



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

718



600004774S

26.718.

A
LETTER
TO THE
ELECTORS,
UPON THE
CATHOLIC QUESTION.

BY THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH.

(Price One Shilling and Sixpence.)

A

S. H. 1826.

LETTER

TO

THE ELECTORS,

UPON THE

CATHOLIC QUESTION.



BY THE

REV. SYDNEY SMITH, &c. &c.

YORK :

Printed by Thomas Wilson and Sons, High-Ousegate :

SOLD BY LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN;

PATERNOSTER-RROW, LONDON ;

AND BY J. AND G. TODD, YORK.

1826.

718.

A LETTER,

&c. &c.

WHY is not a Catholic to be believed on his oath ?

What says the law of the land to this extravagant piece of injustice ? It is no challenge against a jurymen, to say he is a Catholic ; he sits in judgment upon your life and your property : Did any man ever hear it said that such or such a person was put to death, or that he lost his property, because a Catholic was among the jurymen ? Is the question ever put ? Does it ever enter into the mind of the attorney or the counsellor to inquire of the faith of the jury ? If a man sell a horse, or a house, or a field, does he ask if the purchaser is a Catholic ? Appeal to your own experience, and try by that fairest of all tests, the justice of this enormous charge.

We are in treaty with many of the powers of Europe, because we believe in the good faith of Catholics. Two-thirds of Europe are, in fact, Catholics ; are they all perjured ? For the first fourteen centuries all the Christian world were Catholics ; did they live in a constant state of perjury ? I am sure these objections against the Catholics are often made by very serious and honest men, but I much doubt if Voltaire has advanced any thing against the Christian religion so horrible, as to say that two-thirds of those who profess it are unfit for all the purposes of civil

life; for who is fit to live in society who does not respect oaths? But if this imputation be true, what folly to agitate such questions as the civil emancipation of the Catholics. If they are always ready to support falsehood by an appeal to God, why are they suffered to breathe the air of England, or to drink of the waters of England? why are they not driven into the howling wilderness? But now they possess, and bequeath, and witness, and decide civil rights; and save life as physicians, and defend property as lawyers, and judge property as jurymen; and you pass laws, enabling them to command all your fleets and armies, * and then you turn round upon the very man whom you have made the master of the European seas, and the arbiter of nations, and tell him he is not to be believed on his oath.

I have lived a little in the world, but I never happened to hear a single Catholic even suspected of getting into office by violating his oath; the oath which they are accused of violating is an insuperable barrier to them all. Is there a more disgraceful spectacle in the world than that of the Duke of Norfolk hovering round the House of Lords in the execution of his office, which he cannot enter as a peer of the realm? disgraceful to the bigotry and injustice of his country, to his own sense of duty, honourable in the extreme: he is the leader of a band of ancient and high-principled gentlemen, who submit patiently to obscurity and privation, rather than do violence to their conscience. In all the fury of party, I never heard the name of a single Catholic mentioned, who was suspected of having gained or aimed at, any political advantage, by violating his oath. I have never heard so bitter a slander supported by the

* There is no law to prevent a Catholic from having the command of a British fleet or a British army.

slightest proof. Every man in the circle of his acquaintance has met with Catholics, and lived with them probably as companions. If this immoral lubricity were their characteristic, it would surely be perceived in common life. Every man's experience would corroborate the imputation; but I can honestly say that some of the best and most excellent men I have ever met with, have been Catholics; perfectly alive to the evil, and inconvenience of their situation, but thinking themselves bound by the law of God and the law of honour, not to avoid persecution by falsehood and apostasy. But why (as has been asked ten thousand times before) do you lay such a stress upon these oaths of exclusion, if the Catholics do not respect oaths? You compel me, a Catholic, to make a declaration against transubstantiation, for what purpose but to keep me out of parliament. Why, then, I respect oaths and declarations, or else I should perjure myself, and get into parliament; and if I do not respect oaths, of what use is it to enact them in order to keep me out? A farmer has some sheep, which he chooses to keep from a certain field, and to effect this object, he builds a wall: there are two objections to his proceeding; the first is, that it is for the good of the farm that the sheep should come into the field; and so the wall is not only useless, but pernicious. The second is, that he himself thoroughly believes at the time of building the wall, that all the sheep are in the constant habit of leaping over such walls. His first intention with respect to the sheep is absurd, his means more absurd, and his error is perfect in all its parts. He tries to do that which, if he succeed, will be very foolish, and tries to do it by means which he himself, at the time of using them, admits to be inadequate to the purpose: but I hope this objection to the oaths of Catholics is disappearing; I believe neither lord Liver-

pool, nor Mr. Peel, (a very candid and honourable man,) nor the archbishops, (who are both gentlemen,) nor lord Eldon, nor lord Stowell, (whose Protestantism nobody calls in question,) would make such a charge. It is confined to provincial violence, and to the politicians of the second table. I remember hearing the Catholics from the hustings of an election, accused of disregarding oaths, and within an hour from that time, I saw five Catholic voters rejected, because they would not take the oath of supremacy; and these were not men of rank who tendered themselves, but ordinary tradesmen. The accusation was received with loud huzzas; the poor Catholics retired unobserved and in silence. No one praised the conscientious feelings of the constituents: no one rebuked the calumny of the candidate. This is precisely the way in which the Catholics are treated: the very same man who encourages among his partizans the doctrine, that Catholics are not to be believed upon their oaths, directs his agents upon the hustings, to be very watchful that all Catholics should be prevented from voting, by tendering to them the oath of supremacy, which he is certain not one of them will take. If this is not calumny and injustice, I know not what human conduct can deserve the name.

If you believe the oath of a Catholic, see what he will swear, and what he will not swear: read the oaths he already takes, and say whether in common candour or in common sense, you can require more security than he offers you. Before the year 1793, the Catholic was subject to many more vexatious laws than he now is; in that year an act passed in his favour, but before the Catholic could exempt himself from his ancient pains and penalties, it was necessary to take an oath. This oath was, I believe, drawn up by Dr. Duigenan, the bitter and implacable

enemy of the sect, and it is so important an oath, so little known and read in England, that I cannot, in spite of my wish to be brief, abstain from quoting it. I deny your right to call No Popery, till you are master of its contents.

“ I do swear, that I do abjure, condemn, and detest, as
 “ unchristian and impious, the principle, that it is lawful to
 “ murder, destroy, or any ways injure, any person whatso-
 “ ever, for or under the pretext of being a heretic ; and I
 “ do declare solemnly, before God, that I believe no act,
 “ in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified
 “ or excused by or under pretence or colour, that it was
 “ done either for the good of the church, or in obedience to
 “ any ecclesiastical power whatsoever. I also declare that
 “ it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I
 “ thereby required to believe or profess, that the Pope is
 “ infallible ; or that I am bound to obey any order, in its
 “ own nature immoral, though the Pope, or any ecclesiastical
 “ power, should issue or direct such order ; but, on the con-
 “ trary, I hold that it would be sinful in me to pay any
 “ respect or obedience thereto. I further declare, that I
 “ do not believe that any sin whatsoever committed by me,
 “ can be forgiven at the mere will of any pope or any priest,
 “ or of any persons whatsoever ; but that sincere sorrow for
 “ past sins, a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future
 “ guilt, and to atone to God, are previous and indispensable
 “ requisites to establish a well-founded expectation of for-
 “ givenness ; and that any person who receives absolution,
 “ without these previous requisites, so far from obtaining
 “ thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the additional
 “ guilt of violating a sacrament : and I do swear, that I
 “ will defend, to the utmost of my power, the settlement
 “ and arrangement of property in this country, as established

“ by the laws now in being.—I do hereby disclaim, disavow,
 “ and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present
 “ Church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a
 “ Catholic establishment in its stead; and I do solemnly
 “ swear, that I will not exercise any privilege to which I am
 “ or may become entitled, to disturb and weaken the Pro-
 “ testant religion, and Protestant government in this king-
 “ dom. So help me God.”

This oath is taken by every Catholic in Ireland, and a similar oath, allowing for the difference of circumstances of the two countries, is taken in England.

It appears from the evidence taken before the two houses, and lately printed, that if Catholic emancipation were carried, there would be little or no difficulty in obtaining from the Pope an agreement, that the nomination of the Irish Catholic bishops should be made at home constitutionally by the Catholics, as it is now in fact, * and in practice, and that the Irish prelates would go a great way, in arranging a system of general education, if the spirit of proselytism, which now renders such a union impossible, were laid aside. This great measure carried, the Irish Catholics would give up all their endowments abroad, if they received for them an equivalent at home; for now Irish priests are fast resorting to the continent for education, allured by the endowments which the French government are cunningly restoring and augmenting. The intercourse with the see of Rome might and would, after Catholic emancipation, be so managed, that it should be open, upon grave occasions, or, if thought proper, on every

* The Catholic bishops, since the death of the Pretender, are recommended either by the chapters or the parochial clergy, to the Pope; and there is no instance of his deviating from their choice.

occasion, to the inspection of commissioners. There is no security *compatible with the safety of their faith*, which the Catholics are not willing to give. But what is Catholic emancipation as far as England is concerned? not an equal right to office with the member of the Church of England, but a participation in the same pains and penalties as those, to which the Protestant dissenter is subjected by the corporation and test acts. If the utility of these last-mentioned laws is to be measured by the horror and perturbation their repeal would excite, they are laws of the utmost importance to the defence of the English Church; but if it be of importance to the Church that pains and penalties should be thus kept suspendant over men's heads, then these bills are an effectual security against Catholics as well as Protestants: and the manacles so much confided in, are not taken off, but loosened, and the prayer of a Catholic is this: "I cannot now become an alderman without perjury. I pray of you to improve my condition so far, that if I become an alderman, I may be only exposed to a penalty of £500." There are two common errors upon the subject of Catholic emancipation; the one, that the emancipated Catholic is to be put on a better footing than the Protestant dissenter, whereas he will be put precisely on the same footing; the other, that he is to be admitted to civil offices, without any guard, exception, or reserve, whereas in the various bills which have been from time to time brought forward, the legal wit of man has been exhausted to provide against every surmise, suspicion; and whisper of the most remote danger to the Protestant Church.

The Catholic question is not an English question, but an Irish one; or rather, it is no otherwise an English question than as it is an Irish one. As for the handful

of Catholics that are in England, no one, I presume, can be so extravagant as to contend if they were the only Catholics we had to do with, that it would be of the slightest possible consequence to what offices of the state they were admitted. It would be quite as necessary to exclude the Sandemanians, who are sixteen in number, or to make a test act against the followers of Joanna Southcote, who amount to one hundred and twenty persons. A little chalk on the wall and a profound ignorance of the subject, soon raises a cry of No Popery, but I question if the danger of admitting five popish Peers and two Commoners to the benefits of the constitution, could raise a mob in any market-town in England. Whatever good may accrue to England from the emancipation, or evil may befall this country, for withholding emancipation, will reach us only through the medium of Ireland.

I beg to remind you, that in talking of the Catholic religion, you must talk of the Catholic religion as it is carried on in Ireland; you have nothing to do with Spain, or France, or Italy: the religion you are to examine is the Irish Catholic religion. You are not to consider what it was, but what it is; not what individuals profess, but what is generally professed; not what individuals do, but what is generally practised. I constantly see in advertisements from county meetings, all these species of monstrous injustice played off against the Catholics. The inquisition exists in Spain and Portugal, therefore I confound place, and vote against the Catholics of Ireland, where it never did exist, nor was purposed to be instituted.* There have been many

* While Mary was burning Protestants in England, not a single Protestant was executed in Ireland; and yet the terrors of that reign are, at this moment, one of the most operative causes of the exclusion of Irish Catholics.

cruel persecutions of Protestants by Catholic governments ; and, therefore, I will confound time and place, and vote against the Irish, who live centuries after these persecutions, and in a totally different country. Doctor this, or Doctor that of the Catholic church has written a very violent and absurd pamphlet ; therefore I will confound persons, and vote against the whole Irish Catholic church, which has neither sanctioned nor expressed any such opinions. I will continue the incapacities of men of this age, because some men, in distant ages, deserved ill of other men in distant ages. They shall expiate the crimes committed, before they were born, in a land they never saw ; by individuals they never heard of. I will charge them with every act of folly which they have never sanctioned and cannot control. I will sacrifice space, time, and identity, to my zeal for the Protestant church. Now in the midst of all this violence, consider for a moment, how you are imposed upon by words, and what a serious violation of the rights of your fellow-creatures you are committing. Mr. Murphy lives in Limerick, and Mr. Murphy and his son are subjected to a thousand inconveniences and disadvantages, because they are Catholics. Murphy is a wealthy, honourable, excellent man ; he ought to be in the corporation, he cannot get in because he is a Catholic. His son ought to be king's counsel for his talents, and his standing at the bar ; he is prevented from reaching this dignity, because he is a Catholic. Why, what reasons do you hear for all this ? because queen Mary, three hundred years before the natal day of Mr. Murphy, murdered Protestants in Smithfield ; because Louis XIV. dragooned his Protestant subjects, when the predecessor of Murphy's predecessor was not in being ; because men are confined in prison, in Madrid, twelve degrees more south than Mur-

phy has ever been in his life, all ages, all climates, are ransacked to perpetuate the slavery of Murphy, the ill-fated victim of political anachronisms.

Suppose a barrister, in defending a prisoner, were to say to the judge, "My lord, I humbly submit to your lordship that this indictment against the prisoner cannot stand good in law; and as the safety of a fellow-creature is concerned, I request your lordship's patient attention to my objections. In the first place, the indictment does not pretend that the prisoner at the bar is himself guilty of the offence, but that some persons of the same religious sect as himself, are so; in whose crime he cannot, (I submit,) by any possibility, be implicated, as these criminal persons lived three hundred years before the prisoner was born. In the next place, my lord, the *venue* of several crimes imputed to the prisoner is laid in countries, to which the jurisdiction of this court does not extend; in France, Spain, and Italy, where also the prisoner has never been; and as to the argument used by my learned brother, that it is only want of power, and not want of will, and that the prisoner *would* commit the crime *if he could*; I humbly submit, that the custom of England has been to wait for the overt act before pain and penalty are inflicted, and that your lordship would pass a most doleful assize, if punishment depended upon evil volition; if men were subjected to legal incapacities from the mere suspicion that they *would* do harm *if they could*; and if it were admitted to be sufficient proof of this suspicion, that men of this faith in distant ages, different countries, and under different circumstances, had planned evil, and when occasion offered, done it."

When are mercy and justice, in fact, ever to return upon the earth, if the sins of the elders are to be forever visited on these who are not even their children? Should the first act of liberated Greece be to recommence the Trojan war? Are the French never to forget the Sicilian vespers; or the Americans the long war waged against their liberties? Is any rule wise, which may set the Irish to recollect what they have suffered?

The real danger is this, that you have four Irish Catholics for one Irish Protestant. That is the matter of fact, which none of us can help. Is it better policy to make friends, rather than enemies, of this immense population? I allow there is danger to the Protestant church, but much more danger, I am sure there is, in resisting than admitting the claims of the Catholics. If I might indulge in visions of glory, and imagine myself an Irish dean or bishop, with an immense ecclesiastical income; if the justice or injustice of the case were entirely indifferent to me, and my only object were to live at ease in my possessions, *there is no measure for which I should be so anxious as that of Catholic emancipation.* The Catholics are now extremely angry and discontented at being shut out from so many offices and honours: the incapacities to which they are subjected, thwart them in all their pursuits: they feel they are a degraded caste. The Protestant feels he is a privileged caste, and not only the Protestant gentleman feels this, but every Protestant servant feels it, and takes care that his Catholic fellow-servant shall perceive it. The difference between the two religions is an eternal source of enmity, ill-will, and hatred, and the Catholic remains in a state of permanent disaffection to the government under which he lives. I repeat that if I were a member of the Irish Church, I should be afraid of this posi-

tion of affairs. I should fear it in peace, on account of riot and insurrection, and in war, on account of rebellion. I should think that my greatest security consisted in removing all just cause of complaint from the Catholic society, in endearing them to the English constitution, by making them feel, as soon as possible, that they shared in its blessings.

I should really think my tithes and my glebe, upon such a plan, worth twenty years' purchase more than under the present system. Suppose the Catholic layman were to think it an evil, that his own Church should be less splendidly endowed than that of the Protestant Church, whose population is so inferior; yet if he were free himself, and had nothing to complain of, he would not rush into rebellion and insurrection, merely to augment the income of his priest. At present you bind the laity and clergy in one common feeling of injustice; each feels for himself, and talks of the injuries of the other. The obvious consequence of Catholic emancipation would be to separate their interests. But another important consequence of Catholic emancipation would be to improve the condition of the clergy. Their chapels would be put in order, their incomes increased, and we should soon hear nothing more of the Catholic Church. If this measure were carried in March, I believe by the January following, the whole question would be as completely forgotten as the sweating sickness, and that nine Doctor Doyles, at the rate of thirty years to a Doyle, would pass away one after the other, before any human being heard another syllable on the subject. All men gradually yield to the comforts of a good income. Give the Irish archbishop £1200 per annum; the bishop £800, the priest £200, the coadjutor £100 per annum, and the cathedral of Dublin is almost as safe as the cathe-

dral of York.* This is the real secret of putting an end to the Catholic question; there is no other; but, remember, I am speaking of provision for the Catholic clergy after emancipation, not before. There is not an Irish clergyman of the Church of Rome who would touch one penny of the public money before the laity were restored to civil rights, and why not pay the Catholic clergy as well as the Presbyterian clergy? Ever since the year 1803, the Presbyterian clergy in the North of Ireland, have been paid by the government, and the grant is annually brought forward in parliament; and not only are the Presbyterians paid, but one or two other species of Protestant dissenters. The consequence has been loyalty and peace. This way of appeasing dissenters you may call expensive, but is there no expense in injustice? You have at this moment an army of 20,000 men in Ireland, horse, foot, and artillery, at an annual expense of a million and a half of money; about one-third part of the expense of the allowance to the Catholic clergy; and this army is so necessary, that the government dare not at this moment remove a single regiment from Ireland. Abolish these absurd and disgraceful distinctions, and a few troops

* I say *almost*, because I hate to overstate an argument, and it is impossible to deny that there is danger to a Church, to which seven millions contribute largely, and in which six millions disbelieve: my argument merely is, that such a Church would be more safe in proportion as it interfered less with the comforts and ease of its natural enemies, and rendered their position more desirable and agreeable. I firmly believe the toleration act to be quite as conducive to the security of the Church of England, as it is to the Dissenters. Perfect toleration and the abolition of every incapacity as a consequence of religious opinions, is not, what is commonly called, a receipt for innovation, but a receipt for the quiet, and permanence of every establishment which has the real good sense to adopt it.

of horse, to help the constables on fair-days, will be more than sufficient for the Catholic limb of the empire.

Now for a very few of the shameful misrepresentations circulated respecting the Irish Catholics, for I repeat again that we have nothing to do with Spanish or Italian, but with Irish Catholics: it is not true that the Irish Catholics refuse to circulate the Bible in English, on the contrary, they have in Ireland circulated several editions of the Scriptures in English. In the last year, the Catholic prelates prepared and put forth a stereotype edition of the Bible, of a small print and low price, to ensure its general circulation. They circulate the Bible with their own notes, and how, as Catholics, can they act otherwise? Are not our prelates and Bartlett's Buildings acting in the same manner? and must not all Churches, if they are consistent, act in the same manner? the Bibles Catholics quarrel with, are Protestant Bibles without notes, or Protestant Bibles with Protestant notes, and how can they do otherwise, without giving up their religion? They deny, upon oath, that the infallibility of the Pope is any necessary part of the Catholic faith. They, upon oath, declare that Catholic people are forbidden to worship images, and saints, and relics. They, upon oath, abjure the temporal power of the Pope, or his right to absolve any Catholic from his oath. They renounce, upon oath, all right to forfeited lands, and covenant, upon oath, not to destroy or plot against the Irish Protestant Church. What more can any man want, whom any thing will content?

Some people talk as if they were quite teased and worried by the eternal clamours of the Catholics, but if you are eternally unjust, can you expect any thing more than to be eternally vexed by the victims of your injustice? You want all the luxury of oppression, without any of its inconvenience. I should think the Catholics very much to blame, if

they ever ceased to importune the legislature for justice, so long as they could find one single member of parliament who would advocate their cause.

