Monopolies &c &c &c. continued from p. 17

Ministers of religion paid by the entire nation.

The establishment of the chaplainship to Cong.s is a palpable violation of equal rights, as well as of a Constitutional principle. The tenets of the ~~majority~~ chaplains elected ~~by the majority~~ shut the door ~~on~~ at of worship ag.st the members whose creeds & consciences forbid a participation in that of the majority. To say nothing of other sects, this is the case with that of Roman Catholics & Quakers ~~which~~ who have always had members in one or both of the Legislature branches. Could a Catholic Clergyman ever hope to be appointed a Chaplain? To say that his religious principles are obnoxious or that his sect is small, is to lift the veil at once, and exhibit in its worked deformity the doctrine that religious truth is to be tested by numbers, or that the major sects have a right to govern the minor.

~~If religion the nature of religion makes it~~ If Religion consist in voluntary acts of individuals, singly, or voluntarily associated, and it be proper that public functionaries, as well as their Constituents sh.d discharge their religious duties, let them like their Constituents, do so at their own expense. How small a contribution from each member of Cong.s w.d suffice for the purpose? How just w.d it be in its principle? How noble in its exemplary sacrifice to the genius of the Constitution; and the divine rights of conscience? Why should the expence of a religious worship be ~~provided for the pose~~ allowed from for the Legislature, be paid by the public, more than that for the Ex. or Judiciary branch of the Gov.t

Were the establishment to be ~~tested~~ tried by its fruits, are not the daily devotions conducted by ~~the~~ the legal ecclesiastics, already degenerating into a scanty attendance, and a tiresome formality?

Rather than let this ~~going to overreachment~~ step beyond the landmarks of power have the effect of a legitimate precedent, it will be better to apply to it the ~~legal~~ aphorism de minimis non curat lex: ~~Or~~ or to class it cum maculis quas aut incuria fudit, aut humana parum cavit natura.

2218

Better also to disarm in the same way, ~~than~~ ~~consecrate~~ crack the precedent of Chaplainships for the army and navy, than crack them into a political authority in matters of religion. The object of this establishment is seducing; the motive to it is laudable. But is it not safer to adhere to a right principle, & trust to its consequences, than confide in the reasoning however specious in favor of a wrong one. Look thro' the armies & navies of the world, and say whether in the appointment of their ministers of religion, the spiritual interest of the flocks or the temporal interest of the shepherds, be most in view: whether here, as elsewhere the political care of religion, is not a nominal more than a real aid. If the spirit of armies be devout, the spirit out of the armies will never be less so; and a failure of religious instruction & exhortation from a voluntary source within or without, will rarely happen: and if such be not the spirit of armies, it will the official services of their Teachers are not likely to produce it. It is more likely to flow from the labours of a spontaneous zeal. The armies of the Puritans had their appointed Chaplains; but without these there would have been no lack of public devotion in that devout age.

The case of navies with insulated crews may be less within the scope of these reflections. But it is not entirely so. The chance of a devout officer, might be of as much worth to religion, as the service of an ordinary chaplain, ~~were it admitted that religion has a real interest in the latter~~. But we are always to keep in mind that it is safer to trust the consequences of a right principle, than reasonings in support of a bad one.

Religious proclamations by the Executive recommending thanksgivings & fasts are shoots from the same root with the legislative acts reviewed.

Altho' recommendations only, they imply a religious agency, making no part of the trust delegated to political rulers.

The objections to them are 1. that Govts ought not to interpose in relation to those subject to their authority, but in cases where they can do it with effect. An advisory Govt is a contradiction in terms. 2. The members of a Govt as such can in no sense, be regarded as possessing an advisory trust from their constituents in their religious capacities.

They