

receive is from a polluted source, and is further desecrated by the channel of its transmission. It is in a large degree, from the intemperance of the community, and so from that which it is, *ought to be, the grand object of the clergy to purge from the colony*, that their state-stipends are furnished, and are, if at all, to be augmented. And the government manifests no repugnance to a revenue so raised. Is it, or is it not, consistent for the preachers of moral purity to depend upon a mode of livelihood so connected with immorality? How can all the churches, as such, set themselves to an earnest reformation of society, with the thought haunting them that the destruction of the vice would destroy the revenues on which they depend?

Again, there are four denominations receiving state-pay. Does not each of these denominations really, sincerely, and fully believe that its own system of religious teaching comprises the perfection of religious truth, and that to each of the other three more or less of error is attached? or more closely still—does not each of these four denominations believe, that some one, or more, of the rest teaches a dangerous heterodoxy? Is there any common ground, beyond principles the most elementary, between Roman Catholic teaching, and that of the Wesleyans or Presbyterians?—Or do either of these latter deem the Episcopal pretensions to apostolical succession, or regeneration by baptism, a matter of small account? It is nothing to our argument which of these is right or wrong—it is clear enough that they cannot be all right, nor even right enough to be equally safe, or to be competent expounders of divine truth to the people. And it is clear enough that every man is not only responsible for his convictions, but also for the conformity between his conduct and those convictions. Our argument, therefore, applies with equal force to the four churches, whichever of them may be right.

Now, why does the Roman Catholic priest consent to keep up by his own practice, a system of pecuniary support, which gives to a heretical church, dangerous to the truth, £15,000, while his own receives but some £10,000? And why does the Wesleyan give, by the reception of a paltry sum of some £700, his countenance to the receipt, by a church which he believes to be in deadly error, of £10,000 or £11,000? Or why does the Presbyterian, by the receipt of £3000, support antagonist systems to the amount of £25,000? If it be believed that these churches could not do without these sums, that is equivalent to believing that without this aid, error must in great measure perish, and if so, such it is an imperative duty to prevent that aid. And if it be believed that every system but our own could do without such assistance, that is the same as believing, that what we hold to be truth is less efficacious for its own propagation than error. And in either case it amounts to a direct support of error for the sake of a supposed pecuniary advantage to ourselves. We maintain, therefore, that every clergyman receiving state-aid compromises what he deems truth, and is, therefore, of necessity himself dishonoured.

Do we wish the religious monitors of the people to continue in a position so false and so degrading? We do not. We maintain that nothing can be worse either for their interests or their objects. The Legislative Council talks of utility, and in so talking it utters nonsense. There can be no utility in placing any profession in a false light, and in nullifying its purposes. What then, it may be asked, should be done? The answer is not difficult. The people must awake from their slumbers; they must repudiate the meanness of sending those for state-aid whom it is their duty to support themselves; they must learn to cherish a just sense of the value of the labours of their ministers, and come forward handsomely for their sustenance.—It is a debt they owe them, not to be content with now and then a "testimonial" to eke a treasury-stipend, but to take upon themselves the entire and generous charge. And we declare our conviction that nothing but irreligion can make them negligent of that charge. Meanwhile the clergy must glorify their own principles by showing the people the absoluteness of their trust in them.

#### BURNETT PRIZES.

These prizes are the proceeds of a sum of money left by Mr. John Burnett, Merchant, Aberdeen, Scotland; and directed by his will to be divided, every forty years, in the proportion of three and one, between the authors of the two best Essays on the following theme:—