The putting the matter to rest by an effort of the county of York, or by any decision of parliament against them, is utterly hopeless. Every year increases the Catholic population, and the Catholic wealth, and the Catholic claims, till you are caught in one of those political attitudes to which all countries are occasionally exposed, in which you are utterly helpless, and must give way to their claims: and if you do it then, you will do it badly; you may call it an arrangement, but arrangements made at such times, are much like the bargains between an highwayman and a traveller, a pistol on one side, and a purse on the other: the rapid scramble of armed vigilance, and the unqualified surrender of helpless timidity. *If you think the thing must be done at some time or another, do it when you are calm and powerful, and when you need not do it.*

There are a set of high-spirited men who are very much afraid of being afraid; who cannot brook the idea of doing any thing from fear, and whose conversation is full of fire and sword, when any apprehension of resistance is alluded to; I have a perfect confidence in the high and unyielding spirit, and in the military courage of the English; and I have no doubt, but that many of the country gentlemen, who now call out No Popery, would fearlessly put themselves at the head of their embattled yeomanry, to controul the Irish Catholics. My objection to such courage is, that it would certainly be exercised unjustly, and probably exercised in vain. I should deprecate any rising of the Catholics as the most grievous misfortune which could happen to the empire and to themselves. They had

far better endure all they do endure, and a great deal worse, than try the experiment. *But if they do try it, you may depend upon it, they will do it at their own time, and not at yours.* They will not select a fortnight in the summer, during a profound peace, when corn and money abound, and when the Catholics of Europe are unconcerned spectators. If you make a resolution to be unjust, you must make another resolution to be always strong, always vigilant, and always rich; you must commit no blunders, exhibit no deficiencies, and meet with no misfortunes; you must present a square phalanx of impenetrable strength, for keen-eyed revenge is riding round your ranks; and if one heart falter, or one hand tremble, you are lost.

You may call all this threatening, I am sure I have no such absurd intention, but wish only, in sober sadness, to point out what appears to me to be the inevitable consequences of the conduct we pursue. If danger be not pointed out and insisted upon, how is it to be avoided? My firm belief is that England will be compelled to grant ignominiously, what she now refuses haughtily. Remember what happened respecting Ireland in the American war. In 1779, the Irish, whose trade was completely restricted by English laws, asked for some little relaxation, some liberty to export her own products, and to import the products of other countries; their petition was flung out of the House with the utmost disdain, and by an immense majority. In April 1782, 70,000 Irish volunteers were under arms, the representatives of 170 armed corps met at Ulster, and the English parliament (the lords and commons both on the same day and with only one dissentient voice, the ministers moving the question) were compelled, in the most disgraceful and precipitate manner, to acknowledge the complete independence of the Irish nation, *and nothing but the good*

sense and moderation of Grattan prevented the separation of the two crowns.

It is no part of my province to defend every error of the Catholic Church : I believe it has many errors, though I am sure these errors are grievously exaggerated and misrepresented. I should think it a vast accession to the happiness of mankind, if every Catholic in Europe were converted to the Protestant faith. The question is not, Whether there shall be Catholics, but the question (as they do exist and you cannot get rid of them) is, What are you to do with them? Are you to make men rebels because you cannot make them Protestants? and are you to endanger your state, because you cannot enlarge your Church? England is the ark of liberty: the English Church I believe to be one of the best establishments in the world; but what is to become of England, of its Church, its free institutions, and the beautiful political models it holds out to mankind, if Ireland should succeed in connecting itself with any other European power hostile to England? I join in the cry of No Popery, as lustily as any man in the streets, who does not know whether the Pope lives in Cumberland or Westmoreland, but I know that it is impossible to keep down European popery, and European tyranny, without the assistance, or with the opposition, of Ireland. If you give the Irish their privileges, the spirit of the nation will overcome the spirit of the Church: they will cheerfully serve you against all enemies, and chant a *Te Deum* for your victories over all the Catholic armies of Europe. If it be true, as her enemies say, that the Roman Catholic Church is waging war all over Europe, against common sense, against public liberty; selling the people to kings and nobles, and labouring for the few against the many; all this is an additional reason why I would fortify England and Pro-

testantism by every concession to Ireland ; why I should take care that our attention was not distracted, nor our strength wasted by internal dissension ; why, I would not paralyze those arms which wield the sword of justice among the nations of the world, and lift up the buckler of safety. If the Catholic religion in Ireland is an abuse, you must tolerate that abuse, to prevent its extension, and tyranny over the rest of Europe. If you will take a long view instead of a confined view, and look generally to the increase of human happiness, *the best check upon the increase of Popery, the best security for the establishment of the Protestant Church is, that the British empire shall be preserved in a state of the greatest strength, union, and opulence.* My cry, then is, *No Popery* ; therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may not join with foreign Papists in time of war. *Church for ever* ; therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may not help to pull it down. *King for ever* ; therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may become his loyal subjects. *Great Britain for ever* ; therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may not put an end to its perpetuity. *Our government is essentially Protestant*, therefore, by emancipating the Catholics, give up a few circumstances which have nothing to do with the essence. *The Catholics are disguised enemies* ; therefore, by emancipation, turn them into open friends. *They have a double allegiance*, therefore, by emancipation, make their allegiance to their King so grateful, that they will never confound it with the spiritual allegiance to their Pope. It is very difficult for electors, who are much occupied by other matters, to choose the right path amid the rage and fury of faction : but I give you one mark, *vote for a free altar* ; give what the law compels you to give to the establishment ; (that done,) no chains, no pri-

sons, no bonfires for a man's faith, and above all, no modern chains and prisons under the name of disqualifications and incapacities, which *are only the cruelty and tyranny of a more civilized age*; civil offices open to all, a Catholic or a Protestant alderman, a Moravian, or a Church of England, or a Wesleyan justice, *no oppression, no tyranny in belief: a free altar, an open road to heaven; no human insolence, no human narrowness, hallowed by the name of God.*

Every man in trade must have experienced the difficulty of getting in a bill from an unwilling paymaster. If you call in the morning, the gentleman is not up; if in the middle of the day, he is out; if in the evening, there is company. If you ask mildly, you are indifferent as to the time of payment; if you press, you are impertinent. No time and no manner can render such a message agreeable. So it is with the poor Catholics: their message is so disagreeable, that their time and manner can never be right. "Not this session. Not *now*: on no account at the present time; any other time than this." The great mass of the Catholics are so torpid on the subject, that the question is clearly confined to the ambition of the few, or the whole Catholic population is so leagued together, that the object is clearly to intimidate the mother country." In short, the Catholics want justice, and we do not mean to be just, and the most specious method of refusal is, to have it believed that they are refused from their own folly, and not from our fault.

What if O'Connell (a man certainly of extraordinary talents and eloquence) is sometimes violent and injudicious? What if O'Gorman or O'Sullivan have spoken ill of the reformation? Is a great stroke of national policy to depend on such childish considerations as these? If these

chains ought to remain, could I be induced to remove them by the chaste language and humble deportment of him who wears them? If they ought to be struck away, would I continue them, because my taste was offended by the coarse insolence of a goaded and injured captive? would I make that great measure to depend on the irritability of my own feelings, which ought to depend upon policy and justice? The more violent and the more absurd the conduct of the Catholics, the greater the wisdom of emancipation. If they were always governed by men of consummate prudence and moderation, your injustice in refusing would be the same, but your danger would be less. The levity and irritability of the Irish character, are pressing reasons why all just causes of provocation should be taken away, and those high passions enlisted in the service of the empire.

In talking of the spirit of the Papal empire, it is often argued that the *will* remains the same; that the Pontiff *would*, if he *could*, exercise the same influence in Europe; that the Catholic church *would*, if it *could*, tyrannize over the rights and opinions of mankind: but if the power is taken away, what signifies the will? If the Pope thunders in vain against the kingdoms of the earth, of what consequence is his disposition to thunder? If mankind are too enlightened and too humane to submit to the cruelties and hatreds of a Catholic priesthood: if the Protestants of the empire are sufficiently strong to resist it, why are we to alarm ourselves with the barren volition, unseconded by the requisite power? I hardly know in what order or description of men I should choose to confide, if they *could* do as they *would*; the best security is, that the rest of the world will not let them do as they wish to do; and having satisfied myself of this, I am not very careful about the rest.

Our government is called essentially Protestant ; but if it be essentially Protestant in the distribution of offices, it should be essentially Protestant in the imposition of taxes. The treasury is open to all religions, parliament only to one. The taxgatherer is the most indulgent and liberal of human beings ; he excludes no creed, imposes no articles ; but counts Catholic cash, pockets Protestant paper ; and is candidly and impartially oppressive to every description of the Christian world. Can any thing be more base than when you want the blood or the money of Catholics, to forget that they are Catholics, and to remember only that they are British subjects ; and when they ask for the benefits of the British constitution, to remember only that they are Catholics, and to forget that they are British subjects.

No Popery was the cry of the great English Revolution, because the increase and prevalence of Popery in England, would, at that period, have rendered this island tributary to France. The Irish Catholics were, at that period, broken to pieces by the severity and military execution of Cromwell, and by the penal laws. They are since become a great and formidable people. The same dread of foreign influence, makes it now necessary that they should be restored to political rights. Must the friends of rational liberty join in a clamour against the Catholics now, because in a very different state of the world they excited that clamour a hundred years ago ? I remember a house near Battersea bridge which caught fire, and there was a general cry of "Water, water." Ten years after, the Thames rose, and the people of the house were nearly drowned. Would it not have been rather singular to have said to the inhabitants, "I heard you calling for water ten years ago, why dont you call for it now ?"

There are some men who think the present times so

incapable of forming any opinions, that they are always looking back to the wisdom of our ancestors. Now, as the Catholics sat in the English parliament to the reign of Charles II. and in the Irish parliament, I believe, till the reign of King William, the precedents are more in their favour than otherwise; and to replace them in parliament seems rather to return to, than to deviate from, the practice of our ancestors.

If the Catholics are priest-ridden, pamper the rider, and he will not stick so close; dont torment the animal ridden, and his violence will be less dangerous.

The strongest evidence against the Catholics is that of Colonel John Irvine; he puts every thing against them in the strongest light, and Colonel John (with great actual, though I am sure, with no intentional exaggeration) does not pretend to say there would be more than forty-six members returned for Ireland who were Catholics, but how many members are there in the house now returned by Catholics, and compelled, from the fear of losing their seats, to vote in favour of every measure which concerns the Catholic Church? The Catholic party, as the Colonel justly observes, was formed when you admitted them to the elective franchise. The Catholic party are increasing so much in boldness, that they will soon require of the members they return, to oppose generally any government hostile to Catholic emancipation, and they will turn out those who do not comply with this rule. If this is done, the phalanx so much dreaded from emancipation, is found at once without emancipation. This consequence of resistance to the Catholic claims is well worth the attention of those who make use of the cry of No Popery, as a mere political engine.

We are taunted with our prophetic spirit, because it is said by the advocates of the Catholic question, that

the thing must come to pass ; that it is inevitable : our prophecy, however, is founded upon experience and common sense, and is nothing more than the application of the past to the future. In a few years' time, when the madness and wretchedness of war are forgotten, when the greater part of those who have lost in war, legs and arms, health and sons, have gone to their graves, the same scenes will be acted over again in the world. France, Spain, Russia, and America, will be upon us. The Catholics will watch their opportunity, and soon settle the question of Catholic emancipation. To suppose that any nation can go on in the midst of foreign wars, denying common justice to seven millions of men, in the heart of the empire, awakened to their situation, and watching for the critical moment of redress, does, I confess, appear to me to be the height of extravagance. To foretell the consequence of such causes, in my humble apprehension, demands no more of shrewdness, than to point out the probable results of leaving a lighted candle stuck up in an open barrel of gunpowder.

It is very difficult to make the mass of mankind believe that the state of things is ever to be otherwise than they have been accustomed to see it. I have very often heard old persons describe the impossibility of making any one believe that the American colonies could ever be separated from this country. It was always considered as an idle dream of discontented politicians, good enough to fill up the periods of a speech, but which no practical man, devoid of the spirit of party, considered to be within the limits of possibility. There was a period when the slightest concession would have satisfied the Americans ; but all the world was in heroics ; one set of gentlemen met at the Lamb, and another at the Lion : blood and treasure men, breathing

war, vengeance, and contempt; and in eight years afterwards, an awkward looking gentleman in plain clothes, walked up to the drawing-room of St. James's, in the midst of the gentlemen of the Lion and Lamb, and was introduced as the *ambassador from the United States of America*.

You must forgive me if I draw illustrations from common things, but in seeing swine driven, I have often thought of the Catholic question, and of the different methods of governing mankind. The object, one day, was to drive some of these animals along a path, to a field where they had not been before. The man could by no means succeed; instead of turning their faces to the north, and proceeding quietly along, they made for the east and west, rushed back to the south, and positively refused to advance: a reinforcement of rustics was called for, maids, children, neighbours, all helped; a general rushing, screaming, and roaring ensued; but the main object was not in the slightest degree advanced: after a long delay, we resolved (though an hour before we should have disdained such a compromise) to have recourse to Catholic emancipation; a little boy was sent before them with a handful of barley; a few grains were scattered in the path, and the bristly herd were speedily and safely conducted to the place of their destination. If, instead of putting lord Stowell out of breath with driving, compelling the duke of York to swear, and the chancellor to strike at them with the mace, lord Liverpool would condescend, in his graceful manner, to walk before the Catholic doctors with a basket of barley, what a deal of ink and blood would be saved to mankind.

Because the Catholics are intolerant, we will be intolerant; but did any body ever hear before that a government is to imitate the vices of its subjects? If the Irish were a rash,

violent, and intemperate race, are they to be treated with rashness, violence, and intemperance? If they were addicted to fraud and falsehood, are they to be treated by those who rule them, with fraud and falsehood? Are there to be perpetual races in error and vice between the people and the lords of the people? Is the supreme power always to find virtues among the people; never to teach them by example, or improve them by laws and institutions? Make all sects free, and let them learn the value of the blessing to others, by their own enjoyment of it; but if not, let them learn it by your vigilance and firm resistance to every thing intolerant. Toleration will then become a habit and a practice, ingrafted upon the manners of a people, when they find the law too strong for them, and that there is no use in being intolerant.

It is very true that the Catholics have a double allegiance,* but it is equally true that their second or spiritual allegiance has nothing to do with civil policy, and does not, in the most distant manner, interfere with their allegiance to the crown. What is meant by allegiance to the crown, is, I presume, obedience to acts of parliament, and a resistance to those who are constitutionally proclaimed to be the enemies of the country. I have seen and heard of no instance for this century and a half last past, where the spiritual sovereign has presumed to meddle with the affairs of the temporal sovereign. The Catholics deny him such power by the most solemn oaths which the wit of man can devise. In every war, the army

* The same double allegiance exists in every Catholic country in Europe. The spiritual head of the country among French, Spanish, and Austrian Catholics, is the Pope; the political head, the king or emperor.

and navy are full of Catholic officers and soldiers ; and if their allegiance in temporal matters is unimpeachable and unimpeached, what matters to whom they choose to pay spiritual obedience, and to adopt as their guide in genuflexion and psalmody ? Suppose these same Catholics were foolish enough to be governed by a set of Chinese moralists in their diet, this would be a third allegiance ; and if they were regulated by Bramins in their dress, this would be a fourth allegiance ; and if they received the directions of the Patriarch of the Greek Church, in educating their children, here is another allegiance : and as long as they fought, and paid taxes, and kept clear of the quarter sessions and assizes, what matters how many fanciful supremacies and frivolous allegiances they choose to manufacture or accumulate for themselves ?

A great deal of time would be spared, if gentlemen, before they ordered their post-chaises for a No-Popery meeting, would read the most elementary defence of these people, and inform themselves even of the rudiments of the question. If the Catholics meditate the resumption of the Catholic property, why do they purchase that which they know (if the fondest object of their political life succeed) must be taken away from them ? Why is not an attempt made to purchase a quietus from the rebel who is watching the blessed revolutionary moment for regaining his possessions, and revelling in the unbounded sensuality of mealy and waxy enjoyments ? But after all, who are the descendants of the rightful possessors ? The estate belonged to the O'Rourkes, who were hanged, drawn, and quartered, in the time of Cromwell ; true, but before that, it belonged to the O'Connors, who were hanged, drawn, and quartered in the time of Henry VII. The O'Sullivans have a still earlier plea of suspension, evisceration, and division. Who is the

rightful possessor of the estate? We forget that Catholic Ireland has been murdered three times over by its Protestant masters.

Mild and genteel people do not like the idea of persecution, and are advocates for toleration; but then they think it no act of intolerance to deprive Catholics of political power. The history of all this is, that all men secretly like to punish others for not being of the same opinion with themselves, and that this sort of privation is the only species of persecution, of which the improved feeling and advanced cultivation of the age will admit. Fire and faggot, chains and stone walls have been clamoured away; nothing remains but to mortify a man's pride, and to limit his resources, and to set a mark upon him, by cutting him off from his fair share of political power. By this receipt, insolence is gratified, and humanity is not shocked. The gentlest Protestant can see, with dry eyes, Lord Stourton excluded from parliament, though he would abominate the most distant idea of personal cruelty to Mr. Petre. This is only to say that he lives in the nineteenth, instead of the sixteenth century, and that he is as intolerant in religious matters as the state of manners existing in his age will permit. Is it not the same spirit which wounds the pride of a fellow-creature on account of his faith, or which casts his body into the flames? Are they any thing else but degrees and modifications of the same principle? The minds of these two men no more differ because they differ in their degrees of punishment, than their bodies differ, because one wore a doublet in the time of Mary, and the other wears a coat in the reign of George. I do not accuse them of intentional cruelty and injustice: I am sure there are very many excellent men who would be shocked if they could conceive

themselves to be guilty of any thing like cruelty ; but they innocently give a wrong name to the bad spirit which is within them, and think they are tolerant, because they are not as intolerant as they could have been in other times, but cannot be now. The true spirit is to search after God and for another life with lowliness of heart ; to fling down no man's altar, to punish no man's prayer ; to heap no penalties and no pains on those solemn supplications which in divers tongues, and in varied forms, and in temples of a thousand shapes, but with one deep sense of human dependance, men pour forth to God.

It is completely untrue that the Catholic religion is what it was three centuries ago, or that it is unchangeable and unchanged. These are mere words, without the shadow of truth to support them. If the Pope were to address a bull to the kingdom of Ireland, excommunicating the duke of York, and cutting him off from the succession, for his Protestant effusion in the House of Lords, he would be laughed at as a lunatic in all the Catholic chapels in Dublin. The Catholics would not now burn Protestants as heretics. In many parts of Europe, Catholics and Protestants worship in one church. Catholics at eleven, Protestants at one ; they sit in the same parliament, are elected to the same office, live together without hatred or friction, under equal laws. Who can see and know these things, and say that the Catholic religion is unchangeable and unchanged ?

I have often endeavoured to reflect upon the causes which, from time to time, raised such a clamour against the Catholics, and I think the following are among the most conspicuous :

1. Historical recollections of the cruelties inflicted upon the Protestants.
2. Theological differences.

3. A belief that the Catholics are unfriendly to liberty.

4. That their morality is not good.

5. That they meditate the destruction of the Protestant church.

6. An unprincipled clamour by men, who have no sort of belief in the danger of emancipation, but who make use of No Popery as a political engine.

7. A mean and selfish spirit of denying to others the advantages we ourselves enjoy.

8. A vindictive spirit or love of punishing others, who offend our self-love by presuming on important points, to entertain opinions opposite to our own.

9. Stupid compliance with the opinions of the majority.

10. To these I must, in justice and candour add, as a tenth cause, a real apprehension on the part of honest and reasonable men, that it is dangerous to grant farther concessions to the Catholics.

To these various causes I shall make a short reply, in the order in which I have placed them.

1. Mere historical recollections are very miserable reasons for the continuation of penal and incapacitating laws, and one side has as much to recollect as the other.

2. The state has nothing to do with questions purely theological.

3. It is ill to say this in a country whose free institutions were founded by Catholics, and it is often said by men who care nothing about free institutions.

4. It is not true.

5. Make their situation so comfortable, that it will not be worth their while to attempt an enterprise so desperate.

6. This is an unfair political trick, because it is too dangerous, it is spoiling the table in order to win the game.

The 7th and 8th causes exercise a great share of influence in every act of intolerance. The 9th must, of course, comprehend the greatest number.

10. Of the existence of such a class of No Poperists as this, it would be the height of injustice to doubt, but I confess it excites in me a very great degree of astonishment.

Suppose, after a severe struggle, you put the Irish down, if they are mad and foolish enough to recur to open violence; yet are the retarded industry, and the misapplied energies of so many millions of men to go for nothing? Is it possible to forget all the wealth, peace, and happiness which are to be sacrificed for twenty years to come, to these pestilential and disgraceful squabbles? Is there no horror in looking forward to a long period in which men, instead of ploughing and spinning, will curse and hate, and burn and murder?

