting rock, and on those spiritual laws, on which Jehovah has founded his kingdom: let Christianity by the Spirit of Christ in her members support herself: LET CHURCH AND STATE BE FOREVER DISTINCT:* but, still, let the doctrines and precepts of Christ govern all men, in their relations and employments.”

It did not suit the convenience of the persons who furnished the Senate with extracts from my sermon, to give them a sight of these lines, which originally stood as they now stand, in immediate connexion with some of the extracts published.

For twenty years past I have publicly returned thanks, on almost every Lord's Day, for our civil and religious liberties, and for our freedom in this happy country from an unhallowed union of Church and State; and I can confidently assure my fellow-citizens, that there is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, neither Minister nor Elder in the Presbyterian Church in the United States, who is an advocate for any establishment of any religious sect by any civil government. Our whole system of Presbyterian Church government coincides with the civil liberty and the representative governments of our country. All our pastors are *chosen* by their congregations, and all our ruling Elders in our Sessions and Presbyteries are the *representatives* of the people.

It is not true that I ever was the *Agent* of the American Sunday-School Union, or “*in full confidence and league*” with that Institution,

in the sense in which two of the Senators would convince their constituents that I am. Last May a committee of the Managers of that union, requested me to compile their annual report for them, from documents which they furnished. That labour I performed. The Managers took my compilation into their own hands; and altered it according to their own pleasure. Subsequently I read the report in public.— At another time, by particular request, I examined a small publication, which they reprinted. This is all the connexion I ever had with the Sunday-school Union, direct, or indirect; if you except the purchase of a few of their books; the obtaining of one donation in books from them for Cantonment Leavenworth in the Missouri Territory; and the contribution, lately, of a small sum to their funds. It is not more than 3 months since I first became a subscriber of any thing to this truly philanthropic charity. I hope, however, in future to become more effectually their fellow servant in their benevolent operations, as some compensation for the injury intended them, and partially done them, by the discharge of broken fragments of my discourse at their devoted head. There is reason to hope, that the resistance which the School Union has experienced in the Senate will commend it to the more ardent friendship of all who love the progress of knowledge, liberty, and piety in our land.

It was an error in the Honourable Mr. Duncan, to speak of my discourse as having been delivered at *Norristown*. He was probably led into this mistake by some representations in the News-Papers of a sermon which I preached in that place on the 2d of September last.

In illustration of the assertion, that we can form correct notions of the moral character of a being whom we have never seen, I reminded my hearers, that they had all formed some conceptions of the moral character of Washington; and latterly of General Jackson. My notions of his character might be correct, or incorrect; but I would tell them an anecdote which I thought conveyed a just idea of him. I then stated what I now reiterate:

That between three and four years prior to the General's being first nominated as a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Sommerville, then an accomplished young officer in the Navy, but since deceased, informed some of my family connexions, that he had lately spent a week in the General's company, at his own house; that the General appeared to him to be greatly changed in several respects; and that the General had said to him, in a very serious and impressive manner, "YOU MAY DEPEND UPON IT, SOMMERVILLE, THAT WITHOUT TRUE RELIGION THERE IS NO HAPPINESS IN THE PRESENT LIFE, AND NONE TO BE EXPECTED IN THE NEXT." I told my hearers, that this is a true saying; and I was aware that coming from a distinguished fellow citizen it might have some influence with *some men* who more regard the word of their deservedly favourite Hero than the word of God.

This statement has been shamefully distorted; but I think the anecdote worthy of any pulpit, and calculated to do good. Would to God that many admirers of General Jackson would record this among many of his patriotic and excellent sentiments, on the tablets of their hearts! They would then cease to think him likely to prove a patron of their exterminating party zeal, and licentious lives. I have repeated the same anecdote, years ago in Flemington, N. J.; and in August last in

Huntingdon in this state. My numerous hearers will recollect the anecdote. If ever the General should be President, as I freely acknowledge it is my hope that he may be, I may predict, from my knowledge of him, without the spirit of prophecy, that he will disappoint many of his friends and foes, by being the impartial, temperate, prudent, and exemplary Chief Magistrate of the whole nation.

Mr. Duncan has intimated that my discourse on the 4th of July, "was preached in favour of the election of General Jackson." How far this is true, every person who will read, may judge for himself.—Those who represent General Jackson as one of the worst of men, must think my sermon a point blank shot into his heart.

Since, however, I have been called in question about my politics before the Senate, I will here state: for I fear nothing from candour; that Mrs. Jackson, (for the politics of the day, include her) is an eminently pious woman, and has sustained this character for about a quarter of a century. On the subject of baptism, I believe she is a Baptist, and has been immersed. I have heard no evil said of her, by those who know her, unless it be this, *that she prefers a prayer-meeting to a palace;* and this will not *sink* her in the estimation of any who do not forget their religion in their politics.

