

nected with morality, and both with religion. If the political character of a people is bad, their morals are equally bad, and their religion is good for nothing. The same man who appears in the character of a politician, is also a subject of moral government, and a candidate for immortality. Therefore if he act right or wrong as a politician, he acts equally right or wrong as a subject of God's moral government; his character as a politician will be brought into the grand review at the last day, and his future state will be determined accordingly. This doctrine I am sensible is not agreeable to the practice of some men, who act with a tolerable regard to principles of morality in their common business; but when they get into a political body, relax their ideas of morality, and endeavor to carry a point by any means whatever. Against such an idea of politics, I think it my duty to protest; for I believe that honesty is the best policy, both in private and public life.

"Had the Apostles lived in these days, and among us, who have the privilege of choosing our own rulers, I have no doubt that they would have exhorted us to exercise our privileges by none but honest and lawful means. They would have advised the people to carry the principles of Christian morality to a town meeting as well as to the exchange. They would have advised legislators to carry the same principles to the senate and house of assembly; they would have advised executive and judicial officers to carry the same principles to the bar, to the bench, to the council-board, and to the Governor's chair. They would have advised us to be consistent and uniform in our regards to God and man, in every situation, private or public; and this is the duty of gospel ministers.

"It is very strange that we may not preach on the same subjects which are recommended to us as subjects of prayer. In the annual proclamations for fasts and thanksgivings we are exhorted to pray and give thanks on a great variety of political subjects, foreign and domestic. And what good reason can be given why these same subjects should not be discoursed on, as well as prayed over? It is expected, that we bring them into the pulpit in our prayers, and it is by some people highly resented if we do not. When we have them in our mind as proper subjects for devotion, why should we not speak and discourse on them for the instruction of our hearers? Must we make an address to God on political subjects, and may we not make an address to our brethren on the same subjects."

"But 'there is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, though their teeth are as swords!' And how liberal are some tongues, some pens, and some presses, with their abuse, when we appear warm and zealous in the cause of our country! When we speak or write in support of its liberties, its constitution, its peace and its honor, we are stigmatized as busy-bodies, as tools of a party, as meddling with what does not belong to us, and usurping authority over our brethren.

"Whatever may be the views of those who are of a different opinion from me, respecting this matter, yet I consider their principle, that the clergy have no right to meddle with politics, and their endeavor to stop our mouths, as 'pregnant with mischief,' tending to keep the people in ignorance, and exposing them to be misled by those who would always pretend that the people shall govern, provided that they shall govern the people."

"The time has been when some of these same persons were very fond of engaging the clergy in politics, encouraging them to write and preach, or, to use a phrase of their own, 'blow the trumpet,' in defence of the liberties of their country. But, alas, how changed, how fallen! From such politicians, and such patriots, the good Lord deliver us!"

THE END.