There seems to me a sort of injustice and impropriety in our deciding at all upon the Catholic question. It should be left to those Irish Protestants whose shutters are bullet proof; whose dinner-table is regularly spread with knife, fork, and cocked pistol; salt-cellar and powder-flask. Let the opinion of those persons be resorted to, who sleep in sheet iron night-caps; who have fought so often and so nobly before their scullery door, and defended the parlour passage as bravely as Leonidas defended the pass of Thermopylæ. The Irish Protestant members see and know the state of their own country. Let their votes decide * the case. We are quiet and at peace; our homes may be defended with a feather, and our doors fastened

* A great majority of Irish members voted for Catholic emancipation.

with a pin; and as ignorant of what armed and insulted Popery is, as we are of the state of New Zealand, we pretend to regulate by our clamours, the religious factions of Ireland.

It is a very pleasant thing to trample upon Catholics, and it is also a very pleasant thing to have an immense number of pheasants running about your woods; but there come thirty or forty poachers in the night, and fight with thirty or forty game preservers; some are killed, some fractured, some scalped, some maimed for life. Poachers are caught up and hanged; a vast body of hatred and revenge accumulates in the neighbourhood of the great man; and he says the "sport is not worth the candle. The preservation of game is a very agreeable thing but I will not sacrifice the happiness of my life to it. This amusement, like any other, may be purchased too dearly." So it is with the Irish Protestants, they are finding out that Catholic exclusion may be purchased too dearly. Maimed cattle, fired ricks, threatening letters, barricadoed houses, to endure all this, is to purchase superiority at too dear a rate, and this is the inevitable state of two parties, the one of whom are unwilling to relinquish their ancient monopoly of power, while the other party have, at length, discovered their strength, and are determined to be free.

Gentlemen (with the best intentions, I am sure) meet together in a county town, and enter into resolutions that no farther concessions are to be made to the Catholics; but if you will not let them into parliament, why not allow them to be king's counsel, or serjeants at law? Why are they excluded by law from some corporations in Ireland, and admissible, though not admitted, to others? I think before such general resolutions of exclusion are adopted,

and the rights and happiness of so many millions of people disposed of, it would be decent and proper to obtain some tolerable information of what the present state of the Irish Catholics is, and of the vast number of insignificant offices from which they are excluded. Keep them from parliament if you think it right, but do not, therefore, exclude them from any thing else, to which you think Catholics may be fairly admitted without danger, and as to their content or discontent, there can be no sort of reason why discontent should not be lessened, though it cannot be removed.

You are shocked by the present violence and abuse used in the Irish Association : by whom are they driven to it ? and whom are you to thank for it ? Is there a hope left to them ? Is any term of endurance alluded to ? any scope or boundary to their patience ? Is the minister waiting for opportunities ? Have they reason to believe that they are wished well to by the greatest of the great ? Have they brighter hopes in another reign ? Is there one clear spot in the horizon ? any thing that you have left to them, but that disgust, hatred, and despair, which breaking out into wild eloquence, and acting upon a wild people, are preparing every day a mass of treason and disaffection, which may shake this empire to its very centre : and you may laugh at Daniel O'Connell, and treat him with contempt, and turn his metaphors into ridicule ; but Daniel has, after all, a great deal of real and powerful eloquence ; and a strange sort of misgiving sometimes comes across me, that Daniel and the Doctor are not quite so great fools as many most respectable country clergymen believe them to be.

You talk of their abuse of the Reformation, but is their any end to the obloquy and abuse with which the Catholics are, upon every point, and from every quarter, assailed ?

Is there any one folly, vice, or crime, which the blind fury of Protestants does not lavish upon them? And do you suppose all this is to be heard in silence, and without retaliation? Abuse, as much as you please, if you are going to emancipate, but if you intend to do nothing for the Catholics but to call them names, you must not be out of temper, if you receive a few ugly appellations in return.

The great object of men who love party better than truth, is to have it believed that the Catholics alone have been persecutors; but what can be more flagrantly unjust than to take our notions of history only from the conquering, and triumphant party? If you think the Catholics have not their Book of Martyrs as well as the Protestants, take the following enumeration of some of their most learned, and careful writers.

The whole number of Catholics who have suffered death in England, for the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, since the Reformation :

Henry VII.	59
Elizabeth	204
James I.	25
Charles I. and } Commonwealth }	23
Charles II.	8
<hr/>	
Total	319

Henry VIII. with consummate impartiality, burnt three Protestants, and hanged four Catholics for different errors in religion, on the same day, and at the same place. Elizabeth burnt two Dutch Anabaptists for some theological tenets, July 22, 1575, Fox the martyrologist vainly pleading with the queen in their favour. In 1579, the same

Protestant queen cut off the hand of Stubbs, the author of a tract against popish connexion, of Singleton, the printer, and Page, the disperser, of the book. Camden saw it done. Warburton properly says it exceeds in cruelty any thing done by Charles I. On the 4th of June, Mr. Elias Thacker and Mr. John Capper, two ministers of the Brownist persuasion, were hanged at St. Edmond's-bury, for dispersing books against the Common Prayer. With respect to the great part of the Catholic victims, the law was fully and literally executed; after being hanged up, they were cut down alive, dismembered, ripped up, and their bowels burnt before their faces; after which, they were beheaded and quartered. The time employed in this butchery was very considerable, and, in one instance, lasted more than half an hour.

The uncandid excuse for all this is, that the greater part of these men were put to death for political, not for religious crimes. That is, a law is first past, making it high treason for a priest to exercise his function in England, and so when he is caught and burnt, this is not religious persecution, but an offence against the state. We are, I hope, all too busy to need any answer to such childish, uncandid reasoning as this.

The total number of those who suffered capitally in the reign of Elizabeth, is stated by Dodd, in his Church History, * to be one hundred and ninety-nine; further in-

* The total number of sufferers in the reign of queen Mary, varies, I believe, from 200 in the Catholic to 280 in the Protestant accounts. I recommend all young men who wish to form some notion of what answer the Catholics have to make, to read Milner's 'Letters to a Prebendary,' and to follow the line of reading to which his references lead. They will then learn the importance of that sacred maxim, *Audi alteram partem.*

quiries by Milner made their number to be two hundred and four: fifteen of these were condemned for denying the queen's supremacy; one hundred and twenty-six for the exercise of priestly functions, and the others for being reconciled to the Catholic faith, or for aiding, and assisting priests. In this list, no person is included who was executed for any plot, real or imaginary, except eleven, who suffered for the pretended plot of Rheims; a plot, which Dr. Milner justly observes, was so daring a forgery, that even Camden allows the sufferers to have been political victims. Besides these, mention is made in the same work, of ninety Catholic priests, or laymen, who died in prison in the same reign. "About the same time," he says, "I find fifty gentlemen lying prisoners in York Castle; *most of them perished there*, of vermin, famine, hunger, thirst, damp, dirt, fever, whipping, and broken hearts, the inseparable circumstances of prisons in those days. These were every week, for a twelve-month together, dragged by main force to hear the established service performed in the castle-chapel." The Catholics were frequently, during the reign of Elizabeth, tortured in the most dreadful manner. In order to extort answers from father Campian, he was laid on the rack, and his limbs stretched a little, to shew him, as the executioner termed it, what the rack was. He persisted in his refusal; then for several days successively, the torture was increased, and on the last two occasions, he was so cruelly rent and torn, that he expected to expire under the torment. While under the rack, he called continually upon God. In the reign of the Protestant Edward VI. Joan Knell was burnt to death, and the year after, George Parry was burnt also. In 1575, two Protestants, Peterson and Turwort, (as before stated,) were burnt to death by Elizabeth. In 1589, under the same queen, Lewes, a Protestant,

was burnt to death at Norwich, where Francis Kett was also burnt for religious opinions in 1589, under the same great queen : who, in 1591, hanged the Protestant Hacket for heresy, in Cheapside, and put to death Greenwood, Barrow, and Penry, for being *Brownists*. Southwell, a Catholic, was racked ten times during the reign of this sister of bloody queen Mary. In 1592, Mrs. Ward was hanged, drawn, and quartered for assisting a Catholic priest to escape in a box. Mrs. Lyne suffered the same punishment for harbouring a priest ; and in 1586, Mrs. Clitheroe, who was accused of relieving a priest, and refused to plead, was prest to death in York Castle ; a sharp stone being placed underneath her back.

Have not Protestants persecuted both Catholics, and their fellow Protestants in Germany, Switzerland, Geneva, France, Holland, Sweden, and England? Look to the atrocious punishment of Leighton under Laud, for writing against prelacy ; first, his ear was cut off, then his nose slit ; then the other ear cut off, then whipped, then whipped again. Look to the horrible cruelties exercised by the Protestant Episcopalians on the Scottish Presbyterians, in the reign of Charles II. of whom 8000 are said to have perished in that persecution. Persecutions of Protestants by Protestants, are amply detailed by Chandler, in his *History of Persecution* ; by Neale, in his *History of the Puritans* ; by Laing, in his *History of Scotland* ; by Penn, in his *Life of Fox* ; and in Brandt's *History of the Reformation in the Low Countries* ; which furnishes many very terrible cases of the sufferings of the Anabaptists and Remonstrants. In 1560, the parliament of Scotland decreed, at one and the same time, the establishment of Calvinism, and the punishment of death against the ancient religion : " With such indecent haste (says Robertson) did the very

persons who had just escaped ecclesiastical tyranny, proceed to imitate their example." Nothing can be so absurd as to suppose, that in barbarous ages, the excesses were all committed by one religious party, and none by the other. The Huguenots of France burnt churches, and hung priests wherever they found them. Froumenteau, one of their own writers, confesses, that in the single province of Dauphiny, they killed two hundred and twenty priests, and one hundred and twelve friars. In the Low Countries, wherever Vandemerk, and Sonoï, lieutenants of the prince of Orange, carried their arms, they uniformly put to death, and in cold blood, all the priests, and religious they could lay their hands on. The Protestant Servetus was put to death by the Protestants of Geneva, for denying the doctrine of the Trinity, as the Protestant Gentilis was, on the same score, by those of Berne; add to these, Felix Mans, Rotman, and Barneveld. Of Servetus, Melancthon, the mildest of men, declared that he deserved to have his bowels pulled out, and his body torn to pieces. The last fires of persecution which were lighted in England, were by Protestants. Bartholomew Legate, an Arian, was burnt by order of king James in Smithfield, on the 18th of March, 1612; on the 11th of April, in the same year, Edward Weightman was burnt at Litchfield, by order of the Protestant bishop of Litchfield and Coventry; and this man was, *I believe*, the last person who was burnt in England for heresy. There was another condemned to the fire for the same heresy, but as pity was excited by the constancy of these sufferers, it was thought better to allow him to linger on a miserable life in Newgate. Fuller, who wrote in the reign of Charles II., and was a zealous Church of England man, speaking of the burnings in question, says, "It may appear that God was well pleased with them."

There are, however, grievous faults on both sides ; and as there are a set of men, who, not content with retaliating upon Protestants, deny the persecuting spirit of the Catholics, I would ask them what they think of the following code, drawn up by the French Catholics against the French Protestants, and carried into execution for one hundred years, and as late as the year 1765, and not repealed till 1788 ?

“ Any Protestant clergyman remaining in France three
 “ days, without coming to the Catholic worship, to be
 “ punished with death. If a Protestant sends his son to a
 “ Protestant schoolmaster for education, he is to forfeit 250
 “ livres a-month, and the schoolmaster who receives him, 50
 “ livres. If they sent their children to any seminary abroad,
 “ they were to forfeit 2000 livres, and the child so sent,
 “ became incapable of possessing property in France. To
 “ celebrate Protestant worship, exposed the clergyman to a
 “ fine of 2800 livres. The fine to a Protestant for hearing
 “ it, was 1300 livres. If any Protestant denied the au-
 “ thority of the Pope in France, his goods were seized for
 “ the first offence, and he was hanged for the second. If
 “ any common prayer-book, or book of Protestant worship
 “ be found in the possession of any Protestant, he shall for-
 “ feit 20 livres for the first offence, 40 livres for the second,
 “ and shall be imprisoned at pleasure for the third. Any
 “ person bringing from beyond sea, or selling any Protes-
 “ tant books of worship, to forfeit 100 livres. Any ma-
 “ gistrates may search Protestant houses for such articles.
 “ Any person, required by a magistrate to take an oath
 “ against the Protestant religion, and refusing, to be com-
 “ mitted to prison, and, if he afterwards refuse again, to suf-
 “ fer forfeiture of goods. Any person sending any money
 “ over sea to the support of a Protestant seminary, to forfeit

" his goods, and be imprisoned at the king's pleasure.
 " Any person going over sea for Protestant education, to
 " forfeit goods, and lands for life. The vessel to be for-
 " feited which conveyed any Protestant woman, or child
 " over sea, without the king's licence. Any person con-
 " verting another to the Protestant religion, to be put
 " to death. Death to any Protestant priest to come
 " into France; death to the person who receives him; for-
 " feiture of goods, and imprisonment to send money for the
 " relief of any Protestant clergyman: large rewards for
 " discovering a Protestant parson. Every Protestant shall
 " cause his child, within one month after birth, to be bap-
 " tised by a Catholic priest, under a penalty of 2000 livres.
 " Protestants were fined 4000 livres a-month for being absent
 " from Catholic worship, were disabled from holding offices
 " and employments, from keeping arms in their houses, from
 " maintaining suits at law, from being guardians, from prac-
 " tising in law or physic, and from holding offices, civil or
 " military. They were forbidden (bravo, Louis XIV.) to
 " travel more than five miles from home without licence,
 " under pain of forfeiting all their goods, and they might
 " not come to court under pain of 2000 livres. A married
 " Protestant woman, when convicted of being of that per-
 " suasion, was liable to forfeit two-thirds of her jointure:
 " she could not be executrix to her husband, nor have any
 " part of his goods; and during her marriage, she might
 " be kept in prison, unless her husband redeemed her at the
 " rate of 200 livres a-month, or the third part of his lands.
 " Protestants, convicted of being such, were, within three
 " months after their conviction, either to submit, and re-
 " nounce their religion, or, if required by four magistrates,
 " to abjure the realm, and if they did not depart, or depart-
 " ing returned, were to suffer death. All Protestants were

" required; under the most tremendous penalties, to swear
 " that they considered the Pope as the head of the Church.
 " If they refused to take this oath, which might be tendered
 " at pleasure by any two magistrates, they could not act as
 " advocates, procureurs, or notaries public. Any Protestant
 " taking any office, civil or military, was compelled to abjure
 " the Protestant religion; to declare his belief in the doc-
 " trine of transubstantiation, and to take the Roman Catho-
 " lic sacrament within six months, under the penalty of
 " 10,000 livres. Any person professing the Protestant
 " religion, and educated in the same, was required, in six
 " months after the age of sixteen, to declare the Pope to be
 " the head of the Church; to declare his belief in transub-
 " stantiation, and that the invocation of saints was according
 " to the doctrine of the Christian religion; failing this, he
 " could not hold, possess, or inherit landed property; his
 " lands were given to the nearest Catholic relation. Many
 " taxes were doubled upon Protestants. Protestants keep-
 " ing schools, were imprisoned for life, and all Protestants
 " were forbidden to come within ten miles of Paris or
 " Versailles. If any Protestant had a horse worth more
 " than 100 livres, any Catholic magistrate might take it
 " away, and search the house of the said Protestant for
 " arms." Is not this a monstrous code of persecution? Is
 it any wonder, after reading such a spirit of tyranny as
 is here exhibited, that the tendencies of the Catholic
 religion should be suspected, and that the cry of No
 Popery should be a rallying sign to every Protestant nation
 in Europe?.....Forgive, gentle reader, and gentle elector,
 the trifling deception I have practised upon you. This
 code is not a code made by French Catholics against
 French Protestants, but by English and Irish Protestants,
 against English and Irish Catholics; I have given it to

you, for the most part, as it is set forth in Burn's 'Justice' of 1780: it was acted upon in the beginning of the last king's reign, and was notorious through the whole of Europe, as the most cruel and atrocious system of persecution ever instituted by one religious persuasion against another. Of this code, Mr Burke says, that "it is a truly barbarous system; where all the parts are an outrage on the laws of humanity, and the rights of nature: it is a system of elaborate contrivance, as well fitted for the oppression, imprisonment, and degradation of a people, and the debasement of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." It is in vain to say that these cruelties were laws of political safety; such has always been the plea for all religious cruelties: by such arguments the Catholics defended the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the burnings of Mary.

With such facts as these, the cry of persecution will not do: it is unwise to make it, because it can be so very easily, and so very justly retorted. The business is, to forget and forgive, to kiss and be friends, and to say nothing of what has past; which is to the credit of neither party. There have been atrocious cruelties, and abominable acts of injustice on both sides. It is not worth while to contend who shed the most blood, or whether, (as Dr. Sturgess objects to Dr. Milner,) death by fire is worse than hanging or starving in prison. As far as England itself is concerned, the balance may be better preserved. Cruelties exercised upon the Irish go for nothing in English reasoning; but if it were not uncandid and vexatious to consider Irish persecutions * as part of the case, I firmly believe there

* Thurloe writes to Henry Cromwell to *catch up* some thousand Irish boys, to send to the colonies. Henry writes back he has done so; and desires to know whether his highness would choose as many

have been two Catholics put to death for religious causes in Great Britain, for one Protestant who has suffered; not that this proves much, because the Catholics have enjoyed the sovereign power for so few years between this period and the Reformation, and certainly it must be allowed that they were not inactive, during that period, in the great work of pious combustion.

It is, however, some extenuation of the Catholic excesses, that their religion was the religion of the whole of Europe, when the innovation began. They were the ancient lords and masters of faith, before men introduced the practice of thinking for themselves, in these matters. The Protestants have less excuse, who claimed the right of innovation, and then turned round upon other Protestants who acted upon the same principle, or upon Catholics who remained as they were, and visited them with all the cruelties from which they had themselves so recently escaped.

Both sides, as they acquired power, abused it; and both learnt from their sufferings, the great secret of toleration and forbearance. If you wish to do good in the times in which you live, contribute your efforts to perfect this grand work. I have not the most distant intention to interfere in local politics, but I advise you never to give a vote to any man, whose only title for asking it is, that he means to continue the punishments, privations, and incapacities of any human beings, merely because they worship God in the way they think best: the man who asks for your vote upon such a plea, is, *probably*, a very weak man, who believes in his own bad reasoning, or a very artful man, who is laughing

girls to be caught up: and he adds "doubtless it is a business in which God will appear." Suppose *bloody queen Mary* had caught up and transported three or four thousand Protestant boys and girls from the three ridings of Yorkshire!!!!!!

at you for your credulity : at all events; he is a man who, knowingly or unknowingly, exposes his country to the greatest dangers, and hands down to posterity all the foolish opinions and all the bad passions which prevail in those times in which he happens to live. Such a man is so far from being that friend to the Church which he pretends to be, that he declares its safety cannot be reconciled with the franchises of the people ; for what worse can be said of the Church of England than this, that wherever it is judged necessary to give it a legal establishment, it becomes necessary to deprive the body of the people, if they adhere to their old opinions, of their liberties, and of all their free customs, and to reduce them to a state of civil servitude ?

SYDNEY SMITH.

ERRATA.

Page 7, for *suspendant*, read *suspended*.

Page 13, for " *about one-third of the expense of the allowance*, read
" about one-third of this sum would be the expense, &c.

Page 11, for *four Catholics*, read *six Catholics*.

Page 15, for *armed vigilance*, read *armed violence*.

(*Thomas Wilson and Sons, High-Ousegate, York.*)

J. H. 1826

THE ELECTOR'S TRUE GUIDE.

A

REVIEW,

OF THE

REV. SYDNEY SMITH'S

LETTER,

TO ELECTORS;

UPON THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

BY AN EAST RIDING FREEHOLDER.

**HERETICS WHEN STRONG ARE TO BE COMMITTED TO GOD, BUT
WHEN WEAK, TO THE EXECUTIONER. *Bellarmino.***

LONDON:

**PUBLISHED BY RIVINGTON'S, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD; SEELEY AND SON,
FLEET-STREET; AND BELLERBY, YORK.**

1826.