Of the General I shall say, that he is as far from *hypocrisy* as any man living; and shall give a few extracts from some of his letters, which I think will show him in his private character, in a true light. I must beg his pardon for making, without the opportunity of asking his consent, the present use of his friendly communications to me.

Under date of Nashville, April 21st, 1823, he thus writes me on the subject of a clergyman who had been suspended for many years on account of some imputed errors in doctrine;—

"SIR,—Being informed by my friend, the Rev. Mr. C. of this place, that the case of the aged, pious, and reverend Thomas B. Craighead, is to be discussed before the General Assembly at Philadelphia, at its approaching session, I feel it my duty to address you on that subject.

Having known Mr. Craighead from my boyhood,—having been raised in the neighbourhood in which he commenced his ministry;—having been wafted by fortune to this Western Country, in which he had settled himself and presided over a congregation large and respectable;—and having for the last thirty-four years of my life lived within five miles of his house; I am authorized in saying that I have a full knowledge of him, both in his private walks and public ministry. And if we are justified in judging the tree by its fruits, I can with great truth testify, that no man has laboured with more zeal in the ministry, and that none have been more respected for piety, or more revered as Christians, and as men. He has done much good, and would have done still more, but for the unhappy difference which arose between him and some of the clergy in Kentucky on some doctrinal points. This, originating warmth of discussion, was carried, perhaps, too far; and enlisting advocates nearly poised on both sides, limited the extent of his services, and has ended in his suspension for some years:—a circumstance which has been much regretted by a great proportion of the good citizens, and Christian professors here; and has injuriously affected, as I believe, the Presbyterian cause.

To see a venerable man, whose hairs have grown grey in the service of his God; a man whose walks have been the piety, morality, and benevolence of the true religion; respected by all—but deprived of the benefit of communion, and for that which many, very many of the most pious Presbyterians, cannot regard as inconsistent with the Holy Scriptures, which are the guide of all Christians; has filled us here with much regret: and it may be truly said, that nothing would give more general satisfaction, or tend more to the prosperity of this church, than his restoration.

Disunion is evil in both Church and State; and the present is a period, when every means, consistent with the principles of true religion, ought to be employed to restore harmony and union to the Christian cause. 'Tis religion to inculcate charity, and if a brother err, to forgive him. And in the sincere reliance upon those principles, while I shall be acquitted of any view to dictate to the calm deliberation of the Assembly, I hope that this address will be excused from my desire to represent fairly the character of the aged and pious Mr. Craighead. This alone has been my motive; and to have done less would have been injustice to my own feeling, as well as to the interests of the Church."

Under date of Washington, Jan. 1st 1824, on the same subject, the General writes to me, "Before I close this letter, will you again permit me to bring to your recollection the case of my aged and pious friend, the Rev. Mr. Craighead, and request that you will endeavour to have his case finally considered before your next General Assembly? My prayer is, that he may be restored to his Church, and fellowship with the Christian brethren. This, and this alone, can bring his hoary head in peace to the grave."

Suffice it here to say, that soon after this, the case of Mr. Craighead was finally reviewed; he was restored to the ministry and the Presbytery within whose bounds he resided, with the full approbation of the assembly; and has since retired to his everlasting rest.

One short extract more, is from a letter dated at his Hermitage, July 12th 1827, in which the General says,

"Having been educated and brought up under the discipline of the Presbyterian rule (my mother being a member of that Church) I have always had a preference for it. Amongst the greatest blessings secured to us under our Constitution, is the liberty of worshipping God as our conscience dictates. All true Christians love each other, and while here below ought to harmonize; for all must unite in the realms above. I have thought one evidence of true religion is, when all those who believe in the ample atonement of our crucified Saviour are found in harmony and friendship together.

My enemies have charged me with every crime but hypocrisy: I believe they have never alleged this against me: and I can assure you no change of circumstances, no exalted office can work a change upon me. I will remain uniformly the same, whether in the chair of state, or at the Hermitage. My habits are too well fixed now to be altered."

Such as these extracts from his letters, written without any conception of their ever being made public, indicate him to be, I believe General Jackson is. I have never affirmed, that he is a renewed man, by the power of divine grace. That question must be left with himself and his Maker.

I have declared my knowledge of the fact, that he is the avowed friend of Christianity; and I claim the liberty of thinking and speaking as freely on this subject as those numerous Editors of papers, who for the sake of abusing the candidate for the Presidency whom they oppose, have been very abundant in their vituperations of myself.

No office, no worldly emolument do I seek. I feel no conviction of having prostituted the pulpit, for the promotion of sinister, party purposes. My desire is, that correct religious principles may govern myself, and all of my fellow citizens, *in all* the transactions of private and public life. I freely confess that I esteem General Jackson much; and I love my country much; but I love Christ more.