718

H. BELLERBY, PRINTER, YORK.

TO
RICHARD FOUNTAYNE WILSON,
AND
WILLIAM DUNCOMBE,
ESQUIRES,
THE TRULY
CONSTITUTIONAL CANDIDATES
FOR THE REPRESENTATION OF THE
COUNTY OF YORK,
THE FOLLOWING REVIEW
OF THE
REV. SYDNEY SMITH'S LETTER
TO ELECTORS,
UPON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION,
IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,
BY
A FREEHOLDER,
WHO WILL GIVE THEM HIS VOTE
ON
THE DAY OF ELECTION,
UPON THE
GOOD OLD PROTESTANT PRINCIPLE OF
NO POPERY.

A

REVIEW &c. &c.

A LETTER has lately appeared in the meridian of York, addressed to electors, on the Roman Catholic question, and though internal evidence might soon have told the public whose it was, without the formal aid of a signature, yet to remove all rash surmises, the author has graciously signed his name. That the title of Reverend should be annexed to such a Letter is subject matter for regret, but, though this feeling may remain, all wonder ceases when it is known to be a Reverend who sets every consequence at defiance, which others might fear, if he can but prominently crack his joke. This facetious Divine, whose head has not been craniologized when he was destined for the Church, is not solicitous to appear, either before the public, or in a private circle, in any other light than that of a humourist, for it is not, I dare say, in any one's recollection that he ever treated a serious matter seriously, or for five minutes together talked gravely, either upon a literary or theological subject, or spoke either of men or things, without giving to the whole a ludicrous turn, and raising a laugh at some one's expence. Those who know him best and have seen him most, never, I dare say, saw him in company but this was clearly his object, and I never heard him spoke of but with this idea annexed. Even in the pulpit the auditor looks for humour, and Scripture is ex-

B

pected to be some how or other twisted to exite a smile, and favour his innate propensity to fun. The solemnity of an Assize cannot restrain this propensity, and while our Judges are amused at the expense of orthodoxy, the Clergy at a visitation, with infinite irony, are edified with the excellencies of Mrs. Fry. So exuberant indeed is his wit, and withal so flippant, that no occasion can boast of freedom from its effect, and no company complain of its quiescence. And he is equally indiscriminate in its application, as he is fertile in its invention, and like the great author of his being, though in a very different point of view, he has no respect of persons, or things, of time or of place.

When subjects and occasions of this kind are prostituted to mirth, which is not innocent, the spirit gets wounded by a certain intrepidity and profligacy of remark, as well as jaded by incessant repetition, and none but congenial spirits, or men of no reading or thinking, and sometimes not even they, can bear the harrass of such continual dropping. In any it is intolerable, but most of all in one who bears the sacred name of Clergyman. Whatever I have seen of the writings of this Divine is certainly below mediocrity, except in eloquence of words, liveliness of fancy, and exuberance of wit, and this last ingredient is always so predominant, that in his gravest moments, and soberest productions, it is not easy to distinguish whether or not he be serious. Labouring under this suspicion, and of acknowledged inferiority in point of sound sentiment or solid thought, whatever he writes can have no hold of any reflecting mind, and by the great majority will be treated with contempt, or as all a joke.

In his Letter to the Electors, upon the Roman Catholic question, we may say, with the Roman Poet, "Ecce iterum Crispinus." We here meet him again, as at

Thirsk and at Beverley, exhibiting, in the cause of catholic emancipation, the same flow of eloquence and of wit, the same boldness of assertion, the same love of paradox, the same studied antithesis, the same irrelevancy of simile, the same confusion of principles, and the same false reasoning ; and at all times you find him in merry mood, and making up in banter what he wants in argument. Admitting fully his devotedness to the cause and claims of the Papist, he evidently aims to attain his object with the Electors of Yorkshire, and confound them by pouring out the *humours* of his mind in a Letter, arguing from false premises and drawing false conclusions, ludicrously perverting what he cannot prove. In the spirit and manner of Tristram Shandy, whom I am told he somewhat resembles, he bolts upon the Elector with a notable question, which, as it is viewed, will bear an answer both negative and affirmative. By this sudden mode of attack, and the quality of the question, the respondent feels confused, and while he is contriving how to extricate himself from the confusion, a redundancy of matter bears upon him from the questionist, and he is, as it were, knocked down by a reverberation of question and answer, without any sound argument, and forced to yield to the multitude and impetuosity of words.

By a mischievous and invidious interrogatory, he first asks, " Why is not a Catholic to be believed upon his oath." To say that he is not he affirms to be an extravagant piece of injustice, contradicted by their sitting upon Juries, and by the commerce held with them in the sale or purchase of a horse or a field. This is true as far as these transactions go, but it is not by these that the question is to be tried or answered in its main bearings, and we pronounce it, without hesitation, captious, frivolous, and vexatious. On these

grounds they have never been doubted, any more than other men, but on other grounds they have, and justly so, as the sequel will show, and as every one knows who has read the history of Popery. As a further proof of his position he instances our transactions with foreign powers, professing the Romish religion, and as faith is preserved under these circumstances, he infers that they are to be believed in all. This plea however is equally irrelevant as the former, and calculated, after his manner, more to confound than to convince. But he infers, that, because they possess property, and bequeath it, witness and decide civil rights, save life as physicians, defend property as lawyers, and judge it as jurymen, therefore they are to be believed. In these relations we do not deny his inference; but notwithstanding all this, says he, as if they were analogous cases, you turn round upon them, and tell them they are not to be believed upon their oath: Why then permit them, adds he, to breathe the air or drink the waters of England, and why not drive them into the howling wilderness?

I appeal to any candid unprejudiced reader how very disingenuously the matter is stated, and how jesuitically he has involved points at variance. By implication he imputes to Protestants what they to a man deny, and repel with indignation, ready as they are to have intercourse with Roman Catholics in the usual relations of life. But the man is seen in his communication, and the irritating tendency of his statement is most striking, not unlike the provoking excitements of a mischievous person, who strives to irritate men or animals against each other. What he has said, and his manner of saying it, is indeed calculated to excite the most unfriendly feelings, nay the bitterest passions of man against man, and if these are not excited, no thanks to the Reverend letter writer, but to the good sense of English-

men, who are not to be caught by such snares, or such vile sophistry.

His next attempt at excitement is a statement of the real regard which Roman Catholics have for an oath, and that rather than violate their oath to the Church and to the Pope, or turn apostates to their religion, they forego the emoluments of office, and the advantage of political power, yea submit to privations and obscurity rather than violate their consciences; and yet with all this evidence of their regard for an oath, they are, adds he, not to be believed upon their oath. He thus most fraudulently evades the real point at issue, and dwells upon what nobody denies, viz, their regard for that oath which originates in popery, attaches them to popery, and is sanctioned by its infallible head, or the decrees of a no less infallible council. To this species of oath we know they adhere with scrupulous pertinacity, and this very adherence, and the nature of the oath to which they adhere, instead of increasing our faith blights our hopes of dependence upon them, under the circumstances of any oath, which is not founded in the religion, or does not promote the peculiar interests of Rome. Under the existence of this express principle, which dissolves in their minds every other, there is neither disgraceful bigotry nor injustice in restraining the Papist from office and power, nor is it a disgraceful spectacle, as the Reverend Gentleman intimates, to see the Duke of Norfolk hovering around the house of Lords in the execution of his office, which he cannot enter as a Peer of the realm. If there be any disgrace at all in this, it is in the admission of the Duke officially, without being under the obligation of those oaths which the laws of Parliament have ordained.

But after an attempt at illustration, or something else, which is not very clear, and at best but a bad one, in the

supposed case of a farmer, a few sheep, a field and a wall, he expresses his opinion, whether in jest or earnest I cannot really say, that the objections to the oaths of Roman Catholics are disappearing every where among leading men, who are now opposed to the measure, and that the opposition "is confined to provincial violence, and the politicians of the second table." With just noticing the author's innate propensity to a joke, in his allusion to the second table of the law, at the conclusion of the last sentence, we remark that he does but repeat casual incidents upon hustings or in booths, which rest precisely upon the previous statement. Their obstinacy in the unaltered principles of Rome, generated an hostile feeling to the king's supremacy, and the oath which acknowledges that supremacy no Papist, he says, will take; and why not take the oath, but because it interferes with the Supremacy of the Pope, and proves him therefore to be a bad subject of his liege Lord, the King of these realms, and that his allegiance, as far as it can be, is transferred to a foreign power. They may it is true show a strong regard to an oath which is precisely upon their own principles, a point which has never been denied; but it by no means follows that they are to be trusted, or believed, when a similar act is required of them towards a protestant King and Government; nay, their very zeal in this matter indisposes them, both to take and abide by any oath which may seem to attach them to any other than the interests of the Church of Rome; and besides this, they are provided, under all circumstances, with means sufficient to neutralize the effects of instruments, apparently the most binding, and here the great difficulty and danger lie.

He quotes an oath, drawn up, he says, by Dr. Duignan, who, without a joke, he calls bitter and implacable, This

oath, he further says, is now taken by every Roman Catholic in Ireland, and also in England, allowing for difference of circumstances in the two countries, and he denies our right to call out "no popery" till we are master of its contents. I also deny his right, or that of any one, to restrain the good old "no popery" cry, till he has demonstratively proved that there is no danger from the power, to unloose all such obligation, which actually rests with the Roman Pontiff. It is well known that James the I. appointed an oath of allegiance, which he drew up himself with great care, and expressed in terms as binding as the form of Dr. Duignan. The Gordian knot he thought so fast tied that no wit of man could loose it, and he persuaded himself that could the Roman Catholics be once caught in it, they must be forever tied firmly to his throne. But the king was deceived, and all his craft was over matched by the superior craft of the Jesuit. Let us hear the words of Paschenius, who, with Bellarmine, wrote against the king, and in condemnation of the oath, and they are words which deserve the particular attention of the Electors of Great Britain, at the present momentous crisis. "See, in so great craft, what great simplicity doth bewray itself in the king. When he had placed all his security in that oath, he thought he had found such a manner of oath, knit with so many circumstances, that it could not with safety of conscience, by any means, be dissolved by any man. *But he, that is the king, could not see, that, if the Pope did dissolve that oath, all the tyings of it, whether of performing fidelity to the king, or of admitting no dispensation, would be dissolved together. Yea I will say another thing, which is more admirable. You know, I suppose, that an unjust oath, if it be evidently known, or openly declared to be such, bindeth no man, but is, ipso facto, null. That the king's oath is unjust,*

hath been sufficiently declared by the Pastor of the church himself, that is, the Pope. You see, therefore, that the obligation of it is vanished into smoke, so that the bond, which by so many wise men was thought to be of iron, is become less than straw." It is obvious enough, from the above doctrine of a grave and learned writer of the Romish church, that if the Pope declares an oath, which has been taken by a papist to his protestant Sovereign, to be unlawful, it at once ceases to be of any obligation,

An oath more severe than that of James was imposed by an act of William III. but it necessarily, from the principles of the Romish religion, became subject to the prohibitory dictum of the Pope, and by this decision of course null and void. The oath which Duignan helped to frame, whom our letter writer presumes to call implacable, because he was a zealous Protestant, this oath, I say, of the last reign is exactly circumstanced as every preceding one, losing all its influence the moment it is declared unlawful by the Pope, which shows the paramount allegiance of a Roman Catholic to his spiritual supreme head, when placed in the balance with his allegiance to the king. But the Rector of Foston tells us that this oath is taken by the Papists, and we are elsewhere told that it is approved by the Pope, and all the catholic Bishops in the three kingdoms. But the worthy Rector must excuse us if we consider his information as of no importance at all, but somewhat problematical, when we notice that on the subject of oaths Dr. Butler's catechism and Delahogue's treatise, both drawn up for the sole use of Irish students, fully *admit the right or liberty of breaking a solemn promise, which tends to injure their church*; so that this doctrine may be regarded as settled, and very generally received by Roman Catholics at the present time. *

* Blair's Letters to Wilberforce, p. 193.

The absurdity of expecting any security to the protestant establishment from any such oath, the famous Letter of Quarantotti to Dr. Poynter, in the year 1814, will sufficiently evince. "Let the clergy, says the Cardinal, *acquiesce*, and it will be sufficient for them to declare, that this, *and this only*, is the sense in which they have sworn to it, so that nothing in the oath may be adverse to orthodox doctrine; and that this protest may be generally known, and be for an example to posterity, *this construction of it shall be publicly recorded.*"* Here we have the interpretation of an oath commanded and recorded by a Cardinal of Rome, and from this fact it evidently appears that however an oath to a protestant state may be taken by the Bishops, Priests, or Laity of Rome, yet that a foreign influence will put whatever construction upon it, which may best suit the interests, not of the *Protestant*, but of the *Romish Church*. On this ground I affirm, in opposition to our gallant champion of popish claims, that no provisional approbation of the Pope and Bishops gives any permanent validity to an oath, or the least security to any protestant Government, that it shall not be broken; it being the privilege and practice of the Dignitaries of Rome to give a temporary approval to any thing that may suit their purpose, or that they cannot help, and to withdraw it as soon as circumstances alter.

* Bp. of Ossory's Speech in the House of Lords, p.p. 18. 19. The religionists of Rome are told "that no settlement can be final and satisfactory, which has for its basis, or at all involves any innovation or alteration to be made, by authority of Parliament, in the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic church of Ireland."^v And they are further apprised that in any oath they may take, they are not called upon to depose, that high treason, rebellion, perjury and murder, on the score of conscience, are articles of their religion, but that they make no part of their particular belief.—See Protestant Advocate, v. 3: p. 42.

As a case in point, we know that the Pope approved of the usurpation of Buonaparte, so far as to crown him, and bless him as his dear son in the faith, and the eldest son of the Church. But this was done because he could not help it, and was therefore a provisional act, to be altered or broken according to further contingencies. Under the same circumstances is he placed respecting the Roman Catholics and their cause in Britain. He cannot help them, or procure for them, as in days of yore, the privileges they seek from the British Government, without the oath of allegiance being taken, as the law requires. He therefore approves of their taking it, and accordingly acquiesces. But as he retains his own interpretation, and has never by any public act renounced his right to dispense with the oaths of his adherents, we have no security at all against his doing, what has so often been done by his predecessors, whenever he may think that he can beneficially exercise his power for the benefit of the Holy See. Then the oath will be pronounced unlawful and unjust by the Pontiff, according to the previous interpretation of the Vatican, its obligations become nugatory, and all restraint removed from the conduct and the conscience of the good Papist, who has not a will of his own on the subject, but implicitly submits to the decision of mother church, under the direction of her supreme infallible head. Under the special unceasing control of his church, in which every Roman Catholic is placed, reliance cannot certainly be had in his oath, as it relates to a Protestant state or church, though he may be an honourable man in his social or commercial relations, and you may safely buy of him, or he of you, a horse, a house, or a field. The parallel is not just in its various bearings, and the question formed upon it, however characteristic of the proposer, is neither fair nor honest, nor has it a pacific

aspect, but rather an irritating tendency to excite hostile feeling.

It is the object of the Reverend Gentleman's Letter to do away with the position that faith is not to be kept with heretics, and to obviate the main question, that an oath may consequently be broken, as soon as ever the Pope deems it unjust, or contemplates injury to the religion of Rome; and we know that in the present day it is pretty generally disavowed, at least by English Romanists, because the thought is contrary to their feelings, as honourable men in society. But it is not either upon the argument of the one, or the disavowal of the other, that the matter rests, but upon these unchangeable principles of the Romish Church, which were formally settled at the Council of Trent, and have an unbounded influence over those, who may otherwise wish to evade the charge in their intercourse with a numerous Protestant population. As subjects of the Pope and under the influence of religious veneration, every private opinion or feeling vanishes before the decisive tone of a papal mandate, which declares the oath unjust, whatever may be its nature, and the parties contracting absolved from their obligation. In such a case there is not a true Roman Catholic in Great Britain or Ireland, who durst adhere to the dictates of honour, of conscience, or of better judgement, against such an authoritative injunction. A simple fact will illustrate this point to the satisfaction of every reader. A Roman Catholic of considerable influence in society, was one day familiarly addressed in the following manner by a Protestant neighbour of equal respectability. "Supposing you were fully convinced in your own mind, from previous thought and research, of the truth of any article of faith, and confirmed in its belief, and the Pope should issue his Brief condemnatory of that particular

point, what would you do in the conflict between your own previous conviction, and the Pope's mandate? To which the Romanist made the following reply; "As a consistent Roman Catholic I must give up my own opinion, embrace that of the Pope, and acquiesce in his decision." This is a fact, not unknown to fame, which gives the fullest answer to the Rector of Foston's leading question, "why a Roman Catholic is not to be believed upon his oath."

Another fact among the records of history, may also be adduced as a further reply. In the year 1768, when an oath of allegiance, to be taken by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, was in the contemplation of Parliament, the Pope's legate at Brussels, Thomas Maria Ghillini, made the following animadversions upon that oath, in four letters to the titular Archbishops of Ireland. Those clauses in the proposed oath, which contained a declaration of abhorrence and detestation of the doctrines, "that faith is not to be kept with heretics; and that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be deposed and murdered by their subjects, the legate treats as absolutely intolerable; because, he says, these doctrines are defended and contended for by most catholic nations, and the Holy See has frequently followed them in practice. On the whole he decides, that as the oath in its whole extent is unlawful, so in its nature it is invalid, null, and of no effect, insomuch that it can by no means bind or oblige the consciences." *

A practical proof of the correctness of the legate's interpretation of this fundamental principle of Popery, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, and that oaths are not obligatory, appears in the conduct of the Council of Constance toward the celebrated John Huss. This learned reformer

* Musgraves memoirs of Rebellions in Ireland p. 40. or more fully in the Protest. Adv. v. 3, p 222 &c.

was summoned before the Council on a charge of heresy, but his friends being apprehensive for his safety, procured from the Emperor Sigismund letters of safe conduct to the Council and back again. In these the Emperor solemnly pledged his honour for the entire safety of Huss. Under this guarantee he came to the Council, and being found guilty of what they deemed heresy, he was, as a thing of course, condemned to the stake. The Emperor interposed, pleading his honour, and his plighted faith; but the fathers of the Council told him, that *faith plighted to a heretic was not binding to the detriment of the church, and the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline.* The consequence of which was, that the Emperor yielded, and Huss was burned, to the eternal disgrace of these holy fathers, and of Popery. Here is an example deduced from the highest authority, that could sanction a doctrine or precept of Rome. A Council no doubt esteemed infallible, as it deposed a Pope, opposed an Emperor, established as a law the refusal of the cup to the laity, and by its own authority burned both Huss and Jerome. This law of keeping no faith with heretics, and consequently dissolving oaths, as acted upon by the fathers at Constance, was recognized and placed upon its unchangeable basis by the Council of Trent. A Council which comprises the doctrines, the precepts, and the discipline of Rome, and all the canons of which every priest binds himself upon oath to maintain. We have hence a double voucher and of the strongest kind, to which every other Council lends its aid, that the oath of a Papist is of a very fragile nature, and not only may but certainly will be broken when it is for the interest of the Church, and either the Pope or a Council command it.

The Rector of Foston may therefore say what he likes, and so may all the milk and water emancipators in the

kingdom to the contrary, I challenge both him and them to verify their own words, or to alter the decree of a Pope against the lawfulness of any specific oath, or the inviolable laws of Constance or of Trent. These are upon record, unchanged and unchangeable, it is therefore worse than folly or weakness to endeavour, either in joke or in earnest, to persuade the Electors of Yorkshire, or any other Electors, that the religion of Rome is not now what it always has been, and that the oath of a Papist to a Protestant government is inviolable, and cannot be broken or dissolved. The Councils and decrees of an infallible church, and her supreme head, tell a very different tale, her uniform practice contradicts the statement, and her trusty intriguing sons secretly laugh at Protestant credulity, while they watch with manifest approbation the too successful progress of imposition.

His speculations on the effects of emancipation * are equally frivolous, flippant and false, as his previous remarks upon the supposed validity of a Roman Catholics oath. In both he displays extreme perversion, or a strange ignorance of truth and matter of fact, and in neither is he therefore an Elector's guide, unless it be to error and to danger. He insidiously attempts to remove all idea of hazard, arising from power entrusted to the hands of Papists, by telling us it is an Irish and not an English question, and, in the exuberance of his fancy he remarks, that it is of quite as much importance to the constitution of this country to exclude sixteen Sandemanians, and an hundred and twenty followers of Joanna Southcote, as to exclude the English Roman Catholics from power. The admission of five Peers and two Commoners to Parliament, he says with abundant humour, would not raise a mob in any market town in Eng-

* p p. 6, 7.

land, though a little chalk, and profound ignorance of the subject, would soon raise the cry of a no Popery mob. The motive for placing the matter in this ludicrous point of view, is obviously, after his manner, to raise a laugh, and cause the real merits of the case to be lost sight of in the boisterous mirth of the moment. But let the observation be met with the contempt it deserves, as a feeble but scandalous attempt to neutralize a great question. With all his promptitude in accusing others of ignorance, and all his confidence of assertion, no man, with a little pen, ink, and paper, has thrown more materials to the mob, or shown more profound ignorance of the subject, than himself. In the great pending question of granting political power to the Papists, for every other they already possess, it is impossible to separate the consolidated interests of Great Britain, and Ireland, and their destiny, as the writer well knows; and the excess of power, systematically acting, in the united kingdom, against the Protestant Government both in church and state, would under pontifical control, be much more ominous to the safety of the whole, than any thing that could arise from sixteen Sandemanians or one hundred and twenty Southcotians. But the argument is ridiculous, and he meant it to be so, that he might laugh us out of all sense of danger, and when this is effected, equally laugh at our folly and credulity.

As he proceeds in his letter, and his wits rise in buoyancy, he advances in absurdity till he attains to perfect nonsense, in his estimate of the prevailing principles of Rome. With the same view as before, viz. to lessen our dread of Popery, without the least solid foundation for his remark, he reminds us that in talking of the Roman Catholic religion we are to consider it as it is carried on in Ireland, and not as it exists in Spain, or France, or Italy.

I think he has here made an unfortunate remark for the cause he advocates, because if we take into consideration the comparative view, Popery in Ireland seems of a worse description, if possible than in the three kingdoms he has selected. In short it seems there more practically a system of blood and murder, than any where else. If it be said in mitigation, that the exhibition of these features may be attributed to its perpetual intercourse with a Protestant population and Government, this mars rather than mends the matter, for it shows us, in the clearest manner, that the collision, instead of having a good effect, has a contrary one, and excites those latent feelings of enmity, which Popery naturally and by system, bears to every thing truly Protestant. He of course gains nothing by this exclusion.

But it is truly absurd to talk of Popery as substantially differing in different countries; and if it does not substantially differ, every apparent shade of difference is in fact of no consequence at all. For the insinuation he has thrown out, even the Papists themselves cannot thank him, because it implies at least a modification of their religion to a modern standard, which they boast of being unchanged; and it is also in fact untrue, for the Pope having supremacy over all, and pervading by his influence every part of the Roman Catholic Church, the religion of Popery is identically the same, whether you view it in Ireland or France, in Spain or Italy; it cannot indeed be otherwise, as we know to be the fact; and whatever results from its profession in one kingdom, must equally result from its profession in another. We are not then to be persuaded by any Jesuit, or jesuitical Protestant, who may choose to tell us so, that Popery is not the same in Ireland, as in any other country; whatever he may advance, in the lubricity of his mind, in support of his notion that Popery

is altered, or not the same every where, there is not a professor of that unchanged religion, who would not contradict him to his face, and deny the disgraceful charge, if prudence did not dictate silence, as more conducive to the interests of mother church.

Unity indeed is one of their boasted marks of the true Church, and if the Rector of Foston would persuade us to the contrary, he either is deceived himself, or wishes to deceive others. Dr. Baines, the Romish Bishop of Siga, in his consecration sermon at Bradford, states a position the very reverse of that which a Protestant Clergyman thinks it proper to insist upon :—“ Unity, says the Bishop, exists in it (the Romish Church) alone, and not a difference will be found in any one article of faith ;” and after enumerating nearly every known portion of the globe, especially the European kingdoms, he insists upon perfect uniformity, without admitting any difference ; and he then adds, “ Unity like this is indispensable in any Church which claims to teach the unchangeable doctrines of Christ.”* What then, in the face of such opposing evidence, can a man mean, but to deceive, when he assumes the office of reporter, and confidently informs us, that in talking about the religion of Ireland, we have nothing to do with the religion of Spain, or France, or Italy, as if they at all differed. This position is perfectly false and delusive, and were it not for its property of deceiving the Protestant, and being expressly laid as a snare to deceive and entangle, I should suppose it would be the most offensive imaginable to the ears of a Roman Catholic, who affirms his religion to vary in no clime. But what would be still worse for the author of such a libel, were he personally to appear

* Baines's Sermon at Bradford, pp. 36 and 37.

within the mud-walled cottage of any Hibernian, who comprehended his meaning, he would doubtless be saluted with an Irish ejection, for advancing a sentiment so disparaging to their boasted unity.

In the same spirit of adventure, and with a view to try the credulity of the Protestant, our author, against all evidence to the contrary, further tells us to consider, "Not what Popery was, but what it is, and not what individuals profess or do, but what is generally professed or done."— This nonsensical position we reject upon the same ground as the former, and that is, the declared unity and unchanged nature of Popery. What it was, it still is, as all their writers constantly maintain. Mr. Butler has just told the world, and I place it in array against the gratuitous assumption of the Reverend Sydney Smith, Rector of Foston,— "That it is a tenet of their creed, that *what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it now is, and such it ever will be.*"* This is most decisive, and as to any alleged distinction between individual and general practice or profession, to which he calls our attention, it is the mere ignis fatuus of his own disordered brain, which is to lead Protestants into the quagmires of inextricable confusion. Some, it is true, may be less cautious than others, and bolt out what the more wary may think it prudent to conceal ; but this is no more than what is consistent with the varying character of man,— altering no law, and infringing upon no constitutional principle of the Church of Rome. Whether it be individual or general profession or action, the latter necessarily including the former, and under whatever varying shade either may appear, one spirit actuates the whole body po-

* Butler's Book of the Rom. Cath. Ch. p. 9.

litic of Rome. The Trent Creed is their great polar star, by which—doctrine, practice, and discipline, are regulated; and there is one infallible pilot, stationed at Rome, to whom they all look, and whose dictates they all obey. Where then is the ground upon which our ingenious author would make individual, general, or national difference to rest? Where indeed, but in his own imagination, which is far too vagrant for a sober thinker, or one who wishes to attain to truth.

Upon the vain supposition, however, that Popery is not now what Popery was, he indulges in one of his flights of fancy, in order to bring into contempt the understanding, the opinions, and the practices of Protestants. Without any just cause for our so doing, he supposes us to sacrifice time, and space, and identity of person, to our zeal for the Protestant faith, and our indignant feelings at the wrongs we have received from Rome. We hence, he says, vote against Catholic emancipation, because of enormities committed centuries ago; for crimes perpetrated before they were born, we make modern Romanists expiate; for guilt contracted in lands they never saw, and by persons they never heard of, we make them responsible; and we charge them with follies they never sanctioned, and had it not in their power to control. He thus holds up Protestants to derision or to hatred, as the most egregious fools or the most consummate knaves, as unreasonable persecutors, and unprovoked oppressors. All these consequences I would grant, were there no connecting links between ancient and modern times, or were the features of Popery changed from what they were in those times, and places, and persons, to which he alludes. But this we deny, and shall meet his argument more fully in the sequel; at present we do but request him, as he has

done us, to "consider for a moment how he is imposed upon," and wishes to impose upon us, "by words, and what a serious violation of the rights of his fellow creatures he is committing," by the absurd statement he has made.

But so convinced is he of the correctness of his argument, and its manifest exposure of Protestant absurdity, that he proceeds to an illustration, purely of his own invention. He supposes one Murphy, in Limerick, who cannot get into the corporation because he is a Roman Catholic, and that he has a son, who, notwithstanding his talents, cannot be made king's counsel, because he is a Roman Catholic. And why, asks he, what reasons do you hear for all this? While something luminous may here perhaps be expected, the reader does but witness his wilful confusion of time and place, and how unconsciously the poor Gentleman involves himself in the absurdity with which he meant to overwhelm others. The reason he assigns is this:—Because Mary murdered Protestants in Smithfield, three hundred years before Murphy's natal day; because Louis XIV. dragooned his Protestant subjects, before the predecessor of Murphy's predecessor was in being; and because men are confined in prison, in Madrid, twelve degrees more south than Murphy has ever been in his life:—thus, adds he, all ages and climates are ransacked to perpetuate the slavery of Murphy; to which I subjoin, that no other age than his own need be ransacked, to perpetuate the absurdity and folly of the constructor of this theory. The reasoning is false and fabulous; but, as every one who knows him will allow, it is a fine specimen of the mind and manner of the Reverend Sydney Smith, &c. &c. Had he pursued this line of argument, this *reductio ad absurdum*, at the Earls or the Squires table, at the palace of his Diocesan, or at a meeting of Magistrates

or Commissioners at the Lobster House, I conceive the unutterable confusion of a poor unfortunate disputant, from the loud peals of laughter which this novel, this highly ridiculous, but profoundly contemptible mode of reasoning would excite. It is in this way that all *his* triumphs are gained, and the modest unassuming, nay probably the confident well prepared opponent, may be laughed to scorn and to silence. But this is the triumph of folly, and arises from this circumstance, that men are generally more inclined to laugh, than to hear or give a reason.

But the humour of his Reverence is not yet exhausted. He personates a lawyer, and draws up his brief, representing the invalidity of the indictment against the prisoner at the bar, because he is indicted for crimes which he himself has not committed, but which others perpetrated three hundred years before he was born; that the crime is laid in countries where the prisoner has never been, and that he has not really committed the crime, but only would if he could. All this is very clever, very amusing, and very characteristic, and might do as a good joke, at an assize dinner, on the ingenious prolixity of lawyers, as we know him to be expert at this kind of desultory warfare; but here it has no force, though he has garnished it with humour and a liquid flow of words. He has indeed stated the case with his accustomed ridicule, and endeavoured to make every thing appear as absurd as possible; but he has failed most egregiously of his object, and reduced himself and his cause to the absurdity he contemplated. Though neither Mary, nor Louis, nor the Spanish Inquisition, ever hurt us personally, or put us in bodily fear, and their acts were those of ages past, and some of them in countries we never saw, we have no hesitation in declaring, whether he

may laugh or not is no consideration, that the "terrors of those reigns, and of those days, are at this moment, among the most operative causes of the exclusion of Irish, and of all Catholics," from political power, under a Government essentially Protestant. Does this modern Democritus need to be told, that if principles do not change, neither distance of time nor of place can change the consequences ensuing, or separate the effect from its cause? In the ridiculous light in which he has unwarrantably placed it, the thing may indeed appear absurd to the superficial observer, who had rather laugh than think, but by no means so to the contemplative man, who reduces it to the continued action of unchanged principles.

This is precisely the case with Popery: it has not changed its character since the days of Mary, of Louis, or of the Inquisition, never mind how many hundred years ago; nor can he, with all his dexterity, satisfactorily prove that it has. In this case, therefore, his special pleading and his flourish of words, amount to nothing but a joke: in the whole there is neither truth nor honesty, but a laboured effort at wit, through the contemptible medium of quirk and quibble. I beg to tell him plainly, and all whom it may concern, that so long as these horrible facts in history are had in remembrance, in connection with the unchanged nature of Popery, which of course makes them returnable upon us, so long shall we, if we are wise, keep the Papists from political power, equally regardless of the petty grievance of the supposed Murphy, and the still more petty appeal of the real Sydney Smith. "Are we to be told, Sir, says Southey to Butler, that the Papal Church is not answerable for its acts and deeds, but only for such of its words as it thinks proper at this time to acknowledge? That it is not answerable for the crusade which it

proclaimed against the Albigenses? for the Marian persecution? for the tragedy of St. Bartholomew's day? for the Inquisition? for the sufferings of the Vaudois? for the Irish massacre? and for the Dragoonades of Louis XIV.? Sir, it is to history that I look for what the Papal religion has manifested itself to be. I FIND ITS CHARACTER IN ITS ACTIONS. *A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Wherefore, by their fruits shall ye know them, and judge.*"*

But after attempting to ridicule us out of our senses, and persuade us that all our fears are groundless, after indirectly telling us that we are the greatest fools imaginable, and the most unreasonable oppressors that ever existed, how shall we appreciate or extricate him from the direct charge of having no other intention than to deceive, or to promote a laugh against the Electors of Yorkshire, when we find him telling them in the very next page (11) that "He allows there is danger, and real danger, to the Protestant Church," from *the disproportionate numbers of Roman Catholics to Protestants in Ireland, from the discontented spirit of the former, their permanent disaffection to the Government under which they live, and the eternal source of enmity arising from the difference between the two religions.* It is not improbable but that he may have said this in order to carry his point by intimidation, and to this cause, rather than to candour, or conviction, or good will to Protestantism, we ascribe the declaration. Gladly however do we hail truth through any channel, or from any motive, but, how to act under these circumstances, we are doomed to differ with the Rector of Foston. His plan is to admit the claims, and advance to political power *those*

* *Vindiciæ Eccles. Anglic.* p. 41.

who have a permanent disaffection to the Government under which they live, and may live quietly, and who have an eternal hatred to the religion of that Government. But my plan is to keep them out, and I go upon the prudential maxim that it is much safer to keep the Lion out than to admit him. He however is for admitting the Beast that he may tame him. The experiment is too perilous for the adoption of Protestants, and they refer to the records of Mary, of Louis, and of the Spanish Inquisition.

Had he, however, visions of glory before him, of becoming an Irish Bishop or Dean, (and a fair wind to his honour across the channel) emancipation he says, would be the first object of his heart, in order that he might live quietly in his possessions. Otherwise, he says, in peace he would fear insurrection, and in war would have the dread of rebellion; and rather than lose his Bishoprick or his Deanery, for every man, he feelingly observes, yields to the comforts of a good income, he would soothe the Papist and admit him to power, would accord with what he considers the *pacific curses and decrees of Trent, and admit the fraternal hug of the Pope.* In this resolve I give him full credit for honest intention, especially for the reason he assigns, which is that he should think his tithes and his glebe worth twenty years purchase more, than under the present system of exclusion. And besides securing the revenues of his own snug Deanery, which I commend him for attending to, emancipation, he seems to think, would silence all complaints, restrain insurrection, content both Clergy and Laity, and like the quack doctor's nostrum heal all ills. In short, were the measure carried, and the Priests of Rome pensioned, he would persuade us that in ten months, the whole would be as completely forgotten as the sweating sickness, and that nine Dr. Doyle's, at the rate of thirty

years to a Doyle, would pass away before another syllable was heard upon the subject.

All this, is very confident, and passing merry, but contrary to experience and historical facts, and to the nature and genius of Popery. What Popery was, Po- is, and must be, on its own principles.

Its Divines and Lawyers tell us it cannot change and never has, and Mr. Butler has recently informed us, that "the Church cannot err in faith, and that to her they therefore ascribe this infallibility." We must never lose sight of this fundamental principle of Popery, that it is unchangeable, and consequently incapable of improvement. When therefore we look at the system and the history of the Church of Rome, and compare them as a connected whole: when to inerrancy, infallibility, and immutability we annex the acts of Mary, of Louis, or of the Spanish Inquisition, with innumerable Irish murders, such as Ennis-corthy, Vinegar Hill, Scullabogue, and Wexford Bridge,* we see not even the shadow of change, we hence naturally contemplate a recurrency of evils so bound up in their system, and so inseparable from their practice, and therefore we may justly complain of the visionary speculations by which he attempts to impose upon credulous Protestants and particularly the honest Electors of Yorkshire.

Experience, confirmed by history, gives a view of things very different from the specious unsound exhibition of our letter writer. In every case of English history, Popish power has produced suspension of privileges, privation of rights, coercion, persecution, and death. Mary, of bloody memory, gave her subjects the strongest assurance, by a

* See Musgraves Memoirs of Rebellions in Ireland, 4to. pp. 356, 357, 363 to 367. 425, 460, 485 to 497.

declaration in council, that she would permit them to pursue any such religion as their conscience should dictate, but when firmly established on her throne, she promoted the burning of her Protestant subjects, on no other ground than their religion. She gave herself up to Popish advisers, and believed it her duty to act up to the worst principles of her persecuting Church, and boasted that she was a virgin sent from God, to ride and tame the Protestant people of England.* As one of her first steps, says the historian, she made Gardiner, Chancellor, and it was evident that a fiery persecution was at hand. The Accession of James II. is a memento to Protestants not to trust to the promises or oaths of Papists, as they regard religion. Though solemnly engaged to protect the Protestant faith, yet the second Sunday after his coming to the throne, he publicly attended Mass with all the attractive pageantry of his Church, and the superadded insignia of royalty. He openly sought to subvert both civil and ecclesiastical relations in society, by substituting Papists for Protestants among his Counsellors, in Parliament, in the Universities, in Corporations, in the Army, and in the Navy. Thus he revelled in the exercise of his religious zeal, in defiance of every engagement to his Protestant subjects, and they presently found that there was no sincerity in his profession, for all pledges were set at nought, if the interests of the Romish Church required, and they always did require, that they should be broken. In consequence of this he ceased to reign, and his short rule, with all its characteristic features, affords a warning, how dangerous it is to permit a Prince infected with Popery, to sway the British sceptre, for Popish counsellors to be our legislators, Popish lawyers

* Southey's Book of the Church.

our Judges, Popish Gentlemen to fill our Corporations, or Popish Priests to rule in seminaries of learning, and guide the minds of our Protestant youth, This answers the delusive declamatory argument of the Foston Rector, and as to his humour it may be safely left, to evaporate in the shrill contemptuous laugh, with which this ingenious Gentleman, I understand, usually accompanies his jokes.

But he turns, with as severe a frown, as his eternal smiles will admit, to what he chooses to call shameful misrepresentation of Irish Romanists, in which he again deprecates any mixture from Spain or Italy. Sturdily as he objects to this, as sturdily do I maintain that they cannot be separated, in justice either to themselves or to us; for if you do, you destroy their boasted unity, and the Protestant is deceived by a groundless ideal change. They must indeed stand or fall together; and there can be no better specimen of Spanish or Italian Catholicism on earth, than in the Irish priesthood and the Irish priest ridden Papist. These reputed misrepresentations are, on the circulation of the Scriptures; the Infallibility of the Pope as a necessary part of their faith; the worship of images, saints, and relics; the temporal power of the Pope, and his power to absolve from an oath; their right to forfeited lands, and their covenant not to destroy or plot against the Protestant Church. The charges on these heads, he says, are false, and they deny them upon oath. If so they are not Papists but Protestants, and there is an end of the matter. But we do not so easily take for granted the assertion of our friend the Rector, knowing how loose his foundations are, and consequently how unsafe, are his superstructures. Let us examine them one by one.

First he says, it is not true that the Irish Roman Catholics refuse to circulate the Bible in English, but that

they do it with their own notes, and only object to the Protestant Bible. Were I at liberty to enter into the mystery of iniquity, working hitherto on this point, I could easily disclose a long series of insincerity and fraud, and how under the semblance of free circulation, they not only restrain it to a formal licence from the Priest, but most rigorously restrain the interpretation, under pain of damnation, to the peculiar sense given by the Priest, as already dictated by mother Church. Whatever therefore the circulation may be, it is nullified to every useful purpose by this damning prohibitory law. As he evidently does not know every thing, though he assumes a high tone, he might not know this, but with his erudite cunning it is perhaps more probable that he concealed his knowledge from vulgar gaze. The learned Rector however ought to have considered, as he owns he endeavours sometimes to reflect, that there is such a thing as being forced into a measure against the will, and often for self defence. In his diversified learning he ought to have known, that in the XVI century the Rheimish Testament was published under this very principle, as Archbishop Newcome and the learned Lewis would have told him, had he "in sober sadness," submitted to consult their pages. He would there have found, as he may also in the preface to the Testament itself, that the translators really thought it was an erroneous opinion, that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought to be read indifferently by all, because such reading they affirm, would do more harm than good; and that they judged such translation, neither more convenient in itself, more agreeable to God's word and honour, nor more conducive to edification, than to be kept and studied in the ecclesiastical languages, that is, such as are only understood by the learned.

Here is some excellent information for our friend at the Rectory, as he may neither have Newcome, nor Lewis, nor the Rhemish Testament; and I inform him further, from the same source, the reason of such translation, which was this; because finding it impossible to keep the English Bible out of the hands of the common people, they were resolved to have an English translation of their own making, with notes particularly opposed to Protestantism; and *they were not ashamed to own that the Protestants by their translation had forced them to translate the Scriptures into English against their will.* This is the fact, and I doubt not but this very reason operates at present both in England and Ireland, and elsewhere. They see with concern the unexampled dissemination of the Scriptures, which the late Pope called a wicked and nefarious scheme, and the present Pope thinks injurious to faith and morals; it is purely upon the strictest principles of self defence that they are now acting, not from any conviction that it is right or expedient. They dread truth, fear for their craft, and therefore, as an antidote, they have dispersed a stereotype edition of the Bible, as he informs us, *with their own notes.* The act is as clearly against their will, as the College of Rheims expressed it, when they published their edition in 1582.

Our author, therefore, by his statement, sets aside no one principle of the Church of Rome, against the free distribution of the Scriptures, and he ought to have known better than to assert, in so unqualified a manner, that they disseminate them as freely as we do. The fact is, they do no such thing; and it is only by constraint they publish them at all, and then with so many guards, notes, and licences, as in effect to neutralize the pretended privilege. He ought to have known, before he made his boast, as

their own authors inform us, that it is opposed to a principle of their Church, to print the Bible in the vulgar tongue. He ought to have been aware, that they never put the English Scriptures into the hands of the poor and ignorant, nor give them gratuitously, even with notes, to every applicant, but only under the direction and at the will of their superiors. He ought to have known that none of them think the Scriptures necessary to salvation, and that their only mode of teaching religion, is by elementary tracts, upon the exclusive principles of the Council of Trent. He ought to have known, that this Council commands, as an absolute standard principle, that none shall presume to read the Bible, but by a written licence; and whoever shall presume, without permission, *to read or possess* such Bible, may not receive the oblation of his sins, till he has returned it to the Ordinary; and also; that every bookseller, who may sell or supply Bibles to any person not possessed of a licence, shall forfeit the price, and submit to other punishment, but that no one is to buy or read those Bibles, without the permission of their Pastors. And he ought to have known, that it is not the Protestant Bible alone that they quarrel with; which indeed they have both burned and buried; but their own authorised Bible, if it does not come by permission of the Priest. If he was ignorant of all this; he should not have spoken with the confidence he has done; or if he knew better, common honesty should have kept him from attempting to deceive the Electors of Yorkshire.

His second point is, that "they deny upon oath; that the infallibility of the Pope is any necessary part of the Catholic faith." Our author may not perhaps be aware; that the unity of the Romish Church is broken by the opposite opinions which are held on this very point, as to

the seat or source of infallibility. Some place it in the Pope, some in a Council, some in their union, and some in the Pope and Cardinals in conclave, when settling articles of faith. In this diversity, there is much ground for quibble and subterfuge, which admirably accords both with the genius of the author of the letter before us, and those whose cause he so adventurously advocates. I cannot but look upon the oath on this point, if taken as he affirms, as a shocking piece of duplicity, hypocrisy, or perjury: as an article of faith, they certainly do receive it, and the difficulty may perhaps be got over in the way he has proposed it, that it does not absolutely form an article of Pope Pius's Creed. Hence, in an equivocal sense, they may swear that it forms no *necessary* part of their creed; and they may also do it on the ground of certain differences among them as to the real seat of infallibility. But what is an oath good for, when capable of such ambiguity? Unless this infallibility be, in some sense or other, an article of their faith, and acted upon, we cannot easily account for such declarations as I shall produce, in opposition to his assertion. In the decretals, it is said,—“That nothing is true except what the Pope approves, and every thing which he condemns, is false.” “We can believe nothing, says Lewis Capensis, unless we believe with a divine faith, that the Pope is the successor of St. Peter, and infallible.” It was expressed by Baronius, that “it depends upon the Pope to ratify decrees, and to alter them when ratified.” Bellarmine tells us, that “the Pope is absolutely above the Catholic Church, and above a general Council, so that he has no judge above him on earth.” The same high authority affirms, that “the Pope cannot err nor be deceived, and that it must be conceived concerning him, that he knows all things.” To pass from

individuals to Councils, we observe that many of these have acknowledged the infallibility of the Pope; such as Florence, the last Lateran Council, and that of Trent; and those that did it not, either divided the power, or assumed it. I go not into instances of infallibility, which the Popes themselves have arrogated, as the discussion would be too extensive; but I finally observe, that the canons, with their glossaries, teach that the Pope "hath a heavenly power, and therefore changes the nature of things, applying the essential attributes of one to the other; that he can dispense with law, and in a word, hath a plenitude of power."* With such authorities we combat his assertion,—“That the Irish (Roman) Catholics deny upon oath, that the infallibility of the Pope is any *necessary* part of the Catholic faith.” It is of no consequence at all that a parcel of Gentlemen, or of Priests, meet and profess to take certain oaths, in order insidiously to attain certain objects, for by this they neither alter the laws, the doctrines, nor the discipline of the Church, nor yet their own belief: these remain unchanged, whatever such Gentlemen may swear, or their reporter, without sufficient data, may affirm; and I am very certain, that, after any such meeting or resolution to swear, were the Pope to issue his Bull on the subject, they would all acknowledge his infallibility without scruple, or subscribe to any thing he might dictate. We therefore think that the facetious Rector has attempted a grand hoax, and rather too good a joke upon the Electors of Yorkshire.

But we pass to his third position, which is, that “they declare upon oath, that Catholics are forbidden to worship images, saints, and relics.” This we are aware they gene-

* The Protestant, vol. 1, p. 34, &c.

rally affirm, though not always upon oath, as he asserts, and they do it because, in their intercourse with Protestants, they cannot meet the absurdity, not to say evident idolatry, with which the act is chargeable. We may suppose also, that the better educated Roman Catholics see the folly of the act, and therefore avoid its grossness; but still it is a doctrine of their Church; and to profess or swear that such worship is forbidden, is among the phenomena to which our Letter writer calls public attention. But if it be as he says, what consistency is there between this alleged oath, and the firm belief which, according to the Trent Creed, every Papist expresses—"That the saints are to be worshipped and prayed to, and their relics had in veneration; and also that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, and due honour and veneration paid them." Is there any thing here like forbidding to worship them? Is it not rather commanded? And again, if the prohibition be sworn to as so strict, and they really do not infringe upon the commandments of God, by the worship with which we charge them, why do they so systematically exclude the second commandment, or the greater part of it, in Popish Ireland, and in every place where Protestantism does not prevail? Why, to obviate an evil which they swear does not exist, are they so strenuous to maintain a distinction between *adore* and *bow down*? Surely these oaths and this practice are directly opposed to the Rector of Foston's assertion, and give us no reason to believe that such worship is forbidden. The constitution of the Church cannot be affected or changed by the oaths which individuals may enter into. Our Letter writer's Popish friends may therefore persuade him as they like, and swear as they like, and he may give every publicity possible to what

they tell him, or he may believe without telling, but they cannot, nor dare they, alter what the Church enjoins by her Councils or her supreme Head, and immemorial practice sanctions; and were they called to account before the proper authorities, their oath would evaporate in thin air. We again therefore accuse him of deceiving the Electors of Yorkshire, by the shadow of an oath, which, if ever taken, is null and void, because it stands in opposition to the unrepealed decrees of Councils, and the unvaried practice of the Church of Rome.

Let us now proceed to his fourth point, which is—that “they upon oath abjure the temporal power of the Pope, or his right to absolve any Catholic from his oath.” It has been too much the practice among speculative politicians, to separate in their minds the temporal and spiritual power of the Pope, and to deny him any civil authority whatever, and it seems to be upon this ground that this part of his argument rests. To abjure a power which the Pope is supposed not to possess, and to deny a right to absolve which does not exist, is not too formidable even for the timid; and to make a declaration of this kind, is a convenient subterfuge for the fraudulent: but the real fact is otherwise. “Of all fallacies, none appears more palpable, more egregious, than that which regards spiritual authority as altogether unconnected with temporal. Theoretically, indeed, they are distinct, but practically, in most cases, it is hardly possible to disunite them.” “Like the soul and body, says Bellarmine, though each have special qualities and special interests, yet they act one upon the other by mutual co-operation, and affect each other by mutual influence. It may be easy to say, this is a spiritual right, and that a temporal right; this is an exercise of civil power, and that of ecclesiastical; but when you come

to apply these to individual cases, they will be found so blended together, as to render their separation always difficult, sometimes impracticable." "The Pope, as Pope, has not directly any temporal, but only a spiritual power, yet by reason of the spiritual, he has at least indirectly a certain power, and that supreme, in temporals. By his spiritual power, he can dispose of the temporal things of all christians, when that is required for the end of the spiritual power, to which the ends of all temporal powers are subordinate." Again, says the Cardinal, "the spiritual power does not mix itself in temporal concerns, but suffers all things to proceed, so long as they do not oppose the spiritual end, or be not necessary to obtain it. But if any thing of this sort occurs, the SPIRITUAL CAN. AND OUGHT TO COERCE THE TEMPORAL, BY ANY MEANS WHICH SHALL SEEM NECESSARY FOR ITS PURPOSE."*

These undisguised sentiments of so celebrated a writer among the Romanists; as Bellarmine, sufficiently prove that the spiritual authority of the Pope extends to matters of practice as well as faith; and the frequency with which he has absolved subjects from their obedience, and individuals from the criminality of civil offences, even murder, confirms the fact beyond contradiction. Screened behind the delusion, that the Pope has no temporal power; it is easy for the Papists to affirm, and for their doughty champion to echo the sound, that they abjure this power upon oath, or the Pope's right to absolve them. This is indeed more ludicrous than any farce that can be imagined, and its delusion is as complete. Whatever their advocate may believe, every Romanist has a practical knowledge of the influence which the Pope's spiritual power has over

* See the Bishop of Llandaff's (Van Mildert) Speech in the House of Lords.

them in temporals, and there is not one of these reputed abjurers of the temporal power of the Pope, who durst avow such a sentiment, and resist or deny the right, were that power exercised for the interest of Mother Church, and as the ends of his spiritual authority might, and frequently do require. In this case, the obligation of every such oath would be formally set aside, and we poor deluded dupes should be left to the mercy of the absolved Romanist, and to the laughter of his restless recreant apologist.

His last position is—that “they renounce, upon oath, all right to forfeited lands, and covenant, upon oath, not to destroy or plot against the Protestant Church.” I would warn Electors against this specious pretence, as a falsification of matter of fact, and a complete trick upon the credulous Protestant. It is well known, and I speak from the information of intelligent natives, that the Irish Papists have the most accurate knowledge of forfeited lands, according to existing plans, and that any one of a clan, can with ease point out the inheritance of their fathers. They preserve also a clear and distinct descent from their attainted ancestors, and they look for a re-investiture of every forfeited possession, when power shall enable them to realize their expectations; and the fact is equally true in regard to Protestant Churches and endowments. Both in Ireland and England they consider and avow the churches to be theirs. A declaration to this effect was made not long ago, to the Freeholders of Yorkshire, from a high quarter, and their scheme is so matured, that it is not improbable but they may have a successor to the Rector of Foston and Lonsbro’, unless the present Incumbent has secured the perpetual advowson, by his zeal for their service.

That their object is and must be the subversion of the Protestant Church, instead of maintaining its integrity and

existence upon oath; as our Rector suggests, let us hear, a Protestant Dissenter, who cannot be accused of an unfair prejudice in favour of the Church of England. "The Church established by law, is a part of the Constitution, and though the Roman Catholics profess to have no intention to overturn it, yet I must remind them that their profession is flatly contradicted by their religious principles: If upon being admitted into Parliament, they were to act according to their principles, their first effort should be to abolish the Church of England, and establish the Church of Rome. I may be told that they disavow this intention; I know they disavow it, and I know also that they disavow the intolerant religious exclusion which is ascribed to their system; But how is the disavowal made? *It is made by individuals who have no authority to make it. The character of Popery has been drawn from the Bulls of Popes, and the canons and decrees of Councils, and it has been disavowed by individuals only, or by bodies of Laity, not competent to make such avowal or by unauthorised meetings of Clergymen equally incompetent.*"* This is precisely the case with those whom the Rector mentions as meeting and taking oaths. Whatever they may have said or done, or whatever he may affirm, is quite null and void, because the whole is but the unauthorised act of individuals, who have just as much right to make a declaration contrary to the Bulls of the Popes and the Decrees of Councils, as a private Clergyman or Layman has to declare his exemption from the Law of the Land, or the Canon Law of the Church. In each case the declaration and oath is unauthorised, and consequently invalid.

This is true of every point he has so confidently enu-

* Blair's Letters to Wilberforce, p. 113 &c.

merated. Supposing the oath to be made according to his statement, yet want of authority in the persons making it, and direct opposition to every principle of the Church of Rome, destroy the whole force of his argument. We justly answer his subjoined question, on every point, in his own words: "we want more," than what he has alleged amounts to:—we want Papal authority for all that he says, and all that they profess to swear:—we want the Church of Rome herself by her Popes and Councils, and not unaccredited individuals, or even bodies of men to step forward, and make these declarations. The act is otherwise illegal and forbidden, the hope it excites is illusory and vain; and a Papal mandate, issued at any time, would, in a moment, dissipate the pleasing but delusive phantom. I therefore most decidedly denounce the author's *five points*, on Roman Catholic oaths, as frivolous, and warn my brother Freeholders against the empty show which he has exhibited. There is nothing either safe or solid to rest upon, and there is no reliance at all to be placed in our guide. The object is to deceive, but if we suffer ourselves thus to be duped, the blame is our own, and derision will be the least of what we shall have to suffer.

The remaining part of the Letter is so declamatory, desultory, and disunited, as to make it difficult to follow him, either with effect or satisfaction. Argument he has none: in fact his writing, like his conversation, is mere verbiage. Protestants, he very courteously observes, are eternally unjust, and riot in all the luxury of oppression; and as on this account, he says, we deserve to be eternally teased and inconvenienced by the Papist, it must be a high gratification to him to stimulate them against us by his encouraging voice; but as a Clergyman there may be doubts whether or not he be reputably employed. In the way of

intimidation he tells us that the strength of the Papists is numerically increasing, and that it is therefore vain either for the County of York, or even for Parliament to think of setting their claims at rest. He thinks the Papists would be to blame to cease their importunity to the legislature, for that we must yield, and probably as a traveller yields to an armed robber. This highly unbecoming language, will, I hope, stimulate rather than discourage the Protestants of the United Kingdom. We thank him for his simile of the highwayman and the traveller, though his friends the Papists have no reason to do so. They too faithfully resemble the highwayman, and we the unsuspecting traveller. They lie in wait to deceive under the shadow of such oaths as the Rector of Foston has recorded, and we are deluded into a false security by concealed danger, till they can demand the surrender of our civil and religious privileges, and force us to yield to the necessity of our condition. The simile well illustrates the relative character and circumstances of the Papist and the Protestant, and loudly calls upon the latter to be upon his guard.

He next ridicules the courage of the English against Irish Papists, and hints that it is exercised unjustly, and may be unavailing against the *keen eyed revenge of an impenetrable Papish phalanx*, but at the same time he remarks that the rising of the Papists, may be a misfortune not only to the empire, but to themselves. Against such language as this it is not easy to find words sufficiently expressive of our indignation. He himself indeed confesses, that his tone may be called threatening, and so it undoubtedly is; though he assures us he has no such intention. The impartial reader will however scarcely acquit him of the very (shall I only call it) unclerical intention to inflame and to intimidate. But let us proceed. In a menacing sort of

attitude, he tells us, that what we haughtily refuse, we shall be compelled ignominiously to grant, a threat which he illustrates by an incident in the American war. Now though I think no such thing, yet he has done his utmost to bring on such a crisis by his inflammatory language, which might, much more reasonably, have been expected from a Popish demagogue, or the late Rector of Aberdeen, than the Rector of Foston and of Lonsbro, or, I should hope, any other clerical Rector in the kingdom.

He faintly owns that Roman Catholics have errors, and that he does not mean to *defend them all*. This laudable resolve of a Protestant Rector joins somewhat oddly with the tenor of the rest of his letter. He is evidently the advocate of these errors to a considerable extent, for he affirms that they are grievously exaggerated and misrepresented. This merely proves that he has undertaken a subject of which he is disgracefully ignorant. I firmly believe, that no man who has attentively considered the rise and progress of Popery, can think any terms too strong to expose those erroneous corruptions of Christianity, which were incorporated by the Council of Trent as her unalterable system, are confirmed by every Pope, sworn to by every Priest, and adhered to by all the members of that Church, under the dread of a suspended anathema. Let any one look at those errors of Rome, as they are found in the additional articles of Pope Pius's creed, and judge whether, as gross deviations from primitive truth, they can be too much deprecated for their heterodoxy, their folly, or their impiety. And if it be said that they are changed, I answer, no, and that the very supposition of change is an insult both to the understanding of the Protestant and the boasted immutability of Popery, a position also in which the

Protestant advocates of Popery and the Papists themselves are at issue.

We are not to make them rebels, he says, because we cannot make them Protestants, nor endanger the state because we cannot enlarge the Church. On neither of these grounds are we culpable. We do not want to make them Protestants by pains or penalties, nor to enlarge our Church by coercion, nor do we see how any one but a sophist could unite such consequences, to such premises. If rebellion arise or the state be endangered, it is not owing to us, but to the religion of Rome, which contains in itself those seeds of hostility which must endanger every Protestant state; and it may be further observed, that these effects which he anticipates must be ascribed more than to any other cause, to such irritating Letters as the Rector of Foston has seen it expedient to publish to the world. His verbiage about the excellency of our Protestant Church, I assent to, but to retain it I certainly would not adopt his method of letting Popery into power, nor would I risk the loss of our civil and religious liberties, for the precarious boon of Te Deum being chaunted in Popish Chapels for victories over hostile armies. Preserving things as they are cannot distract our attention, nor waste our strength, nor paralyse our arms among the nations, but an ascendant Popish power might produce all these effects.

In order "to secure the Protestant Church, and preserve the British Empire in its well known state of strength, union, and opulence," while we tolerate Popery, yet we must watch it as capable of doing much mischief in its natural state, because of its avowed intolerance, and its coercive proselyting spirit, upon its own unvaried principles. To proceed in the lively strains of the Letter writer (page 18) I therefore join the cry of "*No Popery*" as lustily as any

man in our streets, who may not know so well as our learned Rector that the Pope lives at Rome, and that Rome is mystic Babylon, and therefore I say emancipate not the Romanists, lest acquired power become subservient to the re-action of unchanged principles, and in any emergency they join foreign Papists, whose aid they are now soliciting, in order to subvert Protestantism, and with it freedom and toleration. I say "*Church for ever*," therefore do not emancipate the Roman Catholics, and grant them power lest they pull it down. "*King for ever*" therefore do not emancipate the Roman Catholics, lest in the plenitude of power the Pope depose our Protestant Sovereign, and transfer his throne to a Papist. "*Great Britian for ever*," therefore beware of emancipating Roman Catholics, lest they put an end to its perpetuity. "*Our Government is essentially Protestant*," therefore do not emancipate Roman Catholics, lest they deprive us of its essence.. "*The Roman Catholics are disguised enemies*," take care therefore you do not emancipate them, lest power inspire confidence, and put them in a condition to emit all their rancour and employ all their resources as open enemies. "*They have a double allegiance*," therefore do not grant them political power, lest they withdraw their constrained allegiance to the King, and transfer it openly and entire to the Pope.

No POPERY may therefore very safely be the Electors guide, in the hurry and confusion of a canvass, or a poll ; and this mark may and ought to be observed,—*vote for a free, that is, a Protestant altar*, and support the existing Religion and Government of Britain. That done, let these impressions rest upon the minds of Electors, *no chains, no prisons, no bonfires for a mans faith, as in Popish story ; no Smithfield burnings, no Massacre's of St. Bartholomew, no revocation of oaths or edicts, no Albigensian crusades and.*

murders, no Inquisition, no restraints upon conscience, and no exclusive salvation, as Popery teaches, but an open way to heaven, a free altar, and free toleration. These are points which illustrate the history and true spirit of Popery, and these are what Electors should always keep in mind when they are asked for their vote, or when they exercise their elective franchise. He indeed upbraids us with refusing the claims of the Romanists, and boldly brands us with injustice and cruelty, but the above practical hints on the unaltered marks of Popery, fully answer his declamation, and show cause why the rule should not be granted for which he so strenuously pleads.

With paradox for his guide, he professes to think that the violence of the Irish demagogues is a childish consideration for denying their claims, which he pronounces just, and that the more violent and absurd the conduct of the Papist may be, the greater the wisdom of giving them power by emancipation. This is not argument that will strike every man as wise and prudent. If a drunken brute, with a pistol or a bludgeon in his hand, should attack the Rectory house at Foston, where he yields to the comfort of a good income, would the worthy Incumbent reason thus, and think that the greater the man's violence, the greater would be his own wisdom in removing all impediments and letting him in? I suspect not. The transition is easy to the violent Papist, who demands admission to privileges and power. He bullies, and swaggers, and threatens, and makes his claims with insolence and oaths. *It is utterly hopeless,* he cries, *to put the matter to rest by any effort of the County of York, or by any decision of Parliament, you must give way to their claims.* * *In vain,* cries another, *shall states-*

* Sydney Smith's Letter, p. 15.

men put their hands together, in vain shall Parliament declare the established Church permanent and inviolate, in vain shall the lazy Churchman cry from the sanctuary to the watchman on the tower, that danger is at hand, it shall fall, and nothing but the memory of the mischiefs it has occasioned shall survive. * Thus are we menaced, and were the Rectory House at Foston so menaced, I should question whether it would be opened to such an assailant. Respecting the demands of the Papists, though violence may justify opposition, yet I do not say that these demands shall be resisted merely because of brutal insolence, but because this insolence implies violence after admission, and is in fact Popery practically displaying the real unchanged principles of that religion. O'Connell, O'Gorman, Dromgoole, Sydney Smith, and others cannot restrain themselves, they speak out; but in their violence or their indiscretion they utter the sentiments of Popes and Councils, and speak the acts of former days. In short they tell the truth, from whence we collect the true spirit of Popery, and how they would conduct themselves had they power. From these premises we argue, in the face of his wit and his ridicule, that the will is the same, the principle of action unaltered and obligatory, and the Roman Catholic Church would, if it could by the accession of power, tyrannize now, as it ever has done, over the rights, and privileges, and opinions of mankind. This argument is valid, and considered so by a great majority of the nation; and here we rest our opposition to Popery, whether urged by the intemperate demagogue, the insidious aspirant after power, or our declamatory Popish advocate.

His analogy between the distribution of office and the

* Dromgoole's Speech at the Catholic Board, &c.

imposition of taxes, and his inference that the former ought to be granted to the Papist, because the latter is imposed upon him, is so contemptible and so opposed to common sense and common experience, that his better judgement, if he has any, would have excluded the argument altogether, had not his precipitancy and his love of paradox driven him into this extreme of folly. But something more than folly is attributable to him in the next paragraph, for he purposely, (inadvertency in such a case is out of the question) calls the rebellion against Charles I. the English Revolution. Now that which is uniformly so distinguished, and of this he could not be ignorant, is the exclusion of James II. for Popery, and the Accession of the Protestant William to the throne of Britain. This great Epoch he has designedly excluded from his page, because its peculiar history would have completely answered every part of his letter. The injurious effects of Popery upon religious liberty which he has attempted by his wit to ridicule, and by his abortive argument to neutralize, are so prominent in the character and conduct of James, as to convince any one who is open to conviction, and chooses to give the matter an impartial and deliberate examination. The events of that short reign the author was doubtless aware would overturn the whole of his wild theory, he therefore refers us to the "No Popery" cry of Cromwell's Protectorate, and the severe military execution of the penal laws by which the Roman Catholics were broken to pieces. This he misnames the English Revolution, and ends his anachronism with a very silly story of "water, water" from the Thames.

Unfortunate as he has been in his illustrations and allusions, his additions or omissions, he certainly is not less so in depreciating the wisdom of our ancestors. A wise and provident policy appears in all their acts respecting

the adherents of the Church of Rome, and the prevalence of that religion in a Protestant State. They saw, and felt, and acted with a discernment and a precision, which no future generation has yet thought fit to set aside; or if this has been done as it respects Popery, no essential benefit has accrued to the State, and we have neither increased our blessings nor secured our peace. In proportion as any of these laws have been relaxed or repealed, in the same proportion are we, in his own language, "teased and worried," which he thinks we deserve to be, by the encroachments of an aspiring enemy, and the undisguised insolence of anticipated power. This is apparent in the unqualified reproaches incessantly poured upon the Reformers and the Reformation, and the open hostility manifested to every Protestant institution. Politically it is seen in the exercise of the elective franchise, to which they have been admitted, for here, upon the authority of the Reverend Sydney Smith, they "*are so increasing in boldness, that they will soon require of the Members they return, to oppose generally any government hostile to Roman Catholic emancipation, and will turn out those who do not comply with this rule.*"* This system is carried on to a great extent in Ireland, to which the populace are instigated by the Priest in the exercise of his sacred functions, by whom they are led in groups to the hustings.† Such is the consequence of contempt for the wise precaution of our ancestors; and worse will be our condition, in an inconceivable degree, if we deviate further, and prefer the advice of the Rector of Foston.

To avoid those sad effects to which his speculative folly leads, the zealous Protestant should resist his principles and obviate the evils to which they lead, by conti-

* Letter, p. 22.

† Prot. Adv. v. 1, p. 311. where cases are adduced.

nuing the cry of—"No Popery," regardless of his sneer that it is a mere political engine. If the danger continue and increase, as it clearly does both to Church and State, the use of this engine should not be discontinued. I speak not from my own views, but agreeably to the prophetic spirit of the Reverend Sydney Smith, *for Saul also is among the prophets*. With a confidence exceeded only by his illustrious predecessor in the same cause, Dr. Dromgoole, he predicts an explosion of the Protestant Government by Papal rebellion, equally certain and inevitable, as if a lighted candle was stuck in an open barrel of gunpowder. He may be taunted with a prophetic spirit, as, he says, he and his fellows have been, (p. 22, 23,) but he affirms it to be founded upon experience and common sense, by the application of the past to the future. How gladly do we hail the very name of common sense, so barren as the Letter is of this very useful ingredient; but we sigh "in sober sadness," when we find it to be "vox et preterea nihil."

But for the prophecy.—Scenes of war, our sagacious prophet observes, will be acted over again, when those who, in the late wars, lost legs and arms, health and sons, are gone to their graves.—This, I suppose, is the exercise of common sense, but we required no prophet to inform us of it, nor indeed of the sequel, viz.—that when we are at war with foreign powers, or in any difficulty, the Roman Catholics will watch their opportunity, and soon settle the question of Catholic emancipation, that is, by force. Now though we have every reason to expect this, from their implacable, unchanged animosity to every thing Protestant, we did not expect so explicit an avowal from their friend and advocate. We gratefully receive the information, as of the highest possible authority, and look for its

accomplishment with the same infallible certainty, as for an explosion from "a lighted candle stuck in an open barrel of gunpowder." "If danger be not pointed out and insisted upon, as he observes at page 16, how is it to be avoided?" How indeed! And hence we thank him the more cordially for giving us this seasonable warning. I hope we shall be put upon our guard against the machinations of an enemy nourished among us, protected in their person and property, and tolerated in their religion. The "No Popery" cry may well be raised, upon his information alone, by every considerate Protestant, who wishes to retain an abiding sense of the danger which, from this quarter, hangs over his country, and Electors should keep this in mind, as one of the few useful hints which they may gather from the Letter of the Reverend Sydney Smith.

I only glance at his allusion to the result of the American war, for the sake of observing that he manifests the same mischievous spirit, as in previous illustrations, and exhibits the same species of wit. But in the subsequent page, (24) he fairly outdoes himself. Who would think that the friend and advocate of the cause of Popery, would make the comparison he has done: *whenever he sees a herd of swine driven, he thinks of the Popish question?* Though he may, in the keenness of his satire, represent the leading opponents of the Roman Catholic claims, as the drivers of these herds, and as brutish as the pigs themselves, yet it is scarcely within the line of probability that he should assimilate the Nobles, Right Honourables, and Honourables, among the Roman Catholics, their Orators and their Divines, to a herd of swine! But so it is; and it seems from this circumstance, that when he lashes around him with his wit, he spares neither friend nor foe, neither Papist nor Protestant. Swine are bad to drive,

and this seems to have reminded him of the obstinate Papist, which is no doubt an admirable comparison, and founded upon the innate association of ideas; and as a little boy, with a handful of barley, may sometimes lead the bristly herd, when force cannot drive them, his proposal is, that Lord Liverpool would gracefully walk before the hoggish Romanists, whether Nobles, Commoners, or Divines, and endeavour to lead them by scattering barley, or courteous words. The method here suggested, he says, would be more efficient than the breathless hurry of Lord Stowell, the oath of the Duke of York, or the mace of the Lord Chancellor. This is no doubt a very facetious illustration, in his own estimation, and in mine it is a very just one; but will his Popish friends thank him for the likeness? I fear it will be less palatable than that of the highwayman. I indeed quarrel with neither, and think this last inimitable; but his clients of Rome may think themselves aggrieved, and I have heard that they do most bitterly complain of the indignity. What fuel does it supply for the inflamed spirits of Electors? Mr. Burke, about some half century ago, gave great offence by calling the common people "the swinish multitude;" but this is a trifle when compared with the offence of Sydney Smith, who multiplies obnoxious comparisons, including all ranks, and indiscriminately assimilating them to the unprincipled robber, or the ignoble swine. The measure of punishment for this offence, I leave to be settled between the Reverend defamer, and the party defamed. The moral of his remark, I am willing to admit, for I clearly see the justice of the comparison, in the unchanged, obstinate Papist, whom it is difficult either to lead or drive, and whose nature is not changed even with kind words. Precarious as the effect of courtesy may be upon a pig, I should fear its influence

would be as unavailing with the Romanist; nay, when "I endeavour to reflect" upon Popish story, I cannot help thinking the pigs of Rome the more obstinate of the two. From this, however, I should not wonder, if the cry of "No Popery" should be changed into "no highwaymen," "no Romish swine;" and if so, who have they to blame but their own Reverend Advocate.

He admits that Roman Catholics are intolerant, and that the Irish Papists are rash, violent, and intemperate, (p. 24, 25,) and immediately turns upon us with the questions—are we also to be intolerant, or violent, and is the Government to imitate the vices of the subject? My answer is, we are not so, nor does the Government imitate those vices which it sees in Roman Catholic subjects. Where or when was toleration more perfectly understood, or more extensively practised? Or what ground is there for accusing Protestants of being rash, or violent, or intemperate toward the Papist? Surely nothing but the most consummate assurance could have insinuated this to be the case. He indirectly, however, helps us to the fact, that Roman Catholics are intolerant, and that the Irish Papists are rash, violent, and intemperate. To this he had before testified, in the examples of O'Connell, O'Gorman, and O'Sullivan; and as to intolerance, the Church of Rome is so by her very constitution. We hence, from his own admission, perceive the fearful certainty that the principles and practices of Papists are unchanged, and that there is equal necessity as ever there was, for the cry of "No Popery," because we are sure that intolerance and violence would be the necessary consequence of their ascendancy. He remarks upon the double allegiance of the Papists to the King and to the Pope, and labours to make it appear, in a way peculiar to himself, that there is no more harm

in this, than if some of them should choose to be governed by a Chinese, others by a Bramin, and others by a Greek Patriarch. Having, as he supposes, excited a laugh by the introduction of this strange group, the incompatibility of a double allegiance is treated as a joke, and the laugh is continued against all who think, that allegiance to the Pope infringes upon allegiance to the King.

I have met him before upon this ground, and exposed his fallacy. But I would add yet further, on this very important subject, that the spiritual allegiance of the Papist does, upon the clearest principles of his religion, interfere with civil relations and allegiance to the crown. If, according to the Romish canon, "the Pope has power to dispense with all the laws of God," much more may he extend his power to dispense with all the laws of men. History tells us that this power has always been in exercise, and never suspended, unless as a matter of expediency. Pope Boniface VIII. excommunicated Philip, King of France, and cursed him and his race to the fourth generation, because he would not permit him to draw money out of his kingdom, which is surely having something to do with temporal and civil rights: and his address to the King is a remarkable instance of the arrogant interference of the spiritual Head of the Church, with the jurisdiction and civil rights of Kings and subjects.—"God hath established us, he says, over Kings and kingdoms, to pluck up, to overthrow, to destroy, to scatter, to build and to plant, in his name, and by his doctrine. Do not allow yourself to be persuaded that you have not a superior, and that you are not subject to the Head of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. *He that thinks thus is a fool, and he that obstinately maintains it, is an*

infidel."* Of this alternative, I leave my very, very Reverend Friend of Foston, to take his choice.

Here is one proof, and there is abundance of others to show, that the spiritual Sovereign has attempted to meddle with the affairs of the temporal Sovereign; and that our author's statement, and "the Roman Catholics denial of such a power, by the most solemn oaths that the wit of man can devise,"† is neither more nor less than a solemn piece of mockery on the part of the Papist, and a scandalous fraud upon the credulous Protestant. Buonaparte understood well the real nature of the interference of the spiritual with the temporal power, and therefore decreed its abolition, because, says he to the Conservative Senate, "it has been demonstrated unto me, that the spiritual influence exercised in my States by a foreign power, (the Pope) was contrary to the independence of France, and to the safety and dignity of my throne." So it is of every throne; and if our worthy champion of Popish claims, has neither seen, nor heard, nor read of an instance of the meddling interference of the Pope, for a century and a half, he has made very bad use both of his eyes and ears.

The information which he suggests (p. 26) country Gentlemen should make themselves masters of, before they order their post chaises to attend a "No Popery" meeting, I earnestly recommend to him, and to others, before they either write upon the subject, attend Popery meetings, or sign requisitions to Popery candidates. Had he himself followed this rule, he would not, I am sure, have damned his own fame, by writing the Letter he has done. He abruptly adverts in this page to the resumption of property by Irish Papists, in case they should attain power, which

* See the Protestant, vol. 1, p. 39.

† Vide Sydney Smith's Letter.

he had before affirmed they renounced upon oath, but which he now says they cannot do for want of a knowledge of the rightful possessor, and yet they are watching the moment for regaining their possessions. Of these, as I said before, they have the most accurate knowledge, whether they belonged to the O'Rourkes, the O'Connors, or the O'Sullivans. But here we remark both malevolence and ignorance: the former he exhibits in the declaration "that Catholic Ireland hath been three times murdered by its Protestant masters," which is as false as it is inflammatory; and the latter appears in his ascribing one of these seasons of murder to the reign of Henry VII. who was as rank a Papist as ever swayed the British sceptre. Here is ignorance which need not have existed, had he sought after the information which he recommends to the "No Popery" men; and as to the malevolence of his insinuation, that we have murdered three times over, the Papists of Ireland, I want words to express my abhorrence of the suggestion, and of the cold blooded nature of that man who could frame and utter such a sentence: a fit companion truly is such a one for a friend whom he eulogizes, (p. 19) and who, with an equal want of feeling, has declared that the calamities of England were to him a consolation.

With persecution he never fails to stigmatize the Protestant, while he strenuously labours to remove the charge from the Papist. We are intolerant, he says, for depriving the Papist of political power, and by this our insolence is gratified. We are unfeeling, because we can see with dry eyes, Lord Stourton excluded from Parliament, and we revel in the wounds we inflict upon a fellow creature, on account of his faith. Thus he accuses us of cruelty and injustice, and tells us we think ourselves tolerant, because we are not so intolerant as in ages of fire and faggot, chains and

stone walls. All this is pure inflammatory declamation, neither founded in truth nor supported by argument. The Church of which he is a minister, and I am sorry to say an accuser, is neither persecuting, nor insolent, nor cruel, nor unjust, nor intolerant, nor can he prove the things which he basely lays to her charge. I had much rather impute his abominable charges to that want of information, which is conspicuous in "Popery" as well as "No Popery" Gentlemen, than to wilful misrepresentation or malignity of heart. Though we restrain the Papists from power, because they always abuse it, yet he knows full well that we are not intolerant; that we pull down no man's altar, and punish no man's prayer; we heap no penalties on those supplications which are offered up to God in divers languages, in varied tongues, or in temples of a thousand forms, but every man, by a spirit of toleration unexampled in any nation or at any period, is suffered without either pain or penalty, insolence or persecution, nay under the strongest legal sanctions, to worship God, just as he pleases, in any tongue, in any form, in any temple he likes, or in no temple at all, but the open canopy of heaven. The charge is therefore unfounded in fact, and unbecoming in him to allege. What he can expect from his depreciation of the Church of England, and his advocacy of the Church of Rome I cannot tell, unless it be to partake largely of the hospitality of that Nobleman, whom he mentions by name as excluded from Parliament, but whose exclusion, the Noble Lord will soon discover, the Reverend Gentleman can look upon not merely with dry eyes, (p. 27) but even with a merry countenance.

That the Roman Catholic religion is what it was three centuries ago, or that it is unchangeable and unchangeable, he affirms to be completely untrue. With his usual

effrontery our Divine has advanced this opinion before, and echoed it through the county, from Thirsk to Beverley, from Beverley to Foston Rectory, and from Foston Rectory to the Electors of Yorkshire. I however as confidently assert that the position is completely true, and for proofs, I refer not to any unaccredited Romanists who may meet and swear that it is changed, but to rescripts of Popes and decrees of Councils which have never been reversed; I refer to the Trent Creed which is precisely the same now and as precisely obeyed as it was 800 years ago; I refer to their great leading doctrine of infallibility,* no matter where it resides, which must be done away with if their religion is changed; and I refer to their own writers, Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, Barristers, and other laymen. These all directly contradict our intrepid Rector, and so adverse to his position is the whole system of Popery that we may confidently affirm, that "there is not the shadow of truth to support him." I wish *such Gentlemen, before they sit down to write Popery Letters, or order their Post Chaises for Popery Meetings, would read and inform [themselves even of the rudiments of the question.* In this case a great deal of time, pen, ink, and paper would be spared, and they would not fall into such egregious blunders as this headlong, (not long headed,) Gentleman has done, which are insulting to the Papist and delusive to the Protestant.

It is true, as he says, that the Pope would be laughed at as a Lunatic, were he to issue a Bull excommunicating the Duke of York; that Papists may not now burn Protestants, though in Ireland we have some dreadful cases of

* I resolved, says Southey, to qualify myself to expose the baneful system of Popery, in its proper deformity, and show it to my countrymen such as it has been, is, and must continue to be, so long as it maintains its pretensions to be infallible.—*Vindiciæ Eccles. Angli.* p. 12.

outrage ; and they may, for any thing I know to the contrary, worship in the same Church at different times of the day, but this proves nothing except their impotence. Have we not positive proof of the disposition of Popery to coerce rights and restrain religious privileges, in the language of the late and present Popes, and the proceedings of Romish Priests, and mobs instigated by them in Ireland, against the distribution and reading of the Scriptures ? Have we not equally corroborative proof in the annual curse and excommunication from the Papal chair, upon all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, and Heretics, and whosoever shall receive, defend, or favour them ! Is it not clear from the still subsisting oath of fidelity to the Pope taken by every Romish Bishop, “ that the Roman Papacy he will assist to defend against all men; the rules of the holy fathers, the decrees, orders, appointments, reservations, provisions, mandate apostolical, with his might he will observe, and cause to be observed by others ; and all heretics, schismatics, and rebels against our said Lord, the Pope, and his successors, he will to the utmost of his power, PERSECUTE AND IMPUGN” ? And do we not derive the same information from the oath, which every Popish Priest is obliged to take, of obedience to the supremé Pontiff, and to the doctrines of the sacred canons and general Councils, especially the holy Council of Trent, and that all heresies condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church, he equally condemns, rejects, and anathematizes ? All this is surely opposed, in the most direct manner to the ignorant and wilful assertion of the Rector of Foston. But I would say in the spirit of his own words, who can see and know these things, and deny, as he has done, that the Roman Catholic religion is unchangeable and unchanged ? He has not the shadow of truth to sup-

port him, and I really do wish our Popery Advocate would inform himself even of the elements of the question, before he puts pen to paper again upon the subject, and obtrudes upon British Electors his indigested matter.

Of all animals it is the characteristic of man to reflect, and combine cause and effect, so as to distinguish their mutual relations. According to this peculiarity of his species, our worthy Rector, in spite of his innate volatility, has *often endeavoured to reflect*. Judging from what has transpired, it may perhaps be concluded that he has thought seriously on nothing, and matured nothing. But he tells us himself, and who would not believe him, that he has often *endeavoured* to reflect upon the causes which have raised such a clamour against the Roman Catholics, and he has, after many acknowledged efforts, fixed upon ten as the most prominent, and has arranged them like a sober reflecting man, under ten heads, and given to each a distinct answer. This is at least orderly, and it is the only instance in his Letter, if it be not satisfactory.

The first cause is "historical recollections of cruelties inflicted upon Protestants." This he says, is a miserable reason for the continuance of penal laws, when one side has as much to recollect as the other. So far do I differ from my reflecting friend, that I hold historical recollections of cruelties to Protestants to be among our best reasons for the enforcement of incapacitating laws, and especially as those, of whom these cruelties are recorded, are unchangeable, and want not the will but the power to enact the same scenes over again. And as to one side having as much to recollect as the other, it is untrue in the proportion of one to ten thousand.

His second cause of clamour against Papists, as the result of his second endeavour to reflect, is "theological dif-

ferences," which he disposes of as not coming under the cognizance of State. This I admit as to liberty of conscience, but deny under the conviction that these very doctrines have been the direct cause of Popish cruelty, and hence with these the State has in this peculiar sense to do, and against such practical effects it ought to provide by salutary restraints.

His third discovered cause is a "belief that the Roman Catholics are unfriendly to liberty." As this is true, it is a sufficient cause, and I presume he is convinced of its truth, as his reflecting mind has supplied no answer; but he contents himself with observing, that it is ill to say this in a country whose free institutions were founded by Roman Catholics, and for those to say it who care nothing about free institutions. As this reply evades the question, it betrays his latent conviction that the Romish religion is unfriendly to liberty, and especially, as its principles prove and its writers unconsciously proclaim, that it is unfriendly to every Protestant institution, civil or religious

The fourth cause why we raise a clamour against them, is "that their morality is not good;" and cause enough. But he says, it is not true; we answer, it is true, and that its truth is founded upon the very nature of Popery, especially their demoralizing Indulgences, their purgatorian societies, and their pecuniary commutation for sins, according to the tax book of the sacred Roman Chancery.

The fifth cause, which his reflecting mind suggests, is "that they meditate the destruction of the Protestant Church." Without meeting the case, he says, make them so comfortable that it will not be worth their while. This is a miserable reason, because no comforts can change their principles, and therefore it is always from principle, worth

their while to effect the destruction of the Protestant Church, and upon this they daily meditate. He indeed, by his evasion admits the fact, but it is more satisfactorily proved to a Protestant mind by the character and conduct of Papists at all times, where a Protestant Church has existed, by the Bulls of Popes, decrees of Councils, the oaths of their ecclesiastics, and the annual curse pronounced against all Protestants from the Papal chair.

But we proceed to his sixth cause, which is "an unprincipled clamour by men who have no sort of belief in the danger of emancipation, but make use of no Popery as a political engine." This he pronounces an unfair political trick, and we denounce his assumption as most unwarrantable. It is a clamour justifiably founded upon the known principles of the Romish Church, and the clearest experience of ages, And if there is any trick or duplicity at all, or any want of principle, it is with the Popish recusant, the designing emancipator, or the uncandid apologist, who reckless of consequences, sweeps away the foundation of our Constitution, and would deceive us to our ruin.

His seventh and eighth causes are, "a mean and selfish spirit of denying to others the advantages we enjoy, and a vindictive spirit of punishing others for entertaining opinions contrary to our own." These causes, he says, have a great influence in every act of intolerance; and so they may where they exist, but this is not the great principle by which Protestants are actuated, and it certainly cannot be laid to the charge of the Church of England. This base insinuation is of course a harmless weapon, which cannot hurt us, though its whizzing may somewhat discompose and irritate our feelings.

His ninth reason is "a stupid compliance with the

opinions of the majosity." These stupid folk, he observes, comprehend the greatest number, and I am glad to find him acknowledge that the "No Popery" men have real numbers on their side, and are the majority; a concession the more consolatory, as he threatened us a few pages back with the vengeance of overwhelming millions. But this stupid compliance is not, I am persuaded, the obstinacy of brutal ignorance, *or of a swinish multitude*, but the sober stand of mind and numbers, zealous for the truth, and reasoning from the page of history and experience upon the certain bearings of principles upon practice, and the unvarying influence of cause upon effect. Judging from the good sense of English Protestants, these are they whom he incautiously calls stupid, but whom I call steadfast in a good cause; who have sat down and endeavoured to reflect, and are now acting upon their own sober reflection, and these are such as I hope constitute the great body of Yorkshire Electors.

But there is yet a tenth cause, which, he tells us, he adds in justice and candour. Ave! Ave! these scarce commodities! this is "a real apprehension on the part of honest and reasonable men, that it is dangerous to grant further concessions to Roman Catholics." Here he observes, that of the existence of such a class of "No Popery-ists," it would be the highest injustice to doubt, but adds he, "in sober sadness," "I confess it excites in me a very great degree of astonishment." Whether he includes among these, or the former class of stupid opponents to Popish claims, Lord Stowell, who gets out of breath, Lord Eldon, who strikes with the Mace of office, or the Duke of York who swears,* I cannot tell, though it may probably be with

* Lest this should be taken for common swearing, which his Reverence seems to wish us to believe, the reader should be apprised of the Royal Duke's solemn declaration and oath, in the House of Lords, never to yield to Popish claims. His speech was afterwards distributed extensively, and printed in letters of gold.

the stupid class that they are to stand muster, from the scurrility of his manner when he names these Royal and Noble Bulwarks of our Protestant faith. But be this as it may, he professes surprise at the existence of the last cause. Why however should he be so astonished at the decision of *honest and reasonable men, against any further concessions to the Roman Catholics?* His surprise may be that such men are not converts to his opinions; but the main ground of surprise to others doubtless will be, that he, and those who are similarly circumstanced, are not converts to the opinions of *honest and reasonable men*, whom he in contempt denominates "No Poperists." As honest and reasonable men I should be utterly astonished did they unite with him in opinion, or he with them; but I seriously request him to *endeavour to reflect* whether it would not be creditable to himself, and contribute to redeem his name from merited censure, were he cordially to unite in sentiment, on the Popish question, with those whom even his pen of gall has been constrained to eulogise as *honest and reasonable*. Verbum sat sapienti.

He speaks of a struggle with the Irish, as if we were the authors and aggressors, and strove to retard the industry of thousands. He is ignorant, or wilfully forgets, that the Irish Papists, led on by heated demagogues, are themselves the cause of industry being retarded, and of all the evils of that unhappy country. Without our instigation, but as the natural consequence of their own principles, which are radically and perpetually hostile to Protestantism, they are now and have long been engaged in "pestilential and disgraceful squabbles;" and instead of "ploughing and spinning," industry is paralyzed, and they are "cursing and hating, burning and murdering" the Protestants without mercy.—This is the state of Ireland, caused not

by us, but by the violence and injudicious harangues of such Orators as he chooses to eulogize, and by such inflammatory Letters as that now before us. He objects to the English deciding the Popish question, as unjust and improper, as if we were not interested in the question: it ought, he thinks, to be left to the Irish themselves. But this is not at all admissible, if the danger at present from numerical strength so far preponderates on the side of Popery, that Protestants are obliged to "dine with a loaded pistol, and sleep in an iron night cap;" and if Papists have discovered their strength, and are determined to be free.

(p. 30)—Such language might have been uttered by the inflamed Orators of Hibernia, but ill becomes the reflecting Rector of Foston, who has already allowed that honest and reasonable men are against the Roman Catholic claims. It is calculated to produce the squabbles he speaks of, and to multiply indefinitely "maimed cattle, fired ricks, threatening letters, barricadoed doors, and murdered inhabitants." (p. 31.) No wonder, under these circumstances, that many Irish Members (he says a majority) vote for Roman Catholic claims, fear stimulating more than conviction; and no wonder that he, as an avowed emancipator, should say, "let the votes of these Members decide the case."

Gentlemen meeting in a county town, and entering into resolutions against further concessions to the Romanist, are not so ignorant of the question, or of Irish affairs, as he would humourously represent them. These affairs are sufficiently notorious, and "honest, reasonable men," are shocked at the violence of Irish Papists, as well as the tendency of such Letters as his; and it is from these demonstrative proofs of the unchanged nature of Popish principles and practices, that these Gentlemen meet and resolve as they do. Their combinations also become more

united, and their resolutions more prompt and vigorous, when they see, as in the Letter of an English Rector and Magistrate, fuel thrown among the hot embers of discord, and political and religious feeling excited to phrenzy, by the most irritating interrogatories; such as,—“is there a hope left?—any term of endurance?—any boundary to patience?—any good wish from the greatest of the great?—or any brighter hopes in another reign?—is any thing left to the Papist but disgust, hatred, and despair, breaking out in wild eloquence, acting upon a wild people, and preparing a mass of treason and disaffection, which may shake the empire to its centre?”—(Letter, p. 32.) In this inflammatory manner he proceeds, and tells us neither to laugh at O’Connell, nor treat him with contempt, or his metaphors with ridicule, for he is not so great a fool, as many most respectable Clergymen suppose him to be. Our author seems to have some brother Clergyman in view, who may perhaps be upon Wilson’s or Duncombe’s Committee: of this I know nothing, nor am I the advocate of any individual; but I bear a most decided testimony against such language, which if it be not itself absolutely seditious, must at all events create a high degree of excitement.

On the subject of persecution, he pours out all the eloquence of his pen, for the express purpose of extenuating any thing of this kind that may be charged upon the Papist, and amplifying whatever is chargeable upon the Protestant: the former indeed he scarcely mentions, but by allusion, while he enters into a disgusting detail of cruelties alleged against the latter. This may be thought an impartial adherence to truth, when it is considered that the accuser is a Protestant Clergyman, and the Incumbent of two very good Rectories. He is, however, deliberately guilty of the grossest partiality to the side of the Romanist,

not only in his statement, but in his authorities, which are Dod, a notoriously bigoted Popish historian, and the modern Bishop of Castabala, Milner, a writer of the same school, and the same dubious veracity on this particular subject; entirely omitting every Popish persecution, he diligently searches after the individual evils of this nature, and they are but individual, in which Protestants have been criminally engaged, and for which no one that I know of has ventured to apologize. But after all his diligence in exploring Dod, Milner, and similar authorities, what is the result of his discovery? In six reigns, comprising about 140 years, the aggregate number is 319 of his own telling, and this includes the reign of Henry VIII. I suppose, but misnamed VII. who was a Papist, and therefore inadmissible, and the turbulent period of Charles and Cromwell. This certainly is no great number for the period, though more by the whole than can be defended; yet by comparison it may be asked, what are these among so many, as the Roman calendar of murders presents to our view?

While we reprobate these cruelties, we declare them repugnant to religion, and to the principles of Protestantism; but we cannot say so of the persecutions of Rome, or that they are reprobated, but they are of its very essence, and are virtually continued to this day, in their periodical anathemas, and their oaths for the extirpation of heretics. The history of Popery in its doctrines, declarations, decrees, oaths, and continued practice, clearly proves that persecution is inseparable from its nature, and the deliberate judicial character of its persecutions, fixes upon it the infamy it has acquired; an infamy which the oratorical extenuations, recriminations, and perverted reasoning of the Reverend Gentleman, will not be able to efface. Of Henry,

whether VII. or VIII. the allegation is not appropriate, as in either case Popery was prevalent, and to this religion it must be attributed. We therefore deduct his 58 of this period, and of course reduce his number to 260. Of Elizabeth's reign, I see he takes the Popish Bishop Milner for his guide, and makes her martyrs 204. This is totally untrue; and though he may reject the plea, there can be no doubt in a really reflecting mind, that these deaths were not inflicted for religion, but for treason; and that even here not so many by a great deal as he and his friend Milner would persuade the world.—If, as he recommends to “No Popery” men, he had consulted *proper* authorities before he wrote his Letter, and “informed himself of the rudiments of the question,” he would not have committed these blunders. Sir Edward Coke, attorney-general to James I. has told us that in the reign of Elizabeth, there were executed for TREASONABLE PRACTICES, about thirty priests, and for religion, NOT ONE.

When it is considered that Elizabeth was cursed and excommunicated by four successive Popes, and her subjects absolved from their allegiance, and that to the priests in her dominions, or sent there for the purpose, was committed the execution of these Papal mandates, we plainly see why they were proceeded against and punished, and that it was the treasonable plots of Popes and Jesuits which brought down the vengeance of Government against the comparative few that suffered. He does not bring Mary forward, which as an impartial man he ought to have done, because he knew the case would make against him; for in that short reign of five years, near three hundred were burned or otherwise perished, which is more than even he has assigned to the long reign of Elizabeth. As to those who were put to death in this latter reign, they were no more

executed for their religion, except as religion was the vehicle of their crimes, than the Cato-street conspirators; but the sufferers under Mary, were punished for Protestant heresy, and by the death of the heretic, namely, burning. This it is in vain to deny, and I wish Gentlemen would inform themselves better, before they write their Popery, or no Protestant Letters. It may indeed seem strange, and the ingenious Sydney may turn it into ridicule, that in the reign of Elizabeth, a law was passed making it treason to introduce or receive into the kingdom, Agnus Dei's, crosses, or pictures, blessed by the Pope. But however loud our Rector may laugh, and there are few perhaps that would not laugh at such foolery, all wonder as well as laughter will cease, when it is known that through them were committed various acts of treason for compassing the death of the Queen, and subverting the Protestant religion. Gregory XIII. for instance, sent to Sir Thomas Stakeley, certain crucifixes, in 1578, granting fifty days of indulgence to any one who should pray before one of them, *for the reducing the realm of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the extirpation of heresy, of which Elizabeth was head.* The expulsion of Jesuits and seminary Priests from the kingdom, and their punishment when discovered, is also accounted for, as well from this, as from the circumstance of foreign colleges sending over jesuitical missionaries, with the avowed object of re-establishing Popery, overturning the Government, and murdering the Queen. Nothing more can be necessary to acquit Elizabeth of the charge of religious persecution. The deaths of this description in her reign, I fearlessly affirm, were political and not religious, nay, for the most direct treason, and his insinuations to the contrary are worse a great deal than childish and uncandid.

He speaks of twenty-six as put to death in the reign of James I. at which we need not wonder, nor hesitate to pronounce their acts treasonable, when we know that he was deposed by Clement VIII. ; that the oath of allegiance which he himself had drawn up, was written against by the Papists, and declared null and void ; and that among other conspiracies in his reign, is to be numbered that pre-eminently hellish contrivance of blowing up the Parliament with gunpowder, and since then commemorated on the 5th of November. The deposition of Charles I. by Urban VIII. and the consequent acts of treason and rebellion in Ireland, account for the executions of that reign, and for their power being broken in pieces under the iron hand of Cromwell. I notice not his eight deaths in the reign of the semi-Popish Charles II. ; but against his two or three hundred at most, the very great majority of which were for treason and not religion, I proceed to record the thousands and millions which Popery has murdered, entirely for their religion :—

Of the Albigenses and Waldenses	1,000,000
In the Low Countries, by the Duke of Alva	100,000
* Massacre of St. Bartholomew, in Paris ..	10,500
In the Provinces at the same time	90,000
In 1641, in Ireland	140,000
	<hr/>
	1,340,500

On the revocation of the edict of Nantz, I cannot ascertain the numbers that were put to death purely for the religion of Protestants, but I know that innumerable multitudes were harassed in all manner of ways, and put to death by the most cruel and ignominious methods men or devils could invent ; and eight hundred thousand persons (Vol-

* When news of this massacre arrived at Rome, Te Deum was sung and public thanks given by the Pope, who ordered that a Jubilee should be observed throughout Christendom.

taire says five hundred thousand) left the kingdom, and fled wherever they could escape the safest and most expeditiously." Of those who have been put to death by the Inquisition in Spain or in the Indies, and by other methods in different parts of the world, I have no numeration : that they are immense, there is no doubt, and upon the whole it has been affirmed, with what accuracy I pretend not to say, that the Church of Rome has, at different periods, murdered, in various ways, FIFTY MILLIONS OF PROTESTANTS ; and that according to St. John, *in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.* But I have done with the sickening list, and how scanty is our Letter writer's detail, when compared with the thousands and millions above mentioned ! How flat is his memoir, though decorated by his misplaced wit and his abortive eloquence, aided by a malevolence of invention and the most disgusting meretricity of delineation.

Mere historical recollections, he says, are miserable reasons ; and yet he has made his little contemptible collection, and exhibited it to the world as a glaring bauble, which is to obscure the light, and even obliterate all recollection of Papal usurpations, wars, persecutions, and murders. Had our author *endeavoured to reflect*, and inform himself better on this part of his subject, and had he laid aside a little of his quicksilver, he might possibly have been ashamed of the part he has taken, and the things he has uttered. He would not have raked together his paltry little group of two or three hundred put to death by Protestants, a circumstance which we lament. Had he first contemplated the millions of victims to the cruelties of Rome, which no Papists lament, but which some affect to deny, he would not have framed, as insidiously as a Jesuit,

what he calls the code of persecution ; had he known, or regarded with proper feeling, the causes and the absolute necessity of the penal laws upon our statute book, repealed or not repealed ; had he judged of these causes with the intelligence of a statesman, the sensibility of a Protestant, or the urbanity of a gentleman,—he would not have pronounced the plea of policy for these punishments or privations, *childish and uncandid*, nor thrown out that egregiously false and wicked insinuation, that these penalties were enacted, or in any form are wished to be continued, *merely because the Roman Catholics worship God in the way they think best*. This is so entirely false, as to excite surprise at the hardihood of the declaration, and the grossness of the remark is neutralized by their free and full toleration.

Had he understood the rudiments of the question, and not rushed into it with thoughtless temerity, but decided with the prudence and impartiality of a liberal mind, he would not have uncandidly magnified faults which might be chargeable upon Protestants, and courteously extenuated those flagrant ones which attach to Popery. Had he endeavoured to reflect, and properly consider the matter, he would have discovered that whatever has been committed by Protestants is not the result of their religious principles, but that the cruelties of the Papists are inherent in their religion, and as naturally flow from it as streams from a fountain. Had he looked into the page of prophecy, a species of study he may possibly deride, he might have descried Popery in the mirror, and been afraid of raising his voice or handling his pen in its defence, and especially of giving it a character opposed to the word of God, and the experience of every age. Had he looked impartially into history, the interpreter of prophecy, he would have noted

its pages stained with the blood of a world, shed by Popish persecution, and every land soaked with Protestant gore. Had he done all this as he ought, he would not have acted or expressed himself as he has, nor as a Patriot and Priest of the Reformed Church of England, have thrust himself before the publick as the avowed apologist, or rather advocate of the faith and practice of the Church of Rome. This is indeed Scandalum Magnatum in itself, and the manner in which the service has been performed, superlatively enhances the disgrace.

But it is time to have done with the review of a Letter, which has already perhaps extended too far. To take some notice of such a production seemed indispensable, and to say less was unavoidable. The tone of confidence assumed by the writer, is here meant to impress the Electors with an idea that he is the grand depository and arbiter of truth, and that wisdom dwells with him. But there is no proof, from the review we have taken, that he possesses either the one or the other. Whatever else we may find, there is very much to disgust the true Protestant, and mislead the unwary, and there is not a little which must be extremely offensive to the Papist, especially his simile of the swine, which, independent of its vulgarity, may be taken up at an election as a party name, and become even more annoying than the "No Popery" cry.—And besides all this, the intelligent reader will presently see that the Letter is mere verbosity, without any thing like sound argument or correct information, that it is thrown together in a way which is calculate to surprise and confound, rather than convince, and that the main object seems to be to raise a laugh against both parties. The discovery of this, must inevitably bring the Letter into merited contempt with all sides, and degrade the author from his assumed office of Guide to Electors on

the Roman Catholic question. Indeed he is most unsafe on every point, whether we consider his materials, or the use he has made of them in the construction of his Letter. His information is defective and his statements erroneous not being *the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.*

But as it may be read, and attract notice from the merry mood in which the author is always found. I warn Electors not to allow any prejudice on this important question to creep in upon their minds, through the medium of a witticism, nor to permit themselves to think at all more slightly of the dangers and mischiefs of Popery than their ancestors, or than they themselves have been accustomed to think. Popery has persecution on its banner, and death incorporated in its system, as when Mary burned, Louis dragooned, or the Inquisition tortured. It is unchanged and unchangeable upon its own principles, and upon the testimony of all its writers, and consequently as ready now as it ever has been, to unite persecution with acquired power, and to realise that extirpation of heretics, which the spiritual guides of Rome swear to effect with all their might. If there be no systematic persecution, it is because they cannot practice their own principles; though in Ireland there are some strong proofs of hostility, *in maimed cattle, fired ricks, threatening letters, plundered houses, and murdered inhabitants.* But they act generally upon the policy of Bellarmine; *Heretics, says he, are not to be attacked when they are the strongest. When they are strong they are to be committed to God, when weak to the executioner.* This is Popery in few words, and answers all the declamatory fudge of forty three pages, which our Rector has bestowed upon the Electors; and tells you why you are not burned, or dragooned, or tortured, and it tells you not only that they

would if they could, an idea which our Letter writer laughs at without just cause, but that they must do it when they are able, they *must commit the weak to the executioner*, that is, in plain English, execute the Protestant when he is weak and cannot resist them.

ELECTORS OF YORKSHIRE, here is a plain case. If you would escape and be free, let those men have your votes who will oppose the claims of the Roman Catholics; and if you would have no intolerance, oppose with all your might Popish Ascendency; for by this means alone, can you hope to preserve in undiminished lustre, the glorious light of Protestantism in **PROTESTANT BRITAIN.**

THE END.

H. Bellerby, Printer, York.



